

time of that disaster and reciprocate to the very fullest extent the kindly aid we received from the motherland of the ancestors of the people who were the sufferers from the disaster I spoke of.

Mr. FIELDING. My friend has laid down two principles, neither of which I entirely concur in. In the first place, in the sense in which he uses the words, I cannot agree with him that charity begins at home. It is particularly the business of the Dominion of Canada to attend to the giving of foreign charity if a case may be worthy of charity, but the government of Canada is not a body for distributing charity at home. We have organizations, provincial and municipal, for the granting of charity at home, and the fact that the Dominion government did not grant charity in any particular case where disaster has arisen at home would by no means be evidence that the Dominion parliament was lacking in liberality or had in any respect failed in its duty. We are the proper dispensers of charity for a foreign country if Canada desires to give such charity, but this parliament is not the proper dispensing body for charity at home.

Mr. HUGHES. Are we to understand that the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) is to apply to a foreign government for charity in his locality.

Mr. FIELDING. No; but I have such faith in the provincial and municipal organizations of Manitoba that I would say that with these provincial and municipal organizations, in 19 cases out of 20 there would be no need of any foreign charity assisting the people of that section. But if there be any exceptional and unusual case of need, then it is a question whether the Dominion parliament shall grant it. We have sometimes had embarrassing questions as to whether we should grant relief in the cases of fires in Canada, and I think on the last occasion when we were considering a grant of that kind, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) pointed out, and reasonably, that it was very difficult to lay down any principle upon which we should aid funds of that kind from the Dominion treasury. However, if there should be anything of that kind exceptional and unusual, I have no doubt the parliament of Canada would respond.

My hon. friend's second thought was that charity should be reciprocal. 'And now abideth faith, hope and charity, but the greatest of these is charity.' It does not add that it must be reciprocal; charity must be voluntary in every case.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not subscribe to the principle that charity begins at home

in such a case as this. There is but one idea that should animate the human breast in making gifts of this kind, it is that of humanity. A great calamity has happened, humanity is suffering, humanity is in need and I think that neither relationship, nationality or anything else should actuate us beyond the tie of human brotherhood that binds us to the human race. I think it should be given on that line and on that line alone.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not propose to say anything against the resolution introduced by the Minister of Finance. If there is suffering and want in Paris because of the unusual floods that have taken place, there, it is quite proper for the Dominion government to give out of its plenty something for the relief of those sufferers. But I wish to call the attention of the government to a case in my own county—not that I want to ask for any charity from the funds of the Dominion of Canada for the people in a portion of the county of Frontenac, but I want to ask for consideration of the rights of the people of the township of Bedford who suffer every year owing to floods caused by a certain government dam, known as the Wolf Lake dam. These people have had to meet the damages thus caused, and I think that this is a proper occasion to call the attention of the government, and particularly of the Minister of Railways, to this case.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask whether the Prime Minister has considered this question? This must be, unless there is a string to it, a severe jolt to the autonomy of which the government speak.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I fail to see the joke.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not my intention to take any exception whatever to the grant of \$50,000 to aid the sufferers in France; but it has occurred to me that possible we ought to learn some lessons from what has occurred in the old lands which may be useful to us in this country. If the flood has been caused, as some suggest, by the meandering of the comet which has been roaming around the world for the last 70 or 80 years, of course we can take no action, we cannot defend ourselves. But it is alleged that the clearing away of the forests in the north of France, where the river takes its source, has largely been the cause of the flooding of the country. Rains were plentiful, and there was nothing to hold back the water. The natural forests had been cut away, the result being that the water came down with greater rapidity, and caused the overflow which has brought about so much trouble. Now, in this country are we doing our part