

scheme is put forward to arrange that by the payment of a small sum family washings can be brought there and made white as the falling snow.

It is estimated that 100 family washings can be handled a day and that the receipts would go a great way toward paying the expenses of the institution.—Dispatch to Chicago Chronicle under date of October 18.

REPUDIATION IS BECOMING RESPECTABLE.

It is monstrous that a tyrant should be able to burden future generations simply because he is in possession of the material government. If investors felt that in international law loans incurred against the will of the people would not attach to the country in the event of a change of government there would be less of that monetary support of misgovernment which has disgraced the high finances of the nineteenth century.

For 50 years Spain has ruled Cuba in defiance of the will of the Cuban people and in spite of the constant protests of the United States. The cost of her military operations there has been met by loans specially chargeable upon Cuba, in the first place in order to punish the Cubans and in the second in order to arrange for a cheap retreat in the event of being driven out of America. In a word, the debt has been charged upon Cuba largely with the object of saddling it upon the United States. The bondholders were encouraged to look to the supposed doctrine of international law as part of the security while they were lending to Spain against the will of both Cubans and Americans.

It is to be hoped that the United States, while assuming sovereignty over Cuba, will refuse to pay any part of the debt except the money used in the development of the island, thereby setting a most useful precedent, of which tyrants and financiers will do well to take note.—The London Speaker.

THE SLUM BABY.

Suppose the paper came out with headlines, an inch or two in height. "A Vanderbilt Baby Born and Brought Up in the Slums." "Little Brother of William K. Vanderbilt Heartlessly Left to a Miserable Existence in a Filthy Tenement." "Appalling Neglect, Brother of a Millionaire Resigned to the Care of Paupers and Criminals." etc. Would people believe it? No, not even if they saw it in the New York Journal. And yet babies are born and brought up in the slums, and we say

we are all brothers; and millionaires go to church and read the Bible and pay fine ministers to preach the brotherhood of man. We are not brothers. We ought to be, and our saying we are is a very encouraging sign, because it shows our ideals, and where our ideals are we shall be some day. But we are not brothers now. Our actions belie our words. Imagine, if you can, a millionaire allowing his baby brother to be raised in the slums by the most degraded men and women in the land. Even a millionaire as stingy as Russell Sage would not do it, let alone a respectable millionaire, or an ordinary working man. Imagine a baby in the slums with a dozen millionaires for brothers and sisters, all of whom knew he was there, and was their lawful brother in direct need and sore distress. Imagine a baby in slum life with brothers and sisters worth sixty-five billions of property! You can't do it. Yet that's what the brothers and sisters of every baby in the slums of this country possess, according to the brotherhood of man and the census of 1890—nearer seventy-five or eighty billions, probably, but it might as well be zero as far as the average slum baby is concerned. It doesn't do any good to be born into Uncle Sam's family, if he is a billionaire, and a multi-billionaire at that, for most of the family won't acknowledge the relationship except with wind.—Prof. Frank Parsons, in *The Kingdom*.

HOW TRADE FOLLOWS THE FLAG.

President McKinley, in one of the brief speeches which he made in Iowa, is reported as saying:

We have pretty much everything in this country to make it happy. We have good money, we have ample revenues, we have unquestioned national credit, but what we want is new markets, and as trade follows the flag, it looks very much as if we were going to have new markets.

The phrase "trade follows the flag" had its origin in the eighteenth century at a time when England, France, Spain and Holland were reddening the seas with their best blood in their efforts to retain or establish colonies in the East and West Indies, in North America and South Africa.

A colony, at that time, meant a portion of the earth's surface whose inhabitants were authorized to trade only with the mother country and to allow only the ships of the mother country to carry their imports and exports. This principle formed the real groundwork of the colonial wars in which our own ancestors took part before the revolution. France and England were in a deadly

struggle for trade in North America, in India, and in the Antilles. The British colonists and the French colonists joined in the fight as a matter of course. When the British arms prevailed, the home government naturally felt at liberty to apply the rules of exclusive trade and navigation to the colonies that she had so long fought for, and when the colonists felt the pinch they remonstrated and finally rebelled against the tyranny.

The phrase "trade follows the flag" is true only in this wicked sense. When a country is strong enough and selfish enough to seize another country or province, and to force the latter to buy and sell only with the conquering country, then, and then only, does trade follow the flag. The flag in this case means simply powder and ball, although that idea is not offensively presented in the euphemism which President McKinley employed. The flag may represent either peaceful commerce or violence and bloodshed. That it means the latter when it is used as Mr. McKinley used it is evident, because to say that trade follows peaceful commerce would be tautology and sheer nonsense. And yet nobody would think that Mr. McKinley meant to say that trade follows the cannon-shot. What he probably meant was that since our guns have taken possession of certain territory and populations heretofore belonging to Spain, and which were oppressed by her commercial restrictions, therefore we may apply our own restrictions to them; of course not so severe as those of Spain, but such as will insure good trade for us. Mr. McKinley believes in moderation in all things. He said at Omaha that in dealing with our new international problems we must "avoid the temptation of undue aggression and aim to secure only such results as will promote our own and the general good." In his first message to congress Mr. McKinley said that seizing foreign territory in certain cases named would be "criminal aggression." He has now got down to "undue aggression," which is simply the amount of aggression that we think fit.

The words which we quoted at the beginning of this article are the first that Mr. McKinley has uttered in any public way regarding his policy in the Philippines and other territory that succumbed to our arms during the war. They indicate that his purpose is to hold everything that we have laid our hands on. We may be mistaken in our interpretation of his remarks. It is just possible that he