

Criminal Code

north are indicating that we are still awaiting the implementation of these recommendations. For example, I do not think that the second magistrate for the Northwest Territories has been appointed, which was one of the recommendations. I do not believe that counsel is now being provided for indigent native peoples in the north, certainly not in the Yukon, and this was another recommendation. I do not want to go down the whole list and embarrass the minister.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Is the hon. member aware that of 74 recommendations about 65 have been implemented.

Mr. Nielsen: All I have here is a summary of 11 recommendations, the central, really important ones, and we are still waiting for their implementation. However, I will leave them with the minister and perhaps he will make some inquiries. I think he will find that at least on this occasion I am semi-accurate.

Now, about this just society. At the same time that the government is trying to create this society the ordinary Canadian, having had his right to possess arms seriously curtailed, will have no defence against the creatures of this new enlightenment if they should happen to invade his privacy. There are in Canada serious problems of reform, both economic and constitutional. These fire-arm provisions, which require that a person must have a permit signed either by the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. or somebody delegated by him, cause me to wonder what the Eskimos in our isolated communities in the high north are going to do when they are required to travel several hundred miles to the nearest R.C.M.P. post to apply for a permit to carry a rifle so they can shoot their food. These provisions will be pretty difficult to implement in circumstances such as these.

Parliament must come to grips with the problems that arouse the conscience of Canadians. One of the more serious of those problems affects the living conditions of our Indian and Eskimo people in the north, indeed our Indians throughout Canada. Whether or not we agree with the approach proposed by the Minister of Justice it is in his favour—and I say this frankly—that he has at least attempted to deal with basic social problems. In so doing, of course, we cannot accept solutions which affront the conscience of a majority of our citizens. We have just heard from one member on the minister's side of the house, and there must be others who have similar remarks to make.

[Mr. Nielsen.]

By the government having adopted the course it has adopted and forcing us to vote on this omnibus bill, members opposite as well as on this side of the house are placed in the position that they must vote for something this is repugnant to them.

Mr. Flemming: Or against it.

Mr. Nielsen: For example, they may not believe in abortion. Or, as my hon. friend says, they must vote against the measure. This is an extremely untenable position in which to put any member. Any member on the other side of the house who has the intestinal fortitude of the hon. member who preceded me will rise and declare that he is not going to be forced into the position of voting for this bill—after all we are debating the principle which includes all of the bill—because it includes something that he does not believe in, namely, abortion. I wonder how many of these members are going to be absent or behind the curtain when the vote comes.

Mr. Gray: Where will you be?

Mr. Nielsen: I may not be here. I may be at home attending an examination for discovery in proceedings that have been brought against me by the Liberal Association. I am likely to be absent from time to time by compulsion. I do not object to that, but if I am able to be here I am going to vote against the bill. Although I adopt 80 per cent of its provisions, I do not adopt the abortion provisions. It seems to me that the government is being entirely inconsistent. It abolishes capital punishment. We must not kill. But the government is going to kill human beings unborn. I suggest it is adopting an entirely inconsistent position.

I am speaking about the majority. It seems to me that somebody must speak on behalf of the majority. The great silent majority remains voiceless. The government has spent too much time, in my view, in a dilatory pursuit of marginal problems. That statement is not meant to be partisan but factual. It is perhaps a temptation to any government to pursue that which is remunerative in terms of headlines rather than those sober but necessary solutions that the times require.

We can no longer, for instance, put off remedial action to deal with the problems that face not only eastern agriculture but those which gave rise to the long debate last Wednesday evening. We must give serious consideration to the problems of education in