

be very unfair to those whose goods are being carried to compel them to pay more for its carriage in order to divert these would-be carriers, if there are such, from the profitable employment in which they are engaged. If the foreign people in question choose to pay their carriers heavy subsidies in order to enable them to do the carrying for their neighbours the more cheaply, this should surely be an additional claim for gratitude, not a cause for complaint.

Was the late Jay Gould a great man? The Rev. Dr. Burrill, of New York city, says "Yes," with what after-limitations we do not know. He is reported as follows: "He was a great man, who poised his lance many times in Wall Street, and we must say in admiration that he always won." Success, then, according to this "preacher of righteousness," is the test of greatness. It is encouraging to note that very few, so far as appears, either in pulpit or press, have been so blinded by the shimmer of Jay Gould's millions as to concur in Dr. Burrill's dictum. That dictum, however, suggests an interesting question and one worthy of study in the presence of such a life-record as that of the deceased railway king. How much of the success of such a man in money-making, which was, of course, the one object for which he lived, was due to his superior ability, and how much to his utter unscrupulousness? We might enlarge the question, and ask whether it may not be that there are hundreds or thousands of men in business life whose success in money-making is due more largely to their consciencelessness than to their intellectual superiority, and hundreds or thousands of others who might have achieved equal or greater success but for the tender consciences which made cowards of them at times of crisis. However true may be the copy-book maxim, "Honesty is the best policy," so far as the mere earning of a respectable livelihood, or gaining a moderate competence, is concerned, it is at least doubtful whether it holds with regard to the acquisition of vast fortunes, and it must be more than doubtful in the cases in which those fortunes have been made in Wall Street speculations and "cornering" railway stocks.

Material for use in connection with the above question may be had in abundance from the most cursory survey of the leading events of Gould's life, which has been pretty thoroughly overhauled within the last week or two. One of the first of his successes was achieved by open violence, he having not scrupled, when the title to a piece of property was in dispute, to organize a band of men and drive away his opponents by force. "As he acquired wealth he changed his tactics, but not his principles. He used the law and the courts as the implements of his campaign; bought judges; corrupted legislatures; did so openly and avowedly; and avoided arrest, when arrest was threatened, by fleeing from one State to another with his booty." Many of his successful speculations were based upon the assumption that all over the country were multitudes of small speculators upon whose ignorance of the state of the markets he could safely trade. At the time of the great fight for the control of the Erie railroad stock, Gould, being asked how many legislators and judges had been "approached," replied: "As well ask me how many freight cars passed over the line on a

given day." Given a sufficient number of corruptible legislators and judges, no very extraordinary abilities would seem to be necessary to enable any man with ample means and without conscientious scruples or troublesome notions of honour, to accomplish his ends by similar means. A man is not necessarily a great genius because he is a successful scoundrel.

### ARE NEUTRAL SCHOOLS AN IMPOSSIBILITY?

Replying to a previous article in these columns, Professor Stockley, of the University of New Brunswick, maintains in our last number: first, that neutral schools are an impossibility; secondly, that our public schools are Protestant. The inference is—but we are going to ask our correspondent to kindly tell us what the inference is.

The question is of the very first importance. It involves the issue of national justice or national injustice to the Catholic portion of our population. We hope we need not assure our readers that we are as desirous to "honestly look at things as they are" and to avoid wronging ourselves "by taking words for things," if by that is meant cheating ourselves by the use of words which do not correctly represent the things for which they stand, as our correspondent can be.

Had Professor Stockley informed us exactly what he understands by the words "Protestant" and "Catholic," our comprehension of the force of his argument would have no doubt been much easier. We confess that, after re-reading his letter very carefully, we are unable to reach its conclusions save by giving to the word "Catholic" a meaning which we hope no good Catholic would be willing to accept. Take, for instance, Professor Stockley's illustration of the supposed Mohammedan public schools. There would be, he says, an atmosphere which good English-speaking Protestants would not wish their children to breathe. Grant it. Would this atmosphere be peculiar to the public schools? Would it not be equally characteristic of the public streets and the public assemblies and of every other place in which the English-speaking Protestant children were brought into contact with the people and the institutions of the country? The contamination is, it must be observed, not in the teaching—if they were bona fide public, undenominational schools, we could prevent that—but in the atmosphere. And how could we expect our children to live in the country and yet be kept out of its atmosphere?

Does our correspondent wish to push this argument and illustration to its logical issue? If so, will he not kindly help us to be "clear-seeing" by defining just what that something is in the atmosphere of a public school which a good Catholic should fear to have his children breathe, and just what that quality is in Catholicism which would be endangered by breathing that atmosphere? When we have clear ideas on those points we may be in a better position to determine whether and by what means the danger can be removed or the injustice remedied. It must not be forgotten that under the Public School system, as now established in Manitoba, the choice of teachers rests in every case with the local trustees, and in localities in which the Catholic population is considerable there would be nothing to prevent the teachers being Catholic. In fact in Catholic districts

they would almost surely be so. Would the atmosphere in those localities be safe?

Other questions and difficulties suggest themselves. Professor Stockley's Mohammedan illustration, also that of the Protestant lady gathering Catholic children for reading and recreation in a room under a Protestant Church, have force, so far as we can perceive, only when it is postulated that this is a Protestant country, and hence that neither Government, nor Parliament, nor people, could if they would free the atmosphere from the objectionable quality or element. What then is to be done? Would it be reasonable to demand that the Mohammedan Government should free the English-speaking residents from contributing to the support of the public schools, which were deemed indispensable to the well-being of the State? Ought it not to be accepted as fair if they were to say, "We will not ask you to send your children to the public schools, to which you conscientiously object. You are free to educate them in accordance with your own views, but seeing that those views are alien to those of the country and adapted to bring our cherished institutions into disrepute, you cannot expect us to give the sanction of the State, or freedom from its school taxes, in order to aid you in propagating your alien ideas, much less to give you State aid in so doing." This reply, let us repeat, is only in answer to the above postulate, which seems to be demanded by the views we are discussing. For our own part, we should be sorry to believe that there is, in this country and in this age, any such irreconcilable antagonism between the Christian faith of Protestants and that of Catholics as is implied in the atmospheric illustration.

Take another view. Grant that the illustration holds good and—for this is, we suppose, the conclusion to which Professor Stockley would push us—that justice demands the Separate School system for Catholics. Are their conscientious scruples alone to be regarded? Anglicans who regard our public schools as "the establishment of middle-class dissent" no doubt think their atmosphere very unhealthy for Anglican children. Seeing that the great majority of the Protestants are Pedobaptists, there is no doubt a Pedobaptist taint in the public school atmosphere which is objectionable to Baptists. Shall we, then, have Separate Schools for Anglicans and for Baptists, and for every other denomination which objects to something in the atmosphere of the public schools? It is not sufficient to show that there are objections to a given system if one is unable to recommend a better one.

But one question at a time is perhaps enough. What, then, is the injurious element in the atmosphere of the public schools which renders it impossible that they should be neutral, and to what particular article in the faith of Catholics is that element so antagonistic that they ought not to be asked to tolerate it?

### TARIFF REFORM THE NECESSITY OF THE HOUR.

Evidence is every day accumulating which must make it clear to all who are willing to see things as they are, not as they wish them to be, that there is a considerable amount of political unrest in the country, and that it is growing from day to day. Many of the statements given to the public are no doubt greatly