to universities as an institution—as the "prophet, priest and philosopher" of democracy. "The university," he said, "must lead the people." Mr. Harper has a somewhat distorted notion of democracy. In democracies the people lead themselves. They may make use of universities for securing knowledge as it is acquired, as a sort of intellectual storehouse, just as they use the library or the primary school; but the university as prophet, priest and king would be as repugnant to thorough going democracy as any other species of priestcraft and kingcraft. The true object of universities is to help men to think, not to do their thinking for them.

But that is not the object of the university as Mr. Harper sees it, nor as the professorial cult would have it. Another one of this cult, also attached to the Rockefeller establishment, made that plain in a newspaper article published soon after Mr. Harper's discourse. We refer to C. R. Henderson. He assures us, not without some angry grinding of his teeth, that it is dishonest for any man to set up for a teacher in the field of social reform, economic and political, without equipping himself by many years of special study of industrial history, economic science and modes of administration. Thus, according to the professorial cult, no one is fit to form an opinion as to the righteousness of any public policy, unless he has gone through the professorial mill. Acceptance of that doctrine would indeed make the university the prophet, priest and king of democracy. No one would be esteemed fit even to vote unless he held a university diploma for excellence in industrial history, economic science ("as she is taught") and modes of administration. What university, governed by professors and endowed by millionaires, could safely be entrusted with such authority? Macaulay said that professors of physical science could not be trusted as authorities upon the law of gravitation if great pecuniary interests were at stake. How much less, then, can economic professors be trusted as authorities upon questions of fundamental property rights, which do involve great pecuniary interests?

Then what reason is there to suppose that "solid learning," as it is called, will imbue professors with the good judgment and sound sense necessary to make trustworthy economic priests and kings? Here, for illustration, is Prof. James Mavo, of the University of Toronto. He is doubtless well crammed with industrial history, economic science and modes of administration, to say nothing of Latin and Greek. With the "authorities" he is as thoroughly conversant as any of his cult. But in an article in the Toronto Evening News of Christmas eve, he demonstrated the inadequacy of these acquirements.

Prof. Mavo, of Toronto, had been moved by much the same impulse that stirred Harper and Henderson of the Chicago university. He, too, wants the public to look to the university as prophet, priest and king. Popular propaganda, consequently, is to him exceedingly distasteful. His antique and rather wordy disquisition in the Toronto News we must as a whole pass over. To reply to a paper against propagating opinions in a democracy would be a waste of space; none the less so as the professor's paper is utterly void of argument. But Prof. Mavo makes two or three observations in his paper to which attention may be called as showing how little "solid learning" has assisted him to do straight thinking. At one point, referring superciliously to socialists, he says: "If the existing 'competitive' system is obnoxious to anyone, it is not so difficult after all, on this continent at least, to retire from the competitive field, and to live a wholesome though isolated rural life." For our part, we have no fault to find with competition. On the contrary we believe it to be essentially as natural and beneficent as gravitation. But the man who seriously and honestly says that it is possible to retire from the competitive field shows lack of perception of the simplest conditions in which he lives. He may be full to bursting with knowledge of all that has ever been written in industrial history, economics and administration, but it wouldn't be safe to take his advice on the simplest practical proposition. Then again Prof. Mavo observes that "if the payment of rent to the 'robber landlord' is disagreeable, land may yet be had for the clearing of it." This is a professorial slant at the single taxers, of whom there are many in Toronto. If it fairly exhibits Prof. Mavo's understanding of the single tax, he proves himself again short in sense, however long he may be on "solid learning." Even a professor should know that the single taxers insist not only that all men have a right to land, but that they have a right to exemption from taxation on their labor, and to equal participation in the values which general growth, as distinguished from distinguishable individual effort, attaches to land. Yet Prof. Mavo implies that single taxers can secure these rights by taking up wild land and clearing it. Even if they abandoned their rights to a share in existing communal values, where could single taxers find a place on the habitable globe in which they would be secure against having their individual earnings confiscated by taxation? There is no such place. Prof. Mavo's apparent obtuseness goes in some degree to show how wofully incompetent men of his class would be as the prophets, priests and kings of democracy. As school teachers, conveying to immature minds an understanding of what the books contain, the class is useful; but when it sets itself up as authority for full grown men, not only on what the books say, but also on what is true and right, it is pretty apt to expose the intellectual limitations that are inseparable from mental cramming.

Somebody having published a paragraph asserting that a free silver newspaper could not get the news from the Associated Press, the manager of that news-gathering associa-

tion, Melville E. Stone, replies with a flat denial, which he asks to have accepted "in the most comprehensive way." He goes on to explain that the Associated Press—

has no politics of any sort. Its mission is to state facts as they appear. Its board of directors include men of every shade of political opinion, and the mere suggestion that a newspaper should be denied admission because it favored the Chicago platform or because it favored the St. Louis platform would raise a storm which would echo all over the country.

The assertion is admirably denied, because it was faultily made. If a Chicago platform paper were to apply for Associated Press news, it would not be turned away expressly because it was a Chicago platform paper. But it would be turned away. The real indictment against the Associated Press is not that it refuses news to free silver papers not already in its ring, but that it refuses news to all papers not in its ring. If the telegraph system were part of the postal department, this policy of the Associated Press would count for nothing. Independent news associations could then compete on an equal footing with it, and so force it to sell its news to all comers for a fair price. But with the aid of our monopoly system of telegraphing, the Associated Press has established itself as a crushing news monopoly.

A romantic story is told by the New York Tribune, about Charles H. Chapin and his iron mine. Many years ago Mr. Chapin was a village merchant in the upper peninsula of Michigan. In this useful occupation he failed, and all his little property went to his creditors. But the creditors, being generous, gave him back a quarter section of timber land, which, though rocky, might yield him a frugal living if it were cleared. In clearing up that land the presence of iron ore was discovered. Mr. Chapin thereupon gave a mining lease of the land to a corporation, a condition of the lease being that not less than 80,000 tons of ore should be taken out annually, and that for all ore taken out he should receive a royalty of 50 cents a ton. This is the origin of the Iron Mountain mine in Dickinson county. Under his lease Mr. Chapin received $40,000 a year and upwards for many years; and though the royalty has since been reduced, the mine is so rich that last year the royalty receipts amounted to over $100,000. Such is the Tribune's story. It is not an isolated case. In Louisiana there is a profitable salt mine, the royalties from which support one idle family in princely luxury; while throughout this country and the civilized world, some men receive for the use of land—mining land, farming land and town lots—incomes, enormous in the aggregate, which are precisely the same as these royalties. They are wholly unearned by the recipients. But what is amazing about it all is this, that so many intelligent and well-meaning people, to whom these facts are patent, see no relation between them and the social phenomenon of poverty in the midst of plenty.

A rich brewer of St. Louis has got into trouble by donating a sum of money to a western college. He was asked to do it, and now he wonders why friends of the college denounce him for it, and demand that the money be refused. Their point is that he made his money by brewing beer; but he says he has made money in other ways as well as in his brewery. In all probability the money he made in his brewery was made with least injury to his fellow men. At any rate his income from beer is not plunder. It is paid him voluntarily. Why may it not, then, be acceptable for college purposes, so long as the plunder of oppressive monopolists like Rockefeller is welcome. Is drink money worse than blood money?

Some of the best work done upon newspapers is done by men whose names are never heard of outside their own circle of friends and acquaintances. Not the least important of this class of work is that of the scissors man. Scissors work when well done is as valuable and requires as high an order of skill and judgment as pen work; yet it usually goes without other reward than the weekly stipend. For that reason them readable. It is by all odds the scissors work of the Chicago Chronicle. The reprinted clippings which appear in the Chronicle are selected by some one who knows what items are worth clipping and how to make them readable. It is by all odds the best reprint department of any Chicago daily, if not of any American daily.

English working men of the public servant class are learning a valuable lesson about "tips." The American system of checking baggage having at last been largely adopted in England, the "tipping" of porters has fallen off, and in consequence railway servants who have heretofore been "tipped" for helping passengers with their baggage are beginning to feel the pinch and are urging an increase of wages. Thus the fact has been brought to light that the real person "tipped" is not the "tippee," but his employer.

This has not been generally understood in England, nor is it in this country. Yet a moment's thought should make it plain. Hotel waiters where "tips" are good are no better paid than are those where "tips" are poor. They are often not as well paid. The wages of waiters at Delmonico's used to be $25 a month. We don't know what it is now, but doubtless it is less rather than more. The waiter was expected to eke out his wages with "tips." So on Pullman cars, the "tips" go in reality not to the porters who collect them, but to the Pullman company. Porters' wages on Pullman cars range from $15 a month to $35, according to the opportunities for "tips," $15 being the wages where "tipping" is best and $35 where it is supposed to be worst. But for "tipping," Pullman car wages for porters would have to be double the highest now paid. It is the Pullman company, therefore, that gets the "tips." Most workingmen whose