

made in this chamber last Thursday by the government and which we believe had been agreed to by the official opposition.

It is a question of referring the whole issue of solicitation to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs for consideration in conjunction with Bill C-53 which is presently before the committee. I understood that at that time we had the consent of the official opposition to this proposal. We did not obtain the consent of the third party in the House, but they have now had four days and they had requested a certain amount of time to consider it. I hope that we would have unanimous consent of the House at this time to proceed with this matter so that we can get on with the very important business of dealing with solicitation.

The motion, Madam Speaker, moves:

That it be an introduction to the Standing Committee on Justice and Legal Affairs that during its consideration of Bill C-53, it take into consideration all legal methods of dealing with street soliciting for the purpose of prostitution and including Sections 195.1 and 171 of the Criminal Code of Canada, as well as the various provincial and municipal laws presently in force in this regard, and include the hearing and consideration of the views of the interested persons and organizations.

Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby): Madam Speaker, I had given your Honour notice that I had intended to seek unanimous consent to move a motion very much in similar terms to those which have been discussed earlier.

Madam Speaker: We will deal with this motion first. We must deal with one motion at a time. Does the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Peterson) have the unanimous consent of the House to move this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Madam Speaker, I believe this motion is debatable. I would like to propose the following.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. It has not been proposed yet. It would be debatable after it has been proposed.

Mr. Peterson: Madam Speaker, I move the adoption by unanimous consent of the motion previously posed, without debate.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Madam Speaker, we are prepared to give that consent.

Mr. Robinson (Burnaby): Madam Speaker, certainly the motion is before the House and my understanding is that it is debatable pursuant to the rules. I wish to speak to it.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I understood the hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Peterson) to indicate very clearly that we were willing to move the motion and give it unanimous consent provided there is no debate. If there is debate, there is no consent.

Mr. Nielsen: Madam Speaker, surely the important matter is to get the issue properly before the Standing Committee. The government is prepared to do that in keeping with an undertaking given by the Minister of Justice, pursuant to the

Motions

repeated requests of the member for Vancouver Centre (Miss Carney) because of the pressing nature of the problem. Surely the New Democratic Party would be prepared to have that reference go to committee as quickly as possible. We are prepared to give unanimous consent to have that reference immediately so that that committee can commence work as quickly as possible on this very pressing subject.

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Madam Speaker, I want to draw to your attention that at the time the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Justice asked for unanimous consent to proceed with the motion, he made no reference to that unanimous consent being given subject to the matter being dealt with without debate. The record will clearly show that the only time that the parliamentary secretary mentioned "without debate" was after he had, in fact, moved the motion for the second time.

I want to make it clear that we want to deal with the matter and we want to refer a motion to the committee to deal with prostitution. However, we do not propose to have the matter shunted off without any consideration by the House of Commons. We therefore intend to debate it.

Mr. Pinard: Madam Speaker, I respect what my hon. friend said but it is clear that the intent in what was said, and the spirit of the whole discussion, was that this motion was to be put, provided there is no debate and there is unanimous consent. There being no unanimous consent, we cannot agree to the motion being discussed or put. It was a condition for moving the motion.

Mr. Nielsen: I believe the Chair may be now confronted with a problem. Of course, we have been willing to see the matter consented to without debate, but if I heard accurately, the motion was put and is now before the House. For the New Democratic Party to be denied the right to debate it now, it would mean that the motion had not been put at all. However, it was put and it is now before the House. I think the Chair may have a problem in that regard.

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, I want to join with the House leader for the official opposition in saying quite clearly that when unanimous consent was sought there was no indication that this would be dealt with without debate. The motion is now before the House. The only way in which it can be withdrawn would be with unanimous consent, which we are not prepared to give. We intend to debate it. The matter is now before the House and we ask you to proceed with that order.

[Translation]

Hon. Yvon Pinard (President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, you have not yet read the motion and consequently there is no problem. We shall not present the motion because there is no unanimous consent for a debate. I believe that solves the problem.