

The article was as follows:

"A Celebrated Election Case.

"The extraordinary, if not unprecedented, sum admitted to have been paid by Mr. Dunlop to secure his election for North Renfrew recalls what is, perhaps, the most celebrated election case to be found in the records of the Dominion Parliament or of the Ontario law Courts. This was the petition to unseat the late Mr. John Walker for the city of London 30 years ago. The two candidates at the election had been fellow-members of the Conservative party and warm personal friends. It were bootless to inquire what caused the rift in the lute, but something moved Mr. Walker to run against Mr. Carling, and he was elected by a narrow majority. The election was contested and Mr. Walker was unseated and disqualified. In view of the fact that Mr. Dunlop admits through his official agent an expenditure of over \$7,000, it is more than interesting to note some of the features of the London case.

"The first point is that the agent of Mr. Walker admitted spending various sums paid openly to him by the respondent for legitimate purposes. The Judge who presided at the trial, the late Sir John Hagarty, summed these up at about \$2,100, adding: 'It was not strongly pressed that such a sum would, under the circumstances, be extravagant, nor am I prepared to hold that it was.' As the learned Judge was horrified to discover that the expenditure all told amounted to \$9,000, one may easily imagine what he would have thought of a 'legitimate' expenditure of \$7,000, if such a thing had come under his notice. Among the items were \$120 for livery-stable bills, \$850 for printing and advertising, \$300 for clerks and messengers, and \$700 to ward committees for 'rent of rooms, refreshments, light, vehicles, driving about, canvassing, etc.'

"The personal complicity of Mr. Walker in the illegitimate expenditure which cost him the seat and eventually brought upon him the penalty of disqualification was raised not merely during the trial, but by the presiding Judge in his analysis of the case. One of his business partners admitted paying out between \$5,000 and \$6,000, in sums varying from \$50 to \$1,500. Another \$2,000 was contributed by a member of a legal firm which did business for the respondent. It was argued strongly by the petitioner's counsel that Mr. Walker must either have known that all this money was being spent or have kept himself intentionally ignorant of it. All records of the respondent's organization and cam-