

Electoral Boundaries Commission

This is a federal responsibility and provincial officials should be left out of it. It opens the way for some criticism to be levelled at the members of our courts, and by insinuation and innuendo—I do not know two better words to express it—the adoption of this amendment reflects on the integrity of the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. It reflects on them because it is based on the fact that we do not trust them to fulfil properly their functions as officers of the house.

We already have sufficient criticism of this institution, and we should be on guard against helping to extend that criticism. I have been amazed with the stand taken by the two government frontbenchers, and it is apparent that the Minister of Transport is now very quiet, very reserved and has very little to say.

Mr. Knowles: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. More: Yes, certainly.

Mr. Knowles: My question is based on the concern of the hon. member for Regina City lest by asking the justices to make these appointments we are involving them in something that is political. How does he square that concern with his acceptance—and I accept it too—of the government's main proposal, namely that the chairman of each of these commissions shall be a judge, perhaps indeed the chief justice of the province, and that he shall be concerned with the actual drawing of the boundary lines?

Mr. More: I do not have any trouble at all in that regard. The mind of the judiciary to analyse and judge propositions is better than that of ordinary persons.

Mr. Knowles: Then does not the hon. member think the mind of a justice is capable of impartially picking people to do a fair job?

Mr. More: I do not suggest that is not so. I said "consciously and impartially to the best of their ability". I am talking about the judgment of the people of Canada.

Mr. Knowles: Now, no innuendo against the judges.

Mr. More: There is no innuendo at all, and I make that clear. What I am saying is that if a justice makes an appointment, and the actions of a commission of which his appointee is part are not acceptable to the people of any area, then they are going to point a finger at that justice. This is a [Mr. More.]

logical assumption. So far as the officers of the house are concerned they have a right to be subjected to such criticism if it is necessary, but I do not think it is right, fair or proper that the judges of our courts should be put in this position.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Winch: I understand you are talking it out until five o'clock?

Mr. Woolliams: I rise on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, since the hon. member says we are talking it out until five o'clock. We have just had a long subamendment presented by the Minister of Justice, but just because an arrangement or marriage has been made between the government party and the hon. member's party, there is no reason to point the finger at us.

The Chairman: The hon. member for Yukon has the floor and should not be interrupted.

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bow River took the words right out of my mouth. I was about to say we have witnessed a very curious but entertaining spectacle this afternoon when, having been pressed by the hon. member for Bow River, the Minister of Transport refused to confirm what he had led the house to believe on a previous occasion, when his words were recorded at page 741 of *Hansard*. But it seems he is somewhat smoked out now by the Minister of Justice, and perhaps this is the minister's way of getting back at the Minister of Transport for his lack of co-operation in assisting the government house leader in properly organizing the business of the house.

I think maybe the Minister of Transport has felt his nose is a little out of joint because of the new role of the junior Minister of Justice, and there is this constant play back and forth between them, with the Minister of Transport sitting back and smiling at the difficulties which the Minister of Justice often finds himself in. But he is in another difficulty now because he has presented the committee with a subamendment which, to use the words of the Minister of Transport when he quoted the house leader of the official opposition, is deserving of the most careful consideration by all members of the committee before we make any decision on this very important matter.

I was very interested in the remarks made by the hon. member for Vancouver Quadra and the hon. member for Vancouver-Burrard, both of whom had the courage to stand up and say they were opposed to the amendment