

fairly and openly entered in Allan McQueen's name on the 1st or 2nd day of September, 1854, and in presence of a crowd of witnesses; and I have sworn positively that neither of the two was re-sold sooner than January of the following year. In other words, I have *virtually* sworn that both lots were entered in the sales-book in Allan McQueen's name, all the time from 2nd Sept 1854, till January 1855. Your gratuitous assertion that "all this time" (up to the 6th Oct. 1854,) "the lot had been re-sold to John McLaughlin," is therefore, what I call a *bold falsehood*, one that refuses to be limited by any possibilities or impossibilities, whether natural or moral. On the 6th October 1854, and for full *three months afterwards*, I had never, to my knowledge, seen or even heard of this John McLaughlin. Now, where, Sir, did you get this bold falsehood? I must find it out, for though I can make great allowance for the extravagant servilities of such needy political adventurers as yourself and Mr. Morgan Hamilton, though I am aware of the exigencies of your employer, (for I will not insult Mr. Canoeby by charging him with your appointment) though the enlightened condition of the Province renders the venom of the mercenary hireling comparatively innocuous, and though you come forth at present ruffled in the authority of the Executive, I cannot acknowledge your right to disseminate these bold falsehoods throughout society. I cannot admit that the sanction of even an *honest* administration should protect from punishment and infamy, the man who, in his zeal to serve his employer, recklessly and at random, flings the firebrands of falsehood at the reputation of his master's opponent. This, Sir, is the most "damning" feature in your "Number 8." It is your own—it is *utterly false*, and I demand your authority. You say McLaughlin's name was entered as the "first purchaser." Of this, Sir, I have no personal knowledge, nor does it in any way concern me. I, of course, informed Mr. Clark that the lot was sold, why it was sold, and that the other would also be sold on the first opportunity. I know nothing further of the matter, but I do assert positively, that if the lot was returned in the name of John McLaughlin, as the first purchaser, the *public Sales of September 1854, cannot possibly have been returned to the department sooner than January of the following year*, and on this point Mr. Canoeby or any of his clerks can enlighten you.

I have now, Sir, disposed of your own gratuitous "damning" charge, and what do you

think of it! Will it tell against me or against you? I acknowledge and regret the error of selling the lots, because, in the first place, I suffered the fear of bad neighborhood to force me to an act which I had conscientiously condemned for years previously. In the *second* place, I actually needed the lots, and I should have kept them and got them improved, trusting to the law for protection; and, in the *third* place, I soon discovered that less than three times the price I had received would not purchase two lots equally good, in the same Township. You, are not satisfied, sir, with having flung the poisoned dart, but in order the better to secure your base purpose and more effectually serve your employer, you make a desperate effort to "rub it in," you say.

"In the explanation offered by the Agent, he thus accounts for the letter written by him to Lamont. "I gave this letter (Lamont's of the 28th Sept.) to the person (Mr * * *) whom I found it necessary to employ as an assistant. "during the hurry of the sales, and asked him to ascertain when and to whom they had been sold. After looking over the sales book he said that he could not find that they had been sold to any one, but that they were marked on the printed lists as sold, which he believed was owing to my own order, that all the lots returned on the Surveyor's List as occupied, should be so marked off, to prevent their being sold to others."

And again ..

"Mr * * *, the temporary clerk of the Agent, of whom he speaks in a subsequent part of his explanation, "he had availed himself of his able assistance during the first few days of the sale," sold the lots to himself—re-sold them to others, pocketed the proceeds, entered the name of his son for one of the lots, and the name of one of the other parties to whom he sold for the other, as the original purchasers from the Crown, and when asked by the Agent to find out when and to whom they had been sold," said, "after looking over the sales book he could not find they had been sold to any one!!"

Now sir, I must assure you that had this picture been presented to me by any other man in Canada but Ogle R. Gowan, I would have sought redress otherwise than in the columns of a Newspaper, and yet I am no pistol man. But as no other redress is come-at-able, I content myself with simply declaring that the flag with which you greeted Her Majesty's Representative at Brockville, in 1849, was not blacker than the dark falsehoods you have here stuck together. And, alas! alas! these falsehoods are your own, and not pertaining to "evidence taken before the commission." The falsehoods of the second paragraph I have already refuted on another

I have again r
Land in the Cr
erto any other
stances, wrote a
or on the Map,
such entry to be
manner, at the
days of the sal
But, sir, any
logical argumen
sence, could so
not the person
ing been, requ
Book!" Why
me out of Mr
election, or y
Hamilton, has
brain. Do y
two different l
are literally d
Imagine Mr C
had been requ
book to "accu
had been sold
gave my opin
sold at all—in
Caution in te
assistance" I
agine Mr Cla
tion represent
consummate
chaser of the
ring absurdit
If you have t
my position
tion and serv
for the mere
case against
and a more
peaked you t
as angry. Y
as a quotation
and I therefor
possession.
that does me
any other lot
which he re
in his letter,
quoted to m
book, for the
a talk. I ne
never did pe
referred to
I must till I
You have, in
warned me
and the m
on the New