The Chronicle

Banking, Insurance & Finance.

ESTABLISHED JANUARY, 1881

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

Vol. XXXII. No. 30

MONTREAL, JULY 26, 1912.

Single Copy 10c Annual Subscription \$3.00

A UNITED and the British Dominions in strengthening the naval defences of the Empire will not be wasted, even if

if there is no war. The discussion of the situation has demonstrated in the face of all nations, the essential unity of the Empire. Not only are the Dominions showing up magnificently, but what is perhaps even more significant, political parties both in the old country and in parts beyond the seas are showing themselves superior to party prejudices in the face of danger to the Empire. While this has always been characteristic of the British people, it has never been so strikingly demonstrated as in the present emergency. None of the followers of Mr. Asquith are more cordial and enthusiastic than his political opponents in their support of the Government in this matter. Lord Selborne spoke for every Conservative in England, when speaking of the Premier's and Mr. Churchill's speeches in the House of Lords, he said: "I have no hesitation in saying that their utterances concerning the Dominious form a landmark in the history of the world. I do not for one moment grudge that it has fallen to the lot of my political opponents to be in office when the time came to say those words, because they are sentiments which we share to the full.

"There is nothing we would more rejoice in than that the whole question of Imperial unity be removed from the sphere of party politics, as we hope the question of the navy may be."

of the navy may be."

The same spirit is most gratifyingly manifest in Canada to-day. When "the Day" comes, the enemies of Great Britain will have to reckon with a united Empire.

BRITISH NAVAL
PROGRAMME.

THE Right Hon. Winston
Churchill, First Lord of the
Admiralty, acquitted himself
most creditably in his declara-

tion to the House of Commons of the British naval policy. He dealt frankly, but with an evidently keen sense of responsibility for every word, with a grave and difficult question. The speech, although, no doubt, unpalatable among our German friends, has provoked little resentment among them. The practical and inevitable answer to the German naval challenge was the substantial increase in the British ship-building programme. As this had to be, the Kaiser's subjects probably preferred a perfectly frank though courteous declaration from the First Lord to any beating about the bush. In asking for a supplementary vote of \$5,000,000, Mr. Churchill said: "These supplementary votes are of course only the first and smaller instalment of the extra expenditure which the new German law entails upon us. The number of ships we shall have to build in the next five years in order

to maintain the 60 per cent, standard will have to be raised from the figure at which he had hoped it would stand, namely, from three next year, and four, three, four and three in succeeding years, to five next year and four in each succeeding year.

"The Germans," he added, "are spending about a million pounds a year upon submarines, and we cannot allow our lead in submarines to be diminished. The estimates also include £160,000 for a ficet repair ship attachable to the third battle squadron.

"It was proposed to raise the number of battleships in full commission from 28 to 33, and there would also be a second fleet consisting of eight vessels. We should have from the year 1914 and onwards five battleship squadrons, of which four squadrons would be in full commission. There would thus be 33 ships against Germany's 29."

HONOUR IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

IT is to the everlasting credit of the better class of American newspapers, that they are practically a unit in appealing to the sense of honour in

the United States Senators on the question of the threatened violation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty; and are begginng them not to drag the character of the nation in the dust by a flagrant breach of faith with Great Britain and the other nations interested in the Treaty. The New York Commercial Bulletin, says:-"That 'honourable' Senators of the United States-there is no need to mention names-should admit that under our treaty obligations we cannot without breach of faith discriminate against the vessels of foreign nations passing through the Panama Canal by charging tolls upon them and allowing American vessels to pass free, and at the same time maintain that it would be quite honourable for the Government to pay the tolls of the latter out of the public treasury or grant to their owners a subsidy equivalent to the tolls collected, affords an amazing view of the sense of honour cherished by such Senators.

"If they are capable of logical reasoning they cannot with honest purpose point out any difference in the practical results of these two courses of conduct. When the pledge was made that the 'conditions and charges of traftic shall be just and equitable' and 'there shall be no discrimination' against any nation or its citizens or subjects in respect to them, what was the reason for giving and accepting such pledge except tary votes are of course only the first and smaller equality' in the cost of using the Canal in their trade, and that the vessels of no nation or its citizens should have any advantage at the expense of others? If it is admitted that the United States was included under the phrase 'all nations,' as is admitted by these