

understood in Canada, is very far from paradoxical. How closely Mr. Chamberlain's scheme, as presented and understood in Canada, corresponds with itself as presented and understood in Britain, the people of Britain ought to be able to judge for themselves. If the people, knowing how Chamberlainism is interpreted in Canada, are willing to accept that interpretation and proceed to carry out Mr. Chamberlain's programme on these lines, then they will certainly have the cordial approval of practically everybody in Canada.

SECTIONAL DECEPTION.

Obviously, a plan or policy that is intended for the whole Empire must be understood in the same sense throughout the Empire. Certainly there is no excuse for being misunderstood on the essential or fundamental aspects of Imperial policy. Yet the chief exponents of Mr. Chamberlain's Imperialism have by vague promises roused great expectations as to the concrete personal and sectional benefits to be obtained at the hands of others, with the minimum of sacrifice on the part of the recipients. Is it not perfectly plain to disinterested persons who have the welfare of the Empire at heart, that nothing can be more destructive of all that is best worth preserving in a common British civilisation than the course of sectional deception which is at present being followed?

NOTE.

To what Professor Shortt says may be added the following extract from the *Toronto Globe*, April 12th, the principal Ministerial organ in Ontario:—

"By what authority does Mr. Chamberlain pose as interpreter of Canadian sentiment and ambition? What has he seen of Canada, and what does he know of Canadian feelings, that he should talk about the endangering of Canadian loyalty? Does he measure Canadian loyalty by an extra five per cent. or ten per cent. preference on Canadian wheat, or is he trying to 'lance' the British elector into the adoption of Protection with a logey game of Colonial dismemberment? A man who visited the United States again and again, but only once, even when Colonial Secretary, deigned to touch Canadian soil, is in no position to estimate either the quality or the strength of Canadian sentiment. It would be well for Mr. Chamberlain were he to base his Protective propaganda on the needs and interests of the British taxpayer, rather than the fickleness of Canadian loyalty. Imperialistic tuft-hunters may solemnly, but the point will soon be reached when intelligent and self-respecting Canadians will resent the persistent misrepresentation of Canadian sentiment by British politicians. One of our chief humiliations is the tone of men like Mr. Chamberlain, who think we are bound to the Empire by ties of trade preference."