

producers unless we start implementing programs and facilities that will be of benefit to the producer.

We have had dealings with reciprocal arrangements between the CPR and the CNR in my constituency. In Red Deer, the train must cross a river. The CNR eventually got permission from the CPR to use the bridge belonging to the CPR. It can be done if it has to be done. This is why the amendment moved by my colleague, the Hon. Member for Vegreville, is of basic importance. It will mean that this will have to be done, and the railways can do it.

I do not know whether you recognize it, Mr. Speaker, but it is ridiculous for the CNR to pull a trainload of grain into the port facility at Vancouver and then have to unhook its locomotives and put CPR locomotives on to pull the grain train in and unload it because it is on CPR tracks. I know, Mr. Speaker, that you are amazed by that and I trust that, with any influence you may have on Members opposite, you will help to ensure that they become cognizant of what is happening.

An Hon. Member: Somebody has to have control.

Mr. Towers: No problem. Somebody has to get control, and we are asking the Government to move one step at a time. The Chairman of the Transport Committee can blame the railway brotherhood or whoever he likes, but I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it is the farmers who have to pay the price if the provisions of this Bill are implemented. There is provision in the Bill for the cost of moving grain to increase five times by 1989-1990. This is totally unacceptable to western Canadians and to those of us who represent those grain producers in western Canada.

Further to that, there are extra costs involved in uni-transportation. That occurs when a railway has a monopoly over a certain area and can do whatever it likes. It can move the grain whenever it likes. As I said earlier, wherever competition exists, there will be better service.

Mr. McKnight: What about the cost-plus system?

Mr. Towers: As my colleague, the Hon. Member for Kindersley-Lloydminster (Mr. McKnight) has said, with the cost-plus system the railways absolutely cannot lose. This is one of the deficiencies in this Bill.

I must tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the general mistrust felt by grain producers in western Canada is certainly surfacing at this time. They are angry at the CPR because of what it did through Marathon Realty. They are angry about what happened with Pan-Canadian, and they are really angry about what will happen to them in the years ahead.

Mr. McKnight: They are not happy with the Government.

Mr. Towers: I suppose that is right. They are not happy with the Government. They are angry about that as well. I presume, Mr. Speaker, that the next election will prove that.

I do hope that Members opposite will think about this overnight and accept it. I realize that it is close to adjournment time but I do trust that the Members opposite will think about

Adjournment Debate

this amendment and what it will do. Thinking about it will take no skin off the noses of any of the Liberal Members in western Canada even though their skin is pretty thin and they do not have too much of it. If they would just take cognizance of this amendment, accept it in their policies and draft it into the legislation, then we will certainly move in the right direction.

May I call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker?

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 45 deemed to have been moved.

CANADIAN RADIO-TELEVISION AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION—RESPONSIBILITY TO DEAL WITH TELEVISED PORNOGRAPHY. (B) INQUIRY RESPECTING PENALTIES

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, I have been raising the issue of pornography in broadcasting since last January and the first response of the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) to questions asked of him was relatively favourable. He did express some concern, and also expressed confidence that the CRTC would act. We know that the CRTC has failed to act; it has not amended its own broadcasting regulations to deal with the pornography question. It has not been tough in private with broadcasters and it has basically admitted that it made a mistake in licensing Pay-television. Then, it said to the women of Canada, "Tough luck! You can wait until the licence renewal time is up." That is roughly five years hence, Mr. Speaker. The CRTC failed to act in spite of the fact that the Broadcasting Act was very clear and that the powers given to it are enormous.

● (1800)

The only light at the end of the tunnel as far as the CRTC is concerned, is the recent decision it gave to a complaint from Media Watch. At last the CRTC has shown that it understands the problem of pornography and is able to distinguish between a discussion of violence against men and women as a question of freedom of expression and the advocacy of violence against women directly, which we have in pornography. The CRTC still did not offer any remedy, however.

The Minister of Communications next offered an excuse for not acting by suggesting that men or women who complained about pornography could lay complaints with the police under the obscenity provisions of the Criminal Code, and go to court. Of course, everyone should go to the police, insofar as they can, with obscenity complaints. There are some loopholes in the existing legislation, however. Some instances of pornography—even extremely violent pornography—are not covered by