

under a Settlement Act then in force, on the condition of doing settlement duties. The claim was admitted at the time, but land being then of no value, it remained in abeyance until 1820, when Everts sent in an application to have his claim to 1000 acres affirmed. On that application no action was taken. In 1834, George Everts, son and heir to Oliver Everts, revived the claim and asked that the land might be assigned him so that he might proceed to do settlement duties, on the fulfillment of which the claim alone rested. This was granted, but no location was made—no settlement duties done. It seems that Henry Sherwood soon after bought up the claim, and that Clarke Gamble, in 1843, bought it from Sherwood—but for what consideration has not transpired. In 1844, while a Tory Government was in power, Gamble urged his claim, and was peremptorily refused, on the good ground that no settlement duties had been performed, and the time when they could be performed was gone past. But the ground on which Gamble's petition was rejected in 1844 will be distinctly understood by reading the Decision of Council. It was as follows:

"Report of a Committee of the Executive Council, dated 2nd Jan., 1844, approved 8th of the same month:—

"It appears that in the year 1794, Mr. Oliver Everts was granted for his services, 500 acres of land free of fees, as Clerk and Inspector of Accounts in the Engineer Department, and Storekeeper in the Quartermaster General's department, which grant passed under Patent. That he paid for an additional grant of 1,500 acres as a settler under the regulation, adopted in 1797; that in 1801, he paid of sixpence sterling for each acre patent fee, and at the rate of £1 4s. 9d. sterling, survey fee for each 100 acres, which was ordered July 3rd, 1798. That in 1820 he petitioned to have the claim confirmed, stating the quantity at 1000 acres, upon which petition no order was made. That in 1834 George Everts, as eldest son and heir at law of Oliver Everts, petitioned to have a location made in order to enable him to claim as heir at law of the original nominee, which was ordered. That the location has not since been made, nor any proceedings taken until the present petition.

"The committee think that the parties allowed land under the continuance of the land granting system, as settlers, were bound to proceed in a reasonable time to carry the orders into effect.

"The regulations under which the grants were ordered was intended for the then state of the country, and cannot be held to apply at a time nearly half a century afterwards, and when the mode of disposing of land by grant is abandoned. The objects of the order in favour of Mr. Everts were, firstly, settlement of the land; secondly, the receipt of the fees for the use of the Government. The first of these could not be obtained by a grant of scrip, and the payment of these fees at this time cannot be taken as an equivalent for a like payment in 1798. The grant of scrip would in fact be a gratuity, whereas the order for land was a species of proposal to sell under regulations, which have long ceased to be in existence.

"Certified. "W. H. LEE." The justice of this decision was so obvious that Gamble seems to have given up the claim, and for eleven years no action was taken in regard to it. The moment, however, Macdonald, Cayley and Co. got the reins, with Mr. John W. Gamble in the House, Mr. Gamble's hope seems to have revived and he renewed his application. On 9th December, 1854, he by some means obtained a report to Council from Solicitor General Smith in favour of his claim, and on the 26th Feb., 1855, an order in Council issued entitling Mr. Gamble to purchase 1500 acres, picked from all the Crown Lands of the province, at one shilling per acre.

The whole proceeding was a deliberate fraud upon the public. In the first place Everts never had any claim upon the country; as an early settler, he was entitled to land if he did certain settlement duties; but he never did those duties, nor anybody for him. Then again, even if he had done those settlement duties, he was bound by statute to have perfected his title with the Government before a certain date; this he did not do and could not do because no duties were ever done. But even had he done the settlement duties, and had he established his title within the proper time, the Government were expressly debarred by two statutes from paying any such claims. The Government have no power to give land to any one, and the trick of selling Mr. Gamble picked land, at one shilling per acre, was resorted to with the view of concealing the transaction from the public eye. Had the claim been paid in money, it must have come before Parliament; had land been given gratis, the statute would have been broken; but by selling land worth five or six dollars per acre for one shilling, the job was consummated, and no one likely to hear of it, if Gamble and the Government kept their own counsel. A more corrupt job was never perpetrated.

Farmers of Midland Division! How many of you have tried to have the lands secured to you which were located to your relatives, the first pioneers of the forest, but sued in vain because the settlement duties were not done at the time! You were told that you were too late—the statute forbade it! But had you been a brother of Mr. John W. Gamble, how different would the case have been! You might have had the choicest land in Upper Canada at a shilling per acre!

On the 27th May, 1857, Mr. Darche, seconded by Mr. J. B. E. Dorion, moved an address to His Excellency, praying him to cause steps to be taken to reward Militiamen and other persons who served in the last war with the United States, and who have not hitherto been rewarded for their said service.

The Government, though willing to reward a political friend, and the brother of one of their supporters in the House, by giving him fifteen hundred acres of picked land for \$300, on a trumped up claim of sixty years old, had no generous feelings for those who had perilled life and fortune in defending their country. By a bare majority they voted down the motion, Gamble helping them to do so. The vote was—yeas, 39; nays, 42. Among the nays was JOHN W. GAMBLE.

A Toronto Nunnery and its Protestant Parents.

On April 4, 1855, John Wm. GAMBLE seconded a motion to introduce a bill to plant a papist nunnery or convent, with unusual special corporate powers, in the midst of the free city of Toronto. Granted; the Legislature being then in session at Quebec. [See Journal, p. 802.]

April 19. GAMBLE seconded the second reading of their Nunnery bill. Brown, seconded by Gould, moves to throw it out of the House, as an outrage on equal rights in Upper Canada. GAMBLE rises and defends the creation of "the Sisters of Charity, St. Joseph Convent, Sister Mary Theresa Power, Superior, Power Street, Toronto." [See Lovell's Directory, p. 826.]

Among the 59 nays, who voted to create the Toronto Convent, figures of course the name of JOHN W. GAMBLE. [See Journals, page 810.]

The Nunnery went through another ordeal on May 11; Mackenzie, seconded by Brown, moved to throw it aside, but it passed into law. [Journals, page 1075.]

Our Lady of Loretto.

May 11, 1857.—Dr. Macdonald moved the final stages of the bill

he had been in the House and voted on another motion a few minutes before! [See Journals, page 193.]

The \$1,800,000 to the French Seigniors.

On Nov. 16, 1854, Government had this grant to the French Seigniors under consideration, and it was moved "that it is unjust to the tax-payers of Canada to appropriate any portion of the territorial revenue to the payment of an indemnity to the Seigniors of Canada, as the bill is of local interest, and should be paid by the parties benefited." It was also moved that it is dangerous and improper to pledge the common revenue of Canada for payment of the Seigniors, and thus increase debt and taxation. Mr. GAMBLE was in a strait. He could not vote against the Government and his French friends. On the other hand, he could not face the indignation that would be aroused in West York, if he voted that it was all right to take the money of the Upper Canada farmers to buy farms for the Lower Canada habitants. What then did he do? Mr. GAMBLE, though in the House, and voting the day before, skulked, dodged, and steered clear of every vote that day.

The question again came up on the 21st November, and similar motions were made. Mr. JOHN W. GAMBLE took the same sneaking course as before, and absented himself on every vote!

Do the electors of the Midland Division want, as a Representative, one who has not the manliness to vote boldly Yea or Nay, even on a question which concerns the disposal of millions of the people's money; if they wish one who can play a double game, and desert his post when the most important interests of his constituents are at stake, let them elect JOHN W. GAMBLE.

Let the Jesuits' Estates go to the Seigniors!

Nov. 23, 1854, it was moved that instead of taking millions out of the public purse to fill the purses of French Seigniors, the Jesuits' Estates (there being none of the others left), should go to liquidate their claims—they are worth perhaps \$900,000. Yeas, 20; Nays, 59. GAMBLE, with other Upper Canada traitors and cowards, was invisible!—[See Journals, 1854, page 389.]

Gamble Throws the Public Money into the Grand Trunk Sink!

In the beginning of 1855, it was found that the Grand Trunk was in a bad way, and that all the money the Province had up to that time advanced to it was hopelessly gone. Mr. Cayley introduced a relief Bill, making the Province give the concern another £900,000 sterling, or FOUR MILLIONS AND A HALF OF DOLLARS.

On the 22nd of May, 1855, Hon. J. S. Macdonald, seconded by Mr. Brown, moved an amendment to the effect that before the House was called upon to pledge the further aid of £900,000 to the Grand Trunk, a searching enquiry by a Special Committee should be instituted into the affairs of the Company, and that the Committee should ascertain how far the proffered security of the Amalgamated Grand Trunk Railway could warrant a further advance.—This very reasonable proposal, which had it been carried, would have had the effect of saving the Province not only this Four Millions and a Half of Dollars, but all the money which has since been thrown after it, was negatived by a vote of 65 to 38. JOHN W. GAMBLE was one of those who resisted enquiry. His name is among the NAYS.

On the 3rd May, the resolution, granting the £900,000 sterling, was concurred in by a vote of 61 to 38. JOHN W. GAMBLE sanctioned it by his vote.

An Appeal to the People!

When it was proposed to saddle the labour and property of Canada with a burden of a million a year for the Grand Trunk Railway jobbers' debt, to be raised here and sent annually to creditors in England, an amendment was offered to dissolve the Legislature first, and take the opinion of the Electors. This was May 1, 1857. The yeas were 34, including the members for York, Ontario, and Peel, except GAMBLE; he was eclipsed, however, and INVISIBLE while the clerk was recording the yeas and nays, but instantly thereafter appeared in his seat, and voted on the next question.

Gamble Votes to give up the Provincial Lien on the Grand Trunk.

On the 13th May, 1857, on the question of the third reading of Mr. Cayley's Grand Trunk Bill, Mr. A. A. Dorion, seconded by Mr. Sanborn, moved that the bill be recommitted, for the purpose of providing that in case of failure of the Grand Trunk to fulfil its engagements, the Province might enforce its lien on the Railway, and on all the works and property belonging to the Company, and to provide for mode of disposing of the same, to satisfy the claim of the Province, and of the other creditors of the Company.

The motion was negatived by 61 to 41. JOHN W. GAMBLE, by recording his vote with the nays, showed that the interests of the Province were with him a secondary consideration, when their sacrifice was demanded by the crew of Grand Trunk jobbers and speculators.

Six Dollars a Day. Gamble, Yea.

On March 18, 1856, the Assembly, whose members by statute were entitled to \$4 a day, voted themselves \$6 a day, (and the other House said ditto.) York and South Simcoe sent no \$6 voters except GAMBLE, who must have awarded himself 10 extra \$2 a day for his travels below the bar at voting time.

On March 17, 1857, the Assembly, by a division of 56 to 31, again voted themselves the extra \$2 a day. Hartman, of North York, Wright of East York, and Robinson of South Simcoe, voted nay. The aristocratic JOHN W. GAMBLE clutched at the extra wages, and voted YEA.

Gamble on Ecclesiastical Corporations.

March 6, 1853.—Noel Darche, a zealous Roman Catholic, supported by Laberge, Prevost, Valois, Dorion, John S. Macdonald and others of his Church, declared, that when large sums were yearly voted by Parliament to Nunneries, Colleges, and other establishments for Education according to their and other tenets, a regular periodical account showing the way the public money was spent by the receivers of it was just and proper, and he introduced a bill requiring such annual returns of expenditure by such corporations, &c., thus aided by the public purse.

GAMBLE was indignant. Could the honesty of these pious bodies be doubted? Was not this bill an insult to our French brethren? The Quebec Jesuits did not like the bill; the Coalition (of which Gamble was a slave), hated all accountability; and the yeas for Darche's excellent bill were only 29, while among the NAYS, who kicked out the bill, was JOHN W. GAMBLE. Gamble showed himself more a tool of the Priests than even the Roman Catholics

recommitted to a Committee of the whole House, with an instruction to amend the same, by providing that the Societies or Corporations of the same nature as those described in the said Bill, existing heretofore, or now existing at the passing of this Bill, be subject to the provisions of the said Bill, as far as the same relates to the right of acquiring immovable property in time to come.

The motion was negatived by 58 yeas to 37 yeas. More zealous for the rights of the Nunneries to accumulate property than many of the Roman Catholics themselves, JOHN W. GAMBLE voted with the nays.

Gamble would incorporate Nunneries, but not Orange-men or Masons!

While the same Bill was under discussion, Mr. Fellowes, seconded by Mr. Murney, moved that the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House, with an instruction to amend the same, so as to apply it to all Orangemen, Masons, Odd-Fellows, and Sons of Temperance. The motion was thrown out. The yeas were Chisholm, Daly, Atkins, Brown, Christie, Foley, Larwill, Murney, Powell, Shaw, Supple, &c. The 62 nays included all the French and JOHN W. GAMBLE. Mr. Gamble was ready for any set of subversion, however humiliating, to the French Roman Catholics. At their bidding he was willing to incorporate nunneries and monasteries by wholesale; and also at their bidding he refused to grant the facilities required by Orangemen, Masons, Odd-Fellows, and Sons of Temperance, in the management of their charitable funds. Is that the style of man that any Upper Canada constituency ought to select as their representative for eight years?

Retrenchment and Lower Taxes.

Feb. 27, 1857. It was moved that the House regretted that the Governor had made no recommendation "for the reduction of that heavy burden of taxation, through the Tariff, which presses so heavily upon the great body of the people." Yeas, Wright, Patrick, Wilson, &c. Nays, GAMBLE, Bows, Cauchon, Spence, the Morrisons, &c.—[Journals, page 18.]—Gambles and Gambiers are not the right stuff for farmers' law makers.

On the 16th of March, 1857 it was proposed that as all the necessities of life were then high, some relief should be given to the laborer and mechanic by reducing the tea, sugar, and molasses tax. GAMBLE warmly argued in favour of high taxes, and, with his French friends, and Benjamin, Conger, Larwill, Spence, &c., voted down retrenchment.

Gamble increases the Officials.

On the 19th May, 1857, the question of the third reading of the Bill for Establishing Prisons for young offenders, and for the better Government of Public Asylums, Hospitals and Prisons, being before the House; Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Wilson, moved that the Bill be recommitted, for the purpose of providing that there should be but three Prison Inspectors instead of five. Among the 50 nays who voted down this proposition, saddling the country with high salaries to five Prison Inspectors, when three could have done the work, was JOHN W. GAMBLE.

Temperance—Intoxicating Liquors.

Feb. 27, '57. It was moved that the House deeply regrets that the Governor had invited no co-operation "in any MEASURE whereby the crime and misery of intemperance occasioned by the use of "intoxicating liquors might be diminished."—Wilson, Menro, Brown, Bell, &c. (27 in all) yeas. Nays, GAMBLE, Larwill, Bows, Chisholm, Daly, Spence, &c.

The Coalition Squanders Public Money without a Vote.

A new fashion has come in, for Government to spend on anything they please, from \$150,000 to \$250,000 a year, for which they have no vote of the Legislature, and then ask the House to sanction it all in a lump. On June 25, 1856, Mr. Mackenzie moved a resolution censuring the Executive for spending large amounts without the authority of Parliament. The Coalition, with the aid of their obsequious tools, voted it down. The Division was, Yeas, 25; Nays, 54. The name of JOHN W. GAMBLE is among the nays.

It was again moved, May 26, 1857, that this House cannot "too strongly condemn the practice of expending large sums of the "Public Money without any Legislative sanction, although in many cases the claims for money thus expended could have awaited "without inconvenience the deliberate action of the Legislature." Invisible—dodging! 48 Upper Canada members at \$6 a day, GAMBLE among them. [Journal, pages 531 and 532.] \$29,816 thus voted five minutes after—GAMBLE skulking. (Same pages 1)

Debtors' Exemption Bill.

Sometimes a poor man is out of work, has a large family and is unable to pay. A bill has passed the Assembly twice, and been thrown out in Legislative Council, to exempt a \$100 value in furniture, a cow, tools of trade, &c, so that the sheriff could not seize for debt. On the question to go into committee on this bill, May 14, 1857, Cartier, Meagher, Conger, &c., voted nay, but were defeated. In committee the poor man's relief bill was torn to atoms. Where was GAMBLE? Invisible! Brown, Wright, Dorion, Wilson, &c., voted humanely.—[See Journal, pages 417 and 418.]

An effort was made to get the House to act upon this much required relief bill, May 8, (page 369 of Journal) but signally failed. GAMBLE was a nay.

Lunatic Asylum Tax.

Upper Canada has had a direct Assessment on every man's property for a number of years as an Asylum Building Fund; other buildings were paid for from the proceeds without public vote. Lower Canada had its Asylums upheld from the common purse without any tax at all. Why not abolish it in U.C.? Finding it burdensome and unpopular Cayley proposed to do away with it after 1857, taking \$80,000 from the Marriage License Fund, &c., in its stead. It was moved in amendment to save the country from \$80,000 of taxation by abolishing the Lunatic Tax at once. "NO," said GAMBLE, Cayley, Macbeth, Conger, Jo. C. Morrison, &c.

Gamble Dodges to Prop the Pope.

It is contended that as we Canadians fill the public purse our money ought not to be wasted on Sectarian objects. Government asked, June 25th, 1856, large sums in aid of a number of French institutions properly charitable, but altogether sectarian, and it was moved in amendment by Mr. Brown, and seconded by Mr. Hartman, of North York, "That the appropriation of Public Monies for the support of charitable institutions under the exclusive control of Rell-

It is an evil that the Legislature vote the import duties forever; it should be for a term of years, and then let the whole be revised by each new parliament. It was moved May 22, 1857, to change the system so that all customs taxes not renewed, at the end of four years would expire; as also that new ports of entry and new offices in the customs would only be created by law, the expense of collecting the duties having been increased from \$150,000 to \$408,000 within a few years. Cayley, Conger, O'Farrel and Morrish well-ed the nays. "GAMBLE" was called, but where was he? Echo answered "Where?"—[See Journ., page 490, and 491.]

The Landing Pier Below Quebec.

After being finished, as per estimate, the Government pretended just before the elections of 1854, that \$400,000 more were wanted for them—perhaps it went to corrupt the electors—who can tell! The money was paid out without legal authority—there was no investigation—and on December 13, 1854, the Assembly sanctioned this waste, the pier being a job, and yielding nothing. The yeas [page 594 of Journal] were 62. The nays were 29. Mr. GAMBLE was invisible!

Gamble Propping the Pope.

Mr. Sicotte's Roman Catholic Church Bill, provided that the valuable estate of the parishioners of St. Hyacinthe should be wrested from them, and given to one of the new French Bishops sent here from Rome under Draper and Baldwin's Acts. It dubbed the new priest a "Lord Bishop" took \$4,000 out of their rates for him, and imposed a tax of other \$20,000 for a magnificent Cathedral, to be levied upon ALL the ratepayers of the parish, the Bishop to be pews as at present, and "tenthly, to chaunt or cause to be chaunted, a Libera, according to custom, over the bodies of parish-ioners who shall be interred in the church-yard." On June 4, 1853, Mr. Brown moved to throw out Sicotte's measure. Only 24 members voted. Seven U. C. members voted nay; only seven of them voted yea; GAMBLE ran out of the House as the French could carry the bad bill without his help; so did J. A. Macdonald.

Sectarian Holidays.

Mr. Brown moved the abolition of all merely sectarian holidays—they impede public business—and are an evil. On this vote where was GAMBLE! Invisible. Yeas 13. Nays 64, of whom were Cayley, Macbeth, Meagher, Jo. C. Morrison, and O'Farrell.

Gamble and the 57 Rectories.

Everybody knows that a million of dollars worth of choice Clergy Reserves were picked out by the political priesthood, illegally, and set apart as "the 57 Rectories." In 1858, the Assembly voted to abolish them, and use the moneys for education, roads, &c. In 1853, April 6, Mr. Brown moved 2nd reading of his bill to abolish these Rectories, but not interfering with the life lease of the possessor, GAMBLE, Chauveau, &c., voted to kick Brown's bill out, and did it!—[Journals 1853, page 689.] On the 10th April, 1857, the question was again before the House, and Gamble gave a similar vote.

Gamble against allowing the Reserves for Education.

When it had been decided to give to the country the proceeds of certain Clergy Reserve Sales, it was moved, Nov. 1, 1854, that the Municipalities should apply the money only to support Common Schools and District Libraries, thus lessening the school taxes. GAMBLE, O'Farrell, Meagher, Attorney Gen. Macdonald, &c., were nays. Lost!—[See Journal, 1854, page 334.]

Canada Gazette and Public Printing.

May 26, 1857. It was moved to vote a sum, to that skinnit, Desbarats, who squeezes \$40,000 a year of profit by the Gazette, the printing, the binding, &c.—enough in four years to make eight, or nine miles of railway. In amendment, proposed to save these \$40,000 a year by giving the Laws and the Gazette to the printer who would find security to do the work cheapest. For amendment, 25; against it, Cayley, Spence, Joseph C. Morrison, &c. Hartman and Wright were yeas for East and North York. GAMBLE dodged—had business elsewhere! He was below the bar, and had voted on another matter five minutes before, as the Record will show. (See Journals, pages 517 and 518.)

No Pension Without Public Sanction.

A bill was offered to prevent the coalition or any future government from bestowing life pensions, in large sums, as at present, except where the justice of the case is admitted by legislative vote. The bill was not even allowed to be read; they knew what it wanted to do—that was enough.

The members who put on the gag in this case, were Joseph C. Morrison, Meagher, Stephenson, Cayley, Hincks, &c., 39. Nays 33. Bill smothered! GAMBLE dodged or concealed himself.—[See Journal, Nov. 27, 1854, pages 412 and 413.]

Three Rivers Land Owners' Bill.

The public have lent \$325,000 to the owners of the ground, whose houses were burnt at a fire at Quebec, many of the houses being insured. They defy the law, and neither pay principal nor interest. Monsieur Polette moved, June 9, to pass a bill lending rich owners of the lands in Three Rivers, on the credit of Canada, \$60,000 more, through the Loan Fund. And the yeas are GAMBLE, Baby, Turcotte, Marchildon, &c. A dead loss!—[Journal, 1857, p. 704]

Gamble and "Church and State."

The Clergy Reserves Bill of 1854 was quite offensive to Gamble, for it declared that "all semblance of corruption between Church and State" was done away in Canada. On Nov. 2, that year, [Journal, page 268], Cameron moved, seconded by Mr. GAMBLE, to have the words that destroyed Church and State connexio struck out, and continue to give a third to the Scots Kirk and two thirds to the Church of England, of Clergy Reserve sales moneys, under statute of George 1th as set out at the Union. The yeas were, GAMBLE, O'Farrell, Powell, &c.

Gamble backs up a Violation of the Constitution.

In April, 1856, Mr. J. C. Morrison was appointed a member of the Executive, and a sworn adviser of his Excellency; but because he

to tyrannize over them? Had they no rights to guard, no ties of country, no institutions to foster, no literature to cultivate, that we should endeavour to deprive them of their proper influence, and place them in a humiliating and degrading position? (Applause.) He supposed they all knew there was a legislative union between England, Ireland, and Scotland; but did they ever hear of a demand for Representation by Population? He rather thought not, because in the mother country they say such an arrangement would not be for the public good.

Mr. Gamble for throwing off British Authority and annexing to the States!!!

Every one knows that Gamble is a great admirer of American institutions, such as an elective governor, elective sheriffs, &c., &c. But people may have forgotten that not many years ago he was an open and avowed annexationist. He would be so still, if he dared. Yet he has the ineffable impudence to object to Mr. McMaster—and it is almost the sole ground of objection he takes—on the score of loyalty. Mr. McMaster, according to Mr. Gamble, is a Radical—a rebel, unworthy of the support of any loyal man.—The following extracts from a speech which Mr. Gamble made in July, 1849, at the meeting of the British American League, shows with how little grace that gentleman can raise a cry of disloyalty against a good British subject like Mr. McMaster. After advocating an elective Governor, an elective Legislative Council, &c., Mr. Gamble said:—

"Finding that the idea of an elective Legislative Council was scouted by the majority of the convention, the question he asked himself was, what next can we do? and he thought if we could obtain an independent Government for Canada, granted by Great Britain, that it would be the most congenial to his feelings. "But there was another course which they might pursue, which he would allude to shortly, but he would allude because his opinions differed from those of other gentlemen. That course—and it would be a dernier resort—was to become a part of the United States. Hear, (hear.) If they could only lay aside their British feelings, he felt satisfied that our interests would be greatly improved by such a step. He thought it very probable that before many years there would be some great political convulsion in the United States, and then some of the States would be desirous of coming into a union with us and forming one great body. This, the geographical position of the country pointed out, would be our future fate."

Mr. McMaster's party friends protested against Mr. Gamble's loyal views in 1849, and they protest against Gamble on the British flag and subjects of Her Majesty, not a country, because it suits their pockets. Gamble was an annexationist of 1849 who raises the cry of disloyalty against Mr. McMaster!

In these perilous times, I ask the electors of the Midland Division, is it safe to commit the destinies of Canada into the hands of a man who avows the conviction that, from its geographical position, annexation to the United States must be the future fate of this country?

A Conservative opinion of Mr. Gamble, and how he got his nomination.

Read the following from the Brownsville Examiner, edited by the Secretary of the Convention, on whose nomination Gamble relies as his passport to the suffrages of the electors of Midland Division:—

"It has been stated that the Convention of which we were secretary pledged itself to support its nominee, whoever that person be; my saying is not correct, such a motion was indeed made, but it was lost.

"Our preference was most distinctly for a local Candidate, after Mr. Robinson had refused to accept the Nomination, but while such was the case, we said, that if a real good Convention would bring any other man out (barring Mr. Gamble) we would support him. But we did not hold ourselves bound to support any man merely as the Nominee of the most irregular and viciously conducted Convention the world ever saw, for of the twenty present when Mr. Gamble was nominated, not more than seventeen had any right whatever to act as Delegates; for at a previous meeting they refused proxies, and then at the very next elected delegates themselves. This, together with other irregularities to numerous to mention, against which we and others protested at the time, would fully justify us in refusing to be bound by a Convention of about seventeen legal members, only fifteen of whom voted for Mr. Gamble, as the chairman did not vote and the Secretary voted against him. Even had we supported the above named gentleman, it would have been on his own merits alone, and not as the Nominee of fifteen gentlemen instead of sixty.

"But having two years since been engaged in a contest on the side of Mr. Gamble, we firmly opine that he does not possess the requisite honesty, honor, or sound judgment as a political man requisite to fill so important an office, which in a future issue we shall substantiate by incontrovertible facts.

"But, say some you are going to split the party, and no Conservative ought to do that. Under ordinary circumstances, we grant this theory would be correct, and had Mr. Gamble been a good, and true Conservative, we would in spite of some personal objections have given him our support; but alas! like the Chameleon, he has continually changed colors. At one time a thorough paced aristocratic democrat, and even annexationist, (by his own confession,) and at another time thorough Conservative, we really do not know what he is, and it would puzzle himself, or any one else to tell us, only this that he is changeable as air, therefore as Conservatives and such only, we oppose him.—Sorry are we that the Convention seeing there were so few present should have made such an unfortunate selection, better far would it have been to let the election go by default, than to have selected, one who, even in his own division could not command at this moment the Conservative support, and when at home he has lost the support of his party, we do not see how we can consistently as Conservatives support him."

"And again.—If an election were to take place to-morrow Mr. Gamble could not command Conservative support even in Vaughan where he resides. He also is well aware that at the election for King Division, the Conservatives were defeated by Mr. Gamble's dishonest course, and that the entire party never will forget the shabby way which he acted. Mr. Gamble is well known as proud as Lucifer, and that pride made him insult a noble party and cause a Clear Grit's return, because farouah he lost the nomination of a Convention as fair as the sun ever shone upon."