

What are those rights? Great Britain has complete command of her own ships; we have not. While the war was on the British Admiralty commandeered Canadian ships without, I think, obtaining the consent of this Parliament. Am I wrong in that?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: I think my hon. friend is mistaken. I think the Government of Canada took the position that the British Government had no right to commandeer our ships, that that action could only be taken by this Government; and I think we co-operated in the action taken.

Mr. McMASTER: The Government has not continued to co-operate. It has asked for the return of those ships. Those ships are being returned subject to certain obligations placed upon them when they were under the control of the British Government.

Mr. ROWELL: I speak subject to correction, because I am not familiar with the details of the matter which my hon. friend is now discussing. But I think that the hon. gentleman is incorrect in that. Certain ships are being returned subject to certain conditions imposed by the British Admiralty, but these are ships that were transferred from British registry to some other registry, the British Admiralty imposing the condition on the transfer that they should be subject to all obligations to which they would have been subject had they not been transferred.

Mr. McMASTER: As I understand it, these ships which are being transferred from British to Canadian registry are Canadian ships, owned by Canadian companies or individuals. I am not criticising the Government for this action. I am merely pointing out that if we are to have a status equal to that of Great Britain, we should absolutely control the fate of our own ships.

Great Britain appoints her own ambassadors; we do not appoint ours. I do not wish to say at this time that ambassadors are necessary or that their appointment would justify the expense which would thereby be entailed. But if we are to reach out for the position of a nation having equal status to that of Great Britain, then we must be given the right to name our own ambassadors.

I imagine that if we are to have this full sovereignty—and I wish it for my country—we should have the right to name our own Governor-General. It would be wise, I think, to bring a Governor General from

[Mr. McMaster.]

some other British dominion in order that he should be free from all possibility of party bias in our politics. But it would seem to be a proper development that the Governor General should be named by our own people. In making this suggestion I make no reflection upon the choice which has been made by the British Government in times past or at the present time; Canada has indeed been fortunate in the character and attainments of her Governor Generals.

These are a few of the greater powers of sovereignty which at the present time we do not have and which I believe we should quietly, courteously and insistently aim to attain so that we may come to the stature of a fully sovereign power. We should certainly, Mr. Speaker, decide our own cases at law. The idea that in some provinces if a case involves over \$2,000 the litigant should be subject to having his case taken to courts in another country, no matter how able the judges there may be, seems to me to ill comport with the claim of complete nationhood.

Now, why do I want this nationhood for my country? Is it merely because of a feeling of pride? I grant you that pride has its place. I grant you that I, with Scotch blood in my veins, see no reason why, living on the North American continent, I should have any less powers or should belong to any less sovereign State than my own cousins who stayed in Scotland. That is pride, and I think it is proper pride. But there is something more than that. A sentiment of nationality or nationhood will breed a sense of responsibility, not only in the nation's statesmen but also in the individuals of the nation, which will have an ennobling and uplifting effect upon our party politics. Moreover, I believe that in the fierce and ardent fires of a true national sentiment much of the dross of racial, religious and sectional prejudice will be burned away and thus will be left in better shape the pure gold which is found in the character of the Canadian people.

I pass from this question of the status of Canada and I shall take up a few moments in referring to the League of Nations. The League of Nations proposes a new plan of international life. It proposes a plan founded on the principle that we are members one of another; that no nation, no matter how small, no matter how remote from the great centres of population of the world, can be careless or heedless of what goes on in the rest of the world. I support the League. I support it because it pro-