

field on the eve of the contest; with failing to take the platform against the G. T. P. scheme, with having been sandbagged into silence, lest some secret which I feared to have come out should be exposed; and with having arranged that I should receive \$100,000 as soon as the scheme outlined should be carried out.

These statements Mr. Blair characterizes as "a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end." He says that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, so far from forcing him to desist, did not even suggest that he should not take part in the campaign. He mentions Mr. Russell's name once, to deny that any dispute regarding money had arisen between them.

Mr. Russell is not so reticent in the use of Mr. Blair's name. He evidently likes his sudden rise from obscurity to fame by the coupling of his name with the names of those in high places. If Mr. Russell cannot occupy the seats of the mighty he is willing to crawl under them. He is reported from Montreal as saying:—

Hon. A. G. Blair and myself have instructed our lawyers to at once commence criminal proceedings against the Montreal Herald, the only responsible journal which has copied the malicious attack upon us. It is only fair to Mr. Blair for me to state that when I persuaded him to resign his position as chairman of the railway commission there was no understanding that he would take the stump. I assumed that when he was attacked he would take the stump, and so believing, I wired the editor of the St. John Telegraph that he would do so inside of 48 hours. I admit that I assumed too much but I can assure the public that Sir Wilfrid Laurier nor anybody else ever sandbagged him into silence. He defies any member of the Liberal party to make the charge.

Mr. Russell is great in the use of the word "responsible." An irresponsible paper is doubtless a paper that is not responsible to Mr. Russell—La Presse for example. He is dense enough to fail to see that a reference to responsible papers in announcing an action for criminal libel is misplaced.

"Dave" Russell says that when he persuaded Mr. Blair to resign from the railway commission he assumed that Mr. Blair

would take the stump, and this is his justification for telegraphing the St. John Telegraph "Mr. Blair will take the stump within the next 48 hours". Why couldn't the persuasive Dave persuade Mr. Blair to take the stump? Most people are now convinced by the discussion brought on by the article in these columns Nov. 26, and which was commenced in the daily press by the Toronto World Dec. 3, that a gigantic political plot was hatched in which Mr. Blair was to be used as the central figure whose virtue could no longer tolerate the vices of his time. Liberal cabinet ministers were to be arrested on fake charges, Liberal candidates were to be purchased to act as traitors to their party on nomination day. Liberal newspapers were bought up, and at a signal the mines were all to be sprung and the country stamped into overturning the government. The first step was actually taken. Mr. Russell "persuaded" Mr. Blair to resign his \$10,000 position, and immediately telegraphed his papers in St. John that Mr. Blair would take the stump "within 48 hours." No surmise or speculation about that. Precise and authoritative.

Explanations seem to be the order of the day. First Mr. Russell explained. Then Mr. Blair, having first been closeted with Mr. Russell at the Windsor Hotel in Montreal, made an explanation. Then Mr. J. Lambert Payne made a repudiation of a dastardly accusation. Next Mr. R. L. Borden denied that he knew anything about any of these matters, or that he had any hand in inducing Mr. Blair to resign. Mr. Wm. Mackenzie is said to have denied that his firm had anything to do with the affair, and this denial will be accepted if for no other reason than that it was not in the interest of the Canadian Northern Ry. to have a change of government.

The public have not discussed anything with such keen interest for many years and they want to know the truth. Can't Mr. Russell be "persuaded" to tell?