The Coast Mail.

MARSHFIELD, OREGON:
Thursday, : : : : : : : : February 14, 1884

J. J. Murphy of Salem has been appointed postoffice inspector for this state and Washington territory.

Hon. R. L. Webster, the newly-appointed judge of the first district, is now holding his first term of court at Jacksonville.

John Hall, aged about 83 years, died at his farm near Oakland, on the 31st ult. He immigrated to Oregon and settled in the Umpqua valley in 1853.

The republican state central committee will meet at Portlad on the 21st inst. and the democratic state central committee will meet there on the 28th.

If Senator Miller's anti-Chinese bill becomes a law, the Chinaman's occupation in this country will be gone, unless he was fortunate in getting here prior to August, 1882.

The fish hatchery at Ellensburg is pronounced a success. The Post says R. D. Hume has demonstrated that he can at a trifling expense fill Rogue river with salmon.

Goss, Sawyer & Packard launched from their yards at Bath, January 29, a wooden steamer, not named, of about 950 tons, and designed as a passenger and freight steamer for the Oregon Southern improvement company.

The News says John H. Roberts' record as an honorably-discharged soldier is against him. Of course it is, from a democratic standpoint, for Roberts fought on the wrong side to suit that party. The strongest man on the democratic ticket is a rebel.

One of a gang of Chinamen working on the Yaquina bay railroad unearthed a human skull the other day that contained a full set of teeth. He dropped his pick and departed, while the whole gang followed him, refusing to do more work until the grinning skull had been removed.

The neatest and best calendar that we have received this year came from Geo. H. Himes, the printer, Nos. 5 and 7 Washington street, Portland. It shows all the days of the week from 1825 to 1900—75 years—and is called the Century almanac. It is a compliment from Himes worth sending for.

We take pleasure in recommending to our readers the great Pennsylvania newspaper, the Philadelphia Weekly Press. It is one of the few great metropolitan newspapers which has achieved a national reputation and circulation. The paper is unquestionably one of the most enterprising and best edited in the country; it is sound on all questions of public policy, and is filled with interesting reading for the home and farm. Sample copies may be had at this office or will be mailed free to all who apply. Address, The Press, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Coquille Herald says the political slates being made up in this county will be broken if the river does not receive its share of the offices. So far as the republicans are concerned, no slates are being made up in this part of the county. If the Coquillers be engaged in the passtime of slate-making, and there be anything in it, they certainly ought to get away with their proportion of the ticket or forever hold their peace after the convention. Such expressions as we have heard from the republicans of this vicinity have been in favor of the best man for the offices, regardless of the locality in which they may reside, and this is right.

The United States grand jury, in session at Portland last week, returned true bills in the cases of William A. Stillwell and Daniel T. Hill, charged with mail robbery in this county; Patrick Keefe of Sitka charged with murder, and Joseph Hamilton, accused of uttering counterfeit money by passing a gilded five cent coin for $5. There being no further business for their consideration, the grand jury were discharged, received their fees and dispersed to their homes. Stillwell and Hill were arraigned in the United States court last Friday. Stillwell pleaded guilty, but Hill not guilty, and his trial was set for March 11. One of the postmasters whose mails had been tampered with said that Stillwell had told so many stories concerning the robbery lately that he hoped he would tell one now and stick to it. From this it would appear that his statements are not to be believed implicitly.

The democratic tariff bantling has been born. It is a horizontal hermaphrodite—the worst abortion ever produced in the lower house of congress—and if its parents be not already ashamed of it, they soon will be. The proposition is a 20 per cent. reduction of the present tariff, with a proviso that no reduction shall operate to the collection of duties less than those provided for in the Morrill tariff of 1861. In the introduction of this bill Morrison has proved himself to be a free-trade gun of small caliber. Why he should take shelter behind the Morrill tariff of 1861 is not clear to us, except it be through pure cowardice. We will wait to hear from the Coos Bay News and the Curry County Recorder on this subject. They are a brace of free-trade lights susceptible of making the matter about as clear as mud when they commence wallowing in it. We now begin to grasp the position of the democracy on the tariff question. They have been trying to convince the people that the republican tariff is an outrageous robbery of the poor for the especial benefit of the rich, and the reform the democrats now propose to the muchly-oppressed people is that if the people will only allow the democrats to do the robbing they will do it for 20 per cent. less. In printers' parlance, the democrats propose to "rat" the republicans out of the job. The fact is that the democratic leaders are incapable of intelligently handling the tariff question. Morrison's bill shows this, and the democratic circus has commenced. The California democratic congressmen are bucking at it like broncos, and will vote against the bill. Undoubtedly the tariff needs some amendment, but no such a change as a 20 per cent. reduction all along the line, and the people will not have it that way just at present.

Three Papers for $3 25!

We have received and accepted a proposition to club the COAST MAIL with the San Francisco Weekly Call. The Call is an eight-page paper of 64 columns, printed on a sheet 40 by 52 inches in size. We consider it by far the best weekly published on the Pacific coast, and the price at which it has been offered to us enables us to offer it and the MAIL to advance-paying subscribers at $2 75 cents per annum. This includes the Call's splendid lithographed "Bird's-Eye View of California." Those of our subscribers who want an excellent San Francisco paper should at once improve this opportunity to secure the Call.

This arrangement with the Call does not in any way affect our clubbing arrangement with the Chicago Weekly News, except we give our subscribers their choice between the two papers and charge them 25 cents extra when they select the Call.

We will furnish the MAIL and the News for $2 50, or the MAIL and the Call for $2 75, or all three papers for $3 25 per year in advance. Few people need more good reading matter than these three papers will furnish. Subscribers who have paid for the MAIL and the News, and would have the Call also, can have it by paying us the difference of 75 cents.

"A Foreign Market."

The boundless possibilities of a foreign market is a theme that American free-traders are never tired of descanting on. They drag it into every speech, every editorial and every paragraph, as the old Spanish divines did Saint Augustine into every discourse. "No stew without bacon, and no sermon without a text from Saint Augustine" is the translation of the Spanish proverb. Railroad extension stops, mills run half time, reduce the number of their workmen, cut down wages or close altogether. "Want of a foreign market" is the never-ceasing chorus from the professors, statesmen and editors who are beguiled by the shadow of a limitless market. Like Henry George's solution of the land question, the neck of all the trouble our laboring humanity is heir to is, with the free-trader, the want of a foreign market. Give us a foreign market, they eloquently cry, and the clink of the hammer will be heard on the distant prairie, as mile after mile of steel track is laid, the blast furnaces will roar again, the looms will clatter, the spindles will hum, and the country will resound with anthems to the accomplished statesmen who have led the way to the world's markets. True, markets may be bounded by the barriers of ignorance and cupidity that other benighted nations have created, but these are matters of after consideration. The immediate problem of all long-sighted statesmanship is solved in the words "a foreign market," and to this the democratic party is addressing itself. About 40 years ago England was ablaze with a similar cry. Manchester hungered and thirsted for the world's markets. A league was formed, and enormous sums of money subscribed, the amount one year reaching a half million dollars. Cobden led the hosts, and was paid liberally by the manufacturers for it, receiving from them during his life a modest million dollars. For the moment, there seemed no bounds to the prosperity that followed. England was a century ahead of the rest of the world in manufacturing. Flushed with victory, Cobden undertook to convert Europe and make it a single community. The seed sown then on the continent brought forth the treaty with France, and later, perhaps, free trade in Germany, but withered and died when Germany returned to protection and France refused to ratify the treaty again. The conditions were never so favorable in any country, and probably never will be again, as they were in England when she decided to fight the hostile tariff of the world with free imports. It opened a foreign market. It did more. It opened, also, a home market, and now, as foreign countries become better able to supply their own manufactures, England discovers that serious inroads have been made on the home market. Gladstone, at Leeds, October 8, 1881, admitted that England was annually paying $225,000,000 for manufactured goods (others put it at $250,000,000), such as silks, woolens, gloves, cotton manufactures, iron and steel manufactures, tanned leather, boots and shoes, cloaks, watches, sheet-lead, manufactures of wood, etc.. that they ought to manufacture themselves. Sir Eardley Wilmot, M. P., in a wonderfully able pamphlet just published gives a list of ten articles of manufacture which, in ten years, have cost England $1,400,000,000, while the operatives in those lines have been on the verge of starvation. The same authority shows that between 1872 and 1880 the exports of woolen goods from England decreased one-half. The importation of raw silk has steadily declined from over 8,000,000 pounds in 1871 to less than 3,000,000 in 1881. In the same period the exportation of linen yarn has decreased from 36,000,000 pounds to 16,500,000. The 20 sugar refineries on the Thames have decreased to one, while those at Bristol have gone out of existence. Last year 30,000 watches were imported from America and 250,000 from the continent. The watch-makers' trade has gone. The number engaged in the silk industry in 20 years has declined half, and in the five principal textile industries less are now employed than 20 years ago. German and Belgian competion has seriously crippled the furniture trade. Over a million acres of land have gone out of wheat cultivation. Cattle and sheep have decreased. Says one English writer: "Foreign competition—French, German, Belgian and American—is gradually killing out every industry in England, and if nothing can be done to stop it wages in England will ere long be down to one shilling a day." There are 425,000 fewer cotton spindles in Scotland to-day than 20 years ago. In short, the increased progress of foreign commerce has been coincident with contraction in many of those home industries and productions on which national prosperity depends. In Great Britain, on January 1, 1881, there were over 1,000,000 of persons on the books in receipt of parish relief, a number of which, according to Purdy of the poor law board, represents a total of 3,500,000 applying for parish relief. Hoyle, another expert, argues from this that the whole pauper class of the community—those toeing the line of pauperism, as he put it—in England and Wales is somewhere near 7,000,000. Is this a sign of prosperity? Yet England has enjoyed a foreign market—the world's markets—for 40 years. She has, during that time, been mining more tons of coal and iron ore, smelting more tons of iron, spinning more pounds of yarn and weaving more yards of cloth for the same money. In short, she has had the full benefit of a foreign market. But what profit a country if it gain the world's market and lose its own? During the decade ending in 1880, the population of the United States increased 30 per cent. Manufacturing industries, upon the whole, were prosperous during the 10 years ending in 1880, yet the increase in number employed, capital and value of products was a trifle less than 30 per cent. With the prospect of a similar increase during the coming decade, Is it wise to reach out for that which the economic history of England shows is uncertain and jeopardize that which our own economic history has shown is certain? Perhaps intelligent voters may ponder over these facts before deciding that the possibilities of a foreign market are boundless.

Farmers and the Tariff.

James Wood of New York, a practical farmer, delivered a lecture at Haverford college, Pennsylvania, a few evenings since on the tariff, in its relations to agriculture, from which we make the following extract: "Let us take an American farmer as the representative of his class, who has chiefly cotton and food products to sell. With freights, commission, insurance and waste, his cotton is worth 20 per cent. more in Manchester than at home. Corn is bulky, and on its way to feed the Manchester operatives runs the gauntlet of 'corners' and other risks, and when consumed is worth five times more than where it grew. But when the farmer buys back the cotton manufactured into cloth that corn has gone into the cost of the goods. He thus pays $1 or more for the cotton he sold at 80 cents, and $1 or more for the corn he sold for 20 or 25 cents, and he pays the cost of manufacture, the manufacturer's profit, and the freight on the goods besides. He finds that he is selling 'the hide for sixpence and buying back the tail for a shilling.' He resolves to get some one to make the goods he needs close by his home. He soon finds that these home manufacturers need other things beside cotton, wool, wheat and corn. They want land to build upon, vegetables, milk and butter, and a thousand other things that he could never send to the operatives in Manchester. Thus he has a great variety of productive interests instead of one or two. There cannot be a profitable agriculture, in the long run, without it. His eggs are no longer all in one basket. If we thus add one industry after another to these 'home manufactures, a community will be established with production, distribution and consumption perfectly balanced. All are mutually dependent, and unite in bearing the public burdens, whether it be in building roads and school houses, or paying town, county, state or national taxes. The men in Manchester never took any hand in these. But some one says to the farmer: 'I will sell you all your goods, made abroad, for less money than yours now cost you, and will take your corn and wheat and cotton and wool in exchange for them.' The farmer asks: 'How about my potatoes and other vegetables, and my hay and milk and eggs? Who will buy my surplus land? Who will help pay my taxes? How shall I keep up the fertility of my land? Your goods may be cheaper to-day, but soon our men will have more capital and will acquire skill with experience, and will get a little better machinery, and then they will make better goods than yours, and for less money. They do so now with many things. They are paying me good prices for my water-power and my land, and a hundred things you don't want. I can afford to invest money to-day for the good it will do me to-morrow. I must decline your offer. If you persist in selling your goods here we will put a tax upon them and keep it there as long as is necessary to protect our home manufactures.' That is the tariff question from an agriculturalist's standpoint. If the farmer had continued to send his products abroad, instead of a home market for all his various products, he would have only the foreign market for a few things in which his fellow-farmers would compete with him, and with all the rest of the world trying to undersell him. Instead of the certain home market he would have had only the uncertain foreign one, where the abundance or scarcity of the crops in other countries determined whether he should have any market at all. There is a popular error in reference to the advantages of foreign trade. The ancient cities of Palmyra, Tyre, Alexandria, Constantinople, Venice and Genoa, grew rich by foreign commerce. But this was from goods they bought to sell again, upon which they charged such profits that the consumer paid a hundred fold their original cost; while modern commerce is the interchange between nations, through the medium of money, of the products of one for those of another, and no country buys to sell again, to any considerable extent, except England. Free traders talk of mankind as one nation, and say that free trade is 'natural,' and that protection is 'unnatural.' Is it 'natural' for a nation to have its farms on one side of the globe and its workshops on the other? Is it 'natural' to send cotton and wool half round the world and then bring them back again? With unlimited beds of iron ores and fields of coal, is it 'natural' to bring our railroad and other supplies of iron from across the ocean? With a climate and soil fitted to grow all kinds of food, is it 'natural' to exhaust them in growing but two or three? With a patent office attesting the inventive genius and mechanical skill of the people, is it 'natural' to compel them to grow only raw products for English skill to manipulate?"

Wages at Home and Abroad.

To the Editor of the Philadelphia Press—Sir: To make clear to a friend how much better labor is remunerated in this country than in England, I wish to present the actual figures, which are usually the most convincing. Kindly answer the following question through your valued paper. Representing the proceeds, after paying for the materials used in manufacture, by 100, what is the proportion, approximately, received by labor and capital in each country.

WILLIAM J. AUSTEN.

Philadelphia, January 24, 1884.

To the Editor of the Philadelphia Press—Sir: Will you please publish a list of wages paid in Europe and in this country to men doing the same work. I am opposed to a high tariff and would like to see a list to use in arguing the question.

T. HARRY DAVIS.

Cavetown, Md., January 15, 1884.

In reply to the foregoing, the Press says that it seems that both these correspondents are reaching after the same facts, though they may not be of one economic faith. Referring to the request of Austen, to give the proportion approximately received by labor and capital in England and the United States after deducting the cost of material, we can reply that it would be impossible to give a satisfactory answer, for the reason that the figures upon which to base such an inquiry do not exist. While the census returns of the United States give total value of capital invested, material consumed, amount of wages paid and number of hands employed, there are no corresponding statistics for England. In dealing with the question of the proportion of labor to raw material and the percentage of wages to product, the census figures must be used with care, or the results will mislead. For example, the superintendent of the census recently furnished Mills, of the ways and means committee, with a statement of the value of the manufactured products of the whole country for 1880, with the total amount paid in wages and the per cent of wages to product. This report shows that the percentage of wages to product for the mechanical and manufacturing industries is 17.7 per cent. The real fact is, although Mills and his confreres on the committee think they have a valuable document, the mere wage figures of the census are utterly valuless for the purpose of comparing the relative value of labor to that of raw material or of product. Referring to Mills' table, we find that the percentage of wages (always taken by free-traders when they want to belittle the importance of labor) to product in the cotton industry is 21.6 per cent. Congressman Chase, who is an expert in this industry, has made a careful investigation and shows, beyond question, that labor represents 65 per cent of the cost of manufacturing cotton goods. The distinction, therefore, between wages as returned to the census and the value of the labor necessary to produce the goods must be borne in mind in discussing this question.

The request of Davis is camparatively an easy one. Suppose we take the five great textile industries, woolen, worsted, cotton, silk and flax, and compare the wages paid operatives here and in Europe. Below is a table, the accuracy of which it is impossible to doubt, for Carroll D. Wright is responsible for the Massachusetts figures, Consul Frisbie for those from the Rheims district, Robt. Giffen for the English figures, and Consul Du Bois for those from Germany. They are all for 1882:

OCCUPATIONS.	Average weekly rate of wages paid in woolen factories. United States, Mass. Dist.	France, Rheims Dist.	England, Yorkshire Dist.	Germany, Rhenish Dist.
WOOL SORTERS.				
Men	$9 43	$5 82	$5 76	$5 50
Women	.....	2 70	2 40	2 50
Young persons	5 12	2 00	1 80	1 90
SPINNERS.				
Men (overseers)	12 00	6 50	6 00	6 60
Spinners	9 05	6 00	5 00	5 25
Women	6 18	3 00	3 00	3 00
Young persons	4 81	2 00	1 80	1 90
Piecers	5 00	3 00	2 50	2 40
WEAVERS.				
Men	8 53	4 67	4 80	4 25
Women	7 45	4 00	3 48	4 00
Mechanics	13 43	6 25	5 50	5 00
Laborers	8 58	3 75	3 25	3 00

It would appear that wages are 100 per cent greater in this industry in the United States than in any of the European countries. In the worsted industry the difference is about the same. The most reliable and most recent figures show that in the cotton industry wages are from 50 to 75 per cent lower in England than in the United States. It is more difficult to compare wages in the silk industry, because the goods produced, the machinery and the method of employing labor are entirely different. A careful investigation, in which these differences were taken into consideration, shows that our operatives earn from 100 to 150 and in some cases 200 per cent more than those of Europe. The comparison of the books for a series of years of a flax manufacturing establishment having mills both in Ireland and the United States brings out the fact that wages in this industry are about 100 per cent more here than on the other side of the Atlantic. Should we turn to the iron and steel industry, the per centage in favor of the United States is even greater, while the purchasing power of a dollar, so far as the wants of the workman are concerned, is about the same here as in Europe, though the European workman is obliged to get along with much less of what the American mechanic regards as the necessities of civilized life, of which his European brethren partake but sparingly.