

of the sixteenth century and those of their enemies." Contrast the characters of the turbulent and vicious-spirited John Knox, and the beautiful, loving and lovable, but so sadly unfortunate and basely betrayed, Mary Queen of Scots. That one contrast alone will suffice; if studied well it should serve to convert all Scotland to the Catholic Faith.

IMMIGRATION.

From Ottawa despatches we learn that the Government has decided upon landing all the immigrant passengers during the coming season, at Quebec instead of at Montreal, as heretofore. The enactment applies to third class passengers only and has no reference to the intermediate or the cabin passengers. The reason given by the Government for this change is the lack of proper accommodation in Montreal. Quebec is provided with a good immigrant shed, which it is intended to utilize next season. Montreal, on the other hand, is not so well equipped. Still, we have a good, serviceable building on Commissioners street, adjacent to the wharves, in which from 50 to 100 persons can be accommodated at a time. The case here is not nearly as bad as represented. We know that as many as 150 were sheltered there at one time. The building requires furnishing, more bedsteads and such like necessities. Moreover, we have no doubt but that the newly-appointed agent will exert himself considerably this year in putting everything in good order for the better reception of the trans-Atlantic immigrants.

A suggestion has been made that if the Government, or the Montreal City Council, would erect a few temporary sheds on the wharf, in which to shelter the immigrants during the very short time that they are obliged to remain in that locality, it would suffice for all requirements. It is well known that last summer the two great railway lines contended with each other to have the immigrants transferred to their respective depots as rapidly as possible. The G. T. R. has had busses expressly built for that purpose, while the C.P.R. station is in the vicinity of the wharves, and the transfer is very short.

When we state that Quebec is provided with a good immigration shed we said about all that can be advanced in its favor. Ninety per cent, if not more, of the immigrants are obliged to come to Montreal, which is the great distributing centre, the place whence they radiate in all directions to their respective destinations. They are consequently obliged to come to this city by rail, if they are landed in the former. Just imagine the inconvenience and expense of two unnecessary trans-shipments. To be hustled out in Quebec; then into the cars; to be finally transferred from the cars to the depot sheds or platform in Montreal, to await another change to whatever train is to take them to their ultimate destination. On the face of it the arrangement cannot be in the interests of the immigrants; decidedly it is for the benefit of the steamship companies and the railway lines. This is so obvious that all argument or explanation would be superfluous. The scheme instead of facilitating the transporting of the immigrants only retards it; and instead of decreasing merely augments cost and expenses.

The fact that Quebec has a good immigrant shed (and nothing else) seems to us to weigh lightly in the balance against the hardships which will have to be endured by the poor strangers landing on our shores. To illustrate, let us take a family consisting of a man, wife and four children. They are bound for

Montreal, or for some place west, to reach which they must come by way of this city. And this, we repeat, is the case of over ninety per cent. of the immigrants. Not one in a thousand goes east of Quebec. These people are put off at Quebec and are obliged to take train for Montreal. The inconvenience and extra cost of this double transferring of the family and the baggage is evidently not taken into consideration. Now, let us suppose the members of this family are received into the immigrant shed at Quebec, what provision is made for their maintenance? None whatsoever. The Government will incur no expense for the provisions and other necessities. The immigrants are deprived of the two or three meals that the steamship company would have had to give them on the way to Montreal, and the company is that much ahead, while it escapes all responsibility for them.

We may be asked, "Who is to blame for this lack of adequate accommodations in Montreal?" The answer is a lengthy one, and would require considerable explanation. But we may briefly say: the Government, the Montreal Board of Trade, the City Council, the National and Benevolent societies that profess to look after immigrants, and all citizens who claim to take an active part in these matters. We think that it is the duty of all who are interested in preventing the port of Montreal from being thus degraded by such a blow to unite in protesting and strongly petitioning the Government to reconsider the matter before effect is given to the Order-in-Council. Also, they should ask that suitable immigration buildings should be erected in some convenient locality in Montreal. Unless prompt action be taken it will be too late for this season's work. Quebec seems to have taken advantage of Montreal's apathy in these matters, and has certainly profited to the detriment of this, the natural chief port of the Dominion. But we must remember that Quebec has had an advantage over Montreal; she had two resident Ministers of the Crown, who were lavish in their patronage of the Ancient Capital. Take, for example, the immense sums spent on her Harbor Improvements, which included, of course, the immigrant sheds. Montreal's representative should have been made aware, by the city, of the necessity of having the moneys that were expended for Quebec immigration facilities equally divided and a fair share of that patronage given to this, the more important port. But that was not done; and, now, the next best thing would be for our City Council, our Board of Trade, and our leading and interested citizens to do all in their power—with the aid of their different representatives in Ottawa—to check a measure that will decidedly degrade Montreal to a second class port.

We have no further comment to make. We have pointed out the danger, signalled the cause, suggested the preventative, and can merely await to see whether any action will be taken in the premises.

TWO GRAND CHARACTERS, two magnificent figures upon the rim of the nineteenth century, two monuments of genius upon which "forty centuries" to come will gaze: Leo XIII and Gladstone. The Pope had a long talk with Cardinal Vaughan and Cardinal Logue on the subject of Home Rule and the Queen's speech. In the course of the conversation Leo said: "Gladstone and I, although the two oldest leaders, have the youngest ideas." He is perfectly right and many generations may come and pass before the world will behold two such personages shining during the same period.

NON-INTOXICANT.

The Quebec Legislature has decided that lager beer is not an intoxicant: it contains only four per cent. of alcohol. In future, as far as this province is concerned, a person cannot, according to law, get drunk on lager beer, because that liquor is legally a non-intoxicant. It takes much longer for lager beer to produce an intoxicant effect than for ordinary ale or beer. Consequently, we must consider that this widely-used beverage is not an intoxicant. Next summer it may be sold in the parks on Sunday; men may go there and drink kegs full of it; they may stagger home sick, broken up, incoherent in language, zig-zag in gait; but they cannot get drunk upon it, because the law has declared that lager beer is not an intoxicant. Three or four glasses of ordinary beer will suffice to set some men drunk; the same persons could swallow ten or twelve glasses of lager before a similar effect would take place. Still the result is the same. On one occasion a man got drunk in an hour; on the next occasion it took him six hours to get drunk; in the first case he drank Dow's ale, in the second he swilled lager beer; on the former he was intoxicated, on the latter (the law says) he was sober.

Just follow this rare piece of legislation to its logical conclusion, or rather through all the ramifications of a labyrinth of reasonings ending in countless ridiculous conclusions, and try to be serious: you will find it a difficult task if you have any sense of the ludicrous. Every person knows, if not from experience at least from observation, that larger beer not only intoxicates, but brutalizes a man to a fearful degree. But the law of Quebec says that it is not an intoxicant. Some fine Sunday, during the coming summer, a man goes into one of the parks, spends the whole afternoon there, drinks ten or twelve glasses of larger, reels out upon the street, shouts and "breaks the peace" in some way or other. The law says he is not drunk, because he only drank larger beer, which is (legally-speaking) a non-intoxicant. The man cannot possibly be drunk. The neighbors may think he is, his wife and family may feel that he is, but the law says he is not in that state. Now, while this legally sober man is tearing along the street, a policeman undertakes to arrest him. To the human and fallible eyes of the poor officer the man is in a dangerous state of intoxication, and as a consequence he is "pulled in." This is evidently an illegal arrest. That man should have been allowed to go his ways; he could not be drunk: he had merely filled himself with a heavy load of lager, which the law says is a non-intoxicant.

In all justice that man should have an action of damages, not only for false arrest, but also for defamation of character against all who might have helped in spreading the injurious report that he was drunk on Sunday. The law that arrests him is the same that declares him innocent—because it has declared what he drank to be a non-intoxicant. If not exactly the same article of the law, at least both are upon the same statutes.

But it has been argued that, because it takes so long to become intoxicated with lager beer, that the liquor is a non-intoxicant. A pretty reasoning indeed! Provided the same result follows, what matter does it make—as far as the fact of ultimate intoxication is concerned—whether it takes one hour or four, five glasses or ten to produce that state? Reasoning upon the same line let us see at what conclusion we would arrive in the case of poison? Here is a drug that contains eighty per cent. of a deadly poison; here is another that only contains four per cent. of the same destruc-

tive material. One dose of the former will suffice to kill a person almost instantaneously; of the latter it would require several doses and constantly administered during a long period of time. A man administers a draught of the eighty per cent. poisonous drug, and his victim dies in a few hours: the man is arrested, tried for murder, found guilty and hanged. But another person, somewhat warned by the fate of the first one, administers the poison in the four per cent. form. It takes him full six months or a year before his victim dies. Meanwhile the legislature declares that the drug in question is not a poison, because it only contains four per cent. of poisonous matter. That man should not be tried for murder. It is true he succeeded in killing the one that he wished to get rid of, but he did not use a poison. (The law declared it was not one), and it took him a very long time—compared to the other—to accomplish his purpose.

We might go on *ad infinitum* with such like comparisons; but we think that we have said sufficient to clearly demonstrate the absurdity of a law that declares a liquor to be a non-intoxicant when hundreds upon hundreds, all over this Continent (especially in the summer time) go home blind drunk, or at best muddled from the effects of lager beer. The moment that this small hole is left unplugged in the dike that protects us from a Zadder Zee of alcoholism, we may expect to find the stronger intoxicants flowing in upon the land that is sought to be protected. What is to prevent ale and beer being sold from lager beer bottles? who is going to undertake the detection? what safeguard against swaggering drunkards upon the days when the public parks are frequented? The brutalized drinkers that cannot get liquor elsewhere will flock to the lager beer stand and fill themselves to the utmost. There is no intoxicant half as debasing as that same lager. It requires so much more of it to produce the exhilarating alcoholic effects that it over-loads the stomach and arouses the bile of the worse passions—anger, blasphemy, immorality. The man drunk with lager, or only semi-intoxicated, is very prone to loud talk, to quarrelling, to ugliness, and to the ungovernable passions that are still more dangerous to others than to himself. These are facts well known to every lager drinker, to every hotel-man, to every bartender, to every person who has observed carefully the effects of different liquors upon different characters. However, all that goes for nothing, since the Legislature has declared that lager beer is a non-intoxicant.

IT HAS BEEN denied, time and again by the anti-clericals, that the Jews and Masons of Italy hold the country by the throat, and are complete masters of the government. Italy is supposed to be a Catholic country, one of the most Catholic in the world. Its capital is the centre of the Catholic Faith, its population—or the great majority thereof—kneel at the altars of our Church. Italy contains thirty million people. In the whole country, from the Alps to the heel of the great boot, there are only twenty-five thousand Jews. Notwithstanding all this there are twenty Jewish members in the Chamber of Deputies, nearly one member for every thousand Jews. The rest of the population has about one member for every two hundred and fifty thousand inhabitants. All of these Jewish deputies—or mostly all—are Freemasons. The vast majority of the other deputies consists of Masons and members of secret organizations, freethinkers, atheists, all—without exception—enemies of the Church and the Pope.