

properties were transferred to the F.D.C. That is why at the beginning I made a distinction between two parts of my question and my answer was that the sum of \$1,600 or \$1,658.40 represent the amount which the municipality would collect if the present property, as it exists at present, belonged to individuals. But it does not represent the amount the municipality would receive if the F.D.C. had not bought any property.

IV—The “development” factor must condition the evaluation of the losses suffered

My answer to the question then regarding the amount of \$1,600 has been:

That probable development of the municipality should be taken into account. One member of the Joint Committee had objected that this hypothesis was problematical. I would like to give a few explanations with regard to that answer.

(1) To date no industry which might have wished to establish itself has developed nor could probably have developed on F.D.C. lands included within the boundaries of the municipalities of Ste. Cecile de Masham. The same holds true for a tourist industry which would add increased values; such a tourist industry could be in the form of building summer cottages or tourist hotels.

(2) This area with its many lakes close to the National Capital lends itself admirably to the tourist industry. It is well known that the building of summer cottages has been halted in the park and, what is more, they are removing the existing cottages. Judging from the actual plans of the F.D.C., it is useless to count on such a development. On the other hand we find that during the period extending from 1945 to 1953 the number of summer cottages on the shores of Lakes Fraser, Bell and Gauvreau increased from 15 to 64; today it is still higher. At Lake Gauvreau a fourth row of cottages is being built while at Lac Philippe there was only one row not yet filled.

(3) Other lakes in Masham will be built up soon, but those lakes in the park which are not built up will remain in that state, we believe. If residential and tourist development is promoted in the rest of the municipality, why was it not promoted in the Masham area (of the F.D.C.)? More than 30 farms were sold to the F.D.C., several of which included a number of lots. Several of those lots could have been sold and would have been sold to residents or cottagers who, according to the municipal code, would normally have paid taxes to the municipality. Those farms that were sold, instead of increasing in value, are declining in value because they are returning to wood-lots. Since 1953 wood-lots have been assessed in Masham only \$2.00 an acre, whereas before they were assessed at \$1.00 an acre.

If the construction of camping grounds is no longer allowed in the Masham section of the park, why would a tourist hotel not be allowed to increase the value of the municipality in that section of the park?

In that connection, I must add that Masham has already asked for it and was supported by the Metropolitan Council of Western Quebec and *l'Union des Chambres de Commerce de l'ouest du Québec*. Permit me to quote here a few extracts from the letter sent to the F.D.C. to that effect by the Masham Board of Trade.

“The development of Gatineau Park has had an unfortunate effect on the development of Ste. Cecile de Masham. Indeed, about one-third of the municipality now belongs to the Federal District Commission. Its forest reserves no longer belong to it, its two sawmills are on the point of closing down. A considerable part of its agricultural industry has been wiped out, its local trade has declined, the businesses of several of its businessmen have been jeopardized by the exodus of the population from the properties sold. The value of real