

Criminal Code

believe contributed much to the debate this afternoon by adding some very new and very interesting points of view. Of course, we recognize that those comments came from someone who had worked as a social worker and has had to deal with this situation in a way that makes him far more knowledgeable about those issues than perhaps many other people would be.

We are dealing, of course, with a very serious problem and I know that the topic is not always dealt with by many people in the serious manner that it deserves. I suppose there are reasons for that. The stigma and so forth attached to the topic we are talking about today creates a situation whereby this happens.

● (1710)

The first thing we should recognize, the Minister himself recognized it today in his opening remarks, is that the problem has been with us since the beginning of time and since the beginnings of society. It is obvious that the problem, in the last 100 years and even more so in recent years, seems to be coming more and more evident. We are experiencing difficult economic times and street solicitation does augment income when people are out of work. Prostitution is a way of making a living, not perhaps an occupation that many of us agree with, but nevertheless it exists. Many do not want to do it for a living but have to because they are unable to do anything else. One must conclude, therefore, that unemployment is not a cause for prostitution to exist but is a reason for its increase, particularly in large metropolitan areas, that are suffering from the terrible effects of unemployment.

We must also recognize that the average salary paid to women is considerably less than that paid to men. We know that women make only 60 per cent of the salary of men. The present inequality is a contributing factor to this situation. We heard the Minister say that in his view if we get the prostitutes off the street, it will eliminate the pimps. At least, he said something to that effect. By the Minister's logic, if there were no prostitutes, there would be no pimps. If you follow that logic to the extreme you can also say that if there were no customers, there would be no need for prostitutes or pimps. I have not heard the Minister address himself to that issue. We have not heard the Minister address himself to any of the other issues involving prostitution, other than what he has chosen as the instrument to remove people from the street, which is to place this burden on the prostitute herself, as opposed to the customer and the pimps. Also absent from the Minister's remarks today, and not in the Government's intentions, at least at the present time, are ways to deal with the pimp or to stop them from doing what they are doing. There is nothing new and significant. There is nothing new to stop or to curtail the activities of the customers on the street, at least nothing major. Even more important, there are no measures for rehabilitation or measures to find employment or other ways in order to assist the prostitute herself or himself as the case may be.

We should all be very concerned as legislators about one aspect of prostitution, namely the age of prostitutes. You would have to be blind not to notice, when walking down the streets of any major city, how young they are. Statistics were

given in the House today about the increasing number of juveniles involved. Again, you will recognize, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment among juveniles is higher than in any other age group. We talked earlier about the salary of women being less than men as being a contributing factor to the problem. We can apply that circumstances to young men, and young women particularly, where changes for employment are even less because unemployment is extremely high. The problem is compounded with ever increasing numbers of young women involved in prostitution.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

POINT OF ORDER

TABLING OF NOTICE OF WAYS AND MEANS MOTION

Hon. Ray Hnatyshyn (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Hon. Member for disturbing his very interesting and germane remarks on this important legislation.

Before the end of the Government business, pursuant to Standing Order 65, I would like to table in both official languages a notice of Ways and Means motion to amend the statute law relating to income tax and to make a related amendment to the Tax Court of Canada Act. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you designate an order of the day for consideration of this Ways and Means motion.

Mr. Robinson: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order just to seek clarification. Is it in order to undertake an action of the nature of that undertaken by the President of the Privy Council on a point of order? Certainly if he sought unanimous consent of the House that would be one thing, but surely the nature of this type of motion is such that it cannot be undertaken on a point of order.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Standing Order 65(1)(2) indicates that the Government House Leader can do this at any time during a sitting. I, therefore, find it in order.

Mr. Robinson: But he did not have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): I presume the Hon. Member for Ottawa-Vanier (Mr. Gauthier) is also rising on a point of order?

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out to the Chair that this can be done at any time on the orders of the day. However, I think that it is unacceptable to interrupt a member on a point of order which is not a point of order to introduce or table in the House a ways and means motion. I would not want any precedent to be set. I merely want to