

to a senatorial convention were to be appointed from the largest county in the senatorial district, there were two candidates for state senator. The United States senatorship was the issue and there were two avowed candidates for that office. One of whom was the brother of one of the candidates for state senator and the other a United States senator. Several thousand dollars were spent at that primary. Tickets were issued without limit, which were redeemable in any saloon in the city that night at \$2.00. Other tickets bearing the names of delegates to be voted for were wrapped in \$2.00 bills and handed out as publicly as tickets are sold at a theatre ticket office. A United States marshal was manager for the United States senator.

4. The practice of paying men for the time to go and vote has been carried to such an extent that many men of means who have been regarded as ruggedly honest, are demanding from \$1.00 to \$2.00 for the day to go and vote. During the last congressional election, a farmer with 500 acres of land, unencumbered, drove fourteen miles to the county seat of his county on the day before the election to tell the manager of the campaign he would not vote at the election on the following day unless he was given \$1.50 for his time. His voting precinct was less than two miles from his home. Another farmer went nine miles the day before the election to demand \$5.00 and a jug of whisky for himself and four neighbors, stating that unless the money and whisky was furnished, none of them would go to the polls and vote.

5. The citizens of a certain town in a certain state, being desirous of becoming the county seat, undertook to form a new county out of parts of their own county and adjacent counties, with their town as the county seat. Within one day, the citizens of that town (the population of which is less than 3,000) raised by subscription \$50,000 in cash, and the cashiers of the two banks in that town carried the \$50,000 to the capital of the state where the legislature was in session. A lobby was formed, composed of a number of leading politicians. This lobby was engaged to handle this money in a way that would secure the passage of the bill creating the new county. The effort was defeated only because the county seats of the three counties affected put up a larger fund.

Light Out of Darkness.

Helen Keller, the blind and deaf girl who has astonished the world by the marvellous progress she has made in spite of the fact that the ordinary sources of information are closed, delivered an address at New York recently in which she said: "I am studying economics this year, and I have learned that it is the condition of social life that people shall work for one another, and it is the interest of society to enable every member to work. A human being who does not work is not a member of society and can have no standing in it."

It is strange that this frail being whose sightless orbs look only "into the darkness which the blind see" and whose ears have heard only "the stillness which the deaf hear," has discovered a truth unseen by countless millions who trample upon each other in their mad effort to secure the lion's share of earth's bounties; strange that the harmony of human life should have penetrated her understanding when she is unheard by multitudes of selfish and self-centered people. Why is it? Either some companion has given her an ideal which shapes her thoughts or, protected from the frivolities of life by the wall which her misfortunes have builded, her heart is open to the highest and the best impulses.

Christ, in the beautiful parable of the sower, explains why some receive truth more readily than others. Some seed, He said, fell where the thorns sprang up and choked it, and in interpreting its meaning to His disciples He said that the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the truth. So it has ever been; the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches still choke the truth. Helen Keller's heart seems to be the good ground where seed is free to grow and where it brings forth manifold.

How Rich Should One be?

A Missouri reader of *The Commoner* asks, "How rich is it right to be?" He calls attention to some of the Bible references to riches, especially to the one likening a rich man's entrance into the kingdom of heaven to the camel's passage through the needle's eye. As no one is in position to answer the question authoritatively and as it is not likely that there will ever be a universal agreement in any answer to the question,

those who discuss it are apt to vary widely in the opinions expressed. It ought, however, to be possible to agree upon certain general principles that should govern the solution of the problem. Certain arguments can be drawn from analogy. For instance:

How much food should a person eat? While no one can prescribe a quantity in pounds and ounces, or designate with authority certain kinds of food to the exclusion of others, it is possible to agree, first, that the quantity should be just sufficient, and no more, to give to the body the maximum of strength for the discharge of all of its functions, and, second, that those kinds of food, and those kinds only, should be used which suit the body's needs and add to its efficiency. No one can justify the over-loading of the stomach merely to tickle the palate or to satisfy an unnatural appetite. The welfare of man is above the momentary pleasures of gluttony, and so is the welfare of the body more to be considered than epicurian delights. Bodies differ in the quantity of food that they need and the condition of the body may determine the kind of food required, but no one can justify himself if he either destroys the body by indulgence or occupies all the waking hours in caring for his stomach. If man has no higher purpose in life than to eat he is lower than the beasts, for he neglects to feed the mind and the soul.

How much clothing should a person wear? Well, no one has authority to prescribe the kind or quality of clothing; but it is not unfair to say that both quantity and quality should be determined by the requirements of the body and the purpose of life. There should be sufficient clothing not only to protect the body from harm, but to bring it up to the point of highest efficiency. It would be inexcusable in a person to wear enough clothing to unnecessarily burden his body or to hamper his movements. A man would be thought beside himself if he taxed all the strength of the body to carry clothing, merely to show how much clothing he could support. Neither would it be easy to defend the wearing of clothes so fine as to make an observer think of the clothing more than of the superior qualities of the head and heart; or to excuse the possession of a wardrobe so varied and extensive as to occupy all of one's time in the changing and fitting of clothes. We would be quick to find fault with Nature if she offered us a nut with gorgeous hull and no kernel.

How much money should a person have? Is it so useful that there can be no limit to the amount that one should possess? If man is the climax of creation and the lord of material things, is not money his servant? If a man has so much money (even though it comes to him by inheritance or in a way considered legitimate) that it requires all of his time to take care of it, has he not too much?

There are things which money cannot buy, and they are the dearest things of life. Money cannot purchase love, but the love of money has sometimes separated the best of friends. If one thinks that money can purchase happiness he is doomed to disappointment. The Creator was not so unkind as to make one's highest enjoyment rest upon so unsubstantial a foundation as dollars, nor does he dole out joy in proportion to one's earthly possessions. Compare, for illustration, the joy of the philanthropist (and philanthropy is determined more by the spirit of the giver rather than by the size of the gift) with the joy of the miser (and here, too, it must be remembered that the miser is distinguished by his avarice rather than by the amount of gold that he clutches). Compare the happiness of the virtuous cottage-covered couple whose souls are held together by the indissoluble bonds of a holy love, with the estranged occupants of a palace. Compare the uplifting delights of one who follows, even though unshod, the path of duty, with the revelries of the profligate with inherited millions at his disposal.

Man needs money for the purchase of clothing, for the securing of an education, for the procuring of books and for the gratifying of his spirit of benevolence. He can justify the expenditure of money, if honestly acquired, for travel, if travel contributes to his higher self; for recreation, insofar as it is strengthening, and for social intercourse insofar as it is helpful. But no one can afford to cultivate that love of money which, if not the root of all evil, is the root of far too much of evil, or even to possess so much money that the mere care of it will absorb energies that are deserving of better employment.

The highest purpose that man can have is the betterment of the human family, all other things are secondary; even the improvement of himself—if it has no higher end than self, it is

unworthy. The marble statue may be more nearly perfect in feature and in form than any living creature; its hands do no mischief; its feet run on no errands of evil and its lips speak neither lie nor blasphemy. No human being with passions and frailties can approach in harmlessness the product of the artist's chisel, and if he could, of what value would his life be? It is a low measure of man that estimates him by his negative qualities. He must be positively good to be respected. His back even though it bend, must help to bear his brother's load; his hands, though sometimes idle or worse than uselessly employed, must have a part in the shaping and moulding of the world; his tongue, though it may stammer or sometimes utter what the heart would fain retract, must be the vehicle of a higher and a broader truth than can be found within selfish limits.

As the ship's captain throws over any cargo that endangers the safety of the passengers, so man must be willing to sacrifice anything and everything—yea, even money—if it impedes his progress or prevents the highest possible achievements. Some men can carry a larger load of money than others. Some may run with a burden that would bear others to the ground, but there is a limit to the strength of all, and each must, at his own risk, find the limit for himself.

The ideal wisely chosen and conscientiously followed offers the surest protection against overloading with money, for the ideal will first prevent the accumulation of any money at all except as it comes as a fair remuneration for services rendered to society; second, it will lead to such a use of the money as will be most helpful to the individual and to society; and, third, it will develop impulses that will themselves overmaster and regulate the desire for lucre.

A Good Suggestion.

The St. Louis grand jury which has been examining into the boodling cases, makes a suggestion which is worthy of consideration. After declaring that there should be a statute making it unlawful for lobbyists to ply their profession in the manner in which they now work, the jury adds:

We believe that laws should be enacted providing for the forfeiture of franchises procured by corrupt methods. The rule of law as to stolen property should be made to apply to franchises obtained by bribery. There can be no vested rights in stolen goods, and there should be no vested rights in public franchises secured by venal methods.

Why should title pass from the public any more than from an individual where fraud is clearly shown? Why not make it the duty of the holder of stock in a franchise-owning-company to examine the method by which the franchise was secured? As the grand jury says, title does not pass with stolen goods when the thing stolen is a horse or other piece of personal property. Why should the rights of the public be less carefully dealt with? The jury also advises the passage of a law extending the statute of limitations in case of crimes against the public. It explains that it would have brought in more indictments but for the fact that many of the crimes found had been outlawed.

The investigations that Mr. Folk has been conducting at St. Louis ought to result in great good elsewhere as well as in that state. Those who interest themselves in public affairs—and this ought to include all citizens—may well profit by the facts brought out in Missouri.

A Fallacious Defence.

The Ohio Farmer of recent date publishes an article by a citizen of Ohio, an ex-member of the legislature, on the election of senators by the people. He starts out by saying that the present method of electing United States senators by legislatures was a compromise. That is true. There were men of the Jeffersonian school who believed in the people and were willing to trust them, and there were men of the Hamiltonian school who were afraid of popular government and sought to hamper it by every possible restriction, but certainly a hundred years of experience ought to be worth something. That experience has shown that the government is best when it is nearest to the people, and it is high time for an amendment that will give the people power to elect their representatives in the senate.

The second argument made against the change is that it would lead to the destruction of the equality of the states in the senate. There