

ing would be useless,—none the less there would be ample scope for the common sense, readiness of resource, and energy which every successful civil engineer should possess.

FINAL BROAD VIEW OF SUBJECT,—THE PATRIOTIC STANDPOINT.

Taking a final view of the subject discussed, and from the broadest point of view, we find a close connection between civil and military engineering. Civil engineering has been defined as harnessing the great force of nature for the service of man, and *military engineering may be defined as harnessing those great forces for the service of one's country.*

Looking at it from this point of view; can the building of the Siberian railroad be called distinctively either a military or civil operation? And can the building of the Canadian Pacific Railroad be considered entirely a civil operation? Can a strike, when organized labour enlists natural forces on its side against organized capital be considered a really peaceful operation?

There are more ways of conquering a nation than by actually shooting its inhabitants;—its food supply (for instance) may be cut off, and this may be done by apparently peaceful operations. In the establishment of the internal communications of Canada free from all warlike interruptions, that might disturb its supply of food, of fuel, and of raw material for manufacturers, are not the civil engineers of Canada doing the work that is most essential for the defence of their native land?

In such works as the new Transcontinental Railway, the Georgian Bay Canal, and railway communication to Hudson Bay, Canadian Civil Engineers are carrying out nothing less than the peaceful conquest of their own country.