

balance, which he must have known was a direct impeachment of the integrity of the Auditor General.

MR. CAMPBELL—I think it was not with respect to keeping back of accounts by the Government ; it was with reference to accounts in the North-west—certain purveyors who had spent large sums of money, and of whom the hon. Senator had heard they had kept back their accounts. It is not the accounts the Auditor had anything to do with.

MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman must not attempt to put that colour on the charge now. It is too late.

MR. MACPHERSON—I stated it at the time ; I did not dream of anything else.

MR. BROWN—The hon. gentleman spoke of North-west accounts, after I had repeatedly urged him to explain—but his charge was direct and unmistakable, and repeated more than once.

MR. CAMPBELL—The charge was not with reference to cooking the Public Accounts ; it was with reference to the transactions of certain officers in the North-west.

MR. BROWN—I perfectly understood the hon. gentleman latterly to refer to accounts in the North-west ; but his original charge, and the one he insinuated more than once, was that accounts were kept back at the end of the year to reduce the deficit which honest book-keeping would have shown.

MR. MACPHERSON—I did not intend to reflect on the Auditor-General.

MR. BROWN—Whatever you meant, you certainly did reflect on all connected with making up the Public Accounts, and you are bound now to say what accounts have been kept back. The hon. gentleman has no right to make sweeping accusations against the Government and evade the distinct specification of what his charge is. But enough of this for the present. Let us pass on to the hon. gentleman's indictment of the Emigration Department. And here he has not only fallen into the most palpable errors, but the calculations and conclusions he has sent abroad in his pamphlets as well as in his speeches are utterly wrong and mischievous. For example, he selects three years as his basis—1872-3, 1874-5, and 1875-6—and he states the entire expenditure in these years to have been as follows :—

In 1872-3.....	\$277,368
In 1874-5.....	302,770
In 1875-6.....	385,845

Now, why did the hon. gentleman state the cost in 1872-3 to have been \$277,368, when the public returns show the actual sum to have been \$287,368?—and why did he omit altogether the year 1873-4, when they were \$318,572? His friends were in office these years—surely that could not afford an explanation of it? And why did the hon. gentleman omit to tell that these were but the gross disbursements of the Department—that in every one of these years there were large sums received back that ought to have been deducted? Why did he omit to tell of the Quarantine deductions, the repayments by the Provinces, and the repayments on the Icelandic and Mennonite advances? And

why
Bridg
coolly
Queb
M
St. L
M
the e
he as
who
the S
were
382 t
right
when
which
possi
he on
recor
tion :
more
thus
ceed
assun
capita
hon.
gentle
And i

187
187
187
1870

An

187
187
187
1870

Min
gentle
Minis
Public
Public
figures
was in
that a

Mr.
Mr.