

(4) In the case of Montreal-Ste-Marie, not only has the Commission totally disregarded the representations made during the public hearing held in Montreal on August 31, 1965, but it has also ignored the written representations forwarded afterwards to the Chairman of the Commission, responsible for the Province of Quebec, and which confirmed the objections raised during that hearing. In so doing, the Commission has brought isolation to a rather large sector of the population of that county. In this specific case, the Commissioners as a whole have truly shown that they did not know anything about the geographical realities of an important sector of the county of Montreal. They have, furthermore, in the revised map which they tabled in the House, aggravated the illogical situation which they had previously created in their preliminary report. The Commission should not have divided into sections the former county of St. Mary by an imaginary boundary, while a railway track served the purpose of a natural boundary for the eastern boundary of that county.

The Commission did not know and obviously still does not know that a block of houses is hemmed in between the boundaries it has proposed and the new county of Hochelaga by a railway track, a viaduct and playgrounds, which keep this portion of the population at a distance of about three quarters of a mile from the county to which it is supposed to belong. The Commission acted while being unacquainted with the facts and the geographical and physical situation, contrary to section 13 of the Act, in particular to paragraph 3 (sub-paragraph i). In addition, the Commission did not take into account the population increase anticipated for that county, since the Habitat 67 project to be erected on the Expo site is included within the boundaries proposed for the riding of St. Mary and will result in an increase of 2,000 inhabitants in that county, without mentioning the difficulties in communication which will be created when one thinks that this part will be more easily accessible by the southern shore of the St. Lawrence River or by the MacKay pier, situated in the western part of the City of Montreal.

Furthermore, the Commission has reconnected in the map proposed the part of the Lafontaine Park, which should have been kept in the riding of Lafontaine for obvious historical reasons. By extending the new boundaries of the riding of St. Mary towards the North, the Commission has obviously shown its ignorance of the practical and geographical aspects of that zone.

The Commission should revise the proposed boundaries and replace them as follows: the riding of Montreal-Ste-Marie would be bounded on the south by the north shore of the St. Lawrence River, on the east by the railway track of Canadian Pacific Railways, on the north by Rachel Street up to Papineau, and on the west by Papineau Street towards the south up to Sherbrooke, then towards the west on Sherbrooke up to Amherst and towards the south up to the St. Lawrence River.

Made in Ottawa, February 17, 1966.

SIGNATURE OF MEMBERS:

C. Vincent (Nicolet-Yamaska)
 R.-E. Régimbal (Argenteuil-Deux-
 Montagnes)
 J.-A. Mongrain (Trois-Rivières)
 M. Allard (Sherbrooke)
 G. Grégoire (Lapointe)
 C.-A. Gauthier (Roberval)

G. Laprise (Chapleau)
 R. Langlois (Mégantic)
 M. Asselin (Charlevoix)
 P. Beaulieu (Saint-Jean-Iberville-
 Napierville)
 G. Valade (Sainte-Marie)