

twenty-five years or thereabouts would be granted naturalization if they desired it.

Mr. MACDONALD: They would be German subjects.

Mr. NICKLE: No, they would not. The principles of the law are these: Since 1914 by the principles of the Delbrück law, any German who desires to be naturalized throughout the world for business or commercial or professional reasons, as a citizen of a non-German country has a right to become naturalized, and if he has had the consent of the German authorities, as set out in paragraph 25, to become naturalized, he is still entitled to retain and does retain his German citizenship, and the German Empire recognizes the dual nationality. That is my first proposition. My second is this, that if, prior to that date, any German had become naturalized anywhere in the world, he has a right, under paragraph 13, to become again a German citizen. For the sake of my argument, assuming he had lost his German citizenship under the law of 1870, he can again become a German citizen by making application to the Federal State or to the Imperial authorities by showing that he has business capacity and has led an irreproachable life. In other words, my argument is that the law of 1913 recognized a dual and fluctuating nationality.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does my hon. friend say that an Act passed in 1913 would apply to those who became naturalized British subjects ten, fifteen or twenty years before in Canada? Is it retroactive?

Mr. NICKLE: No, it is not retroactive, nor does it need to be. A law does not need to be retroactive which gives a right to a man to re-acquire his German nationality while in a foreign state it would apply to the future.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where previous to naturalization in a foreign country he had got leave from the German Government. Therefore, it cannot be recognized.

Mr. NICKLE: My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Pugsley) is confusing the argument. Let me repeat the law, as I understand it. Paragraph 25 lays down the principle that if, prior to making application for naturalization subsequent to 1914, the German gets the consent of the German authorities provided for by the second paragraph of 25, he can retain his dual nationality, and he may become a British subject, and still be a German subject. He may become a citizen of the United States,

[Mr. Nickle.]

and still be a German subject at the same time, and if, prior to that date, he acquires the nationality of any one of these countries, or of any other country, while he loses his nationality by doing this prior to the passing of the Delbrück law, by section 13 provision is made for him again becoming a German citizen, although he continues to live in the foreign state in which he acquires nationality; in other words, it recognizes the dual nationality.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would not my hon. friend's remark as to the right to become re-naturalized in Germany apply to the very worthy gentleman from Ontario whom the Prime Minister has indicated would be naturalized?

Mr. NICKLE: It certainly would, but in the case of the man who has lived in the country for twenty-five or fifty years, and helped to build it up, I am prepared to take chances, but I do not want to take any chances with the men who have come to the country within the last five, ten or fifteen years, and who have not become imbued with our ideas of civilization. I am prepared to take chances with the man who has been here for twenty-five years, who has cut himself off from the home land, and who occupies a position, as my right hon. friend says, that the French Canadian occupies, namely, they have cut themselves off from overseas relatives, and are Canadians in sentiment and ideals. However, a totally different condition prevails with reference to the condition of the men who have left Germany within the last ten or fifteen years, and who, perhaps, have brothers and sisters over there who are still members of the German Empire, and are interested in the success of the German arms and the cessation of hostilities.

I am in favour of the Bill for another reason. I believe the mothers, sisters, daughters and the wives of our soldiers are entitled to the vote. I think they are entitled to it because some 300,000 of our men are out of Canada, over at the front, and cannot, therefore, exercise in this election the influence they would ordinarily have; and owing to the fact that some 30,000 are dead, and others lying in the hospitals. I was surprised the other night to listen to the speech of the hon. gentleman from Shefford (Mr. Boivin), who seemed to treat with scorn the sacrifices which the relatives of the soldiers had made in this war. He said they stayed at home and drew separation allowances and from the Patriotic Fund. He must have come from a district where men