

makes us one body politic out of so many heterogeneous elements. It is the religion of Christ. We live as brothers because we recognize the brotherhood of humanity—one Father in Heaven, one origin, one destiny.

If that great humanizing brotherhood can be brought about in the United States by a national system of education, if these foreign elements can be digested by that country and made a portion of the people by a national school system, why cannot the same force work out in this country and humanize, and christianize and brotherize every element in this country in the same way? These are the views held by these people in Ontario who are denounced here to-day and insulted as they have been insulted in this House. Is it wrong for a man brought up under British institutions, who recognizes what is the glory of British history and what are the underlying principles of Britain's greatness, namely, religious freedom, civil equality, no church and state, a national system of education—I say, is such a man, such a Canadian to be stigmatized in a Canadian House of Commons as we in the province of Ontario have been stigmatized here? Is it a sin, is it a crime, to hold views of this kind? As far as I can gather from the speeches which have been made and the criticisms which have been passed upon the newspapers which try to voice the opinion of Toronto and Ontario, it is a crime in the opinion of those who thus stigmatize us. Consider these newspapers of Toronto that have been criticised as so illiberal. There are five newspapers in Toronto that are trying to voice the sentiments of the people of Ontario, and I think that they are doing it. There is just one newspaper there that is supporting the government and that denounces the people of the province of Ontario and denounces its fellow journals as fire-brands and incendiaries.

Mr. TAYLOR. Who owns it?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Sir, the only newspaper that hon. gentlemen on the other side can find in the city of Toronto to voice their views is a newspaper owned and in the name of a lawyer who is the trustee and agent of a number of exploiting capitalists in the city who for consideration received in several directions at Toronto and at Ottawa, are ready to give the support of that newspaper to the government as long as their interests are advanced as they have been advanced.

Mr. TAYLOR. What paper is that?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The only newspaper in Toronto that is supporting the government, and has not been stigmatized in this House as being incendiary and a fire-brand. Now then I have that much to say for the people of my own province. I have listened to the member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) and others in this House who

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN.

have chosen to discuss questions of race. Will the House pardon me if for a moment I refer to myself, only in the way of illustration.

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. It is not the first time.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is it the first time?

Mr. A. LAVERGNE. No, I do not think it is.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I hope the young gentleman will have a little more respect for members who are addressing this House. I do not think he adds any dignity to this House by throwing remarks across the floor and by making these interruptions. Now the illustration I propose to address to the House is personal in this respect, that my own family, five or six generations ago, say about 1760, lived in the highlands of Scotland. They knew not one word of English. Any little refinement, any little education they had, they got from France, they often went to that country. They were Jacobites, they had been all through the wars of Scotland in connection with the Jacobite interest. The cause was lost, the families were broken up, and our people drifted south. For fifty years or so they were located around Glasgow, and early in the last century both sides of my house came to this country and took up land. If there is anything I am proud of it is to be able to say that that land they took up nearly 75 years ago is still in the hands of some of them. Five generations of these people now sleep beneath the sod of this country, and while I may be at times inclined to go back to the idea that I happened to be Celtic and highland Scotch, and that my ancestors spoke Gaelic and could speak nothing else, I am to-day a Canadian and nothing but a Canadian. These recollections of the past are only a romaulic reverie, a reminiscence to me, for to-day I am a Canadian and nothing but a Canadian. There is only one thing that I concede to the member for Labelle as having an advantage over me, and that is that his people were here a little longer than mine. I do give the French Canadian people credit for this, that they are sons of the soil, they are autochthonous, as the Greeks used the term, they are sprung from the soil, and they are proud of it. So am I. I have no other loyalty, in the highest sense of the term, to any other country than Canada. I agree with all my hon. friend from Labelle has said in that respect—he is a son of the soil, the French Canadians are sons of the soil. But, Sir, so are three-quarters, if not a million of the descendants of the old highland Scotch people who came to this country, they to-day are sons of the soil. Now if we are sons of the soil, whether we are of Scotch origin or of French origin, we are also brothers of the soil, and if we are brothers