

quirements of the Verdun deficit and indeed 65% in excess of Westmount's own requirements, the Report which was ultimately to be confirmed by legislation would never have been made.

Is there nothing that can be done to remedy this outrageous condition? The Protestant citizens of Verdun claim that directly and indirectly they pay sufficient taxes to meet all their School requirements, but the tax finds its way into other channels because of the present method of raising taxes on the ownership of residential property and not as it should be, on the occupancy of the property.

If the citizens of the City of Westmount were delinquent in providing School education for their own district and consequently were niggardly in taxing their own people it might possibly be contended that they should be made to suffer by reason of their parsimony but when we know the situation is entirely the reverse, then the question arises why should a relatively small municipality like Westmount be forced by legislation to assume practically the whole of the deficits of other School Municipalities while the City of Montreal with its large contributions from the Neutral tax should assume only \$87,000.?

Now that we have had three years of operation under the objectionable legislation, and the result is in evidence showing that an intolerable injustice is being committed against a single group of citizens, is it too much to expect that the Powers that be at Quebec and the members of the Special Committee will immediately endeavour to bring about a rearrangement of the apportioning of the ever-increasing Verdun School deficit, which will not put the whole burden on the shoulders of one small group of tax payers who have had no more to do with creating the Verdun deficit than have the citizens of the City of Quebec.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) F. W. Sharp

FWS:P