

ple of this country that this judicial commission was refused because the whole rascality and corruption would have been unveiled and brought to light; and the hon. gentleman would stand in the position of having been largely responsible for all that rascality and maladministration that has disgraced the Yukon, and disgraced Canada, in the eyes of the world.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it is much to be regretted that a gentleman of the age and position of the hon. leader of the Opposition should make such a malicious and unwarranted attack on a good Canadian citizen. I may tell my hon. friend that there is not the slightest foundation for the charges he has made against Mr. McGregor. Because he happens to be a farmer and dealer in horses and cattle, the hon. gentleman tries to make fun of him, and casts suspicion on his character, as that of a man who is not worthy of trust. I say to the hon. gentleman—and I believe that this country will agree with me—that among our respectable, honest, hard-working farmers and sons of farmers, he will find the best class of people in this country.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. That is too thin.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It is not, Sir. Mr. McGregor belongs to one of the best-known families in the province of Ontario, whose sons have taken honourable and leading positions in their own province and across the lines. A cousin of this man is one of the most prominent professional men in the city of Detroit, and his uncle is one of the most respectable members of this House. This young man went to school in Ontario, and afterwards went out west, and took up a farm, and, by his ability, energy and good character, proved himself to be one of the best Canadian citizens who ever went into that country.

If he had a fair measure of success it was because he was one of those sturdy young Canadians of character and energy whose word was as good as their bonds. When the hon. gentleman makes the statement that Mr. McGregor returned from that country with a slight upon his character, I set my reputation against the hon. gentleman's and reply that there is not one word of truth in what he has said. When anybody says that Mr. McGregor returned a rich man he states what is equally not true, for he is a comparatively poor man compared with what he was some time ago. This man's character stands high all through the country where he is known and is doing business. There he is reputed to be a man of honour and integrity. The fact that he has dealt in horses and cattle and has been able to conduct a large farm successfully against unfavourable seasons is no disgrace, and when the Government chooses its officers from that class of young Canadians rather than the class referred to by the

hon. gentlemen who are, in all probability, sent away from their own country by their friends in order to get rid of them, that class who are styled "dudes," who can put on airs and pretend they have some education, I think the Government is to be commended rather than blamed for its action. Mr. McGregor is a young man whose grandfather was one of the most respected men, and whose father is equally one of the most esteemed men in the province, and it is unworthy on the part of the hon. leader of the Opposition, it is unworthy of this Parliament, that he should get up and make such a malicious attack without any case. If Mr. McGregor had been guilty of anything, let him be punished, no matter what may be his character, but a man who has made a reputation for himself for integrity and good character among his fellow-citizens, a man who has conducted large business transactions, and whose word would be taken as quickly as that of any member of this House—to get up and without the slightest foundation make a malicious attack on such a man is unworthy the position the hon. gentleman occupies. The hon. gentleman has not a tittle of evidence to support him. An investigation has been held, and all these English gentlemen that he talks about and these Yankee skidaddlers who are knocking about Dawson City making attacks on the Administration, in which they were assisted by people anxious to condemn the Government, failed to materialize when given the opportunity of putting their statements to the proof. What has been the result? This man, by his business experience, good judgment and tact, and who was looked upon as a man of honesty and integrity, was able to approach the miners under the regulations that were, no doubt unpopular, as he has said himself—having to pay a tax is always unpopular—was able to collect the revenue and return it to this country. What better evidence could we desire that he is a good man for the position and a man of courage and integrity. He has been able, under adverse circumstances, and despite opposition, to collect the Government revenue. Why, my hon. friend and other members on that side were crying out that not one cent of this royalty could be collected. Their newspapers reiterated that cry, and yet we find that over \$400,000 was collected and returned into the treasury. Surely the man who had courage and tact and the business acumen to handle these miners, to go into these mines and collect this royalty, which hon. gentlemen opposite said would never be collected owing to the hostility to the tax, surely the man who could do this is entitled to our thanks, and ought to be spared any abuse. I do ask, at least he should not be maliciously attacked in this House or out of it, on the hearsay rumours gathered from a class of Yankee good-for-nothings, men who were known to belong to the criminal