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## STATISTICS OF CONJUGAL CONDITION.

NUMBER OF SINGLE, MARRIED, WIDOWED, AND DIVORCED PERSONS IN THE UNITED STATES: 1890.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, Census Office,<br>Washington, D. C., April 12, 1894.

SIR :
I have the honor to present herewith statistics of the conjugal condition of the people of the United States as shown by the census of 1890 . This is the first presentation of data regarding conjugal condition as a part of the United States census. In the Tenth Census the material for preparing these statistics was obtained by the enumerators, but means were not at hand for their compilation. The discussion is necessarily confined to the figures of the present census, inasmuch as there are no other figures with which they can be compared.

These figures, moreover, present simply the status of the population on June 1, 1S90. They give only the number and per cent of the single, married, widowed, and divorced on that date. They take no account of the widowed and divorced who have remarried, and consequently are but a partial presentation of these two classes.

Of the entire population of the United States in June, 1890, very nearly three-fifths, or 59.29 per cent, were single, a little more than one-third, or 35.66 per cent, were married, and not quite one-twentieth, or 4.74 per cent, were widowed. The divorced constituted but a small fraction of 1 per cent of the whole number, while those whose conjugal condition was unknown constituted even a smaller proportion. In considering the statistics of conjugal condition as applied to the whole population, it should be remembered that children as well as adults are included, and that for this reason there is a very much larger proportion of single persons among the population than of married, widowed, or divorced persons. The number and per cent of each class are slown by the following table :

| conjugal condition. | Number. | Per cent. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The United States....... | 62,622,250 | 100.00 |
| Single | 37,129,564 | 59.29 |
| Married. | 22,331,424 | 35.66 |
| Widowed. | 2,970,052 | 4.74 |
| Divorced. | 120,996 | 0.20 |
| Unknown ....................... | 70,214 | 0.11 |

The table on the following page gives, by states and territories, the number of persons of eacli sex classified according to their conjugal condition, as reported in June, 1890.
conjugal condition of the aggregate population, Classified by sex, by states and territories : 1890.

| atates and territories. | Aggregate. | males. |  |  |  |  |  | females. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total. | Single. | Married. | Widowed. | Divorced, | $\begin{gathered} \text { Un- } \\ \text { known. } \end{gathered}$ | Total. | Single. | Married. | Widowed. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Di- } \\ \text { vorced. } \end{gathered}$ | Unnown. |
| The United States...... | 62,622,250 | 32,067,880 | 19,945,576 | 11,205,228 | 815,437 | 49,101 | 52,538 | 30,554,370 | 17,183,988 | 11,126,196 | 2,154,615 | 71,895 | 17,676 |
| North Atlantic division....... | 17,401,515 | 8,677,798 | 5,072,962 | 3,322,329 | 259,877 | 10,007 | 12,623 | 8,723,747 | 4,683,294 | 3,293,929 | 726,481 | 15,182 | 4,861 |
| Maine .......... ................... | 661,086 | 332,590 | 181,365 | 137,419 | 12,100 | 1,094 | 612 | 328,496 | 159,967 | 137,184 | 29,938 | 1,337 | 70 |
| New Hampshire | 376,530 | 186,566 | 99,233 | 78,658 | 7,684 | 800 | 191 | 189,964 | 91,333 | 78,526 | 18,943 | 1,084 | 78 |
| Vermont ................... .... | 332,422 | 169,327 | 91,690 | 70,140 | 6,808 | 584 | 105 | 163,095 | 77,986 | 69,956 | 14,438 | 677 | 38 |
| Massachusetts. | 2,238,943 | 1,087,709 | 626,862 | 421,946 | 35,513 | 1,394 | 1,994 | 1,151,234 | 619,690 | 421,259 | 107,273 | 2,48! | 528 |
| Rhode Island................... | 315,506 | 168,025 | 97,152 | 64,852 | 5,488 | 391 | 142 | 177,481 | 96,256. | 64,838 | 15,556 | 759 | 72 |
| Connecticut ..................... | 746,258 | 369,538 | 212,478 | 144,054 | 11,542 | 846 | 618 | 376,720 | 197,019 | 143,263 | 34,889 | 1,298 | 251 |
| New York. | 5,997,853 | 2,976,893 | 1,723,617 | 1,155,661 | 91,009 | 2,219 | 4,387 | 3,020,960 | 1,600,156 | 1,149,995 | 265,456 | 3,395 | 1,958 |
| New Jersey ... | 1,444,933 | 720,819 | 420,454 | 278,957 | 20,119 | 363 | 926 | 724,114 | 389,141 | 276,345 | 57,763 | 565 | 300 |
| Pennsylvania.................. | 5,258,014 | 2,666,331 | 1,620,111 | 970,642 | 69,614 | 2,316 | 3,648 | 2,591,683 | 1,451,746 | 952,563 | 182,295 | 3,583 | 1,566 |
| South Atlantic division....... | 8,857,920 | 4,418,769 | 2,881,663 | 1,436,089 | 94,417 | 2,910 | 3,690 | 4,439,151 | 2,657,307 | 1,448,455 | 323,050 | -6,32 | 4,207 |
| Delaware............... ........ | 168,493 | 85,573 | 52,028 | 31,159 | 2,306 | 40 | 40 | 82,920 | 45,484 | 31,192 | 6,154 | 70 | 20 |
| Maryland... | 1,042,390 | 515,691 | 322,428 | 178,195 | 14,125 | 321 | 622 | 526,699 | 303,348 | 179,888 | 42,583 | 582 | 298 |
| District of Columbia ......... | 230,392 | 109,584 | 66,084 | 39,639 | 3,376 | 146 | 339 | 120,808 | 66,775 | 39,675 | 13,929 | 314 | 115 |
| Virginia.. | 1,655,980 | 824,278 | 545,753 | 257,559 | 19,895 | 533 | 538 | 831,702 | 509,779 | 258,116 | 61,877 | 1,039 | 891 |
| West Virginia. | 762,794 | 390,285 | 253,962 | 127,829 | 7,487 | 359 | 648 | 372,509 | 225,783 | 127,576 | 18,389 | 674 | 137 |
| North Carolina | 1,617,947 | 799,149 | 529,705 | 253,635 | 15,074 | 378 | 357 | 818,798 | 502,554 | 257,919 | 56,889 | 836 | 600 |
| South Carolina | 1,151,149 | 572,337 | 378,798 | 182,524 | 10,637 | 210 | 168 | 578,812 | 352,076 | 184,968 | 40,617 | 483 | 668 |
| Georgia... | 1,837,353 | 919,925 | 603,249 | 298,594 | 16,823 | 579 | 680 | 917,428 | 543,369 | 302,097 | 69,125 | 1,551 | 1,286 |
| Florida.. | 391,422 | 201,947 | 129,656 | 66,955 | 4,694 | 344 | 298 | 189,475 | 108,189 | 67,024 | 13,487 | 583 | 192 |
| North Central division........ | 22,362,279 | 11,594,910 | - 7,157,290 | 4,114,822 | 285,802 | 23,230 | 13,766 | 10,767,369 | 5,996,437 | 4,098,449 | 636,284 | 32,230 | 3,969 |
| Ohio. | 3,672,316 | 1,855,736 | 1,109,172 | 691,197 | 50,209 | 3,567 | 1,591 | 1,816,580 | 991,319 | 689,347 | 129,443 | 5,717 | 724 |
| Indiana | 2,192,404 | 1,118,347 | 670,867 | 413,733 | 29,892 | 3,000 | 555 | 1,074,057 | 584,186 | 413,523 | 71,252 | 4,711 | 385 |
| lllinois. | 3,826,351 | 1,972,308 | 1,221,122 | 697,129 | 47,844 | 3,317 | 2,596 | 1,854,043 | 1,035, 123 | 694,531 | 119,131 | 4,926 | 332 |
| Michigan | 2,093,889 | 1,091,780 | 638,209 | 420,700 | 28,482 | 2,805 | 1,584 | 1,002,109 | 522,867 | 416,304 | 59,080 | 3,493 | 365 |
| Wisconsin. | 1,686,880 | 874,951 | 545,698 | 304,210 | 22,453 | 1,639 | 951 | 811,929 | 461,884 | 302,859 | 44,685 | 2,179 | 322 |
| Minnesota. | 1,301,826 | 605,321 | 451,683 | 226,159 | 14,992 | 1,071 | 1,416 | 606,505 | 354,126 | 223,463 | 27,475 | 1,178 | 263 |
| Iowa | 1,911,896 | 994,453 | 619,162 | 349,345 | 23,387 | 1,993 | 566 | 917,443 | 517,787 | 349,983 | 46,625 | 2,880 | 168 |
| Missouri. | 2,679,184 | 1,385,238 | 878,806 | 467,600 | 34,569 | 2,231 | 2,032 | 1,293,946 | 739,428 | 467,892 | 82,989 | 3,201 | 436 |
| North Dakota | 182,719 | 101,590 | 67,698 | 31,611 | 2,025 | 129 | 127 | 81,129 | 47,022 | 31,172 | 2,809 | 106 | 20 |
| South Dakota | 328,808 | 180,250 | 116,151 | 59,647 | 3,818 | 426 | 208 | 148,558 | 84,778 | 58,290 | 5,120 | 328 | 42 |
| Nebraska | 1,058,910 | 572,824 | 368,994 | 190,318 | 11,140 | 1,296 | 1,076 | 486,086 | 278,987 | 187,579 | 17,995 | 1,394 | 131 |
| Kansas | 1,427,096 | 752,112 | 469,428 | 263,173 | 16,991 | 1,756 | 764 | 674,984 | 378,900 | 263,506 | 29,680 | 2,117 | 781 |
| South Central division........ | 10,972,893 | 5,593,877 | 3,654,943 | 1,742,119 | 130,422 | 6,840 | 9,553 | 5,379,016 | 3,174,570 | 1,794,653 | 393,548 | 12,860 | 3,385 |
| Kentucky | 1,858,635 | 942,758 | 603,227 | 313,436 | 23,692 | 1,260 | 1,143 | 915,877 | 534,740 | 313,880 | 63,997 | 2,461 | 799 |
| Tenness | 1,767,518 | 891,585 | 577,598 | 290,440 | 21,198 | 1,154 | 1,195 | 875,933 | 515,379 | 291,665 | 65,859 | 2,660 | 370 |
| Alabam | 1,513,017 | 757,456 | 496,308 | 244,803 | 15,008 | 744 | 593 | 755,561 | 450,032 | 245,952 | 58,018 | 1,419 | 140 |
| Mississippi | 1,289,600 | 649,687 | 431,069 | 202,798 | 14,778 | 581 | 461 | 639,913 | 384,334 | 204,194 | 49,616 | 1,233 | 536 |
| Louisiana. | 1,118,587 | 559,350 | 365,865 | 178,220 | 13,372 | 632 | 1,261 | 559,237 | 327,686 | 179,458 | 50,270 | 1,193 | 630 |
| Texas.. | 2,235,523 | 1,172,553 | 777,933 | 362,324 | 26,848 | 1,497 | 3,951 | 1,062,970 | 629,785 | 360,756 | 69,228 | 2,568 | 633 |
| Oklahoma. | 61,834 | 34,733 | 21,598 | 12,005 | 996 | 99 | 35 | 27,101 | 14,888 | 11,244 | 912 | 49 | 8 |
| Arkansas. | 1,128,179 | 585,755 | 381,3.45 | 188,093 | 14,530 | 873 | 914 | 542,424 | 317,726 | 187,504 | 35,648 | 1,277 | 269 |
| Western division................. | 3,027,613 | 1,782,526 | 1,178,718 | 539,869 | 44,919 | 6,114 | 12,906 | 1,245,087 | 672,380 | 490,710 | 75,252 | 5,491 | 1,254 |
| Montana. | 132,159 | 87,882 | 62,445 | 22,772 | 1,706 | 253 | 706 | 44,277 | 23,341 | 18,766 | 1,906 | 217 | 47 |
| WYoming ......................... | 60,705 | 39,343 | 27,706 | 10,308 | 859 | 144 | 326 | 21,362 | 11,634 | 8,777 | 823 | 105 | 23 |
| Colorado. | 412,198 | 245,247 | 161,033 | 75,735 | 6,044 | 736 | 1,699 | 166,95I | 87,490 | 69,100 | 9,575 | 712 | 74 |
| New Mexico. | 153,593 | 83,055 | 50,985 | 29,343 | 2,479 | 207 | 41 | 70,538 | 36,431 | 28,931 | 4,877 | 290 | 9 |
| Arizona. | 59,620 | 36,571 | 25,972 | 9,536 | 918 | 104 | 41 | 23,049 | 12,628 | 8,764 | 1,595 | 62 |  |
| Utah. | 207,905 | 110,463 | 74,266 | 33,823 | 1,802 | 214 | 358 | 97,442 | 57,408 | 33,790 | 5,708 | 492 | 44 |
| Nevada. | 45,761 | 29,214 | 19,990 | 8,023 | 771 | 166 | 264 | 16,547 | 8,924 | 6,282 | 1,051 | 125 | 165 |
| Idaho.. | 81,385 | 51,290 | 35,393 | 14,500 | 1,120 | 191 | 86 | 33,095 | 18,799 | 12,987 | 1,191 | 111 | 7 |
| Washington... | 349,300 | 217,562 | 146,851 | 63,538 | 5,145 | 761 | 1,267 | 131,828 | 69,902 | 56,380 | 4,986 | 447 | 113 |
| Oregon .......................... | 313,767 | 181,840 | 118,827 | 56,262 | 4,853 | 752 | 1,146 | 131,927 | 73,129 | 52,312 | 5,874 | 537 | 75 |
| California . ...................... | 1,208,130 | 700,059 | 455,250 | 216,029 | 19,222 | 2,586 | 6,972 | 508,071 | 272,694 | 194,621 | 37,666 | 2,393 | 697 |

Considering brietly the results regarding the conjugal condition of males and females, renpectively, for the United States as a whole, it appears that of the $32,067,880$ males in the country, $19,945,576$, or 62.20 per cent, were single; $11,205,228$, or 34.94 per cent, were married ; 815,437 , or 2.54 per cent, were widowed, and 49,101 , or 0.15 per cent, were divorced. The total number of females in the country was considerably less than that of the males, being $30,554,370$, of which $17,183,988$, or 56.24 per cent, were single. This proportion, it will be noted, is decidedly less than that of the males. The number of married females was $11,126,196$, being practically the same as that of muried males, while the proportion was 36.41 per cent, which is greater than that of the males. The number of widows was $2,154,615$, or 7.05 per cent of the total number of females. As is seen, the proportion of widows was nearly three times as great as that of widowers, showing that a greater proportion of widowers remarry than of widows. The number of divorced women was 71,895 , being 0.24 per cent, or considerably more than the proportion of males. This probably indicates that divorced men have remarried to a greater extent than divorced women.

Of the total population in 1890 the males constituted 51.21 per cent and the females 48.79 per cent. Of all the single persons the single males constituted 53.72 per cent and the single females 46.28 per cent, whereas of all the married persons the married males constituted 50.18 per cent and the married females 49.82 per cent. The proportion of widowed females of all the widowed is very much more than that of widowed males, or 72.54 per cent of widowed females as compared with only 27.46 per cent of widowed males. The divoreed females also constitute $59.42 \mathrm{~F} r$ cent of all the divorced persons as against 40.58 per cent of divorced males. By far the greater proportion of all the persons whose conjugal condition was unknown are males, or 74.83 per cent males and 25.17 per cent females.

Classification by general nativity and color is in a measure a classification by station in life, and the results derived from it throw much light upon the conjugal condition of social classes. The native white of native parentage, taken as a whole, form the highest class in the community, as indicated by education, occupation, and freedom from criminality and pauperism. The native white of foreign parentage occupy a middle position in this regard, while the foreign white in the north and the negro in the south occupy the lowest position in the scale. The ranks of unskilled labor are supplied mainly from these classes. With these broad distinctions in mind the differences in conjugal condition among these classes are extremely significant, as shown by the following table:

| CONJUGAL CONDITION. | white. |  | Native whitenative parents. |  | NATIVE WHITEFOREIGN PARENTS. |  | Foreign white. |  | Colored. (a) |  | Negro. (b) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { cent. } \end{gathered}$ | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Per cent. |
| The United States. | 54,983,890 | 100.00 | 34,358,348 | 100.00 | 11,503,675 | 100.00 | 9,121,867 | 100.00 | 7,638,360 | 100.00 | 7,470,040 | 100.00 |
| Single......... ........................ ......... | 32,351,452 | 58.84 | 20,531,731 | 59.76 | 8,831,287 | 76.77 | 2,988,434 | 32.76 | 4,778,112 | 62.55 | 4,669,513 | 62.51 |
| Married ......................................... | 19,918,836 | 36.23 | 12,163,334 | 35.40 | 2,469,589 | 21.47 | 5,285,913 | 57.95 | 2,412,588 | 31.59 | 2,363,231 | 31.64 |
| Widowed. | 2,553,749 | 4.64 | 1,553,224 | 4.52 | 187,345 | 1.63 | 813,180 | 8.91 | 416,303 | 5.45 | 411,888 | 5.51 |
| Divorced ............................... ........ | 104,960 | 0.19 | 74,472 | 0.22 | 12,402 | 0.11 | 18,086 | 0.20 | 16,036 | 0.21 | 15,907 | 0.21 |
| Unknown ....................................... | 54,893 | 0.10 | 35,587 | 0.10 | 3,052 | 0.02 | 16,254 | 0.18 | 15,321 | 0.20 | 9,501 | 0.13 |
| a Persons of negro descent, Chinese, Japanese, and civilized Indians. $b$ Includes all persons of negro descent. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Classifying the population by color, it appears that of the total number of white 58.84 per cent were single, 36.23 per cent were married, 4.64 per cent were widowed, and 0.19 per cent divorced.

The white element comprises three distinct classes, whose conjugal conditions differ widely, namely, native white of native parentage, native white of foreign parentage, and foreign white. Of the native white of native parentage the proportions were as follows: single, 59.76 per cent; married, 35.40 per cent; widowed, 4.52 per cent, and divorced, 0.22 per cent, while among the native white of foreign parentage the proportions were: single, 76.77 per cent; married, 21.47 per cent; widowed, 1.63 per cent, and divorced, 0.11 per cent. The proportion of single persons among the native white of foreign parentage was very much larger than among the native white of native parentage, while conversely the proportion of married, widowed, and divorced persons was much smaller. This result is due to the fact that a great proportion of white persons of native birth but foreign parentage consisted of children whose parents are of foreign birth.

The foreign white element shows the following proportions: single, 32.76 per cent; married, 57.95 per cent; widowed, 8.91 per cent, and divorced, 0.20 per cent. Thus the proportions of single and married were nearly reversed in the native and foreign white elements. The reason for the great disproportion between married and single of the foreign white element suggests itself at once. It is that our immigrants are principally of mature age and consist in large proportion of married persons.

Of the negro element the proportions were as follows: single, 62.51 per cent; married, 31.64 per cent; widowed, 5.51 per cent, and divorced, 0.21 per cent. Thus it appears that the proportiou of the single was much greater among the negro element than among the white, the proportion of married correspondingly less, of widowed somewhat greater, and of divorced persons practically the same.

Analyzing the results regarding the conjugal condition of the population subdivided according to sex and age groups, many interesting features are developed, as set forth in the following table:

## CONJUGAL CONDITION OF THE AGGREGATE POPULATION, SUBDIVIDED ACCORDING TO SEX AND AGE GROUPS.

| conjugal condition. | UNDER 15 years. |  | 15 to 19 years. |  | 20 TO 24 years. |  | 25 тo 29 years. |  | 30 TO 34 years. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Per cent. |
| Males. | 11,290,008 | 100.00 | 3,248,711 | 100.00 | 3,104,893 | 100.00 | 2,698,311 | 100.00 | 2,425,664 | 100.00 |
| Single ................................................ | 11,289,865 | 100.00 | 3,230,835 | 99.45 | 2.505,460 | 80.69 | 1,240,797 | 45.98 | 642,827 | 26.50 |
| Married. | 23 | (a) | 16,746 | 0.52 | 585,748 | 18.87 | 1,421,407 | 52.68 | 1,728,930 | 71.28 |
| Widowed |  | .... ..... | 137 | (a) | 7,610 | 0.24 | 26,601 | 0.99 | 43,777 | 1.80 |
| Divorced.. | 1 | (a) | 28 | (a) | 1,468 | 0.05 | 4,340 | 0.16 | 5,832 | 0.24 |
| Unknown. | 119 | (a) | 965 | 0.03 | 4,607 | 0.15 | 5,166 | 0.19 | 4,298 | 0.18 |
| Females... | 10,952,192 | 100.00 | 3,308,852 | 100.00 | 3,091,783 | 100.00 | 2,529,466 | 100.00 | 2,152,966 | 100.00 |
| Single ................... ............................. | 10,950,672 | 99.99 | 2,987,949 | 90.30 | 1,601,266 | 51.79 | 641,988 | 25.38 | 326,306 | 15:16 |
| Married | 1,411 | 0.01 | 313,983 | 9.49 | 1,444,712 | 46.73 | 1,805,064 | 71,36 | 1,717,204 | 79.76 |
| Widowed............................................ | 17 | (a) | 4,845 | 0.15 | 36,456 | 1.18 | 69,965 | 2.77 | 96,797 | 4.49 |
| Divorced ........................................... | 12 | (a) | 1,101 | 0.03 | 6,931 | 0.22 | 10,588 | 0.42 | 11,161 | 0.52 |
| Unknown | 80 | (a) | 974 | 0.03 | 2,418 | 0.08 | 1,861 | 0.07 | 1,498 | 0.07 |
| conjuoal condition. | $3 \overline{5}$ TO 44 years. |  | 45 TO 54 YEARs. |  | 55 то 64 | Ears. | 65 years and over. |  | UNKNOWN. |  |
|  | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Percent. | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Per cent. |
| Males. | 3,705,648 | 100.00 | 2,627,024 | 100.00 | 1,630,373 | 100.00 | 1,233,719 | 100.00 | 103,529 | 100.00 |
| Single ............................................... | 568,511 | 15.34 | 239,928 | 9.13 | 111,144 | 6.82 | 69,100 | 5.60 | 47,109 | 45.50 |
| Married | 2,997,030 | 80.88 | 2,213,901 | 84.28 | 1,342,414 | 82.34 | 869,925 | 70.51 | 29,104 | 28.11 |
| Widowed. | 120,796 | 3.26 | 157,920 | 6.01 | 166,686 | 10.22 | 287.583 | 23.31 | 4,327 | 4.18 |
| Divorced............................................ | 12,837 | 0.35 | 11,393 | 0.43 | 7,835 | 0.48 | 4.974 | 0.40 | 393 | 0.38 |
| Unknown.. | 6,474 | 0.17 | 3,882 | 0.15 | 2,294 | 0.14 | 2,137 | 0.18 | 22,596 | 21.83 |
| Females.................................................. | 3,346,031 | 100.00 | 2,430,878 | 100.00 | 1,499,997 | 100.00 | 1,188,569 | 100.00 | 58,636 | 100.00 |
| Single............................................... | 330,139 | 9.87 | 171,454 | 7.05 | 86,573 | 5.77 | 66,758 | 5.64 | 20,883 | 35.61 |
| Married. | 2,698,266 | 80.64 | 1,796,979 | 73.92 | 905,627 | 60.38 | 418,399 | 35.35 | 24,551 | 41.87 |
| Widowed........................................... | 296,302 | 8.86 | 447,370 | 18.41 | 499, 120 | 33.29 | 693,324 | 58.58 | 10,119 | 17.26 |
| Divorced............................................ | 18,899 | 0.56 | 13,080 | 0.54 | 6,721 | 0.45 | 3.091 | 0.26 | 311 | 0.53 |
| Unknown. | 2,425 | 0.07 | 1,995 | 0.08 | 1,656 | 0.11 | 1,997 | 0.17 | 2,772 | 4.73 |

a Less than 1 one-hundredth of 1 per cent.
Of the males under 15 years the proportion of married was inappreciable, while of the females under 15 about 1 in every 10,000 was married. Between the ages from 15 to 19 only 0.52 per cent of the males were married and 9.49 per cent of the females. Among those of 20 years of age and upward the proportion of the married increased with great rapidity with both sexes. Between the ages from 20 to 24 less than one-fifth of the males were found to be married, while of the females nearly one-half were married.

Between the ages from 25 to 29 over one-half of the males and nearly three-fourths of the females were married. Between the ages from 30 to 34 nearly three-fourths of the males and four-fifths of the females were married. Up to this point the proportion of married females in each age group was considerably in excess of that of males.

Between the ages from 35 to 44 the proportions were practically equal, the married comprising about four-fifths of the total number for this age group. At this age the proportion of females who were married reached a maximum, Above this age the proportion of married women diminished, owing to the increased proportion of widows. Between 45 and $5 \pm$ years of age the married males comprised five-sixths of the whole number. In this age group the proportion of males who were married reached a maximum, and from this point diminished, owing to the increasing proportion of widowers. For this age group the proportion of married females had declined to less than three-fourths of all females.

Between the ages from 55 to 64 the proportion of married males had diminished to 82.34 per cent and that of married females to 60.38 per cent. For the age group representing persons 65 years and upward, seven-tenths of the males were found to be married, while the proportion of females was only one-half as great, or 35.35 per cent of all females of the ages stated.

The proportion of widows was greater than that of widowers at all ages. It beeame appreciable between the ages from 15 to 19 and increased rapidly. For females 65 years of age and upward the proportion of widows exceeded the proportion of married women. The proportion of widowers was less than that of married men for each age group considered.

As previously stated, persons of foreign birth are generally of mature age and in large part married when they come to this country, so that the proportion of the married, widowed, and divoreed among this elass is very much greater than among the native population. This disproportion is also due to the very much larger number of children of native birth than of foreign birth which are included neeessarily among the single persons, when eonjugal conditions are considered without regard to age limitations. If the adult population only is considered, therefore, that is, persons 20 years of age and over, a very much fairer basis for comparison is obtained. The number and pereentage of adults who were either single, married, widowed, or divoreed are shown in the following table for native white persons of native parentage, native white persons of foreign parentage, foreign white persons, and persons of negro descent, respeetively:

## CONJUGAL CONDITION OF PERSONS 20 YEALS OF AGE AND OVER, CLASSIFIED BY SEA, GENERAL NATIVITY, AND COLOR.

| general nativity, color, and conaugal condition. | persons 20 years of afe and over. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sexes. |  | Males. |  | Females. |  |
|  | Number. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Per } \\ \text { eent. } \end{gathered}$ | Number. | Per cent. | Number. | Per cent. |
| Aggregate...................................... | 33,822,487 | 100.00 | 17,529,161 | 100.00 | 16,293,326 | 100.00 |
| Single ....................... ............. | 8,670,243 | 25.64 | 5,424,876 | 30.95 | 3,245,367 | 19.92 |
| Married ................................. | 21,999,261 | 65.04 | 11,188,459 | 63.83 | 10,810,802 | 66.35 |
| Widowed....................... ........ | 2,965,053. | 8.77 | 815,300 | 4.65 | 2,149,753 | 13.19 |
| Divorced ................................ | 119,854 | 0.35 | 49,072 | 0.28 | 70,782 | 0.44 |
| Unknows.............................. | 68,076 | 0.20 | 51,454 | 0.29 | 16,622 | 0.10 |
| Native white-native parents ......... | 17,858,336 | 100.00 | 9,109,277 | 100.00 | 8,749,059 | 100.00 |
| Siogle.. | 4,240,300 | 23.74 | 2,599,743 | 28.54 | 1,640,557 | 18.75 |
| Married. | 11,958,365 | 66.96 | 6,019,287 | 66.08 | 5,939,078 | 67.88 |
| Widowed | 1,551,081 | 8.69 | 432,196 | 4.74 | 1,118,885 | 12.79 |
| Divorced... | 73,813 | 0.41 | 30,171 | 0.33 | 43,642 | 0.50 |
| Unknown ............................... | 34,777 | 0.20 | 27,880 | 0.31 | 6,897 | 0.08 |
| Native white-foreigo parents........ | 4,536,206 | 100.00 | 2,283,065 | 100.00 | 2,253,141 | 100.00 |
| Single ................ .................... | 1,899,347 | 41.87 | 1,114,564 | 48.82 | 784,783 | 3.483 |
| Married ................. .............. | 2,434,777 | 53.68 | 1,110,774 | 48.65 | 1,324,003 | 58.76 |
| Widowed | 187,065 | 4.12 | 51,376 | 2.25 | 135,689 | 6.02 |
| 1)ivorced ............. .................. | 12,280 | 0.27 | 4,537 | 0.20 | 7.743 | 0.35 |
| Unknown ................. | 2,737 | 0.06 | 1,814 | 0.08 | 923 | 0.04 |
| Foreign white............................... | 7,869,213 | 100.00 | 4,322,931 | 100.00 | 3,546,282 | 100.00 |
| Single .................................... | 1,758,861 | 22.35 | 1,213,128 | 28.06 | 545,733 | 15.39 |
| Married | 5,263,351 | 65.89 | 2,850,115 | 65.93 | 2,413,236 | 68.05 |
| Widowed. | 812,993 | 10.33 | 238,314 | 5.51 | 574,679 | 16.21 |
| Divorced .... | 18,044 | 0.23 | 9,106 | 0.21 | 8,938 | 0.25 |
| Unknown ............................... | 15,964 | 0.20 | 12,268 | 0.29 | 3,696 | 0.10 |
| Persons of negro descent................ | 3,424,153 | 100.00 | 1,697,463 | 100.00 | 1,726,690 | 100.00 |
| Single .................. .................. | 695,776 | 20.32 | 424,552 | 25.01 | 271,224 | 15.71 |
| Married | 2,294,290 | 67.00 | 1,171,671 | 69.02 | 1,122,619 | 65.02 |
| Widowed .. | 409.526 | 11.96 | 91,633 | 5.40 | 317,893 | 18.41 |
| Divorced............................... | 15,590 | 0.46 | 5,199 | 0.31 | 10,391 | 0.60 |
| Unknown ................................ | 8,971 | 0.26 | 4,408 | 0.26 | 4,563 | 0.26 |

C. C. -2

From this table it appears that the married among the native white population of native parentage represent 66.96 per cent of the whole number, or approximately about the same proportion as of married persons among the foreign white population ( 66.59 per cent), and of married persons among the negro population ( 67 per cent), when persons of adult age only are considered. On the same basis, however, a very marked difference is revealed regarding the percentage of married persons among the native white population of foreign parentage, there being but 53.68 per cent of the whole number married as against two-thirds in the ease of each of the other elements of the population. Approximately the same conditions regarding males and females of adult age are shown by the table, except for the native white of foreign parentage, where the married females constitute 58.76 per cent of all the females of that class as against 48.65 per cent of married males.

The following table shows, by geographical divisions, the proportion of single, married, widowed, and divorced, without regard to age, for the aggregate population, the native white of native parentage, the native white of foreign parentage, the foreign white, and for persons of negro descent. The classification by sex is not maintained in this table, as the distinctive features of conjugal condition regarding sex have been previously analyzed.

| general nativity, color, and conjugal condition. | North Atlantic division. | South Atlantic division. | Nortlı Central division. | South Central division. | Western division. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aggregate: | Per cent. | Per cent. | Per cent. | Per cent. | Per cent. |
| Single ... | 56.07 | 62.53 | 58.82 | 62.21 | 61.14 |
| Married... | 38.02 | 32.57 | 36.73 | 32.69 | 34.04 |
| Widowed. | 5.67 | 4.71 | 4.12 | 4.77 | 3.97 |
| Divorced | 0.14 | 0.10 | 0.25 | 0.18 | 0.38 |
| Unknown ... | 0.10 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.12 | 0.47 |
| Native white-native parents: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single. | 55.43 | 62.67 | 59.82 | 62.96 | 60.90 |
| Married. | 38.50 | 32.86 | 35.82 | 32.66 | 34.33 |
| Widowed... | 5.77 | 4.32 | 3.98 | 4.14 | 3.93 |
| Divorced... | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.29 | 0.13 | 0.44 |
| Unknown ............................... | 0.09 | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.11 | 0.40 |
| Native white-foreign parents: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single ... | 76.80 | 68.91 | 77.34 | 72.66 | 78.62 |
| Married .. ............................... | 21.28 | 27.77 | 21.23 | 24.44 | 19.54 |
| Widowed. | 1.83 | 3.19 | 1.29 | 2.73 | 1.54 |
| Dirorced. | 0.06 | 0.09 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.21 |
| Unknown ......... ..................... | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.06 |
| Foreign white : |  |  |  |  |  |
| Single.. | 34.17 | 28.31 | 30.24 | 29.82 | 42.55 |
| Married.. | 55.94 | 58.79 | 61.21 | 57.73 | 49.74 |
| Widowed. | 9.62 | 12.46 | 8.17 | 11.86 | 6.92 |
| Divorced. | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.26 | 0.25 | 0.46 |
| Unknown. | 0.19 | 0.31 | 0.12 | 0.34 | 0.33 |
| Persons of negro descent: |  |  |  |  |  |
| Siugle ..................................... | 55.95 | 63.81 | 58.33 | 62.32 | 61.83 |
| Married | 35.84 | 30.95 | 34.16 | 31.65 | 30.88 |
| Widowed ................................ | 7.87 | 4.99 | 6.90 | 5.64 | 6.21 |
| Divorced | 0.16 | 0.12 | 0.47 | 0.27 | 0.76 |
| Unknown .... | 0.18 | 0.13 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.32 |

This table develops many facts regarding conjugal condition. Considering aggregate population, it is seen that in the North Atlantic division, which constitutes the principal manufacturing section of the country, a section made up largely of urban population, the single are found in smaller proportion than in any other part of the country and the married and widowed in larger proportion. Conversely, the South Atlantic and South Central divisions, which are almost purely agricultural and rural, contain the largest proportion of single persons and the smallest proportion of the married. These results are directly opposed to popular belief. It is assumed that the development of urban population diminishes the number of the married. The explanation which naturally suggests itself is that the larger proportion of marriages in the manufacturing sections of the country is due not only to the fact that the native white population married young and in large proportion at all ages, but also to the fact that the foreign white, who have settled in large numbers in the North Atlantic division, were either married or of a marriageable age at the time of their immigration. If an examination is made of that part of the table which shows the proportion of single and married among the native white of native parentage, it is seen for the North Atlantic division that the proportion of single is even less than among the aggregate population and the proportion of married and widowed
greater. In other words, these figures appear to indicate that in the most densely settled parts of the country, farts where the urban element is greatest, the native white of native parentage marry more freely than in the rural parts of the United States. Considering the conjugal condition of the native white of foreign parentage, the largest proportions of married and widowed are found in the South Atlantic and South central divisions. In the three other clivisions, where this element is much more numerous, the proportions of the married and widowed difler but slightly. The presentation regarding the conjugal condition of the foreign white develops the fact that the largest proportion of the maried is found in the North Central division and the smallest proportion in the Western division. This difference doubtless arises from the character of the immigration to these two sections, that to the North Central division consisting largely of Germans and Seandinavians and that to the Western division largely of English, Scotel, and Irish. The statement relative to the conjugal condition of persons of negro descent shows little difference between the South Atlantic and South Central divisions in the proportion of single and married. In the north and west the negro element is too small to render any conclusions of value.

The following table shows the conjugal condition of the population of the 50 principal cities of the conntry :
CONJ UGAL CONDITION OF THE AGGREGATE POPULATION, CLASSIFIED BY SEX, FOR THE FIFTY PRINCIPAL CITIES: 1890.

| cities. | Aggregate. | males. |  |  |  |  |  | females. |  |  |  | Di- Unvorced known. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Total. | Single. | Married. | Widowed. | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Di-} \\ \text { vorced. } \end{gathered}$ | Unknown. | Total. | Single. | Married. | Widowed. |  |  |
| New York, N. Y | 1,515,301 | 747,579 | 454,765 | 271,353 | 20.054 | 322 | 1,085 | 767.722 | 428,236 | 269,709 | 68,479 | 567 | 731 |
| Chicago, Ill... | 1,099,850 | 568,402 | 319,795 | 205,254 | 10.752 | 567 | 2,034 | 531,418 | 292,515 | 203,069 | 34,629 | 1,073 | 162 |
| Philadelphia, Pa.................. | 1,046,961 | 511,122 | 304,006 | 189,326 | 16,301 | 436 | 1,043 | 535,812 | 293,748 | 188,826 | 51,761 | 718 | 789 |
| Brooklyn, N. Y......................... | 806,343 | 391,123 | 231,363 | 148,967 | 10,231 | 165 | 397 | 412,220 | 227,488 | 148,282, | 36,020 | 239 | 191 |
| St. Louis, Mo. | 451,770 | 228,114 | 144,368 | 77,030 | 5,8s6 | 327 | 543 | 223,656 | 125,289 | 77,183 | 20,484 | 551 | 136 |
| Boston, Mass.. | 448,477 | 217,754 | 131,218 | 78,551 | 6,986 | 215 | 754 | 230,723 | 128,676 | 78,192 | 23,275 | 147 | 133 |
| Baltimore, Md.. | 431,439 | 206,114 | 123,726 | 76,301 | 5,872 | 157 | 55 | 228,325 | 127,061 | 77,827 | 23,025 | 352 | 60 |
| San Francisco, Ca | 298,997 | 169,800 | 111,848 | 51,244 | 4,097 | 407 | 2,204 | 129,197 | 69,067 | 47,465 | 11,871 | 627 | 167 |
| Cincinnati, Ohio | 296,908 | 145,011 | 89,180 | 51,440 | 3,822 | 123 | 146 | 151,897 | 81,277 | 51,920 | 15,341 | 318 | 41 |
| Cleveland, Ohio ....................... | 261,353 | 132,517 | 79,622 | 49,433 | 2,755 | 205 | 492 | 128,836 | 70,563 | 48,60: | 9,019 | 373 | 277 |
| Buffalo, N. Y............................. | 255,664 | 128,881 | 79,022 | 46,631 | 2,839 | 75 | 317 | 126,780 | 71,133 | 46,066 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 9,341 | 118 | 122 |
| New Orleans, La | 242,039 | 113,467 | 71,603 | 38,246 | 3,412 | 111 | 95 | 128,572 | 70,618 | 39,421 | 18,202 | 288 | 43 |
| Pittsburg, Pa. | 238,617 | 121,429 | 79,712 | 41,901 | 2,637 | 81 | 95 | 114,188 | 65.858 | 40,319 | 7,868 | 116 | 27 |
| Washington, D. C...................... | 230,392 | 109,584 | 66,08 | 39,639 | 3,376 | 146 | 339 | 120,808 | 66,775 | 39,675 | 13,929 | 314 | 115 |
| Detroit, Mich............................. | 205,876 | 101,298 | 60,362 | 38,372 | 2,182 | 114 | 268 | 104,578 | 58,160 | 38,499 | 7,516 | 278 | 125 |
| Milwankee, Wis. | 201,468 | 100,773 | 61,489 | 36,970 | 2,095 | 107 | 182 | 103,695 | 59,912 | 37,218 | 6,212 | 255 | 98 |
| Newark, N.J... | 181,830 | 88,980 | 52,276 | 31,199 | 2,345 | 37 | 123 | 92,850 | 50,652 | 34,039 | 7,982 | 86 | 91 |
| Minneapolis, Minn | 164,738 | 87,643 | 55,449 | 29,943 | 1,906 | 176 | 169 | 77,095 | 43,104 | 29,261 | 4,417 | 268 | 45 |
| Jersey city, N. J | 163,003 | 82,016 | 49,467 | 30,295 | 2,202 | 22 | 60 | 80,957 | 44,576 | 29,818 | 6,464 | 48 | 21 |
| Louisville, Ky ... | 161,129 | 78,612 | 48,676 | 27,405 | 2,250 | 157 | 124 | 82,517 | 45,183 | 27,599 | 9,302 | 389 | 44 |
| Omaha, Neb... | 140,452 | 80,108 | 53,907 | 23,633 | 1,565 | 155 | 818 | 60,344 | 35,475 | 22,043 | 2,578 | 178 | 70 |
| Rochester, N. Y. | 133,896 | 64,453 | 38,623 | 21,003 | 1,586 | 39 | 202 | 69,443 | 38,824 | 24,325 | 6,124 | 100 | 70 |
| St. Panl, Minn. | 133,156 | 69,561 | 44,227 | 23,729 | 1,309 | 90 | 206 | 63,595 | 36,395 | 23,351 | 3,641 | 136 | 72 |
| Kansas city, Mo. | 132,716 | 71,051 | 43,299 | 25,574 | 1.772 | 160 | 246 | 61,665 | 31,358 | 25,360 | 4,613 | 314 | 20 |
| Providence, R. I. | 132,146 | 63,569 | 36,702 | 24,594 | 2,053 | 128 | 92 | 68,577 | 37,105 | 24,506 | 6,561 | 365 | 40 |
| Denver, Colo...... | 106,713 | 60,744 | 39,131 | 19,457 | 1,405 | 130 | 321 | 45,969 | 23,855 | 18,429 | 3,491 | 170 | 24 |
| Indianapolis, Ind | 105,436 | 52,303 | 30,430 | 20,183 | 1,485 | 148 | 57 | 53,133 | 27,663 | 20,121 | 4,971 | 360 | 18 |
| Allegheny, Pa ... | 105,287 | 52,612 | 32,766 | 18,554 | 1,195 | 31 | 63 | 52,675 | 30,290 | 18,316 | 3.972 | 80 | 7 |
| Albany, N, Y.. | 94,923 | 45,589 | 27,387 | 16,400 | 1,717 | 34 | 51 | 49,331 | 27,749 | 16,357 | 5,141 | 56 | 31 |
| Columbus, Ohio | 88,150 | 45,019 | 27,128 | 16,603 | 1,110 | 128 | 50 | 43,131 | 23,494 | 16,012 | 3,428 | 174 | 23 |
| Syracuse, N. Y ... | 88,143 | 42,922 | 24,884 | 16,934 | 1,010 | 49 | 45 | 45,221 | 23,978 | 16,933 | 4,154 | 139 | 17 |
| Worcester, Mass. | 81,655 | 42,267 | 21,921 | 16,066 | 1,160 | 52 | 68 | 42,388 | 22,917 | 15,893 | 3,369 | 97 | 82 |
| Toledo, Ohio.... | 81,434 | 40,887 | 24,169 | 15,627 | 999 | 73 | 19 | 40,517 | 22,090 | 15,573 | 2,752 | 127 | 5 |
| Richmond, Va | 81,388 | 38,261 | 23,991 | 12,972 | 1,173 | 48 | 74 | 43,127 | 24,603 | 12,950 | 5,434 | 81 | 59 |
| New Haven, Conn. | 81,298 | 40,437 | 23,988 | 15,200 | 1,015 | 62 | 172 | 40,861 | 21,915 | 15,071 | 3,704 | 111 | 60 |
| Paterson, N. J. | 78,317 | 38,275 | 22,811 | 14,492 | 898 | 10 | 64 | 40,072 | 22,382 | 14,535 | 3,106 | 23 | 26 |
| Lowell, Mass.. | 77.696 | 35,453 | 20,887 | 13,427 | 1,071 | 31 | 37 | 42,243 | 24,519 | 13,811 | 3,806 | 74 | 3 |
| Nashville, Tenn......................... | 76,168 | 36,832 | 22,659 | 12,897 | 1,034 | 52 | 190 | 39,336 | 20,897 | 13,077 | 5,149 | 159 | 54 |
| Scranton, Pa.............. ............... | 75,215 | 38,416 | 24,198 | 13,257 | 867 | 24 | 70 | 36,799 | 21,161 | 13,132 | 2,437 | 38 | 28 |
| Fall River, Mass... | 74,398 | 35,742 | 21,917 | 12,841 | 906 | 23 | 22 | 38,656 | 22,726 | 13,059 | 2,807 | 49 | 15 |
| Cambridge, Mass....................... | 70,028 | 34,204 | 20,940 | 12,241 | 986 | 21 | 16 | 35,824 | 20,116 | 12,304 | 3,354 | 44 | 6 |
| Atlanta, Ga............................. | 65,533 | 31,351 | 19,019 | 11,384 | 853 | 39 | 56 | 34,182 | 17,686 | 11,810 | 4,535 | 141 | 7 |
| Memphis, Tenn......................... | 64,495 | 32,488 | 20,045 | 10,967 | 1,014 | 48 | 381 | 32,007 | 15,944 | 11,066 | 4,817 | 152 | 28 |
| Wilmington, Del........................ | 61,431 | 30,814 | 18,315 | 11,689 | 786 | 11 | 10 | 30,617 | 16,108 | 11,665 | 2,501 | 39 | 1 |
| Dayton, Ohio ............................ | 61,220 | 30,489 | 17,819 | 11,742 | 837 | 62 | 29 | 30,731 | 16,415 | 11,687 | 2,997 | 122 | 10 |
| Troy, N, Y.............................. | 60,956 | 28,591 | 17,355 | 10,215 | 973 | 16 | 32 | 32,365 | 18,618 | 10,263 | 3,411 | 46 | 24 |
| Grand Rapids, Mich .................. | 60,278 | 30,091 | 16,940 | 12,275 | 759 | 83 | 31 | 30,187 | 15,748 | 12,301 | 1,957 | 171 | 7 |
| Reading, Pa.............................. | 58,661 | 29,126 | 17,070 | 11,297 | 699 | 55 | 5 | 29,535 | 16,001 | 11,204 | 2,233 | 95 | 2 |
| Camden, N. .J............................ | 58,313 | 28,527 | 15,726 | 12,027 | 741 | 23 | 10 | 29,786 | 15.096 | 12,048 | 2,606 | 34 | 2 |
| Trenton, N. J............................. | 57,408 | 29,116 | 16,597 | 11,738 | 714 | 9 | 58 , | 23,342 | 11,917 | 11,122 | 2,268 | 29 | 6 |

These cities, taken collectively, have a population of $11,298,148$ and constitnte 18 per cent of the total population. The figures regarding these cities when consolidated represent the conjugal condition of the population under thoroughly urban conditions.

The following table shows, for these cities taken collectively, the number of single, married, widowed, and divorced males and females among the aggregate population, together with the percentage which the number of each class bears to the total number of males and females, and opposite to these percentages similar proportions for the eutire country, for purposes of comparison:

| conjugal condition and sex. | Population of the 50 principal cities. | Proportion of each class in the 50 principal cities. | Proportion of each class in the country at large. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Males... ...................................... | 5,635,550 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Single.............................. .... | 3,435,515 | 60.96 | 62.20 |
| Married.................................. | 2,034,537 | 36.10 | 34.94 |
| Widowed.............................. | 145,612 | 2.59 | 2.54 |
| Divorced ................................ | 5,830 | 0.10 | 0.15 |
| Unkoown.............................. | 14,056 | 0.25 | 0.17 |
| Females........................................ | 5,662,598 | 100.00 | 100.00 |
| Single.................................... | 3,129,269 | 55.26 | 56.24 |
| Married............................ .... | 2,021,376 | 35.70 | 36.41 |
| Widowed............................... | 496,557 | 8.77 | 7.05 |
| Divorced ................................ | 11,148 | 0.20 | 0.24 |
| Unknown... .......................... | 4,248 | 0.07 | 0.06 |

Of the total male population in these cities 60.96 per cent were single, 36.10 per cent were married, 2.59 per cent were widowed, and 0.10 per cent were divorced. Of the total female population in these cities 55.26 per cent were single, being a much smaller proportion than among the males; 35.70 per cent were married, being a slightly smaller proportion than of males; 8.77 per cent were widowed, or more than three times as large a proportion as of males, while 0.20 per cent were divorced, being twice as large a proportion as of males.

Comparing these figures with the corresponding proportions of the total population of the country, we find that the proportion of single is less, the proportion of married greater for males and less for females, of widowed greater, and of divorced less. The differences in the proportion of single, married, and widowed are due to the difference in the constitution of the population of the cities and of the conntry at large as regards native and foreign elements, the foreign element both of birth and of parentage being much greater proportionally in the cities than in the country at large.

The difference in the proportion of divorced is not to be explained in this way, but all the evidence appears to indicate that the proportion of divorced persons in the cities is less than that in the country at large.

The foregoing tables and discussion rest upon comparisons of the single, married, widowed, and divoreed with the total population in each class, and the results are largely dependent upon the character of the population making up that class. For instance, among the native white of uative parentage there is the normal proportion of children and grown people. Among the native white of foreign parentage, however, the proportion of children is vastly in excess of the normal and that of grown people is correspondingly below it. Among the foreign white, on the other hand, the proportion of chitdren is far below the normal and of grown people above it, while in the case of the negro the proportion at the different ages is practically normal. This disproportion in the composition of the population in the case of the native white of foreign parentage and the foreign white affects the results, especially regarding divorce, very markedly. A fairer measure of the extent to which divorce is prevalent is afforded by the following table, which gives, by geographical divisions, the proportion of divorced persons with reference to the number of married persons:

| GEOGRAPHICAL DIVISIONS. | Aggregate popnlation. | Native whitenative parents. | Native whitefor'eign parents. | Foreign white. | Persons of negro descent. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| The UnitedStates............... | 0.54 | 0.61 | 0.50 | 0.34 | 0.67 |
| North Atlantic.......................... | 0.38 | 0.54 | 0.30 | 0.15 | 0.45 |
| Sonth Atlantic | 0.31 | 0.28 | 0.33 | 0.22 | 0.38 |
| North Central. | 0.68 | 0.82 | 0.58 | 0.43 | 1.36 |
| South Central........................... | 0.55 | 0.41 | 0.53 | 0.43 | 0.85 |
| Western.................................... | 1.13 | 1.29 | 1.21 | 0.92 | 2.45 |

For the Cnited States as a whole, it is seen that divoreed persons among the aggregate population represented 0.54 per cent of the married people, that is, there was one divorced person to 185 married. This proportion, however, ranged in different parts of the country from 0.31 per cent in the Sonth Atlantic division and 0.38 per cent in the North Atlantic division to 1.13 per cent in the Western division. The proportion in the North Central division was decidedly greater than in the South Central division.

Turning to the next columm, it is seen that divorce was more common among the native white of native parentage than among the total population, the proportion to the number of married poople being for the United States 0.61 per cent. This proportion was least in the South Atlantie division, next in the South Central division, and rose to 0.54 per cent in the North Atlantic division; was 0.82 per eent in the North Central division, and reached a maximum in the Western division, where it was not less than 1.29 per cent.

The native white of foreign parentage show a smaller proportion of divorced. The proportion for the United States was but 0.50 per cent as against 0.61 per cent among the native white of native parentage. In the North Atlantic division this proportion was 0.30 per cent, in the North Central division 0.58 per cent, and in the Western division 1.21 per cent. In the south the number of this element was so small as to render the resnlts of little importanee.

The foreign white show a still smaller proportion of divorced. For the United States this was but 0.34 per cent, being but little more than half the proportion of the native white of native parentage. In the North Atlantic division this proportion was but 0.15 per cent. It is probable that the smallness of this proportion is dne to the fact that the foreign element includes many Irish and Canadian Catholies. In the North Central division the proportion was but 0.43 per cent, and in the Western division 0.92 per cent, which figures are in strong contrast with corresponding figures for the native white of native parentage.

Among the negro population the divorced were found to be more prevalent than among any of the other classes. For the whole United States the proportion of divorced among the negro element to the whole number of married was 0.67 per cent. In the Sonth Atlantic division it was 0.38 per cent, and in the South Central division 0.85 per cent. In other sections of the country the negro element is not of sufficient importance numerieally to render the results of value.
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