

—and that the minimum requirement is to have it narrowed right down to seniority and incentive which are the only factors we find reasonable or acceptable.

There are many lawyers I respect. Before I go on to the next part of my speech, I should like to tell the House that the greatest lawyer in this country is going to be in town today, a friend of mine, Mr. Justice George Law Murray. He is not sure if he taught me the law, or I taught him; but he is in town today. I also respect very much the members of the justice committee, with whom I have worked very closely, such as the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams), the hon. member for Fundy-Royal (Mr. Fairweather), the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin), the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan), the hon. member for Lafontaine-Rosemont (Mr. Lachance), the hon. member for Toronto-Lakeshore (Mr. Robinson), the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Marceau); and if I have missed anyone who is a lawyer, I apologize. I say this because of what I have to say next.

I have had a long career in the courts, probably handling more cases as a journalist—sometimes five or six a day—than most lawyers handle in a lifetime. But I have also seen the manipulations of lawyers, the cruelty they inflict and the games they play because they know the law. Even if they do not know it, they still use their professional training to confuse and to deal rather ruthlessly and cynically with the average citizen.

I have personal experience of this. I like to be personal because the best proof I have is my own, and it is to be found in the area of the hon. member for Edmonton West (Mr. Lambert) and the hon. member for Edmonton Centre (Mr. Paproski). My family has been manipulated out of an estate in Edmonton, and I am sure that every one of us who helped build that estate will spend the rest of our lives fighting the lawyers who know there is much in it for them. I refer to two Edmonton lawyers in private practice and a third lawyer in a trust company, and a so-called trust officer in the famous Canada Trust.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): Mind the libel.

Mrs. Holt: We know they have done this, but because we do not have unlimited money—we have hired lawyers, too—we cannot cope with the situation. This is the law in Canada, and it must be happening everywhere in the country because of the laws lawyers in the departments of government write, the laws carried through here by lawyers, and the laws which are administered and manipulated by lawyers in our society. The hon. member can watch the law of libel because he is a lawyer and can play with people's lives, threatening libel. I resent very much what has happened to my family and to untold others at the hands of lawyers in this land.

An hon. Member: The Minister of Justice is a lawyer, too.

Mrs. Holt: The Minister of Justice is a lawyer I happen to respect.

Mr. Lambert (Edmonton West): You must be sure that what you say is true.

Canadian Human Rights

Mrs. Holt: The hon. member does not like to have known what goes on in Edmonton, but the benchers there should start looking into their little household. Another behavioural pattern indigenous to lawyers is that they will not fight for a citizen if they endanger one of their brother's careers. That is happening in the hon. member's fair city. I suppose we could retain a lawyer there—and we finally did—one who was not afraid of the system. So doctors do that, too—protect their erring brothers. Some journalists do that, too. This happens daily throughout the nation because the law is written and administered by lawyers.

This bill has minimized the role of the lawyers. It is written in language understandable to the ordinary citizen, and the tribunal which is to be appointed is non-legal. I was originally very concerned about the amendment having to do with appeals moved by the hon. member for Calgary North. I had to decide what was best, a legal tribunal or a three-person, non-legal tribunal. I made the decision that I would feel safer with the human rights bill under a non-legal tribunal, and I voted against that amendment.

● (1600)

An hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Holt: Do not feel badly.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Turner): Order, please. The hon. member for Vancouver-Kingsway (Mrs. Holt) has the floor, and I suggest we listen.

Mrs. Holt: I am also concerned about another exception, and that is clause 63(2) of this bill which reads as follows:

Nothing in this act affects any provision of the Indian Act or any provision made under or pursuant to that act.

In committee I voted for the deletion of this subclause, on the motion of the hon. member for Fundy-Royal. I feel very strongly that the Indian Act is extremely discriminatory legislation. It is probably the most discriminatory legislation in the statutes of this country. It has a unique basis of discrimination in that it discriminates on the basis of blood. There is also blatant cruelty to women. In this respect, the discrimination is based on the choice of marriage partner, and this is only directed toward women. This continues, despite the concern of the whole nation—which members on the other side have heard—in regard to that legislation and the injustice it imposes.

It exemplifies the worst inverse discrimination by selecting a small group of people for special favours. It builds what I guess could be a billion dollar establishment around this small group, with a budget which runs around \$24 million this year for special privileges which no other Canadians have—no, not even all native people, not all native women, not all who have partial Indian blood, and not the remnants of the Indian nations wiped out by other Indian nations.

I hope the Minister of Justice and the government of Canada will look into cleaning up this act or abolishing it. Rather than bringing peace, comfort and freedom to these