

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE MIDLAND DIVISION.

I invite your attention to a few out of many of the votes of Mr. John W. Gamble, given when he was a member of the House of Assembly, from 1854 to 1857.

In each case the date is given, and if Mr. Gamble denies any one charge I have made, many voters have the means of satisfying themselves, by referring to the printed Journals before the election.

I do not address you as Conservatives or Reformers; I ask you, are Mr. Gamble's votes such as you would have given? Is his conduct such as you can sanction? **IS AN ELECTOR.**

Gamble on the Corrigan Murder.

Mr. GAMBLE, (March 7, 1856), seconded an Address ordered to be sent to the Governor for a copy of Judge Duval's extraordinary charge on the trial of Kelly and others, accused of the wanton and cruel murder of Edward Corrigan.

The Government members firmly resisted, but were outvoted, 48 to 44; they had to yield, lose their places, or compel the Assembly to rescind its vote. This was March 10th.—[Journal, 1856, p. 133.]

On the following Thursday, (March 13), the Attorney and Solicitor General told their followers in the House that the above vote must be rescinded, and they moved to rescind it.

They found the House could not be persuaded to do this directly, and, to give them an excuse for keeping their places, they arranged with one of their friends to move an amendment, stating that, notwithstanding the vote on the Corrigan Murder, they still had the confidence of the House. To prevent this dodge, the Hon. John Sanfield Macdonald, seconded by Mr. A. A. Dorion, moved the previous question. If this were carried, the sense of the House would be taken directly on the question of rescinding. If negatived, the matter dropped. It was negatived, and the Government intimated that they accepted this vote as a proof of the confidence of the House, that they would retain their places, and advise His Excellency not to grant the Address. In this business the Coalition found a supple tool in GAMBLE, who voted with the majority to sustain the Government in refusing to carry out the motion he had seconded. Justice on Corrigan's murderers was promptly abandoned by JOHN W. GAMBLE, to please our French masters. The vote was 75 Ministerial; 42 Opposition.—[See Journal, 1856, page 142.]

Picked Lands for One Shilling per Acre!

A CROWN LAND JOB!

Fifteen Hundred Acres for £75!!

March 21th, 1855.—Mr. John Sandfield Macdonald this day dragged to light a most improper proceeding on the part of the present Government, in paying clandestinely an old claim, previously condemned and expressly debarred by statute, in favour of their political friend, Mr. Clarke Gamble, of Toronto, brother of Mr. John W. Gamble, at that time member for West York.

It appeared that about 60 years ago, one Oliver Everts settled in the province and claimed 1,500 acres of land, at a nominal price, 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 1,000 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 fulfilment 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 promptly 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 Quarter Master 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 1800 payment of sixpence sterling for each acre patent fee, and at the rate of £1 4s. 9d. sterling, survey fee, for each one acre, which was ordered July 3rd, 1798. That in 1820 he petitioned to have the claim confirmed, stating the quantity at 1,000 acres, upon which petition no

to incorporate the Sisters of our Lady of Loretto," in Dr. Charbonnel's diocese. The member for Peel, North York, &c., voted nay. Where was West York? Invisible—under the horizon—dodging! GAMBLE, in this great Nunery case, was nowhere!—[See Journal, p. 383.]

March 16.—Second reading of the bill to charter "Our Lady of Loretto's" Nunery in Toronto diocese. GAMBLE was just out of the way; had a sudden call; had not made up his mind upon Nunneries and Convents—dodged the vote!!

Representation by Population.

Gamble was faithless to Upper Canada here also. Sometimes he would vote yes when it would do no good. At other times he was nowhere. If he thought he would hurt the Coalition of Pope and Family Compact, he would vote straight out for Lower Canada against justice to Upper Canada. On the 26th of February, 1856, [see the yeas and nays in page 53 of the Journal of that year] it was moved, "that the several Electoral Districts into which this Province may be divided, under a census to be taken at an early day with a view to the elections of members of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly, shall be arranged as nearly as conveniently may be, upon the equitable principle of representation according to population, and without regard to a dividing line between Upper and Lower Canada."

Among the nays was JOHN W. GAMBLE. No wonder the Coalition folks gave Clark Gamble 1,500 acres of the picked land of Canada for £75, or a shilling an acre!

Legislative Council to be Elected by Population.

On the 14th of March, 1856 (page 148 of Journals), it was moved that the members of the Legislative Council, whenever it is rendered elective, shall be elected according to population. GAMBLE went strong against the principle, and voted accordingly. [See Journal, March 14, where it will also be seen that GAMBLE voted against allowing the Legislative Council even to choose its own speaker!!—[pages 148 and 149.] Gamble is the last man any constituency should push into a Legislature.

On the 27th March, another effort was made to have population made the basis of Representation in the Council. Mr. Hartman, then member for North York, moved that the electoral divisions be so arranged as to embrace within each, as nearly as practicable, an equal population, without regard to a dividing line between Upper and Lower Canada. JOHN W. GAMBLE dodged the vote, although he had been in the House and voted on another motion a few minutes before!—[See Journals, page 193.]

The \$1,900,000 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 Yes or Nay, even on a question which concerns the dismissal 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.

themselves! [For this vote see the Journals of 1855, page 637, vol. 2nd.]

Such was the bitter intolerance and bigotry of Gamble against Presbyterians and Methodists, that in March, 1840, even Scobie of the *Colonist* was moved to remark: "We oppose Mr. GAMBLE'S return for the first riding of York, on account of his known hostility to the Government, his factious disposition, and his intolerance and bigotry, which were so conspicuous in his conduct during the last session. His defeat, with proper management, is certain."

The Corporations Bill.

On the 25th April, 1856, Attorney General Drummond moved a general bill, to regulate the incorporation of religious and charitable Societies. As first introduced by the Government, it would have given facilities for the organization of Numerics, Convents, Monastic establishments, &c., &c., with most obnoxious powers as corporate bodies in law and equity. Brown, Hartman, Wright, Murney, &c., opposed, but the yeas were GAMBLE, O'Farrell, Joseph C. Morrison, Cauchon, Lemieux, &c., 60!!

Afterwards, Mr. Drummond introduced into the Bill some very important restrictions, and the result was that he quarrelled with his colleagues, and was denounced from the altar, and the Bill fell through.

While it was still before the House, an attempt was made to have these restrictions applied to Corporations already in existence. On the 10th June, 1856, Mr. Papiu, seconded by Mr. J. B. E. Dorion, moved "That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House, with an instruction to amend the same, by enacting that the provisions of the Bill which limit the right of bequeathing property to Corporations to be created under or by virtue of the said Bill, be extended to all Corporations of the same kind, heretofore or now in existence at the passing thereof."

Among the 40 who voted for making the Bill really effective, by adding to it this valuable feature, were the following French Roman Catholics—Bourassa, C. Daoust, Darche, J. B. E. Dorion, A. A. Dorion, Huot, Jobin, Laberge, Papiu, Valois. There voted with them Conservatives like Chisholm, Jackson, Murney, and the whole Reform Opposition of Upper Canada, but among the 54 nays, who threw out the resolution, was JOHN W. GAMBLE, voting with Cartier, Cauchon, &c.

Another similar attempt was made to extend the operation of the good features of the Bill. Mr. Papiu, seconded by Mr. J. B. E. Dorion, moved that the bill be 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 55 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 Orangemen 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, Aikins, Brown, Christie, Foley, Larwill, Murney, Powell, Shaw, Supple, &c. The 62 yeas included all the French and JOHN W. GAMBLE. Mr. Gamble was ready for any act of subservience, 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?

rious Sects, is wrong in principle, productive of invidious preferences, and entails a constantly increasing charge on the public revenue; and that in view thereof the Report of the Committee of Supply be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole House, to leave out all grants to institutions of a sectarian character."

The amendment was voted down. Where was GAMBLE? Dodging! He had been in the House and voted a little before; slipped out while this one was being taken, and was back in time to second his vote five minutes afterwards on the immediately succeeding division.

Again on the 23rd May, 1857, more sectarian grants were asked for, and a resolution condemning them was again put. Half the U. C. members (at \$6 a day) were elsewhere, and GAMBLE could be seen at voting time nowhere. Just before that vote \$1,600 a year were voted as pension to an idle clerk (Fairbairn), and \$800 to Widow Antrobus. GAMBLE voted the Antrobus \$800, but he dodged the \$1,600—slipped out just when the yeas and nays were put on record. East York and North York voted nay. [See Record in Journals, pages 497, 498, and 499.]—A supple, limber back has our John W. GAMBLE!!! The voice of the electors of the Midland Division, through their representatives, Hartman, Wilson, and T. R. Ferguson, has hitherto been against sectarian grants. If they wish to give their influence the other way, and to have a representative who will exhibit dissolving views, while the sectarian grants are being pushed through, John W. GAMBLE is the man.

Gamble and the Pet Parsons.

The Parson of Grimstby, the Parson of Thorold, and some sixteen or twenty others who had fat rectories and a glorious slice out of the Clergy Reserves, in the form of a bonus of \$6,000 to \$10,000 each, while Methodist, Free Kirk man, Baptist, Catholic, and Congregationalist, got none, or next to none, petitioned the Assembly, asking for another grand haul of the country's cash as pretended arrears, which they admitted that the Coalition Government was ashamed of, and had refused to give them.

On March 23, Mr. Gamble seconded a motion to refer the parsons' petition to a favourable committee, and seconded the Coalition Government for not dipping deeper into the public purse for Fuller & Co. The thing was really too barefaced, but what will not a Gamble have face for? The yeas were Meagher, Dr. McDonald, O'Farrell, GAMBLE, Jos. Morrison, Polette, Conger, &c., 53. The nays 37.—[Journal 1857, page 125.]

Gamble Gambling Customs Revenue.

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'Farrell and Morrison swelled the nays. "GAMBLE" was called, but where was he? Echo answered "Where?"—[See Journal, 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 12, 1854, the Assembly sanctioned this waste, the piers being a job, and yielding nothing. The yeas [page 526 of Journal] were 52, including O'Farrell, Conger, and Polette. Mr. GAMBLE was invisible!

Gamble Propping the Pope.

Mr. Scotte'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

was not attached to any special department, the Government pretended that it was not necessary for him to go back to his constituents for re-election. On the 21st April Mr. Brown, seconded by Hon. John S. Macdonald, moved "That the appointment of a member of this House to a place in the Provincial Cabinet, without an Administrative Department, and the retention of his seat in the House of Assembly by such member without re-election, by his constituents, is contrary to the system of constitutional government established in Canada, and is calculated to impair that healthful influence which the people ought to exercise over the Executive Government of the country, and over their representatives."

This resolution was voted out by 61 to 45. Among those who voted to sustain the coalition in this and every other unconstitutional act, was JOHN W. GAMBLE. The coalition did not give away the fifteen hundred acres of picked land, at a shilling an acre, for nothing!

Mr. Gamble an opponent of Representation by Population.

In 1860, Mr. Gamble opposed Mr. Rescor in King's Division, and was defeated by that gentleman by a very large majority. On the nomination at Markham, Mr. Gamble spoke as follows, on the Representation Question:

Mr. Gamble: "Mr. Mowat had taken very narrow views with regard to the future of these Provinces—views he was surprised to see possessed by a public man in his position. With reference to Lower Canada, a vast amount of what was said rested upon mere assertion. He (Mr. Gamble) believed from his heart, that if the correct figures were ascertained, they would show that a very fair proportion of the revenue of this country was expended in Upper Canada, so far as it was applied for local purposes. As to lighthouses, canals, &c., these were great national undertakings, and the whole nation was very properly taxed to carry them out. (Applause.) Then, with regard to Representation by Population, did not Mr. Mowat know that so far as the number of representatives was concerned both Lower and Upper Canada were on an equal footing? How was it not the same power in the Legislature as the Eastern section? He asked whether Mr. Mowat remembered the grave and solemn instruments upon which the Union between the Provinces was based, and whether the demand for increased representation was made, not with a view of relieving Upper Canada of tyranny, but to enable us to tyrannize over them? Had they no rights to guard, no ties of country, no institutions to foster, no literature to cultivate, and no 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 and 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