

WAS THERE FRAUD IN THE ELECTION OF 1896?

If So, Was It in Republican or Democratic States?

Some Startling Figures Showing Systematic Suppression of Republican Votes.

The South Would Have Given a Majority for McKinley, as Did the North, Could Her Voters Have Had Fair Treatment.

A Non-Partisan Discussion of the Election Results Based Upon Official Figures.

The final count by Congress of the electoral vote, coupled with the various charges which have been made by different people of excessive votes in certain of the Northern States and suppression of the Republican votes in the South, suggest a careful study of the figures of the election in the light of those of other elections and records of population as well as votes.

Gov. Altgeld and Senator Allen have charged a fraudulent excess of votes in nearly all of the close States which were carried by the Republicans in the late campaign, including Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Kentucky, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Oregon, California, West Virginia, Maryland and even Pennsylvania. Senator Allen published as an official document a paper containing a charge of this character and also introduced a resolution calling for an investigation, but has not up to this time made any move in the way of even asking consideration for his resolution.

Fortunately, it is possible by examining the figures of the census of 1890 to get a pretty fair idea as to whether the alleged vote in any State was actually in excess of the number of voters in the State. The census of 1890 shows the number of males above the age of twenty-one in each State and it is reasonable to assume that there has been a very material increase in the number of males of voting age in all parts of the country, and especially in the Mississippi valley, in the six years between the date of the census and the election of 1896. This makes it comparatively easy to examine in an intelligent way the charges of fraud, as made by Senator Allen and Gov. Altgeld.

Let us examine a few of these charges. In Ohio Mr. Allen charges that the "fraudulent excess" of votes in 1896 was 94,500. Let us see. Ohio, according to his figures gave 1,011,576 votes. There were in Ohio in 1890, according to the census, 1,016,464 males of voting age, or more than 5,000 in excess of the number of votes cast in 1896. Ohio increased her population 14.83 per cent in the decade from 1880 to 1890, and it is reasonable to assume that, with the great prosperity which has attended her development of manufactures in the natural gas region in the past few years, the increase of population from 1890 to 1896 has been, at a very low estimate, ten per cent, which would bring the male population of 21 years and upwards, up to 1,117,000, or 106,000 in excess of the number of votes cast, yet Mr. Allen charges officially, but admits that he does not know by what process he arrives at the conclusion, that 94,500 "fraudulent excess" of votes was cast in that State.

In Indiana and Illinois the total number of votes cast in 1896 slightly exceeds the total number of males above 21 years of age shown by the census of 1890 in those States. In Illinois the excess of votes cast above those of voting age in 1890 in that State is less than 19,000. Illinois gained in population in the decade from 1880 to 1890 24.32 per cent. In view of the great number of people drawn to Chicago during the World's Fair period, many of whom remained there, it is reasonable to suppose that the rate of gain since 1890 has been quite as rapid and that the increase of population and in the number of persons of voting age is fully 16 per cent. This would bring the number of males of voting age in the State up to 1,243,000, or 232,000 in excess of the number of votes actually cast. In Indiana the increase of population has been much more rapid probably than in Illinois, because of the wonderful development of the natural gas region of that State, where industries have been extremely active and prosperous, even while there was depression and absolute inactivity in nearly all other parts of the country. The total male population of Indiana above 21 years of age in 1890 was 595,066, but with the phenomenal growth of population which it has had since that time, it has probably increased 100,000, so that there is every reason to believe that the total number of voters in the State was, in 1896, nearly or quite 700,000, while the total number of votes cast was only 637,284.

The Voters Did Not All Vote. It is unnecessary to pursue in detail the investigation of the relation of the votes cast to the voting population in all the States charged with a "fraudulent excess" of votes in Senator Allen's official paper. The following table gives the number of males of voting age in each of the States in question in 1890 and beside it the number of votes cast in 1896. When it is remembered that the natural growth of population in these States in the six years since the census of 1890 is from 10 to 15 per cent it will be seen that in no case was the vote actually cast in 1896 nearly as large as the number of males over the age of 21 years which must have been in these States on Nov. 3, 1896.

State	Males above 21 years of age in 1890	Votes cast in 1896
Pennsylvania	1,461,880	1,188,354
Maryland	270,738	240,896
Ohio	1,016,464	1,011,576
Michigan	617,455	544,278
Indiana	595,066	637,284
Illinois	1,072,663	1,091,166
Kentucky	450,792	445,934
Iowa	520,332	521,332
Wisconsin	461,722	448,106

Minnesota	370,036	341,539
Oregon	111,744	96,846
California	462,289	294,000

The student of the above table should bear in mind constantly that it is entirely proper to add from ten to fifteen per cent to the figures of the first column in order to obtain approximately the number of male persons of voting age in the States in question at the time of the vote about which Mr. Allen complains, Nov. 3, 1896. The vote of 1892 was a Light One. There is another way of looking at it, and a way which Senator Allen seems to have entirely overlooked. He apparently bases his assumption as to the number of votes to which each State is entitled upon the number of votes cast in 1892, since he includes in his table the figures of that election and compares those of 1896 with them. Had he taken the trouble to examine the figures of the presidential elections during the past twenty years he would have found that the vote of 1892 was the lightest in proportion to the population that has been cast in a presidential election for many years, perhaps the lightest at any time since the close of the war. Certainly the percentage of gain in the total vote in 1892 over the preceding presidential election is lighter than has been the case in any presidential election since 1872. The following table gives the number of votes cast in each presidential election since 1868, the increase in the number of votes and the percentage of increase.

Year	vote cast	Gain over preceding	Per cent
1872	6,466,165	741,479	12.9
1876	8,412,733	1,946,568	30.1
1880	9,209,406	796,673	9.4
1884	10,044,985	835,579	9.1
1888	11,380,860	1,335,875	13.3
1892	12,059,351	678,491	5.9
1896	13,951,283	1,891,932	15.6

It will be seen by a study of the above table that the vote of 1892 was an unusually light one, being a gain of but 5.9 per cent over that of the preceding presidential election. This is the lowest gain made at any time in the quarter of a century which this table covers. The vote of 1892 was evidently the lightest in proportion to the voting population that has been given within the period in question. It would not be surprising, therefore, if the increase in 1896, compared with 1892, should be an unusually large one, especially in view of the fact that the interest in the election was more intense than was perhaps ever felt before, at least in the memory of the present generation. An examination of the percentage column, however, will show that the actual increase over 1890 was only 15.6 per cent, while in 1876 the increase over the preceding presidential election was 30.1 per cent, and the increase in 1888 over that in 1884 was 13.3 per cent, nearly as much as 1896, on which occasion the interest in the campaign was unusually great and the efforts to rally every vote by both sides, were exceptional. A study of this table will show to those who examine it that it cannot be successfully charged that the total vote of the nation in 1896 was excessive or out of proportion in its increase, especially when it is remembered that the vote of 1892 was unusually light and that the percentage of gain is estimated upon that light vote.

In order to give, however, those who assume an excessive vote in certain States, the full advantage of every fact, let us examine the votes in the States of which Mr. Allen complains and compare them with the vote of 1892, confessedly a light vote. Pennsylvania increased her vote in 1896 18.4 per cent, as compared with the vote of 1892, and Mr. Allen complains that there was a "fraudulent excess" of 94,000 in Pennsylvania's vote. He makes no complaint, however, of the fact that the State of Montana, which was as earnest for the free coinage of silver as was Pennsylvania against it, increased her vote 21.9 per cent. Indiana increased her vote 14.7 in 1896, as compared with 1892, yet Mr. Allen, whose party carried South Dakota, makes no complaint of the fact that South Dakota increased her vote 17.1 per cent, nor does he refer to the fact that Indiana, in the election of 1876, when she went Democratic, increased her vote 26.3 per cent. Iowa increased her vote 17.6 per cent, and Mr. Allen charges 77,500 "fraudulent excess" of votes, but makes no comment on the fact that North Carolina, a Populist State, increased her vote 17.8 per cent, nor does he refer to the fact that Iowa in 1876 increased her vote 35 per cent. California increased her vote 9.1 per cent in 1896, as compared with 1892, and Mr. Allen charges 22,000 "fraudulent excess" of votes, but makes no reference to the fact that his own State, Nebraska, increased her vote 11.1 per cent in the same election. Maryland increased her vote 12.9 per cent in 1896, as compared with 1892, and although Mr. Allen charges a "fraudulent excess" of 8,700, he raises no objection to the fact that ten States, giving their votes to the Populist-Democratic candidate, increased their votes in a much greater ratio than did Maryland, nor does he refer to the fact that Maryland herself, in 1888, when she went Democratic, gained 13.5 per cent over her own presidential vote in the pre-

ceding election. Ohio, of which Mr. Allen complains as casting 94,500 "fraudulent excess" of votes, increased her vote 19.1 per cent in 1896 over 1892, yet Mr. Allen complains with entire calmness the fact that Wyoming, a State as ardently for the free coinage of silver as was Ohio against it, increased her vote 25.8 per cent in the same election. He also complains bitterly of Minnesota, which he says cast 12,100 "fraudulent excess" of votes in the election of 1896, but he omits to call attention to the fact that Minnesota's vote in 1896 was actually 8.9 per cent less than her own vote in the presidential election of 1892. Her vote in 1892 was 374,807, and that of 1896 341,539, a falling off of 33,000 votes, but as 107,000 of the votes of 1892 were cast by the Union Labor party, which afterwards merged with the Populists, Mr. Allen makes no complaint of the vote of 1892, which was a gain of 42.1 per cent over that of 1888, while the 1888 vote was a gain of 38.4 per cent over that of 1884. Illinois increased her vote in 1896 24.9 per cent over 1892, and Mr. Allen charges a "fraudulent excess" of votes amounting to 137,000. Yet he offers no complaint over the fact that Mississippi increased her vote 31.9, or that Florida, the birthplace of Populism, increased her vote 30.5 per cent in 1896, as compared with 1892, nor does he refer to the fact that Illinois also gained 25.8 per cent in 1876. The highest percentage of gain of any State in which Mr. Allen charges a "fraudulent excess" of votes is Kentucky, where the gain was 31.1 per cent, as compared with 1892, and the "fraudulent excess" charged is 43,300. Mr. Allen does not, however, offer any objection whatever to the fact that Idaho, which supported the free coinage of silver as enthusiastically as the Kentuckians opposed it, increased her vote in 1896 52.5 per cent, as compared with 1892, nor does he refer to the fact that Kentucky herself gained 30.1 per cent in the year 1876 and 24.7 in 1888, and also omits to mention that his own State, Nebraska, gained 50.7 per cent in 1888. It may be interesting to see some of these figures side by side, as follows.

State	Percentage of gain in 1896, compared with 1892, in votes cast in presidential elections		
Republican States—	Democratic States—		
gain in 1896 over gain in 1896 over 1892—	gain in 1896 over 1892—		
California	9.1	Nebraska	11.1
Maryland	12.9	South Dakota	17.1
Indiana	14.7	North Carolina	17.8
West Virginia	16.3	Tennessee	20.2
Iowa	17.6	Montana	21.9
Michigan	18.8	Wyoming	25.8
Ohio	19.1	Missouri	24.3
Wisconsin	20.4	Florida	30.5
Illinois	24.9	Mississippi	31.9
Kentucky	30.1	Idaho	52.5

Where the Real Fraud Was. It must be apparent to anybody who takes the trouble to examine the above figures that the charges of fraud in the election in the States carried by McKinley are false. Nobody, whatever his political sentiments may be, can doubt that if he examines carefully these figures, which are taken from the official publications.

But how about the South, where the Democracy is always triumphant by one process or another? It is a notorious fact that in the extreme Southern States the colored voters have been disfranchised by one process and another until their participation in national and State elections has practically disappeared. This has been accomplished by various processes at various times, that process which combines the greatest success with the greatest showing of virtue having finally been hit upon in amendments to the State constitutions which require an educational test as a qualification for voting. With a clause in the State constitution requiring each voter to be able to read or "satisfactorily explain" a clause in that instrument itself, and the jury which is to determine whether the reading or "explanation" is well done being "packed" beforehand, it is easy to see that the average colored voter in the South stands little show of an opportunity to cast his vote. This requirement exists in several of the Southern States. In others there is also an educational test in the form of a law which requires a separate ballot box for each candidate with his name printed on the outside, the voter being required to place his ballot for each candidate in its proper box. In order to prevent the successful coaching of voters not able to read the names upon the boxes, the custom is to change the location of the boxes from hour to hour or more frequently if necessary, thus making it absolutely impossible for the voter who cannot read to know whether he is putting his ballot in the right box. In some cases it is found more convenient to count the votes cast for Republican candidates at 5 o'clock, for Democrats and vice versa, but those are no exceptions and the "educational test" is becoming the popular method in the South for keeping the negroes away from the polls. It sounds well, prevents charges of violations of law and yet does the business most effectively. That the experiments which the people of the South have been making in the last twenty years in the line of "How to Exclude the Black Vote from the Polls," have been highly successful, will be seen from the following votes and figures taken from the official records of the Government. Seven of the extreme Southern States, which contain in themselves more than one-half of the entire colored population of the country, are selected as an example. These States occupy the extreme southern belt and in them the art of depriving the negro voter of his right of suffrage seems to have attained its highest perfection.

State	Percentage of gain in 1896, compared with 1892, in votes cast in presidential elections
South Carolina	182,766
Florida	130,534
Georgia	46,776
Alabama	171,697
Mississippi	104,778
Arkansas	96,740
Louisiana	145,823

Suppressing Republican Votes in the South. The States whose vote will be examined here are South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana. Twenty years ago the art of suppressing the negro vote was in its infancy. In the presidential election of 1876 the total vote returned from these States amounted to 989,114. Since that they have gained, according to the United States census, 3,265,406 in population. Yet in the year 1896 they report only 791,011 votes cast, an actual loss of 198,103 votes. Here is an example for those who admire the art of suppressing votes. A gain of 3,266,465 in population and at the same time a loss of 198,103 in the number of votes. A gain of 66 per cent as shown by the official figures and at the same time a loss of 20 per cent in votes, as also shown by the official figures. That this reduction in the number of votes was caused by keeping away colored Republican voters from the polls is shown by the fact that the percentage of the vote cast for the Republican tickets in these States has dwindled year by year until it has reached as low a figure as 4 per cent in Alabama in 1892, 3 per cent in Mississippi in 1892, while in Florida and Louisiana no votes

were recorded for the Republican presidential candidates in that year. Not contented with this, the vote was brought down in many of those States even lower in 1896 than in 1892, the number of votes cast being actually less in the recent election than in an which had preceded it.

The above statements are verified by the following figures taken from the official records of the Government. They indicate the population of those States in 1870 and 1890 as shown by the United States census, and also show the total vote in each State in the presidential elections of 1876 and 1896 as shown by official returns.

State	Population 1870	Population 1890	Vote 1876	Vote 1896
South Carolina	705,096	1,151,149	182,766	68,938
Florida	1,184,109	1,837,353	130,534	162,744
Georgia	187,784	391,422	46,776	44,740
Alabama	969,992	1,519,017	171,697	194,576
Mississippi	827,922	1,239,680	104,778	69,513
Arkansas	484,471	1,128,178	96,740	149,454
Louisiana	726,915	1,118,527	145,823	101,046

The above table, it will be seen, shows a large gain in the population in each of the States in question from the census of 1870 to the last census of 1890. It also shows, however, that in every case except two the vote of 1896 was much less than that of 1876. The total population in these States increased from about five millions in 1870 to nearly eight and a half millions in 1890, yet the total vote fell from 939,000 in 1876 to 791,000 in 1896.

The detail of the vote by States with the gain in population and loss in votes is shown in the tables which follow.

State	Gain in population in 20 years	Gain or loss in vote in 20 years
S. Carolina	446,540	Loss 113,828
Georgia	243,244	Loss 17,770
Florida	663,038	Loss 2,636
Alabama	516,025	Gain 22,879
Mississippi	461,638	Loss 95,265
Arkansas	643,708	Gain 52,714
Louisiana	391,672	Loss 44,777
Totals	3,366,462	Net loss 195,003

Table showing by States the percentage of gain in population in twenty years and the percentage of gain or loss in votes in the corresponding period:

State	Percentage of gain in population in 20 years	Percentage of gain or loss of vote in 20 years
S. Carolina	63	Loss 62
Georgia	53	Loss 4
Florida	56	Loss 4
Alabama	51	Gain 13
Mississippi	55	Loss 57
Arkansas	132	Gain 54
Louisiana	53	Loss 81

ELECTION FIGURES.

The Story of the Presidential Canvass of 1896 in a Nutshell. The canvass of the electoral vote for President and Vice-President in the two houses of Congress presents some interesting figures. The popular and electoral vote were as follows:

Candidate	Popular vote	Electoral vote	States
McKinley	7,105,959	6,454,943	21
Bryan	271	176	22

The number of votes cast shows that the majority of McKinley over Bryan, and that over all other parties, was obtained by a decisive victory over all other parties. Old party lines were obliterated, and high principle was vindicated by men who believed in the honor of the nation above mere party adherence. The total result of the canvass is exhibited in the following figures: Total popular vote.....13,876,633
McKinley over Bryan.....651,016
McKinley over all.....336,255
National Democratic vote.....132,870
Prohibition vote.....131,870
Free Silver people.....43,573
Increase in four years.....12,582,222
Electoral vote for Watson.....27
Bryan received the total Populist vote of 1892, in addition to which was the Republican silver vote, as well as the vote of those Democrats who "voted first and read the platform afterwards." This accounts for the large number of votes cast for him. From Missouri he received the highest number of electoral votes—seven. The votes of nine States were given him, the highest of which had only four electors. The canvass indicates a divergence in the votes of States contrasted by the moral lines of wealth and population. For McKinley the votes from the prosperous, conservative and largely wealthy and populated States were almost unanimous. Bryan's strength lay in those States consisting mainly of territory and not of people. The figures and facts show that after all, while the plurality of Mr. McKinley was great, yet the comparisons of territories make it still more significant—St. Joseph Herald.

DEMOCRACY AND POPULISM.

They Cannot Co-operate—Remains but One Course for the Democrats. There is no possibility of amalgamation between Democrats and Populists, as the principles for which they stand will no more mix than oil and water. It requires no particular powers of political prophecy to foresee that the result will be the same as it was in the last national convention of the Democracy—the Populistic forces will control it and name the platform and candidates. Making due allowance for the many thousands who voted directly with the Republicans, the sound money Democrats can have no reasonable doubt, after their experience in the last campaign, that they are in a hopeless minority in their own party, and that the most they can expect to do, either as individuals or as an organization, is to defeat the aims of their former party associates by supporting the Republican candidates and platform either directly or through a decoy organization contributing to the same result. To recapture and dominate the Democratic organization or to win as a separate organization they have not a ghost of a show. The most effective and consistent course, therefore, for them to pursue is to take the advice recently given to them by Senator Platt, to unite directly with the Republican party.—Pittsburg Commercial Gazette.

The truly great are those who conquer themselves.

PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT.

SKETCHES OF THE LIVES OF M'KINLEY AND HOBART.

Their Public and Home Life Interestingly Outlined.

The new President and Vice-President and their families are naturally subjects of much attention in the public mind and the public eye at the present moment, both in Washington and elsewhere. Both those gentlemen have been before the public for some time, and the story of their lives is pretty well known. It may not be amiss, however, now that they are just assuming the reins of government, to sketch briefly the career of the President and Vice-President, and to give to those interested some facts relative to their families and home life.

William McKinley celebrated his fifty-third birthday a few days before his inauguration. Born Feb. 26, 1844, in the State of Ohio, his career has been a remarkable one and full of activity in public affairs since reaching the age of seventeen. At that early age he entered the Twenty-third Ohio Volunteer Infantry in May, 1861, as a private soldier, serving continuously until the close of the war, when he was mustered out September, 1865, as a captain and brevet major. He was then but 21 years of age. Returning to his home in Stark County, Ohio, he resumed his studies, making such rapid progress with his pursuit of the law that in 1869, only four years later, he was made prosecuting attorney for his county, which position he filled with honor to himself and satisfaction to the people of his county until 1871. His success in this work was such as to clearly point to him as valuable for service in more important fields, and he was elected to the Forty-fifth Congress as member of the House of Representatives, taking his seat in that body when it met in special session Oct. 15, 1877. It is a somewhat singular coincidence that he himself will call a special session of the Fifty-fifth Congress, twenty years from the time that he sat as a member of the special session of the Forty-fifth Congress.

His congressional career was an interesting one, indicating from the first that his constituents had made no mistake in placing in his hands the responsible business assigned to him. From the beginning of his work he developed a special interest in tariff matters and maintained that interest through term after term until reaching the Fifty-first Congress, the careful, persistent work which he had done in his earlier years proved the turning point in his career. He was the candidate for the Speakership, but fate seemed to have reserved for him the higher honor of the presidency, for his defeat for candidate as Speaker was followed by his appointment as chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, and he thus became leader of the Republican majority in the Fifty-first Congress, which enacted what has since been known as the "McKinley tariff act." That act, taking effect but a short time prior to the national election, had not time to prove its value, which, as a result, went Democratic, as did also the presidential election which followed two years later, by which the control of Congress and the presidency was swept into Democratic hands. Meantime, however, the McKinley tariff law had made a record for itself which has since proved so valuable as to commend to the public for the presidency the man whose name it bears, and when its workings were compared with the Democratic tariff law which was enacted three years later, the comparison proved so favorable that in 1896 the people of the country voted not only to elect William McKinley President, but to put into Congress a power which could sweep off from the statute books the Democratic tariff law and enact one framed upon the general lines which gave prosperity during the years the McKinley law was in operation.

Mr. McKinley, at the close of his congressional career, was soon taken up by the people of his State and made Governor of Ohio in 1891 and again in 1893, by an enormous majority.

In his home and family life Major McKinley is extremely happy, though a shadow has been cast over it by the loss of his two children, both of whom died in early life. Mrs. McKinley is a native of Canton, which has been Major McKinley's home for many years, and is the daughter of James Saxton, whose father was for sixty years editor of the "Ohio Repository," published at Canton, and still a prominent paper in the State. Mr. Saxton, who was a banker, placed his daughter, at the termination of her college life, in his bank, where she acted as cashier until her marriage with William McKinley, Jan. 25, 1871. Mrs. McKinley always accompanied her husband during his life in Washington, but being an invalid, was able to appear but little in social life, though she was extremely popular with those who were so fortunate as to make her acquaintance. She has, during the past few years somewhat improved in health, and although the duties of the mistress of the White House are of an exacting nature, it is hoped that she will be able to assume them without endangering her health.

Vice President Hobart.

Garret A. Hobart, who is to serve as Vice-President during the term of President McKinley, was born at Long Branch, N. J., in 1844. He was graduated from Rutgers College before he was 20 years old, and studied law with Socrates Tuttle at Paterson, being admitted to the bar in 1866. In 1872 he was elected a member of the New Jersey House, and was re-elected and chosen Speaker. He declined an election in 1875 and in 1877 he was elected Senator from Passaic County. He was re-elected to that position and served until the expiration of the term 1882, being president pro tem of that body for the last two years of his service. In 1884 he was nominated by the Republican caucus of the Legislature for United States Senator, but was not elected, as the Legislature was Democratic, and John R. McPherson was chosen. In 1884 he became a member of the Republican National Committee.

In business life he has been energetic and active. He is president of the Passaic Water Company, the Aquackanonk Water Company, the Paterson Railroad Company's consolidated lines, the Morris County Railroad and the People's Gas Company. He is a director in several national banks, including the First National of Paterson and the Paterson Savings Institution. He is also on the directory boards of the New York, Susquehanna

and Western Railroad, the Lehigh and Hudson River Railroad, the Barbour Bros. Company, the Harbour Flax Spinning Company, the Pioneer Silk Company, the American Cotton Oil Company and some forty or more additional corporations. With many of these concerns he holds the position of legal adviser. Mr. Hobart is a resident of Paterson, where he has a beautiful home, which is the center of the social amenities of the city. Mr. Hobart will reside temporarily in one of the hotels in Washington, for, although a wealthy man, he has up to this time omitted the selection of a permanent residence for himself for the term of his service in Washington. His family consists of a wife and one son of twelve years of age; their daughter, who is spoken of as an especially attractive young lady, having died in Rome a few years since. Mrs. Hobart is highly spoken of by those who have known her in social life in New Jersey, and will doubtless prove helpful to Mrs. McKinley in the official social duties which devolve upon the head of an administration.

DYING, A HUNDRED A DAY.

The Veterans of the Late War Passing Rapidly Away.

The veteran Union soldiers are dying at the rate of one hundred a day. That is what statistics of the Grand Army and of the pension office show. Away back in the days when the battles were being fought the news that in any day's engagement one hundred men had given up their lives would have pierced the hearts of waiting millions, would have deepened the gloom that overhung the land. In many battles thousands rather than hundreds were the victims, but days and weeks, even months, elapsed before the record of the dead was lengthened. It was not every day in the fiercest, bitterest, bloodiest days of the war that a hundred men fell from the ranks, with their pulses still ebbing, not alone by their own deaths and sisters and sweethearts sitting in their lonely homes, but by the sympathetic heart of the nation. They ranked as heroes, as martyrs, as men worthy of all honor. They had given up homes and the pursuits of peace for their country's sake; they had lost their lives, and in losing won everlasting fame. But of the two millions of men enlisted a vast number escaped the bullets of the enemy, the bursting shells, the starvation prison camps and the scarcely less fatal hardships of field life. They came home and took up individual life again, but not where they had laid it down—oh, no; the threads had been broken that connected these returned soldiers with their former existence. They labored under certain disadvantages at first on account of this lack, but the soldierly qualities they had gained as a compensation carried them through and they have made good citizens in peace, as was to be expected of men who were equal to their duty in great emergency. They have served their country and their fellow-creatures well in whatever capacity they have been tried, but through all the years since the war the soldier spirit in them has been discernible. As they pass on, one hundred a day, they may have assurance that those years and their glories are to grow brighter and brighter in the country's record; that they mark an epoch whose importance is not yet to be measured. If the veteran as an individual craves a little share of this praise and esteem it is a human hunger, and should be gratified. For the service that he and his comrades rendered was great. And they are dying, one hundred a day!—Indianapolis Journal.

OUR CASH PER CAPITA.

It Is Increasing Steadily and Exceeds That of Nearly Every Nation.