

Royal Scots receive a royal reception from the men of Maine, is significant and cheering.

The following is an extract from the Hon. Mr. Duffy's speech:—

"I need not continue to enumerate the resources of our two countries, or the many articles produced by one and acquired by the other; you know all that better than I can tell you. With our two countries lying adjacent to each other, with the numerous articles produced by the one and acquired by the other, it is apparent that an interchange of commerce is not only advisable, but well nigh inevitable. Every one seems to perceive that this interchange of commerce is highly desirable, and the question is frequently asked, how the governments of the two countries can best bring this about—what means would best facilitate this end. My answer is that they have simply to undo rather than do. In the past, in the place of facilitating trade, the governments of the two countries have been engaged in preventing it as far as possible. I am not here to-day to say which government is most to blame in this respect. The discussion of that question would be fruitless. The fact, however, cannot be denied that one government has commenced by raising a tariff wall to obstruct the entry of the goods of the other country. The other country has retaliated by raising a similar wall, and each has kept adding to the wall in order to obstruct as far as possible interchange between the two countries.

We have only to demolish this wall raised by the governments of the two countries in part and to permit the people of the two countries to exercise their own will and carry out their own desires in order to have commerce flow backwards and forwards between the two countries in the most flourishing manner possible.

The erection of this wall in the past has been in a great measure owing to the fact that the peoples of the two countries did not properly understand each other. There has no doubt been to some extent a lack of sympathy between the people of Canada and the people of the United States.

I am not now going to discuss the question as to which country should be attached the blame.

The time, however, has arrived when this misconception has disappeared, and I believe the people of both countries understand and sympathize with each other. We have been living apart as strangers, but we have suddenly discovered that we are brothers and friends.

We have had our own little differences in the past and there may have been unnecessary friction. The last year has witnessed a great change.

More than a century ago England made the same mistake which Spain is now making when she lost her children in the colonies which now form the United States. But England, unwise as she then was, had at least the good sense to profit by the sad lesson. Ever since, she has dealt with her colonies in the most generous manner possible. She has given to

them freedom and self-government according to their several needs, and is always ready to defend them in the hour of danger. They are bound to her by one tie—affection, love and esteem. Round her throne to-day there has grown up a collection of great states, in the Dominion of Canada, in the continent of Australia and in the colonies of South Africa.

In the homes of the Pharaohs, in the thousand islands of the seas and in all these places new empires and new states have arisen, destined in the course of time to equal or to surpass the mother land herself.

In the past you may have thought us selfish, you may have thought us unsympathetic, but in the hour of need you have found the hearts of the people of the British Empire in the right place. Our sympathy has been met with a generous response. From one end of the United States to the other I hear of nothing but expressions of brotherhood and good will. At the opposite ends of this continent may be seen shortly events strangely different in their character. In a few days in the old city of Quebec, the northern extremity of America, there will assemble the representatives of the British Empire and the representatives of the United States, to sit down in a friendly manner, calmly, justly and deliberately to settle all matters of dispute between the two countries. Their deliberations will be guided by a desire to give and take in a friendly manner and to end all matters of friction by friendly compromise. This is a spectacle not only honorable to the two countries concerned, but it is an example to the other nations of the world of that true spirit which is finally to bring peace on earth and good will towards men."

A WEAKNESS IN THE NEW CHARTER.

The new Charter submitted to the City Council by the City's legal advisers practically abolishes while pretending to retain the property qualifications of the Mayor and Aldermen.

The clause relating to the Mayor reads as follows:—"No person can be nominated or elected Mayor unless he has been resident in the City for one year immediately preceding the election and unless he, during a continuous period of six months preceding the day of his nomination has been seized of and has possessed in his own name immovable property in the City of the value of ten thousand dollars as established by the valuation and assessment roll in force at the date of nomination." The clause relating to the Aldermen is similarly expressed with the exception that the amount named is two thousand instead of ten thousand dollars.

The existing law requires that candidates shall hold the real estate upon which they qualify free from all encumbrances; but under the new Charter a man may qualify upon property mortgaged up to the hilt. In other words, the property qualification under the new law will be a greater sham than it is under the old law. If the qualification is to be abolished, it