

of having which I also gained a com- Lamont and tively ignor- the mistake ment that the er they had my son. He cause of this error, pointed out the error had me to give up memory the lots had at the story as false, and had a right surely my own explanation to did not dif- we stated.

Mr. Al- in the way I could not which he set a "right of own Lands but had I not course, have on minutes intention that they were made to make it wish to Mr., he was arrangement pps, would on one of or with an re to clear shopping t less than got for it and I never

ever. The head of the division had in the lots waiting till included to instead, Re-call the sub-

of the "good-will" had been, previous to the public sale. But I did not advertise. I did not even look for a purchaser. I accepted the first offer, and that was from John McLaughlin, a tradesman in Harpurhey. One lot was sold to him in the early part of January 1855, and the other was sold to John McIntosh some weeks after. Both of these men, I believe, have made considerable improvements; but I never had any information of interference on part of the Lamonts, till in June last, I was utterly astonished to learn that Mr. Allan Lamont had been before the Commissioners with a complaint.

I swear by Almighty God and as I shall answer to God at the great day of Judgment, that the foregoing statements are literally true, according to the best of my knowledge and belief.

[Signed] THOMAS MACQUEEN.

Sworn before me in the Town of Goderich, in the County of Huron the 12th January, A. D. 1857.

THOS. NICHOLLS.
A commissioner for taking affidavits
for said Co.

Now, Mr. Gowan, you cannot fail to perceive a most important difference between this picture and your "Number 8" in the Leader of the 25th Dec.—Mine is a plain unvarnished statement of facts. Yours is a few facts enveloped in gross misrepresentation and artfully fabricated falsehoods, varnished with all the plausibility that a prostituted, mercenary intellect is capable of bringing forth. I call a spade a spade, and hence, you must not be startled with my uncouth, vulgar epithets, as I am persuaded that even you, Sir, will acknowledge the justice of these epithets when I bring before you the "damning" features of your "Number 8." My criminality in this case, in so far at least as the "evidence taken before the Commission" is concerned, consists entirely in having unfairly purchased two lots on which two young men had resided and spent their labor for two full years. The black spot on my character, sir, results from these two years of actual occupation and improvements. But I have good reason for believing, Sir, and I will try to prove it if required, that at the time I purchased the Lots, (1st or 2nd Sept. 1854) no Lamont had ever resided twenty four hours or spent ten hours work of a man, on either of the lots. The lots, Sir, were held on the same tenure, as thousand of acres in that and the adjoining townships were held, namely, by virtue of a brush-lease, an hour's "shack" or a "dwelling-house" six feet by nine and

five feet in height, or perhaps, merely, the initials of a name rudely staked on the bark of a tree. On this frail tenure, Sir, thousands of acres were "held"—"held" from actual occupation by industrious settlers who really required homes for their families—"held" till some poor honest simpleton should come along to be duped out of twenty or thirty pounds for the "good will" of a single lot! Many an excellent hundred acres has been "held" from actual settlement in this way, and many a hundred dollars have been fished out of the simpleton in exchange for that very valuable commodity the "good-will." It is of no consequence to me whether these Lamonts held these lots with the prospect of finding a "good will" customer, or whether they intended to hold them in their unoccupied, unimproved state, for ten or twenty years longer, till the boys should grow old enough to need them; it is enough for me to know that they held them for nearly two full years, in a way altogether in opposition to the conditions on which the privilege of squatting on the public lands had been granted by the Government or the Legislature. Mr. Allan Lamont is, I presume, an aged man, but I am sorry that I cannot give him credit for either sagacity or sincerity, when, in his note to the Agent (23rd Sept.) he pretends ignorance of the sale of the lots to me, and also pretends to have heard that I had been offering to sell them previous to the public sale.—This, Sir, is sad trash, to be sent forth in the name of an old man; and more especially when it is known that his brother, Donald Lamont, could easily have set him right on both these points, by simply telling him that I had never heard of either the lots or the lads that claimed them, till informed by him, not "previous" to the sale, but during the sale—and that on his information I had purchased them. But, now come the "damning" features of the picture—

"Strange as it may appear, at the very time this letter was written, and for some time previous to it, these lands had not only been sold to Mr. " " ", but resold by him at a large advance to McLaughlin and McIntosh, and the name of McLaughlin entered on the Agent's map of the Township, as the original purchaser from the Crown!"

Now, Mr. Gowan, this is not "evidence taken before the Commission." This, Sir, is your own gratuitous evidence. It is, I presume, part of the price which you are to pay for your next Government appointment, or, as my Grannie would have said, "It's a big spoke in Mr. Copley's wheel at the next election. I have sworn positively, Sir, that the two lots were regularly,