

not usually found outside of New England, where they take the place of county almshouses, except in New Hampshire, which has both the county and the town system. In Vermont it is usual for several towns to form among themselves an "association almshouse." In Pennsylvania several counties unite and form a "district almshouse." In Arizona, California, Colorado and Nevada, almshouses are termed "hospitals;" in Ohio, "infirmaries;" in Indiana, "asylums;" and in North Carolina the names of most almshouses were changed by a recent act of the Legislature to "homes for the aged and infirm."

The tabulation according to color shows 66,578 white, 5,753 pure negroes, 665 mulattoes, 13 Chinese, and 36 Indians. Of the colored paupers Utah has one Chinaman, one negro, and 60 white paupers. There are 22 counties in Utah in which it is reported neither paupers nor almshouses were in existence. In 1890, nine persons were receiving outdoor relief in Utah, while in 1880 there were 33.

Of the 66,578 white paupers in the country 38,656 are native born, 27,648 foreign born, and the place of birth of 2,274 is unknown. The foreign population of this country contributes, directly or indirectly, in the persons of the foreign born or of their immediate descendants, very nearly three-fourths of all the paupers supported in almshouses.

In the western division Montana shows 132 paupers, Wyoming none, Colorado 87, New Mexico 1, Arizona 23, Utah 62, Nevada 42, Idaho 20, Alaska none, Washington 71, Oregon 99, California 2600. The aggregate is 3138.

The North Atlantic division gives an aggregate of 31,143. This comprises the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

The South Atlantic division gives an aggregate of 8190, the North Central division 25,615, and the South Central division 5049.

It is impossible to obtain through the machinery of the Census Office any approximation to a complete enumeration of the outdoor poor, meaning by that phrase the poor who are permanently supported at public expense at their own homes or with private families.

The number of outdoor poor returned in 1880 was 21,595; in 1890 it was 24,220. This added to 73,045 the number in poor houses makes less than 100,000 in the United States.

### A DEMAGOGUE SCHOOL TEACHER.

MR. FITZPATRICK, whom Omaha has been so unfortunate as to elect to the office of Superintendent of Schools, seems to have an itching to get his name in the papers. Either that or utter ignorance of the state of public opinion all over the country has led him to the trouble of announcing his intention to drive women superintendents out of the public schools of that city.

It is plain that Mr. Fitzpatrick is determined at any hazard to make an individual record. How much the Omaha people will endure of his eubish innovations in this line may be inferred from the expressions of the *World-Herald* on the subject.

Dr. Miller may be assured that he is backed by the overwhelming public sentiment of this city in his protest against the proposed substitution of men for women as principals of our public schools. Superintendent-elect Fitzpatrick may be very much prejudiced against female principals in the public schools, or he may be very enlightened and progressive. It is immaterial which. It is not necessary to question the cause of his extreme position. It is sufficient to know that women are a success as principals in the schools of Omaha, just as they are as teachers. There is nothing experimental about their employment. They have been tried and approved. The high standard of Omaha schools attests their excellence and their success.

That our friend Dr. Miller's chivalry should be aroused by this absurd proposition is what we might have expected. It is simply one among numberless other evidences of his manliness on which we have had so many occasions to congratulate him and the people among whom his influence is most felt. We trust he may be successful in squelching this schoolmaster demagogue as effectually as has many other specimens of the demagogue species before him.

### PUGILISTS AND PRESIDENTS.

HENRY WATTERSON, the famous Kentuckian or "star-eyed goiter" renown, has the following on the decline of the prize ring:

"The sun of the pugilist is setting. There is no doubt about it. Somehow or other he does not command public attention quite to the extent that he used to. It is no longer necessary to issue daily bulletins concerning the health and movements of Mr. John L. Sullivan of Boston. It is not considered advisable to consult Mr. Mitchell of England before renewing the Triple Alliance, and doubtless we will have a Presidential election next year despite the threatened absence of Mr. Fitzsimmons of New Zealand and Mr. Hall of Australia. In time, if this satisfactory progress continues, the President of the United States will become as conspicuous a figure as the champion pugilist of the world. We will hail the appearance of a first-class novelist with the same appreciation that we show for a phenomenal light-weight

fighter. The fame of the lyric poet shall not be inferior to that of a Dempsey or a Paddy Ryan, and the painter and the poet may obtain some of the profit and the glory that have hitherto awaited the victor at the ringside."

The New York *Recorder* replies as follows:

"It is a curious coincidence that Mr. Watterson should lose confidence in prize fighters and in Governor Hill almost simultaneously. What can it mean? The prize fighters of this section are to a man enthusiastically in favor of Mr. Hill as President, and nearly all of them for members of Tammany Hall, certainly devoted followers who do an immense amount of 'knocking out' for it on election day. Tammany Hall sent the late John Morrissey to Congress, and only a few years ago the Democracy of Boston saw in John L. Sullivan a candidate who would do honor to them on the floor of the House of Representatives. Either Mr. Watterson or Western Democracy must be degenerating. In all the history of the party there has not been a period when the champion of the prize ring was not, in the opinion of the 'unterrified,' a greater man than the President, even when the Democracy chanced to have one. A contemporary recently suggested that the great Kentucky editor is becoming a Democratic 'back number.' His repudiation of the 'fancy' would seem to imply that it has a basis of truth."

### TIME TO QUIT IT.

Now that the struggle of the campaign is over and the results are pretty well established, what is the use of continuing the nonsense, and false charges, and base insinuations that were used for the purpose of influencing voters and gaining a victory? It is only ingrained meanness and a love of lying which prompt the repetition of those stupid allegations about a "conspiracy," and voters being "set aside," and the Church telling people how to vote and the rest of it. No good can come of it and the authors only make themselves ridiculous in the eyes of sensible readers.

The "Liberal" organ pretends that it wants the prominent men who have figured in the movement for party division to return to the "Liberal" ranks. Is it likely that they will do this because the "Liberal" organ lies about them? Will they be whipped back with such a lash as that? Who are the men who entered into a conspiracy with the "Mormon" Church? Are they Judge Zane, Judge Miner, Judge Blackburn, Judge Henderson, Marshal Parsons, C. W. Bennett, R. Harkness, Arthur Brown, Arthur Prat, George A. Lowe, E. B. Critchlow and other ardent Republicans? Does the *Tribune* mean to say these gentlemen made a bargain with the "Mormon" Church? Are they Judge Judd, ex-Governor West, ex-Marshal Dyer, R. C. Chambers, S. A. Merritt, P. L. Williams, H. C. Lett, Wendell Benson and other straight out Democrats?