

## A PROTECTED STATE.

### THE FARMING POPULATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

The Census Returns for New Hampshire Show a Decline in the Farming Towns—Manufacturing Cities Are Growing—What Protection Is Doing for the Farmer—A Case Where the Home Market Theory Does Not Work.

The Census Bureau has recently published the details of the census of the State of New Hampshire; and the figures afford an interesting comparison with those of 1880. New Hampshire is largely a manufacturing State, and as such it ought to give the protectionists an excellent field in which to show how protection helps the farmer by developing manufactures and creating a market right at his doors for his farm products.

The census figures of the State, as sent out by Robert P. Porter, show that while the population increased from 346,991 to 376,530, or at the rate of 4.5% per cent, three-fourths of all the towns, or townships, in the State have declined in population since 1880. A highly interesting comparison of the population in ten of the twelve counties of the State by towns, or townships, is made in the following table, showing the number of towns in each county which reports an increase or a decrease:

| Counties.         | No. towns showing increase. | No. towns showing decrease. |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Belknap.....      | 3                           | 8                           |
| Carroll.....      | 7                           | 11                          |
| Cheshire.....     | 10                          | 13                          |
| Coos.....         | 17                          | 8                           |
| Grafton.....      | 11                          | 25                          |
| Hillsborough..... | 11                          | 20                          |
| Merrimack.....    | 8                           | 19                          |
| Rockingham.....   | 15                          | 22                          |
| Stearns.....      | 6                           | 7                           |
| Sullivan.....     | 3                           | 12                          |
| Total.....        | 91                          | 148                         |

When the census report is examined more closely it is seen that the decrease in population is in the smaller or agricultural towns, while the increase is in the larger or manufacturing towns and cities. The decrease has been the greatest in the towns with the smallest population, the towns with less than 1,000 inhabitants having suffered a loss of 10 per cent since 1880.

These changes are exhibited in the following table for the 249 towns and cities of the State:

| Towns and cities classified according to population in 1880. | No. of towns | Population. | Percentage of gain or loss. |
|--|--------------|-------------|-----------------------------|
| Over 20,000.....   | 1            | 44,126      | 32,630 +35.93               |
| 10,000 to 20,000.....  | 3            | 49,105      | 38,927 +36.15               |
| 4,000 to 10,000.....   | 8            | 50,938      | 43,172 +18.02               |
| 2,000 to 4,000.....  | 20           | 54,184      | 43,172 +18.02               |
| 1,500 to 2,000.....  | 24           | 34,184      | 32,867 +14.01               |
| 1,000 to 1,500.....  | 49           | 50,108      | 61,734 +4.10                |
| Under 1,000.....   | 145          | 72,729      | 85,052 +10.97               |
| Total.....   | 249          | 376,530     | 346,991 -16.51              |

\*Increase. \*Decrease.

In the four largest cities of the State the population has increased nearly one-third in ten years. Towns having between 2,000 and 4,000 have increased almost one-fifth; those between 1,000 and 2,000 have slightly decreased; and those below 1,000 have lost almost one-ninth of their population.

This decay of agricultural life in New Hampshire, as compared with manufacturing industry, has been going on for forty years, and has become more marked under the reign of the very protection which always promises to make the farmer prosperous by making the manufacturer rich.

The following table shows the changes of population for forty years:

| Date of census. | Population. | Per cent of total population. |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------------|
| 1800            | 2,674,455   | 98,332 75,723 55,10 24,73     |
| 1810            | 167,388     | 94,601 85,451 48,23 27,23     |
| 1820            | 137,440     | 92,314 88,555 43,16 29,00     |
| 1830            | 126,223     | 97,815 102,220 38,71 30,16    |
| 1840            | 113,566     | 97,628 106,942 35,69 30,71    |

The cause of this decline of the farming communities of New Hampshire is not far to seek. The farmer is not protected and there is no possible way to make protection of any general benefit to him. The manufacturer, on the other hand, has his market shut up, sealed and delivered to him by a high tariff, and, besides, he usually has a trust to help him gather up the tariff spoils.

The case of New Hampshire is the same as that of New Jersey, another great manufacturing State. Last winter Mr. Franklin Dye, Secretary of the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture, was before the McKinley committee, and told the high-tariff solons about the decay of agriculture in his State. The following words from his testimony afford an interesting comment upon the facts above given in regard to the population of New Hampshire:

"I think the year President Cleveland was elected I was in one of the pottery establishments in Trenton, and told the manufacturer that he was taking all our farm hands from us. He said: 'You must pay them the same wages. I said: 'We cannot do it; we pay all the wages we can afford to pay at the price of farm products.' Then I said: 'You are protected; you know just what you are going to get, what it costs to put the material in shape for market, and, consequently, you know what wages you can afford to pay.' What labor is left around Trenton and other manufacturing centers now is largely a poor class of colored people, and now and then Hungarians. For you know the great tide of travel has been westward. Moreover, to give continual protection to manufacturing industries, whereby they have been enabled to reap good-pangs—and in many cases enormous profits, while not equally protecting the farmer in his products, has resulted adversely to our farmers in several particulars."

### American Pork in Germany.

Germany has again refused to admit American pork; but it seems to be generally admitted that the time is now not far distant when the prohibition will be removed. It is very probable that, if we had not so recently passed the two McKinley bills, which are very unpopular in Germany, the late vote in the Reichstag would have been in favor of American pork. Our farmers may judge of the value of the German market to them by the fact that our exports

of hog products to Germany in 1881, before our pork was excluded, amounted to more than \$1,000,000. Lard is now the only hog product which we sell to Germany in any considerable quantities. Our exports of lard to Germany in 1889 amounted to \$3,840,000, and last year to \$7,815,000.

The German working people are anxious for our pork, and for want of it they consume a large quantity of our lard, eating it as we eat butter.

It is the protection sentiment in Germany that keeps our pork out of the country. It was the rich nobles owning large country estates on which hogs are raised for the market who were the prime movers in excluding American pork, and who still keep it out of the country. It is a case of extreme protection applied to us.

### SHALL TEA BE TAXED?

#### THAT IS WHAT A FEW IMPORTERS WANT.

**A Tax on Tea Wanted to Keep Up Prices—The Consumer Left Out of the Calculation—Reciprocity with a Vengeance—Shall the Breakfast Table Remain Free?**

Last year, when everybody was trying to get higher protection on every conceivable thing, a movement was undertaken to have a duty put on all tea imported from places west of the Cape of Good Hope.

was raised, and off went the duties on tea and coffee.

Now a new tariff law has been born into this tariff-riden land. It is a cross between Chinese Wall McKinley and Reciprocity Blame. In this cross-breed tariff law it is coolly proposed to tax every breakfast table in the land again, unless tea-producing countries shall grant us such reciprocal advantages in trade as shall satisfy the President. This is reciprocity with vengeance.

The tax was removed to lighten the burdens on our own people. Now our lawmakers stand ready to reimpose that tax upon our people if China and Japan do not grant us such terms of admission to their ports as shall satisfy the President.

#### The Barbed Wire Trust.

The farmers will probably soon have as great a grievance against the barbed wire trust as they have had against the binder-twining trust.

The barbed-wire trust has been trying to get all the manufacturers of barbed-wire into it, in order to have complete control of the home market, and to be able to raise prices to the farmers.

The trust has just purchased certain patents for \$400,000, and these are to be used for the purpose of crushing out the manufacturers who are not in the trust, or else to compel them to join it. A member of the trust tells very frankly what it proposes to do with the patents.

He says: "We have purchased the patents from the Washburn-Moen Company for \$400,000, and that firm, like any other member of the pool, will be

#### DITCHED.

Granny Hoar's sad predicament.

Good Hope. This was an attempt to revive an old law which was abolished in 1883. This law imposed a duty of 10 per cent on all tea coming from places west of Cape of Good Hope.

The original purpose of the law was to promote the direct shipment of tea from China, Japan and the East Indies to our ports and thus to encourage American shipping. By "places west of the Cape of Good Hope," the old law meant London and Liverpool.

The present demand for the re-enactment of this old law comes from a few importers of tea, and it is not based on the idea of preventing direct importation.

There is another object in view, an object which is frankly avowed. Out of a total of 79,575,984 pounds of tea imported in 1889, only 4,673,864 pounds came in by way of England. Why

should our importers fear this small amount coming from England upon a second shipment and in competition with the bulk of our consumption which is imported direct from China and Japan? The answer to this question may be seen from an extract from a recent number of *Broadstreet's*, as follows:

#### ENGLAND'S GOLD AND SILVER.

**A Lesson in the "Balance of Trade Theory"—England's Exports and Imports of the Precious Metals and Our Own.**

One of the great objects aimed at by the protectionists is to make our exports of domestic goods exceed our imports of foreign goods, in order that to make up for the balance we shall have a stream of gold and silver flowing into the country. They assume that if it were not for the tariff we should buy more abroad than we should sell to foreigners. This would cause gold and silver to "flow out of the country," and we should be of all men most miserable.

According to those gloomy views of

the protectionists who are pushing the measure in question are wonderfully frank. They do not talk about "protection to American interests," they have nothing to say about increasing anybody's wages, and do not promise that competition in the home market will make tea cheaper to the American consumer than ever before. They frankly confess that they want this law for their own benefit. When they succeed in raising prices here, they will have no tea coming in from London in seven or eight days to bring down prices again. China and Japan are a long way off, and if the importers here can raise the price of tea it would take considerable time for other people to get cargoes of tea from those countries into our ports. The few importers here would meanwhile reap extra benefits from higher prices. But the dangers of quick importations from London must be got rid of; and hence this movement of a small number of tea importers to an outward stream of gold and silver from England to other countries?

Here is a table showing Great Britain's total imports and exports of gold and silver for the year 1890:

Imported to Exported to

France..... \$9,420,000 \$6,160,000

Holland..... 15,520,000 12,300,000

United States..... 13,970,000 5,055,000

Australia..... 15,560,000 5,591,000

Canada..... 1,000,000 1,000,000

South America..... 9,490,000 3,275,000

South Africa..... 19,880,000 3,750,000

Portugal..... 8,225,000 16,230,000

Germany..... 2,315,000 4,638,000

East India..... 1,020,000 12,000,000

Germany?..... 1,020,000 8,192,000

Spain..... 600,000 4,540,000

Totals..... \$130,490,000 \$74,157,000

Imports..... \$28,943,73 \$5,641,553

Exports..... 33,976,326 52,148,420

Totals..... \$62,957,39 \$148,782,973

Excess of Imports..... \$5,040,000

Compare with this our own exports and imports of gold and silver for the two fiscal years 1889 and 1890 as follows:

Imports..... \$28,943,73 \$5,641,553

Exports..... 33,976,326 52,148,420

Totals..... \$62,957,39 \$148,782,973

Excess of exports..... \$5,553,574

Thus we see that the balance of trade theory is that for these two years our exports of merchandise were about \$66,000,000 in excess of our imports.

According to the protectionists' "balance of trade theory" this latter sum ought to have come back to us in gold and silver.

On the contrary, we sent Great Britain in these two years \$85,000,000 in gold and silver over and above what we received back from that country.

Thus it is that England, a country of absolute free trade, not only draws

from all other nations a vast stream of merchandise over and above what it sends to them, but also it receives in a single year \$5,000,000 in gold and silver over and above her exports of those metals; and, while we are sending away more merchandise than we get back in exchange, we are also sending abroad much more gold and silver than flows into the country.

The so-called "balance of trade theory," as advocated by the protectionists, cannot survive facts like these.

### SOME KODAK PHOTOS

#### OF MINOR HAPPENINGS IN THE HOOISER STATE.

**An Aged Man Burned to a Crisp—Cut Two by a Saw—Big Fire at Nebraska—Accidents, Deaths and Suicides.**

—Scarlet fever at Aurora.

—Princeton's broken out with measles.

—Thornton will establish a creamery.

—Seymour will organize an athletic club.

—Goshen's first school house built in 1841.

—Maybe Kokomo'll have a knitting factory.

—A religious revival is in progress at Bridgeport.

—You