

the real value suitable for their property, because they intend to sell, for example, or they work in town, or are too old, and wish to leave or sell their properties, or for a host of other reasons. For most of these owners the rate based on the real value is just what they want and suits their purposes.

However, there is another class of owners for whom the rate based on the real value will not be suitable; they will need a new rate which takes into account the replacement value in addition to the real value. This can best be illustrated by the examples. Let us say for example that a certain farmer has a farm with a maximum real value of \$7,000, so estimated either because he is far from a center or because his land is poor or again because his buildings need repairs; but on the other hand this farmer is a good manager and he lives on the produce of his land. That same farmer, finding himself within the boundaries of Gatineau Park, will be obliged to move, because of the Park. He is in good health and has family labour available and wishes to continue to cultivate or operate a farm because that is the only occupation he knows. That farmer does not wish to sell, because he will no longer have the means to buy himself a suitable farm and pay his moving expenses in addition. If he sells, it is understood that he sells to better himself, otherwise he prefers to hold on to the heritage he now possesses for want of something better.

The same principle applies in a host of other concrete examples which could be given. Taking these factors into account, we are better able to establish a term of comparison coming very close to the truth in the scale of assessed values for acquisition by the F.D.C. in carrying out its plan for Gatineau National Park.

3—Present situation with regard to the rate used.

Taking the year 1948 as a basis, I have already established that the average paid in Ste. Cecile de Masham for farms was twice the municipal assessment; however that average did not correspond to the real value.

I have also established that the average paid by the F.D.C. the same year for summer properties purchased at Lac Philippe were $5\frac{1}{2}$ times the municipal assessment. It is apparent from this that the farmer residents at that time certainly did not receive the same as the cottagers.

It would be interesting to know the rate of assessment of the other municipalities included in the park project and to draw up a comparison of the prices paid by the F.D.C. to those various property owners. I am inclined to believe that there is a certain favoritism shown by the F.D.C. in their purchases towards certain classes of owners.

It would be interesting, for example, to find out the prices paid in Hull West, Eardley, Hull South and Onslow in comparison with the assessment rate for those municipalities and also that used in Ste. Cecile de Masham. Those figures, which the F.D.C. should make public, would enable the members of the Parliamentary Committee better to establish a suitable comparison in their inquiry or their review of the work accomplished by the Federal District Commission.

It would also be interesting to know whether the F.D.C. is going to take the necessary steps to correct that state of affairs and place the former owners on the same footing for treatment and also establish a suitable scale of compensation for the future for all municipalities and all owners of land within the boundaries of the projected park.

It would also be interesting to compare those various rates paid with those which the Exchequer Court awards in cases of expropriation, in comparison with municipal assessments of the properties expropriated.