

## REPLY TO THE CRITICISM.

My reply to Mr. Wickham must be the same as that already given to some other critics: "Please re-read the address criticized."

I said that the road of Canada's political development (now nearly 150 years long) had led in the direction of self-government. No one denies that.

I said that Canada was very near the end of that road. No one doubts that.

I said that there is no appearance of halting upon the road. No one questions that.

I said that there is no symptom of deflection from that road, either towards union with the United States, towards a separate republic, towards political incorporation with the United Kingdom, or towards separation from the British crown. No one says that there is.

I said that the end of that road is complete emancipation from the Colonial office, perfect self-government, political equality therefore with the United Kingdom. No one thinks otherwise. Mr. Wickham does not.

I said that for such a political situation the proper designation was not a "Dominion beyond the seas," but "the Kingdom of Canada"—the title desired by Sir John A. Macdonald forty years ago. Does any one doubt that?

I said that Canada ought not to subscribe to the British navy. Canada has converted almost everybody to her opinion upon that point, including the British government, the British Admiralty, Australia (the originator of the practice), and the Navy League itself, of which Mr. Wickham is a vice-president.

These are the main propositions of my address, and my critics thus far have found fault with none of them. Now let me copy Mr. Wickham's complaint, and a paragraph from the document that he complains of. Mr. Wickham says that the picture which I drew falls far short of his ideal, namely, an ultimate "combination, federation, or agreement—call it by what name you will—which will provide for mutual defence and adequate machinery for dealing with foreign relations."

Calling it an "agreement," I said that "one of the greatest benefits to be derived from independence is that by it we should be compelled to place our war-relations upon some satisfactory basis. The advent of Canadian independence will necessitate some definite arrangement." The picture and the ideal appear to be very much alike.

To one other point of Mr. Wickham's letter I make short reply. He says that "the position taken by Canada's representatives at the