

The manager of the F.D.C., Mr. Hay, stated that the Commission pays a grant on the assessment of the buildings demolished, but I believe that I can state positively that the Commission does not pay any. In 1955 the F.D.C. paid to the municipality a grant of \$1,658.40 for loss of taxes in 1954. Payment was made on the following basis; real estate tax at the rate of .80 per \$100 on an assessment of \$103,650, or an amount of \$829.20; special roads tax of .80 per \$100 on an assessment of \$103,650, or an amount of \$829.20.

The total amount of the grant is therefore \$1,658.40 instead of \$1,600 indicated in the brief that was presented, the amount having been entered in round figures.

As I pointed out above, the grant is now paid, that is, since the new assessment roll was made in 1953 and came into force in 1954, on the assessment grant by the municipality. The assessment of \$103,650 represents the present assessed value and does not take into account the demolished buildings enumerated above.

To give a more accurate answer to the question, I must also point out that the present value of the buildings demolished cannot be determined exactly or only with the greatest difficulty for the following reasons: (See sub-title 3 in the index)

There has been no municipal re-assessment of the properties sold to the F.D.C. between 1938 and 1953. As a matter of fact the F.D.C. began making its purchases in Masham in 1940 and has never paid any taxes on the properties purchased since, apart from the grants paid since 1952 and retroactive to 1951. In the face of such a loss, the municipality of Ste. Cecile de Masham did not see fit to incur the expense of a real estate re-assessment every three years and for the properties belonging to the F.D.C. The increasing value of the property and the buildings, particularly since 1938, does not appear in our files so it is impossible for me to determine the value of the taxes lost through the demolition of those buildings.

III—*Losses from 1940 to 1951 cannot be evaluated exactly for the following reasons:*

Having said this I pass on to the next question: What were the losses to the municipalities from 1940 to 1951 on the properties purchased for the Gatineau Park?

We have compiled detailed figures regarding this question according to the assessment existing at the time of sale, which assessment was revised in 1953 to bring it into line with the rate for the rest of the municipality. The amount which I compiled in 1953, less than a year after my appointment as secretary of the said municipality, is \$3,007.76 in tax losses to the municipality. This amount is within the limit I quoted on May 11 last, although I was unable to go into detail then as I had not looked over those figures since 1953. (See sub-titles 1 & 2).

This figure of \$3,077.76 in losses is far from correct if we take into account the factors mentioned above, namely, the increase in the municipal assessment rate from time to time since 1938. (See sub-title 3).

Although the amount of such losses to the municipalities should be considerably increased, there is another factor which enables me to express the opinion that it can also be decreased slightly and I can prove that statement by answering the question of Mr. Richard, M.P. for Ottawa: Did the F.D.C. or the tenants of summer cottages at Lac Philippe pay municipal taxes before 1951, at which time the F.D.C. was receiving rents on those properties?