

April, 1902, no matter what country they came from, have behaved splendidly and have fulfilled everything expected of them. The only reason these men are disfranchised now is because they are distrusted, because it is believed that they cannot be trusted with the privilege of casting their votes according to their conscience. The member for Calgary knows as well as anybody that under British institutions every man has always had the right to say what he wants to say and to do what he wants to do, provided he is within the law. This privilege, however, is now to be denied to certain persons. What reason is given for this course? My hon. friend went further, and tried to justify the action of the Government by saying that these men should not be trusted, because, according to some authority, the name of which he did not give, blood is the most potent incentive of the actions of men. I am not sure that I agree with his philosophy. Blood is certainly a powerful tie; we all admit that. But there is a tie still more powerful, and that is the tie of home; the associations connected with home are more potent than ties of blood. When a man leaves his country to settle elsewhere, though the land of his ancestors may be dear to him, the land of his children is still dearer. When a man leaves a country he does so because he is not satisfied with the conditions that he leaves behind him; if he were satisfied he would remain in the land of his ancestors. He leaves, he comes to Canada; he is welcomed; he comes upon invitation; he is given all the privileges enjoyed by other citizens; he is entitled to become an owner of property and to have the franchise. Suddenly we tell him: We cannot trust you any more. It is quite true that "citizenship" and "franchise" are not synonymous terms. But it is true, also, that citizenship is the basis of franchise. My hon. friend pointed out that Nova Scotia and Quebec had adopted laws effecting an abridgement of the franchise in respect of some classes of His Majesty's subjects—for instance, person employed by the Federal Government. That is true, but I am not aware that this law of exclusion has worked to the advantage of anybody. I am not aware that the Government which introduced or the legislature which adopted such a law ever derived any benefit from it; on the contrary, I believe that all such legislation of a restrictive character has rather proved a boomerang than helped the Government which introduced it.

But my hon. friend brought forth an argument which was really of some consequence. Discussing the status of these German citizens of Canada, he asserted that they were still Germans and that, therefore, they should be deprived of the franchise. In connection with this point he made an argument, which I could not exactly follow; with regard to the amendment to the naturalization law which is to come into force on January 1, next, under the Act passed in 1914. Our naturalization law as it now stands is effective only within Canadian territory. If a man of foreign birth becomes naturalized in Canada and goes to another country, he is no longer a Canadian citizen or a British subject. No matter what country he goes to—United States, England, a foreign country—he is not a British subject; he is a foreigner. The effect of our law after the 1st of January, 1918, will be that a man who is naturalized in Canada will be a citizen of Canada and a British subject no matter what part of the British Empire he goes to. I hope that similar legislation will be introduced in other Dominions, providing that wherever a naturalized British subject shall go he shall continue to be a British subject.

The member for Kingston laid down a new doctrine, to which I am unable to agree; that under the law of Germany a man could have a double nationality—he could be a British subject in Canada and a German subject in Germany. My impression all along has been that the German law claimed jurisdiction over the German subject, no matter where that German subject was naturalized. My hon. friend says that there is an international law on this point.

Mr. NICKLE: By the law of 1870, if a German had been continuously out of Germany for ten years he lost his nationality. The law of 1913 changed that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I shall not dispute that point with my hon. friend. My impression has been that the German law always claimed jurisdiction over the German subject, even when he was naturalized elsewhere. There is no international law on this point, so far as I know. Every nation has its own law in respect of naturalization. Great Britain foregoes her claim upon anybody who goes abroad and becomes naturalized in another country. Other nations do the same, but some nations, including Germany, do not follow that plan. Under the German law, once a German a man is always a German; at