

party to which he belonged was virtually wearing a mask. If the hon. gentleman's statement which he gave us yesterday is to be accepted we must take it as the expression of a sentiment coming from an individual, and not from the party. The writer to whom I refer said further, that "we"—the Liberal party—"had better make for annexation at once instead of making two bites on the cherry." Now, it is gratifying to know—

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The paper never endorsed these views of Mr. Wiman's. Mr. Wiman was never editor of the *Globe*.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—I am not aware that I mentioned Mr. Wiman's name. I regret that the hon. gentleman's comprehension and knowledge of political affairs of this country did not suggest to him that I was referring to the late editor of the *Globe*.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Mr. Farrer was ejected from the *Globe*, perhaps for that very reason. Mr. Wiman has been a contributor of the *Globe* for many years.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—I am glad to learn the fact that he is a secret editor of the *Globe*. This country has never before been informed of that important fact.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The hon. gentleman has no right to misunderstand me. I stated that Mr. Wiman occasionally contributed to the *Globe*. He always wrote over his own name. That fact did not make the *Globe* or the party responsible for his views. I do not propose that the hon. gentleman shall misrepresent me in this manner.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—Neither do I propose that the hon. gentleman shall interrupt me in such a manner or put me off the line of my argument, nor do I propose that he shall draw a herring across the track to put me out. Mr. Wiman, who is living in another country, may have uttered the sentiments to which he has referred and I might also hold the hon. gentleman responsible for Mr. Wiman's opinions, he being in accord with the sentiments which have been uttered by Mr. Wiman in favour of commercial union or unrestricted reciprocity, either of which, to my mind, mean nothing more or less than annexation to the United States. I wish the hon. gentleman to bear in

mind that I have no desire to misrepresent him. I have no desire to do so, nor do I propose to let him, if I can prevent it, say that I wilfully misrepresent him. I repudiate it: I have no desire or intention to do so. I was referring to Mr. Farrer. The hon. gentleman says Mr. Farrer was ejected from the *Globe*. When was he sent from the *Globe*? It is only a few months ago. He was retained on the staff of the *Globe* for about two years, after it was proved he wrote letters to leading statesmen of the United States pointing out to them how they could strike the most fatal blow at Canada, he was not repudiated by the *Globe*.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The *Globe* is not the organ of the Liberal party, and I am not responsible for its opinions.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—I am very glad to hear the hon. gentleman say so.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—The *Globe* does not profess to be the organ of the Liberal party.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—We have another "revelation" here to-day, and that too from the leader of the Opposition, to the effect that the *Globe*, the *Toronto Globe*—the *Globe* that was instituted and established by the late Peter Brown, and conducted with so much ability by a member afterwards of this House, the late Hon. George Brown, and since by a combination of the party, under the control of the party, and under the pay of Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Edgar and others, is not the organ of the Liberal party. If the *Globe* does not utter the sentiments of the Liberal party, it is a great pity that they did not, when they met in convocation, repudiate the *Globe*. I tell the hon. gentleman that neither he nor the party to which he belongs dare repudiate the *Globe* in the province of Ontario, or say that it does not utter the sentiments of the party with which he is at present connected.

Hon. Mr. SCOTT—Not always.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—My hon. friend says "not always." I do not pretend to say that any newspaper utters the sentiments or expresses the opinions in every particular of each individual member of the party to which he belongs or which he leads. Human nature is not so constituted that that is