

railroad about to be begun completed, so as to connect the different provinces with each other, and more especially with the Atlantic in winter time, the militia and volunteer forces of the country could resist any attack on their own ground with the best possible chance of success. The weakest points would, of course, be those where there are fewest settlers, or where the country is almost unoccupied, as in the case of the Red River Settlement and the Saskatchewan Territory. So that the settlement of the latter, far from "weakening our military position," as was asserted not long since in Parliament (as if an increase of population could become a source of weakness), would remove at once both the pretext and the facility for invasion. I say the pretext, for it is well-known how much the Americans envy us the possession of that Territory; and justly enough, since we do nothing with it. That such a beautiful country should be made a preserve for wild beasts, and converted into a wilderness, when millions of our countrymen, who are without a home of their own, would be too happy to have a few acres, and *might* have them with a little assistance; whilst the settlers who occupy the smallest portion of it at the Red River Settlement are so neglected and cut off from the rest of the world, that they are obliged to burn their corn for want of a market, is truly a sin before God and man; a stain upon our national character. That this standing reproach should apply more directly to the Home Government may be true; but when a territory like that of the Saskatchewan is placed by Providence in the hands of an enlightened and powerful nation like the English, such neglect on their part becomes a breach of trust, and a dereliction of duty; and we deserve to be deprived of it. As Mr. Howe of Nova Scotia remarked latterly, when, after contrasting the progress of the Western States with the unoccupied condition of that noble tract of country, he asked, "What has England ever done with that territory?"

But to return from this short digression; Canada's best defence (again to quote Mr. Howe's words) is, "That a feeling of profound attachment to British institutions pervades every portion of Canada, including all races, religions, and parties; and that they are all animated with the conviction, that under the free institutions that prevail in British America, there is a security for life, and property, and personal freedom, which is to be found neither under the despotic governments of Europe, nor the Republican institutions of America." And these feelings have been strengthened by the late Union, which has given the country a higher *status* than could ever have been enjoyed by any province separately, and has elevated the Canadians in their own opinion and in that of the world.

Then, again, if we cast our eyes on the present condition of the United States, are they, or will they be for many years, in a position to become aggressive? or rather is not the time drawing on when separation and discord will again become inevitable? It is true they are still nominally united, if a re-union that has been achieved at the cost of the lives of half-a-million and the tears of the vanquished, can deserve that name. And time, it is true, will gradually calm the