I expressed is a natural view for one who sits as the member of a smaller party. It is always hard for us to imagine what we in this party would be like if we were members of a larger party, or what the Minister of Transport would be like if his party became a splinter party. This may happen some day, of course. But I submit that we are presenting this proposition not because those of us down in this corner happen to be in parties which have no say in this matter. I submit we are presenting this as a matter of principle because we feel that the whole business of redistribution should be taken as far away from party politics as possible.

I was interested in the comments made by the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard. He does not like my amendment because he says we would be buying a pig in a poke. He does not like it because we would be abdicating our responsibilities. I ask him, what does the present bill do but just that? According to the terms of the bill, if my amendment is not accepted, we have not the slightest notion what persons are going to be chosen to fill these two positions. All we know is that the Leader of the Opposition will pick one of them—and I say to the hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings that he might pick a nurse, but what is wrong with a nurse?—and the Prime Minister will pick the other. Surely this is buying a pig in a poke and abdicating our responsibilities.

Mr. Woolliams: You have not much respect for one of the officers of the House of Commons if you believe that.

Mr. Knowles: Apparently my hon. friend, owing to the interesting conversation which he is having with his seatmate, has not heard what I said or what was said by the hon. member for Cariboo. May I say again that the issue is not the integrity of the Prime Minister or the Leader of the Opposition. As the Minister of Transport said, there is no question but that they would make choices which would seem to us to be appropriate choices. Our whole point is the image of this procedure in the eyes of the Canadian public. We feel that this image is not the non-partisan image it ought to be if two of the appointments are made by the leader of political parties.

The hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard wonders why in my amendment I have indicated the categories I have set out, and he had some derogatory remarks to make about provincial chief electoral officers, registrars of vital statistics and surveyors general. I suggest that these are people who are versed in the kind of information required for the drawing of the maps which will be needed for the job of redistribution. I suggest that an even stronger argument is that what we are drawing on is experience. The only experience we have had in Canada of boundaries being drawn by impartial commissions is in Manitoba, where that has been done for the entire province, and in Ontario where it has been done for part of the province. In both these cases the people appointed to do this work have been the very kind of people suggested in this amendment. In Manitoba we had the president of the university, the chief justice of the province and the chief electoral officer for Manitoba. In the case of Ontario, as already indicated by the Minister of Transport, they had the chief electoral officer, a judge of one of the high courts and a professor of one of the universities. Surely our experience in this field is a guide that people in these positions can do the job and can do it well.

The hon. member for Digby-Annapolis-Kings seems concerned about putting this kind of responsibility on the chief justice of a province. I find it very difficult to see how he can draw a line and say that it is wrong, that it is something the Minister of Justice should be concerned about when we ask the chief justice of a province to name three members of the commission. Then he says it is perfectly all right for the chief justice to name one of the members, and even to name himself. That is the way the present legislation reads, Mr. Chairman, and that is the way my amendment reads. I submit that if the task of picking the chairman of the commission for a province is a proper responsibility to lay on the chief justice of that province, it is likewise a proper responsibility to ask him to name the other two.

I suggest that this amendment meets the conditions laid down by the Minister of Transport on March 10 when he said that if anyone could come up with a formula which would provide for the appointment of these people on terms that could be set out in the act, such a formula should be considered. I confess that the night he posed the questions to me I found it difficult to answer them at that moment, but I submit that as a result of the discussions we have had since we have come up with a formula that does get away from the appearance of partisanship and does provide categories of people with experience. I submit this is the kind of thing we should do so that we will