Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman's use of the word 'impertinent' I submit, is out of order, and he should not persist

Mr. SPEAKER. The word 'impertinent' is one of those words classed as out of order in the authorities as I have read them.

Mr. HENDERSON. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that a former Speaker of this House ruled that the word 'impertinent' is allowed, if used in a proper sense.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will not take up time with regard to that. I will simply say that the hon. gentleman's question is not pertinent—which is what I understand the word 'impertinent' to mean. I assure my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) that I did not use the word in an offensive way. I thought he was rather quibbling when he put the question and so answered in the way I did. His point was that I had used hearsay evidence; mine was that I had used the statement of the delegate himself. He asked me if I considered the statement of Mr. Rogers of any value. That was not pertinent to the matter with which I was then dealing. I was pointing out that he was absolutely mistaken, and could not understand why he should be mistaken, when he suggested to me that I was using hearsay evidence and that as a lawyer I ought to know that it was of no value.

Mr. MACDONALD. The question is whether he places any value on the hearsay evidence of Mr. Rogers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If my hon, friend will permit me to say so without offence. I place more reliance on the statement of Mr. Rogers than I do on statements of my hon. friend.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not saying that in any offensive sense. It would be natural as Mr. Rogers has been called a Tory friend of mine, that I should place more reliance on statements of that hon. gentleman than I would on the statements of the hon. member for Pictou. Now, just a word more. So far as the subject I introduced to the attention of the House this afternoon is concerned, I trust my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will not think that I was guilty of any intentional discourtesy in not sending him word about it. The relations between the right hon, gentleman and myself in that regard have been very good, and I think he will do me the justice of saying that I have taken pains, sometimes even when I thought they were unnecessary, to give him notice of matters that I intended to bring up in the House. There was a has fully apologized and excused himstatement made by the right hon, gentleman self for his connection direct or indirect to bring up in the House. There was a

yesterday and he was perfectly in order in making it without giving me notice, though I might have supposed that, if he intended to make the extended remarks he did, it would have been proper that I should have had a word of intimation. But, as the subject was taken up and as it was followed by the statement of His Excellency the delegate himself, I did not suppose for a moment that he would expect further notice from me. And I trust that he will accept the further assurance that if I had dreamed that he would expect notice of my bringing it up to-day, I would have given it and so fulfilled the courtesy that was due to the right hon. gentleman, and which has always been extended from him to myself in all

matters.

So far as the question at issue is concerned, the debate has wandered considerably from the point at which it started. I do not know that I could usefully add anything to what I said this afternoon. I endeavoured to express the views that I hold in a temperate and moderate manner; and, without any idea of fomenting religious discord or race prejudice, I brought the subject to the attention of the House and drew certain inferences which, in my judgment were well founded, but which, are matters of judgment and opinion. These were very strongly controverted by my right hon. friend in the remarks he addressed to the House. I have no fault to find with the tone of his remarks or with the challenge he threw out. It may be that the right hon. gentleman's prophesy will prove correct: If this question ever does come as a direct issue before the people, the course the right hon, gentleman has taken may be found, in the judgment of the people, to have been a wise, prudent, and constitutional course. I greatly doubt it. So far as I am concerned, if that verdict is given, I shall be perfectly willing to accept it. For the present, the only thing that remains for me to say is that whether the verdict of the people shall be as the right hon. gentleman prophesies or not, I shall have no word to withdraw from those which I have spoken on this subject to-day.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, the speech my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has just made is such a speech as those of us who have known him for the last seven or eight years in this House would expect. He is quite evidently heartily ashamed of a great deal that has been said in this House and for which, perhaps, improperly, he has been held responsible, and he is even more ashamed of what has been said out-side of this House; and in as far as it was possible for him to do it, he

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.