

The hon. member may have noticed that when some members use the name of the right hon. Prime Minister or another minister as an adjective, for instance in the case of the Trudeau era or the Trudeau administration, this is entirely acceptable. On the whole, hon. members do not make a habit of referring to other members or ministers by name, but in the very few instances that they do, and considering the time that goes into matters of this kind, I do not intervene if I feel that it was merely an oversight on the part of the hon. member. I cannot really interrupt proceedings every so often, if such infringements of the Standing Orders do not have quite extraordinary consequences for the proceedings of the House.

However, I have noted the hon. member's comments and I shall try to watch this aspect more closely. Sometimes my attention wanders, because I must also watch other members who wish to have the floor, and I do not always hear it when an hon. member happens to use the name of the Prime Minister or another member in the manner referred to by the hon. member.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT

PRESENTATION OF FOURTH REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE—REPORT OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE ON THE NORTHERN CANADA POWER COMMISSION

Mr. Keith Penner (Cochrane-Superior): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present the fourth report of the Standing Committee on Indian Affairs and Northern Development, in both official languages. This report represents the culmination of the work of the subcommittee on the Northern Canada Power Commission and is entitled, "Electrical Power North of 60°".

* * *

PETITION

MR. HEAP—TESTING OF CRUISE MISSILES ON CANADIAN SOIL

Mr. Dan Heap (Spadina): Madam Speaker, I have the honour to present a petition on behalf of citizens of the city of Toronto calling upon Parliament to request the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) to refuse to allow the testing of Cruise missiles on Canadian soil.

* * *

JUSTICE AND LEGAL AFFAIRS

PROPOSED REFERENCE TO STANDING COMMITTEE RESPECTING STREET SOLICITING FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROSTITUTION

Miss Pat Carney (Vancouver Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Simcoe North (Mr. Lewis):

Motions

That, with unanimous consent and without debate, it be an instruction 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—

Madam Speaker: Order, please. I am in a bit of difficulty because motions of this nature should be introduced by the government House leader; this kind of Government business should be introduced by the government. I could cite May and Beauchesne who stated very clearly that government House leaders must put all these matters to the House themselves and that government House leaders also move housekeeping motions, allot supply days and generally ensure that the House is kept busy. Of course, with unanimous consent this can be done in another manner, but it is usual for such a motion to be presented by the government.

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Normally that is the case, Madam Speaker. I am sure the Chair is aware that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Miss Carney) is trying to obtain unanimous consent of the House in order to put a motion which is precisely in the same words as the one the government has endeavoured to have the House accept on two occasions. On both occasions it was thwarted by members of the New Democratic Party.

I suggest that there is nothing wrong. Indeed, it is perfect keeping with our practices for any member on either side of the House to rise, seeking unanimous consent of the House on motions, to put a particular motion. Of course it is another matter if the House does not give consent. I am certain that the government and the Conservative opposition are prepared to give that kind of consent. It remains to be seen whether the motion is acceptable to the members of the New Democratic Party now after they had refused it twice before.

● (1510)

Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain): Madam Speaker, as I explained yesterday, we were quite prepared to give unanimous consent to have the motion moved. I do not believe there was ever any doubt in anyone's mind that not only were we prepared to give unanimous consent to allow the motion to be put, we did in fact give unanimous consent yesterday to allow the motion to be put. There was no attempt on our part to stop it.

However, I would like to make it quite clear that we are prepared to allow that motion to be put with unanimous consent subject to the withdrawal of that part which denies debate, there being no predisposition on the part of the House to deny an hon. member an opportunity to express his or her opinion on any motion put before the House.