

JOB PRINTING
OF ALL DESCRIPTIONS
EXECUTED AT THIS OFFICE
WITH NEATNESS AND DISPATCH
AT SAN FRANCISCO PRICES.

COAST



MAIL.

—PUBLISHED—
THURSDAY MORNING
—BY—
JOHN CHURCH.
Subscription Rates.
One year... \$3 50
Six months... 1 50
Three months... 1 00

VOL. VI. MARSHFIELD, OREGON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1884. NO. 37

Miscellaneous Advertisements.

NEW DEPARTURE!

The undersigned having bought from DR. C. B. GOLDEN the

MARSHFIELD DRUG STORE

Front Street, Marshfield, Oregon.

Solicits a continuance of the liberal patronage extended in the past. Large improvements are being made and the stock heavily increased. Pure Drugs, Chemicals, Patent Medicines, Perfumery, Toys, Sponges, Combs, Brushes, Plain and Fancy Candles, Notions and Fancy Goods of all kinds. The best assortment of Picture Frames in the county, all sizes and at all prices, kept in stock and made to order at short notice. Full and complete line of Oils, Varnishes, Glass and Putty of the purest quality. Painters and Artists materials of every description constantly on hand. Arranging to import through New Orleans, direct from Cuba, the finest brands of Havana Cigars and Tobacco. Long acquaintance with leading tobaccoists in New Orleans will enable me to secure the finest goods at the lowest prices. The local trade will be supplied at liberal rates. All goods at wholesale as well as retail. Correspondence from neighboring counties solicited.

F. A. GOLDEN, Proprietor.
N. B.—Prescriptions and Family Recipes carefully compounded.

GREAT REDUCTION IN PRICES

—AT THE—

XLNT CASH STORE

—ON ACCOUNT OF—

Dissolution of Copartnership

CALL AND SEE FOR YOURSELF.

We are selling CLOTHING AT GREATLY REDUCED RATES. And we have also determined to sell anything that the people need in our line at the LOWEST PRICES.

Remember, we NEVER FAIL to be continually adding to our stock and that we have put

PRICES DOWN TO THE LOWEST NOTCH.

Just drop in and try to comprehend our prices, and you will notice that an active trade is always conducted on the small-profits plan.

Upon viewing our immense stock of DRY GOODS, CLOTHING, LADIES' and GENTLEMEN'S FURNISHING GOODS, BOOTS and SHOES, HATS and CAPS, OIL CLOTHING and RUBBER GOODS, a full assortment of Ladies' and Children's CLOAKS and DOLMANS, GROCERIES, PROVISIONS, TOBACCO, CIGARS, WINES, and LIQUORS, CROCKERY, GLASSWARE, PAINTS and OILS, and other articles too numerous to mention, the universal exclamation is, What a perfect store and what cheap goods!

J. LANDO & SON, Proprietors.

COOS BAY DRUG STORE

Marshfield, Oregon,

Henry Sengstacken, - - - Proprietor,

DEALER IN

Drugs, Medicines, Chemicals, Paints, Oils,

Candles, Tobacco and Cigars, Stationery and Fancy Toilet Articles, Pure Wines and Liquors for medicinal use. Prescriptions skillfully compounded. Agents for Wells, Fargo & Co's Express. N. B.—The Coos Bay Drug Store will continue under the same management and ownership as heretofore. Orders left at either store will receive prompt attention.

BAY VIEW BREWERY

MARSHFIELD, OR.,

CLEMMENSEN & CO.,

PROPRIETORS,

Keep constantly on hand and offers for sale a superior article of

LAGER BEER, ALE AND PORTER,

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL.

MY BAR IS SUPPLIED WITH THE CHOICEST BRANDS OF

WINES, LIQUORS AND CIGARS.

THE PIONEER MARKETS.

MARSHFIELD & EMBURY CITY.

H. P. WHITNEY, PROPRIETOR.

A good supply of

MUTTON, CANNED BEEF, LARD, EGGS, BUTTER, SALT MEATS AND VEGETABLES, and all kinds of Groceries.

VESSLS AND LOGGING CAMPS SUPPLIED AT SHORT NOTICE.

R. L. AGERS, General Blacksmith

—AND—

Nickel Plater,

Front street, north of Postoffice, MARSHFIELD.

HORSESHOEING AND EVERYTHING in the blacksmithing line executed at short notice and at reasonable prices. Having lately brought from the east a speciality of nickel-plating table ware, etc., I make a specialty of that business and am prepared to transform inferior or half-worn table cutlery, etc., into handsome and serviceable articles that are always bright and never need scouring. Orders from the country solicited and promptly attended to.

DAVID YOUNG, HENRY HUDEN

Marshfield SODA WATER WORKS,

Corner of Third and C streets, HUDEN & YOUNG, Proprietors.

SODA, SASSAPARILLA, GINGER ALE, ETC., OF SUPERIOR QUALITY. Constantly on hand and for sale.

Orders from the country promptly filled. Address—orders to Marshfield Soda Works.

FOR SALE.

TRUDE LAND LOT EAST OF THE LUNCH ROOMS BUILDINGS. Front street, Marshfield. Apply to A. M. CRAWFORD, Attorney at law, Marshfield.

NECESSARIES OF LIFE.

How the Tariff Has Reduced the Cost of Cotton and Woolen Goods—Decline in the Price of Blankets, Dress Goods and Cottons—Nails Cheaper Here than in Any Other Country in the World—Cost of Clothing Workmen.

[R. F. Porter in the Philadelphia Press.]

When in Boston a few weeks ago I had a long and interesting conversation with the Hon. John L. Hayes, who for many years has been at the head of the national association of wool manufacturers. Probably no man has had so much to do during the last 20 years with that part of tariff legislation relating to the manufacture of wool. An intimate friend of Senator Morrill, Hayes aided materially in forming the basis of the national schedule which for nearly a quarter of a century has been the law. Hayes, as will be remembered, was president of the tariff commission, and also did effective work in securing the passage of the act of 1883. A well preserved man, now advanced in years, he resides in a charming house surrounded with a fine garden, in Cambridge. Though in the nucleus of Harvard college, he and his sons differ from the "gentle hermits of Harvard" on economic matters. Hayes is a thoroughgoing believer in the American protective system. At a late meeting of the Boston liberal club Hayes was called upon to reply to a number of speeches in favor of free trade, which had been delivered by Gen. Walker, Charles Francis Adams, Jr., and Professor Sumner. The speech of Hayes is said to have been a masterly one. He succeeded in exposing the fallacies of the free trade speakers, especially Professor Sumner, and in placing the question of free trade versus protection in its true light.

He took the ground that the home markets are the base of our commercial edifice, and foreign trade, as the national skill develops itself, can be built on such a basis, but the process can never be reversed because, excepting the great work of creation, something was never yet created out of nothing.

It was, however, on the more practical aspect of the tariff question that I talked with Hayes.

A PRACTICAL VIEW OF THE TARIFF.

"There is a constant reiteration," I said, "among free-traders in regard to the reduction of the duties on the so-called necessities of life. It is urged that there are a great many of these necessities that should be added to the free list. Do you know of any?"

Hayes replied: "I do not hesitate to say that with the most careful study, under exceptional opportunities, I know of no important article which could be added to the free list without violating the rule of the new republican platform, which may be taken as the last expression of the protective sentiment of the country. The reduction of the revenue is to be effected by such methods as will relieve the taxpayers without injuring the laborer in the great productive interests of the country."

"What do you understand is meant by the necessities of life?"

"That is an exceedingly difficult question," said Hayes. "The evidence of necessity is universal demand. It will include the product of the iron manufacture, for we all know this is destined for materials and articles of absolute necessity—materials and instruments of labor, preparation, cooking of food, construction and defense. In the manufacture of cotton the production of fabrics of luxury is too insignificant to be mentioned. The chief product is the material for the necessary inner apparel of every man, woman and child in the land. The woolen manufacture of this country, though capable of producing commodities of the highest luxury, is almost fully absorbed in the production for the masses. Nine-tenths of all card wool fabrics are made direct for the ready-made clothing establishments, by means of which most of the laboring people and all boys are supplied with woolen garments."

"The manufacture of flannels, blankets and ordinary knit goods—pure necessities of life—occupies most of the other mills engaged in working up carded wool. The dress goods manufactured are almost exclusively for the million, women of the fashionable class supplying themselves mainly through French importations. The vast carpet manufacture of Philadelphia, larger than in any city of Europe, has its chief occupation in furnishing carpets for the most modest homes." This sufficiently shows that, aside from food, the necessities of life comprise those articles manufactured by the three greatest industries—iron and steel, cotton and wool.

QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY HAYES ABROAD.

"Is it not a fact that the vast bulk of the productions of these industries are sold in this country as cheaply as they are in free-trade England?"

"Yes; in conformity with the law that the greatest cheapening of prices by the establishment of national industries is exhibited in commodities of the highest necessity. We see in the iron manufacture that the article of nails, the commodity of most universal use produced by that industry, has declined, through domestic production, from \$0 per 100 pounds in 1840, to \$3 50 in 1861, and

\$2 40 in 1883, a cheaper rate than prevails in any country in the world, and enabling us to export in competition with England and Australia to South America, while we send our mail-working machines even to England itself."

"Is this also true in the cotton industry?"

"Unquestionably; we see this illustrated in our cotton manufacture by the reduction of the price of sheeting from 30 cents in 1814 to 6 1/2 cents in 1843; of prints of 23.07 cents in 1825 to 9.15 in 1843 and 5 cents in 1883."

"Will you illustrate the same law in regard to the woolen or worsted industry?"

"In the worsted manufacture it is illustrated by the reduction of delaines, or a fabric corresponding to it, a domestic commodity consumed by our people in the ratio of nearly two yards for each individual of our population, from 30 cents in 1835 to 20.00 cents in 1860, and 11.22 in 1882. In the woolen industry we see this law demonstrated by the fact that the greatest reduction of prices has been in goods of universal consumption, such as flannels, ordinary knit goods, low and medium cloth, and ready-made clothing, the goods, in fact, the demand for which, proceeding from so many millions of our people, sustains the vast scale of production with its resulting economies."

REDUCTION IN THE COST OF BLANKETS.

"Can you give me any statement showing the reduction of the prices on blankets, which I am informed are as cheap here as in England, though the free-trader never tires of talking about 60 per cent tax on blankets?"

"Yes; I have a statement here furnished by John and James Dolson of Philadelphia showing the average prices for the various grades of blankets during the years 1860 and 1883:

1860—\$2, \$2 50, \$2 25, \$3 50, \$3 75, \$5, \$7 50, \$8, \$10, \$13.

1883—\$1 25, \$1 80, \$1 62 1/2, \$2 35, \$3 20, \$3 75, \$5 50, \$5 00, \$7 25, \$8 50.

"The above includes the entire line of blankets from the lowest to the best grades per pair, standard make, of what are known as plain Norway blankets. The figures show a decline of 30 per cent to 60 per cent in favor of the protective system over the 'for-revenue-only' or free-trade system that prevailed prior to 1861. The wool used in the manufacture of these blankets is about 6 per cent below the average price in 1860."

"Have other woolen goods declined in the same ratio?"

"Yes; coarse woolen cloths, particularly those used for blankets, have had the same relative decline. Those worth in 1860 \$1 50 per yard are sold to-day for 80 cents to \$1."

"And yet the woolen industry of the United States pays 100 per cent more wages to its employes than is paid in England."

Accompanied by Hayes I made a personal examination at a typical woolen goods establishment in Boston. We examined the prices of the whole range of goods, namely, ready-made clothing, adapted to all classes of customers. The proprietors of the establishment visited informed us that clothing was from 30 to 40 per cent cheaper now than at the period of lowest prices in 1860, in the lowest and cheapest goods the reduction of price being considerably greater than this rate. Our inquiry was addressed principally to the lowest-priced goods—those supplying the barest necessities of life in apparel.

READY-MADE CLOTHING CHEAPER HERE THAN IN ENGLAND.

Twenty-five thousand pairs of men's winter trousers, made of goods weighing 14 ounces per yard, were being made, to be sold at the price of \$1 50 per pair. Strictly all-wool complete suits were held at \$5 50 per suit. Good heavy winter full suits at \$6 50 and \$7 50. Winter overcoats of satin, at \$2 each. The prices of good and substantial garments, sufficient to supply a workman for a year, were as follows:

A handsome suit for best or Sunday wear, \$10 00
Working suit, 7 00
Extra pair of trousers, 2 00
Overcoat, 5 00

\$24 00

A workman earning \$2 a day can thus obtain his clothing for a year by the labor of two weeks. He can do no better than this in England. I have priced hundreds of workmen's suits and found nothing fit to wear for less than \$10 or \$12. The commonest corduroy trousers cost in England \$2 50, while boots or shoes are more expensive there than in this country.

I found that Hayes took a lively interest in the new south, and especially in the industrial development of that section. In reply to a question as to how a reduction of the tariff would affect relatively the eastern, western and southern states, Hayes replied:

FREE TRADE THE SLOUGH OF BOUZOONISM.

"It is not probable that even a radical reduction of commodities of general consumption would completely annihilate the industries producing them in the present great manufacturing centers of the older states, for the vast capital invested would not submit to its complete extinguishment. The industries in the older states would live, and barely live, but only by reducing the wages of their

workmen to European rates, a reduction which they could almost force upon the large manufacturing populations surrounding these establishments having no other resources than employment in the factory or forge. In the newer states, which have to attract labor, and where it is dearer on account of the cheapness of land, no such reduction in the wages of labor is possible. The older states, with their large capital, complete establishments and skilled labor, might for a time resist a foreign competition, under which the more poorly endowed states must inevitably succumb. In my opinion the new south, just finding compensation for emancipation in its hopeful industries, would fall back into the slough of bouzoonism. The agricultural states of the west must give up their fond hopes of a home market through more diversifying industries and be content with still sending their produce abroad, though in increasing competition with the expanding grain fields of India, Russia and upper Egypt."

While on this subject I will present some figures obtained from the Pacific mills, the largest mills for producing women's dress goods in the United States, showing the average net prices obtained for worsted goods for a period of six months ending:

May 31, 1872.....30.06 cents per yard.
May 31, 1877.....26.75 cents per yard.
May 31, 1880.....25.43 cents per yard.
May 31, 1881.....24.50 cents per yard.
May 31, 1882.....22.82 cents per yard.

Since 1882 the goods made have been of higher quality than the above, and the prices obtained have averaged a little more, though really a little lower in proportion to cost.

These facts in regard to our woolen industry confute effectually the false statements circulated by those opposed to American industry and American labor, to the effect that the masses of the people of this country are compelled to pay a tax to the duty not only on imported goods to the government, but an equivalent amount in increased cost to the American manufacturer for goods made at home. It is also a curious fact that while the cost of the raw material, both in the iron and woolen industry, is higher here than in Great Britain, by the time the product assumes its most highly manufactured condition—in the former industry in cutlery, farming implements, machinery, etc., and in the latter industry in ready-made clothing—the cost to the consumer in this country is but slightly, if any, in excess of the cost in free-trade Great Britain.

The democrats who assembled at Chicago to nominate a candidate for the presidency shamelessly trifled with the leading issue now before the country. That is to say, they placed a tariff plank in their platform which was worded so "artificially artlessly" that to-day leading democratic newspapers are disputing in regard to its meaning! Of course the committee which reported the plank and the convention which unanimously adopted it were well aware that it could be interpreted in several ways. It was prepared with that object in view. To cowardly to speak out plainly and without circumlocution or reserve, the convention resorted to a juggle of words. The intention of the machine that ran it was not to exhibit but to hide democracy's position on the tariff question, a question in which every voter in the country is vitally interested. Cleveland is a conspicuously weak candidate and is growing weaker every day. But even if he possessed great personal strength he could make little headway with such a peculiarly well-developed millstone as this tariff plank about his neck. The republican plank is square for the protection of American industries and the American workman. He who runs may read that in it. But this democratic tariff plank, democrats themselves being judges, is perhaps a political fifteen puzzle—is perhaps a free trade, is perhaps for protection. A party that would deliberately promulgate such a sham upon such an issue has no right to expect the confidence of voters who favor frankness and fair dealing. It is a good rule to mistrust a party that misleads its own principles.

It is folly to say that one party is all pure, and the other all vicious. Most of the voters in each party want good government. If a candidate is put up by the people, as Blaine was in an extraordinary degree, we may be certain that they believe him honest and competent. But there is no such evidence of the people's belief, when a convention is controlled by trickery and rings. The withholding of Tilden's letter enabled tools to put up Cleveland. The result shows the wisdom of trusting the people. Cleveland proves to be a most unworthy man, who consents to accept a nomination at the hands of dishonest officials as a reward for shielding them from punishment. Blaine proves to be a statesman whose ideas win political opponents by the thousands, and of whom the purest and most honored of his associates in congress for many years—men like Dawes and Hawley and Kelly—declare that there is not in public life to-day a man whose public and private character has been more pure. It is a sufficient proof of the singular worth of his character that, in spite of a deluge of defamation which would drown almost any other man, he grows stronger with the people daily.

SOON FAREWELL!

Summer's going, going fast,
Soon it will be over, passed;
Soon the busy hum of bees,
Soon the green of grass and trees,
Soon the glist of dew and shower,
All, all like a happy dream.
To our saddened hearts will seem,
Soon we'll wake to find them past,
When the skies are overcast,
And the hazy clouds are spread;
When the leaves green, golden, red,
All have left the parent trees,
Left them lonely, gaunt and bare,
Shivering in the frosty air.
Summer's going, going fast,
Its gay hours will soon be past,
We are loth to let it go,
For the chilly wind must blow,
Bill and dale wear shroud of snow,
Ere it comes again with flowers,
Birds and bees and sunny hours,
And with shroud of latter pain.
"Though the summer come again,
Can it bring," some sad heart cries,
"E'en with all its gorgeous skies,
O'er my loved voice, one smile we miss?"
No, these with all the passing throng
Of this summer's joys belong.
Every hour that swiftly flies,
Every flower that withers, dies,
And with shroud of latter pain,
All that's sweet must soonest die.
Though the summer will return,
Their sad hearts repeat in pain,
"This one can never come again."
—Julia A. Bennett in *Misouri Republican*.

The Tariff—No. 2.

[From the New York Tribune.]

The Morrison bill has a history. In the elections of 1882 a great many democratic candidates pretended to be "tariff reformers"—not free traders, nor tariff-revenue men, but only "reformers." They falsely asserted that no revision of a useful sort had been or would be made by republicans. But these men, when elected on these false pretenses, elected, as speaker, Carlisle, a well-known Kentucky free trader, and his election was hailed by all free traders as a triumph. He organized a free trade committee, appointed, as its chairman, Morrison of Illinois, a well-known free trader, and declared that the chief duty of congress was to cut down the tariff. Morrison introduced a bill to that end; his committee approved it, with some changes, and it was then submitted to a democratic caucus. All the free traders in the caucus supported the measure, and it was resolved that it was the duty of the democratic party to pass a measure of that nature. As has been shown, 152 democrats voted for the bill at the end, and only 41 voted for various reasons against it.

The essence of this bill was to cut down one-fifth the charge made when foreign producers sought to sell their goods in this market. There were many tricks to confuse and to deceive, but, as to nearly all products, this was the purport of the bill. In order to defend our labor, it had been required that goods made by the 50 cent labor of Europe, if sold here, should pay certain amounts for the privilege of entering this market. The Morrison bill provided that where \$1 per ton had been paid the charge should be only 80 cents; where 5 cents a pound had been paid, the charge should be only 4 cents; and where 50 cents per pound and 40 per cent had been paid, the charge in future should be 40 cents per pound and 32 per cent. This was declared by Dorsheimer, the eloquent democratic member from New York, a "first, firm step toward free trade," and all the other free traders advocated it as only a beginning of the change which they meant to make.

The effect of this bill can be understood if we remember that the tariff had just been revised with intent to make the duties just enough, and not more than enough, to put our labor on equal terms in competition with ill-paid foreign labor. With great care and labor a commission of men, skilled in different industries, had devised a plan to that end, and where congress thought the commission had erred in proposing too high duties, it enacted lower duties. Hence it must be supposed that the balance was as nearly level as men of great skill could make it. If they found that cheap British labor could offer for sale here bar iron at two cents a pound, or \$2 per 100 pounds, whereas like iron made by our labor cost \$2 80 cents per 100 pounds, they fixed the charge to be paid by foreign bar iron at 80 cents per 100 pounds; so that it should have no advantage in our market. If they found that window-glass could be made here, with a decent living for the workers, at \$4 50 per 100 pounds, and that foreign glass, made by cheap labor, could be offered here at \$3, they fixed the charge for the privilege of coming into our market at \$1 50 per 100 pounds. This was the general intent of the tariff as it stood.

To cut off one-fifth of the \$1 50 paid by foreign glass of a certain kind, then, would give the foreigner an advantage of 30 cents on every 100 pounds over the home producer, provided the adjustment was correct before, and wages were not changed. But the maker could not get sand or other materials any cheaper than before. Consequently he must pay 30 cents per 100 pounds loss for making glass, or continue to run at a loss, or stop work. To cut off one-fifth of the 80 cents paid by a kind of iron, in like manner, meant to take 16 cents per 100 pounds from the cost of materials, from profits, or from wages. But this was proposed at a time when prices were very low, and industries much depressed. Many mines had closed,

the miners being unwilling to work for less. Few mines were yielding profits. The chances of getting cheaper materials was slender. The manufacturers generally had been working on exceedingly narrow profits, or no profits. The saving of 30 cents per 100 pounds on glass, or 16 cents per 100 pounds on iron, from profits of the manufacturer at that time, was plainly not possible. The bill, therefore, meant to take the 30 cents or the 16 cents from the wages of labor. And so it was of a great number of industries. If the duties had been rightly adjusted before, to equalize foreign with home products—and the commission of experts and congress had tried to do so—then, at a time when works were running without profits, cutting off duties meant cutting down wages, or the stoppage of the mines and mills, the furnaces and the factories, by the purchase of foreign goods at less than the cost of goods made at home.

That was the meaning of the Morrison bill. Had it been offered at a time when manufacturers were getting good profits, the reduction might have been taken from the profits. But it was offered at a time when the reduction must have come from the wages of labor, or the works must have stopped.

A great many works did stop, in expectation of its passage. A great many more did not dare make contracts for the future with a prospect that loss would result if the bill should pass. The disaster to industry was great and general, and we have not yet recovered from it. Yet the very man who offered this bill to cut down the wages of labor, Morrison, was the chairman of the committee in the democratic convention who reported the platform on which Cleveland is now running.

The Party for Young Men.

A great army of new voters will cast their first ballots for president this fall. Nine-tenths of them are young men who have to make their own way in the world, with brains and industry for their capital. The older men who have saved something have an advantage; it matters less to them whether a day's work brings good wages or poor. But the young man who has to start at the foot of the ladder—how is he to climb, if the wages of labor are to be cut down to his cost of living?

The question whether American or British wages shall prevail here, therefore, is a more vital one to the young men than to anybody else. British wages do not even fill the stomach, and leave nothing for the pocket or the savings bank. American wages enable the thrifty and capable man to support a family decently, and to put aside something for the children or for a time of misfortune. British wages, at the best, keep a sturdy worker hovering on the border between independence and servitude; the first sickness, or loss of employment, or other disaster that comes, is apt to leave him quite at the mercy of employers, and he falls into the ranks of the helpless and hopeless toilers. Those who want to try British wages in this country ought to have their pockets well lined first.

British wages come with British free trade. The main object of that system is to produce cheaply enough to undersell all the world—and that means to get more work for less wages than other people. The system suits the ruling classes in a country where the millions have little part in the government. It does not suit this country, where the worker is also a ruler. Hence the American system protects the worker, so that he may remain as far as possible independent, and free to cast his vote as he pleases, and to put his work where he pleases. It is the American system of protection that gives the young man the chance to make his first savings, even though times abroad are hard, and the manufacturers of many countries are struggling to undersell us and to get the utmost possible out of their workmen.

British free trade is the democratic policy. Where that party dares to tell what it wants, it squarely opposes the protective theory. But it does not dare in this state, and therefore at every election for 25 years it has raised a clatter about something else, which it pretended to regard as "the main issue." It wanted to "save the union" in 1860, and it wanted "peace" in 1864; it was excited about "negro suffrage" in 1868 and about "carpet baggers" in 1872; it wanted "reform" in 1876, and "a change" in 1880—but all the time it fought for British free trade, and whenever it could get a majority in the house attempted at once to tear down the protective system, as it did last winter.

The American policy of protection was established and has been maintained by republican votes, and that party makes no attempt to cheat anybody about its intentions. It means to defend the system which has given working people a fair chance, and enriched the country. Therefore the free-trade bolters go to Cleveland—though they do not dare to tell the truth about it now, as they did six months ago.

It has been discovered by some scientific epure that voters are no more nutritious than milk, with the exception of its digestible and wholesome.