

information. I suggested that it might be accomplished very easily by requiring the returning officer to furnish two classes of ballots—one white and one pink, the white being for the male voters and the pink for the female voters. At the close of the poll, the returning officer would total up the number of white ballots and the number of pink ballots. The paragraph would read something in this way:

The returning officer shall cause two ballots to be prepared, one coloured white and one coloured pink; the white ballot to be given to male voters and the pink ballot to female voters. The returning officer shall make a return showing the total number of each class of vote.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: What good purpose will be served by that?

Hon. W. B. ROSS: You want to know whether more men than women voted, or whether more women than men.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: While I am not very enthusiastic about women's votes, I do not see why you should distinguish between the male and the female votes. It appears to me that it would be a violation of the secrecy of the ballot which has been adopted the world over.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: It is just as secret as ever.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I would point out to the honourable gentleman from Middleton (Hon. W. B. Ross) that while it would be a very interesting study to analyze the ballot in this way, and to determine how many men and how many women had voted, yet there is the insuperable difficulty that if we had to print a new ballot the vote could not take place as has already been arranged. The ballots are all printed.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: Then I withdraw the proposed amendment.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I am informed by Colonel Biggar, the returning officer for the Dominion, that it would take four months to get a new ballot.

The preamble was agreed to.

The title was agreed to.

The Bill was reported without amendment.

By leave of the House, on motion of Hon. Sir James Lougheed, the Bill was read the third time and passed.

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Senate resumed from yesterday consideration of the Address in reply to His

Excellency the Governor General's Speech at the opening of the Session.

Hon. A. B. CROSBY: Honourable gentlemen, in moving yesterday that the debate be adjourned until to-day, I overlooked the fact that to-day would be Friday. This House has been very generous to the honourable gentlemen from Quebec, and as to that I have no protest at all to make, but I now find that some of these honourable gentlemen, who preceded me in this discussion, have left the Chamber. I can quite understand their desire to do so and go to their homes rather than listen to me. At the same time I desire to make my few remarks on the Address when these honourable members are present. My reason is that during their speeches, they did not allow me to ask any questions or make any replies. I would request the House to be good enough to permit me to move the adjournment of this debate until Monday or Tuesday, or whenever the House re-assembles. Then our friends will be here and I shall have a fair field in the debate and shall be able to deal with the honourable members who made statements that were not correct. I therefore move the adjournment of the debate.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: Until Monday or Tuesday?

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: I do not know, but I understand we are going to adjourn till Tuesday.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: My honourable friend from Halifax (Hon. Mr. Power) was desirous of speaking this afternoon. Would the honourable gentleman object to his making his speech now?

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: Certainly not. I shall be delighted to hear it.

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: The honourable gentleman (Hon. Mr. Crosby) wants the proper auditors.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Does it make any difference?

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: On the understanding that it does not take away my right to speak.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: Is this going to be a precedent?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Precedents are made to be broken, you know.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: On any Friday some honourable gentleman who felt that