

bread or to pick up some milk or go to the post office, but there has already been one knifing incident.

Also in that speech I added:

I would like to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that we are not dealing with the age old problem here of street prostitution . . . we are dealing with the problem of prostitution on people's lawns, by their paper boxes, right in front of their grocery stores, in their churches and in their daycare centres. It is an infestation of a quiet and beautiful neighbourhood.

I made those comments with regard to Vancouver Centre, my riding, but the very same comments can be made right now with regard to Vancouver East, as the Hon. Member indicated. It is another historic neighbourhood, another family neighbourhood, which is being subjected to this blight.

I talked with some of the residents of Mount Pleasant last week and went through some areas in the Vancouver East Riding. I found that the same churches, the same lawns and the same beautiful homes were now afflicted. It is too bad the Hon. Member for Vancouver East could not have supported me in my efforts four years ago to have this problem corrected and that now that it is in her riding she recognizes the problem. When it was in my riding, she ignored it. In the meantime there have been four years of problems in neighbourhoods, a deterioration of neighbourhoods, harassment of ordinary citizens and corruption of juveniles in the four years of delay and procrastination before the Bill was brought before the House for second reading. I urge Opposition Members not to delay unduly this Bill, as they know the injunction which applies in British Columbia could be challenged in October. As they also know, there have already been instances of violence in other ridings. No matter what qualifications the Opposition Members may have about the Bill, we share a common desire to avoid the vigilante type of action which is surfacing in the Vancouver area and in other centres across the country.

I want to review some of the history of this measure and the role which my own constituents played in getting us to this stage, because the Conservative Party has been the only Party which has consistently dealt with the issue of street soliciting in a way that enhances families and neighbourhoods. We have consistently advanced the argument, since I entered the House in 1980, that the preservation of neighbourhoods and the preservation of families require that steps be taken to deal with soliciting. I would like to review some of the steps which got us here today. In Vancouver Centre I first became concerned about this issue in 1979 where, with the help of Denny Boyd of the *Vancouver Sun*, I participated in a well televised and well covered walk through some of the areas of my riding. It was the first time that attention had been focused on what happens to a neighbourhood, a family residential area, when it is invaded by this kind of blight. I can still remember the shock of the people who were with me when they saw little children on the streets soliciting, when they saw young women on the streets soliciting, and when they saw what was happening in terms of the noise and degradation of neighbourhoods. It was the first time that people realized that what happened in Vancouver Centre could and subsequently did happen in other centres across Canada.

Criminal Code

In early 1982 I tackled the then Liberal Minister of Justice on the issue. We had just repatriated the Constitution; we just had the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. In response to my continual raising of the issue of what good was the Charter of Rights if residents could not go to church without being hassled by hookers, he finally referred it to the Justice Committee of the House of Commons. About the same time a group was formed in my riding to which I give a lot of credit, the Concerned Residents of the West End, with people like Gordon Price and Jerry Stafford who got together to see what they could do to support myself as their Member of Parliament and other MPs in getting the changes through the House. They lobbied right across Canada and helped form other groups in other cities to focus attention on this issue. This is one of those issues which, if it does not occur in one's own neighbourhood, one tends to ignore it but when it does occur in one's own neighbourhood, one becomes very concerned by what can happen to friends, families and home life.

• (1610)

In 1982, the Justice Committee which, on our side of the table, was spearheaded by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Hnatyshyn), heard representations from all across the country. Again, since it is now three years later, I would like to read into the record the organizations from which we heard before making our recommendations.

We heard from witnesses who came to Ottawa to appear before us representing the Concerned Residents of the West End; the West End Hotel Association; the West End Businessmen's Association; the Mayor of Vancouver, Mike Harcourt; Gordon Neighbourhood House which is in my riding and deals with the issue of juvenile prostitutes; the National Association of Women and the Law; the Elizabeth Fry Society of Toronto; the Canadian Association of Chiefs of Police; the Vancouver Coalition for a Non-Sexist Criminal Code; the National Action Committee of The Status of Women; the Mayor of Niagara Falls; the Mayor of Calgary; the Metropolitan Toronto Board of Commissioners of Police; the Justice Department; Priscilla Platt, a barrister from Toronto; Professor Gerald Beaudoin of the University of Ottawa; and the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies. I have read that list into the record because I want to make the point that in 1982, we were already getting substantial input from citizens across the country regarding this issue. What is now before us is a Bill which can deal with the matter and which should not be unduly delayed.

The results of the Justice Committee hearings were very similar to the legislation that is now before the House. The proposed amendment of the Justice Committee, and all-Party committee, contained in its majority report, dealt with the issue of soliciting for the purposes of prostitution and suggested that it should be banned in public places or any place open to public view including vehicles on the street or in driveways. That was important because today, as then, soliciting does not only take place on the street, it takes place in back lanes, churchyards, shopping plazas and apartment foyers of affected neighbourhoods. The present law does not address this prob-