2. Some municipalities which have been attached to the constituencies of Joliette, Trois-Rivières and Saint-Maurice, should, for geographic and economic reasons, be attached to the constituency of Berthier-Maskinongé.

3. Some municipalities which have been attached to the constituency of Berthier-Maskinongé should, for geographic consideration, belong to some adjacent constituencies.

4. And such other objections that the undersigned Members may consider applicable in order to carry out the spirit and terms and conditions of the Act in question.

Signatures of Members:

A. Yanakis (Berthier-Maskinongé)
G. Laniel (Beauharnois-Salaberry)
J. P. Guay (St. Boniface)
J.-J. Blais (Nipissing)
J. Campbell (LaSalle-Émard-Côte Saint-Paul)
M. Dupras (Labelle)
J. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques)
S. Joyal (Maisonneuve-Rosemont)
P. De Bané (Matane)
B. Loiselle (Chambly)
C. Lapointe (Charlevoix)

The following Objection to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Nova Scotia, filed with Mr. Speaker on Tuesday, February 24, 1976, was again considered:

That, pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Act (Chapter E-2, R.S.C., 1970), consideration be given by this House to the matter of an objection to the provisions of the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Nova Scotia, laid before this House by Mr. Speaker on Monday, January 26, 1976, on the grounds set forth hereinafter:

1. The Commission failed to give and pay proper attention to the physical, social or economic cohesion in many of the new electoral districts created and appeared to ignore and did ignore the question of unity or community of interest and thereby rendering more difficult adequate representation of the people in Parliament.

2. The Commission failed to retain historic and traditional names in some of the proposed changes.

3. And such other objections that the undersigned Members may consider applicable in order to carry out the spirit and terms and conditions of the Act in question.

Signature of Members:

P. Nowlan (Annapolis Valley)
W. Dinsdale (Brandon-Souris)
W. Baker (Grenville-Carleton)
M. Lambert (Edmonton West)
E. MacKay (Central Nova)
Wm. D. Knowles (Norfolk-Haldimand)
G. Fairweather (Fundy-Royal)
J.A. MacLean (Malpeque)
J. Balfour (Regina East)
D. Whiteway (Selkirk)

The following Objection to the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Alberta, filed with Mr. Speaker on Wednesday, March 3, 1976, was again considered:

That, pursuant to Section 20 of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act (Chapter E-2, R.S.C., 1970), consideration be given by this House to the matter of an objection to the provisions of the Report of the Electoral Boundaries Commission for the Province of Alberta, laid before this House by Mr. Speaker on February 18, 1976, on the grounds set forth hereinafter:

1. In some areas of Alberta, the Commission failed to give special emphasis to geographical considerations, the sparsity and density of the population, and ignored or overlooked the special problems of communication and transportation when the Commission divided the said province into twenty-one (21) new electoral districts.

2. In certain areas of Alberta, the Commission failed to give special consideration and special appreciation to accessibility of one region to another region in many of the rural electoral districts when determining the boundaries of the same.

3. The Commission failed to give and pay proper attention to the physical, social or economic cohesion in many of the new electoral districts created, and appeared to ignore and did ignore the question of unity or community of interest and thereby rendering adequate representation of the people in Parliament a virtually impossible task.

4. The Commission erred by failing to apply, for maximum benefit, the terms and conditions of Section 13(i) and (ii) of the Electoral Boundaries Readjustment Act.

5. The Commission has failed to take into consideration the size of some of the rural constituencies it has created, and the difficulty involved in representing an area that large. Although Alberta's representation has increased from nineteen (19) to twenty-one (21), three go to Edmonton and Calgary, so rural Alberta loses one seat.

6. The Commission has failed to either give any reasons or in other instances adequate detail of reasons for proposed changes in constituency boundaries or the elimination of constituencies as such.

7. The Commission has not established the rationale of the decision to limit the urban city ridings at the boundary limits of the cities of Edmonton and Calgary so as to eliminate a possible urban domination of the adjacent rural populations and then immediately reversed itself in its designation of adjacent constituencies where the rural populations are entirely dominated by those of suburban communities whose demographic interests are wholly urban-oriented.

8. The Commission has failed to take into account the fact that the Metro Edmonton population substantially exceeds that of Calgary yet its proposals accord an equal number of constituencies to both Metro City areas.

9. And such other objections that the undersigned Members may consider applicable in order to carry out the spirit and terms and conditions of the Act in question.

Signatures of Members:

S. Schellenberger (Wetaskiwin)
D. Roche (Edmonton-Strathcona)