

"The contributions of the Dominions towards the naval defence of the Empire are based upon the principle of local autonomy. New-Zealand alone has declared herself in favor of one Imperial Navy. Australia and Canada control their own Navies, and reserve the right to decide whether or not in case of war their fleets shall aid the Imperial government. It follows that, with regard to the naval forces of the Empire, there is dual control; **A SYSTEM WHICH IS IMPRACTICABLE IN PEACE AND DISASTROUS IN WAR.**

The plain fact is that, when in 1909 the representatives of the Dominions were called together in conference to discuss the question of their contribution to the naval defence of the Empire, every difficulty was deliberately ignored by the Imperial government, and **THE DOMINIONS WERE LED TO BELIEVE THAT, IF THEY BUILT SHIPS ALL WOULD BE WELL.**

As matters stand, it must be said — however disagreeable the task — that **THE DOMINIONS' NAVIES CANNOT BE RECKONED AMONG THE EFFECTIVE NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE**". (1)

That book and the facts thereby revealed have come in due time to strengthen the many other reasons which demand the immediate repeal of the Navy Act.

The least that can be said, is that such grave charges, brought against the British Admiralty by one of the most distinguished naval officers of the British Empire, demand a full discussion and a thorough investigation, in order that the whole truth be known.

In that discussion, we, Canadians, can take but an academic part. That investigation and the reforms that may be found necessary we have neither the right nor the power to impose. The voters of the United Kingdom, our "brethren" and "equals" in theory, our masters in reality, alone possess such right and power.

But what is in our power, what remains within the very restricted limits of our colonial action, is to let the British authorities understand that we are not prepared to enter blindly into a naval organisation judged to be absolutely inadequate by one of the most important British officers; that we do not mean to hand over the direction of our ships, the lives of our sailors, or the use of our money, to the authority of a board which the same officer publicly charges with ignorance, inability, malversation and betrayal.

(1) "The Betrayal", pages 158 and 160.