

judges from \$7,000 to \$9,000 a year. The reason is that they will have to deal with all these cases under this new franchise Act. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this whole scheme on the part of the Government is intended to prevent as many as possible from voting at general elections. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) this evening asked a question of the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler), whether it was not a fact that German women, once they are citizens of the German Empire or the new German Republic, can never change their status—in other words, once a German always a German.

Mr. CURRIE: They have dual citizenship.

Mr. JACOBS: The point I want to make is that this Act is not providing against anything of that kind; that is provided for in the Naturalization Act, wherein it is declared that if a person has dual naturalization, one, say, German, and the other by reason of the Act, British, in the case of war that person reverts to his former citizenship and is subject to all the disqualifications of an alien enemy. He or she may be interned or deported or may have to report, etc. That is provided for in the Naturalization Act. But here that question does not arise. We will permit that person to vote only on his being provided with this certificate. Now, where is the justice which permits a man to vote whether he is or is not of good character, but declares that his wife must have a good character, otherwise she cannot vote? Why should we be so particular with regard to the character of the womanhood of the country in respect of those who are foreign born, when we do not exercise the same scrupulous care so far as the men are concerned? I have not yet heard of the Acting Solicitor General what the reason for this is. It is purely camouflage; nothing more or less. My good friend from North Waterloo was rather complimentary to the Government. He said that in many respects this was a fair Act.

Mr. EULER: Oh, no.

Mr. JACOBS: Well, I gathered from the tone of his remarks that he thought it was fair in many respects.

Mr. POWER: He was merely polite.

Mr. JACOBS: I do not wish to be tied down, so far as I am concerned, by any remarks made by any hon. member on this side of the House as to the fairness or jus-

tice of the Act. From the very start I have opposed it, and I have pointed out some of the anomalies of it which were very clearly seen to-night when we have half a dozen amendments to improve the Bill, although those amendments are all voted down by the willing instruments of the Government. I will admit that on the face of it this Bill did not look unreasonably unfair, but as soon as it is examined, even only in a cursory way, one cannot but come to the conclusion that it was designed with a view to getting it through the House, and that its so-called fair provisions are not fair at all. Altogether, Mr. Speaker, I feel that if this Bill goes through with this clause as it is it will constitute a blot on the Statute Books, and that is the feeling of tens of thousands of people throughout the country. The minister must know that to be the view, because he is in touch with the outside world; and while I am free to admit that he is a fair and just man in many respects, I think in this case he is but a tool of the Government. I have known him on many occasions to be just and fair in all his dealings and decisions.

Mr. POWER: When he was on our side.

Mr. JACOBS: And even since he has been on the other side. He has not yet fallen to the depths that one would expect of a minister who is associated with such a Government. It shows that his early up-bringing has had some good effect upon him so far. I do not say how long that wholesome influence will abide with the hon. gentleman, because it is evaporating very rapidly if we are to judge by the nature of the law which he is attempting to put through the House. I want to state now that I most solemnly object to the passing of this clause. Although I know that anything I can say at the present juncture will have no effect on the Government, I feel it is my duty as a member of this House representing a very large element of the people affected by this measure to rise in my place and protest against the passage of it.

Mr. JOHN A. CURRIE: (Simcoe North): I have no desire to delay the House, and I rise only because my name has been mentioned by the hon. member who has just concluded his remarks and because of a question which I asked the hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler). Now, if I do not mistake the condition of affairs in this country, there are over half a million returned soldiers who, with their mothers, their wives and their sisters, represent over