

achment of the

o keeping back
to accounts in
sums of money,
kept back their
anything to do

upt to put that

l not dream of

-west accounts,
his charge was

to cooking the
tions of certain

tleman latterly
charge, and the
were kept back
st book-keeping

n the Auditor-

lid reflect on all
you are bound
hon. gentleman
government and

But enough of
tleman's indict-
not only fallen
conclusions he
ches are utterly
ree years as his
entire expendi-

77,368
92,770
35,845

1873 to have been
m to have been
r 1873-4, when
e years—surely
lid the hon. gen-
sements of the
were large sums
did he omit to
the Provinces,
dvances? And

why did he ignore entirely the emigrants arriving by Suspension Bridge, Portland, and Pembina, and at Halifax and St. John—and coolly assume that no emigrants came to Canada except those by Quebec?

MR. MACPHERSON—I stated that I referred to the emigrants by the St. Lawrence.

MR. BROWN—Yes, the hon. gentleman dropped that incidentally at the end of his argument—but why did he conceal the fact that while he assumed the immigration of 1872-3 to have been 36,901, his friends, who were then in office, returned it as 50,050, of which 25,920 came by the St. Lawrence? Why did he state that the immigrants of 1874-5 were but 16,038, when the official return of the Department shows 27-382 to have arrived, of which 12,043 came by the St. Lawrence? What right had he to state that the immigrants of 1875-6 were only 10,901, when the official returns show that 25,633 arrived in the Dominion, of which 7,063 came by the St. Lawrence? The hon. gentleman may possibly know more about the matter than anyone else—but why did he omit to tell that his figures were in entire opposition to the official record, and that they assumed a wholesale falsification of the emigration returns by the officers of the Government? And could anything more reprehensible be imagined than for the hon. gentleman, having thus settled his figures for himself, to ignore all deductions and proceed to average the whole gross cost of immigration on his own assumed numbers, and send that abroad over the land as the cost *per capita* of each immigrant? The result of this manipulation by the hon. gentleman will be seen by the following contrasts of the hon. gentleman's statements and the Official Returns of the Department. And first as to the annual nett expenditure for emigration:—

	<i>Mr. Macpherson.</i>	<i>Official Return.</i>
1872-3.....	\$277,368.....	\$296,617
1874-5.....	362,770.....	241,600
1875-6.....	385,847.....	228,077
1876-7.....	110,670

And now as to the cost *per capita*:—

	<i>Mr. Macpherson.</i>	<i>Official Return</i>
1872-3.....	\$ 7 76.....	\$5 90
1874-5.....	18 00.....	8 82
1875-6.....	26 05.....	8 85
1876-7.....	4 08

MR. MACPHERSON—My statement was strictly correct. The hon. gentleman is reading from the figures handed to him by the hon. Minister of Agriculture yesterday, which are entirely opposed to the Public Accounts. My statements are in strict conformity with the Public Accounts. The hon. Minister of Agriculture said yesterday my figures were incorrect; that my figures included quarantine. That was incorrect. He said I did not deduct refunds from the Provinces; that also is incorrect. They are in the Public Accounts.

MR. PELLETIER—But not in your statement.

MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman incurred a serious responsibility