

Supply—Finance

that was quickly proffered by the federal government to the province of Ontario to help defray the cost of the damage caused by the floods.

If I may be permitted to mention it at this time, the only real solution to the problem is to put into effect there something like the proposal submitted by the Humber valley conservation authority. I understand that the government is considering the possibility of making a grant of some \$5,300,000 to the province to carry out the conservation authority plan. When you weigh the amount involved there against the \$1 million it is apparently going to cost to repair the material damage caused by the hurricane the \$5,300,000 does not seem on balance to be out of the way at all. I urge the government to give sympathetic consideration to that proposal.

As far as the \$1 million is concerned, I presume that will be the total cost. Perhaps the minister can say if that represents the total contribution to the provincial government, and also how the costs were shared and to what kind of losses the contributions were restricted.

Mr. Harris: The contribution was made, of course, to supplement the grant made by the province to those who suffered damage by reason of the hurricane. The province came to the conclusion that the appropriate grant in aid would be 80 per cent of the cost to the householder who lost his building. A minimum of \$100 was imposed; that is, the first \$100 was deductible, and there was a maximum of \$5,000 on the amount of the contribution in respect of any one building. The federal government offered to share one-half of the amount the province was paying, and we think this sum of \$1 million should be \$30,000 to \$40,000 more than may actually be needed.

Hon. members will notice that the item provides for the payment of these accounts up to the end of May rather than the end of the fiscal year in March. The committee set up by the provincial government, by advertisement and by letter, has been urging all those who have claims against the fund to get their bills in so they may be paid. Consequently we expect to be able to settle all accounts within this time limit.

In order that hon. members will know what we have not done, I should add that the provincial government and the metropolitan council of Toronto undertook in addition to buy, not by way of expropriation but by way of purchase, certain properties in order to ensure that no one would build again at these places, and we did not share in that. I think the reason is obvious. This was not

[Mr. Enfield.]

a direct relief effort. It was a decision made by the proper authorities that it would be unwise to have people living in those dangerous areas again.

Mr. Hahn: Can the minister tell us whether or not trailer homes will be paid for out of the fund as well? I understand one war veteran lost his belongings and his trailer home, and has not been able to get restitution from the provincial authorities.

Mr. Harris: I am not familiar with the case but I should remind hon. members that in addition to the moneys paid out by the provincial government to which we are contributing, there was as everyone knows—mayhap many contributed—a substantial sum running into several million dollars raised to assist these unfortunate people. My understanding is that generally that fund was used for the replacement of personal belongings and losses of that kind, and the governments entered into the replacement of buildings and properties.

Mr. Hahn: This individual not only lost his belongings but his trailer house as well. It was later taken to a garage and left there. He was destitute and had no means of acquiring a home. It is a complete loss as far as he is concerned, and he is having difficulty in getting restitution.

Mr. Harris: Of course no federal agency has been engaged in the payment of the money. That has been done through the provincial government and the bodies they set up to handle the matter. If my hon. friend has a particular case in mind and will let me know about it I will see if the provincial people will give consideration to it.

Mr. Knowles: As one who, with others sitting near me, represents a part of the country where in 1950 we received help in time of need from the federal government—indeed, help from far and wide—I want to register my approval of this grant to help those who suffered loss as the result of "Hurricane Hazel".

Mr. Pallett: On behalf of the people who actually received assistance from the fund I wish to thank the government for deciding to put this amount in the supplementary estimates. I think it is a very sound principle. I was also pleased to hear the hon. member for York-Scarborough, who spoke in support of the Humber valley conservation authority plan, recommend that the government should take action on it. As to the suggestion that some people have been omitted in the settlement of claims, I have had something to do