

THE RIGHTS OF LABOR.

SPEECH

OF

HON. J. K. MOORHEAD, OF PENN.

—o—

Delivered in the House of Representatives, March 7, 1860.

—o—

The House being in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—

Mr. MOORHEAD said:

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Three months have elapsed since we assembled in this Hall. Amidst all the excitement which has existed, the members with whom I act have preserved a commendable silence, believing, as they did, that no business but the election of Speaker was in order until the House was organized. I will not review the scenes exhibited during the struggle for the election of Speaker. I will not expose, in all their enormity, the hissing threats of disunion which proceeded from the lips of gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House. I have no heart, Mr. Chairman, to undertake such a work, and would not even recall them, did I not consider it important that the people should understand the purposes entertained by the distinguished leaders of the Democratic party. These threats were, in my opinion, very unwisely made. If intended to prevent the election of a President who has respect for and sympathy with the interests of the free white laboring man, they will be powerless; for the people of this country know their interests, and will protect them. Least of all, will they abandon them under treasonable threats of destroying the Government.

The people have always maintained, and will always maintain, the right of the majority to rule. In disregard of all this bluster, and those threats, the Republican party will meet in Convention, nominate a candidate, elect him if possible, and as surely install him in office as he is elected. They will not brag nor swagger about it. They do not now use the language of defiance. But they will permit no dictation

of interested parties to swerve them from their purpose, or nullify the popular will. It is a slander upon the Republican party to say that they have any design against the persons or property of our Southern neighbors. They are Union-loving men, and will stand by the Constitution and the laws. Whilst they will carefully avoid attacking others, they will resist aggressions upon their rights, come they from what quarter they may. To anticipate the reverse, is in one case to charge them with perfidy, in the other with cowardice—both foreign to the character of the American citizen.

But, Mr. Chairman, I did not rise to discuss any of these topics, believing, as I do, that this Union will not be dissolved, let who may be elected President, but will continue to grow and prosper until we become the greatest nation on the globe. My purpose is to direct the attention of the House to the revenue policy of the Government, and to suggest what, in my opinion, will tend more than anything else to strengthen the bonds of this Union.

Mr. Chairman, the Government must be supported by revenue, which the people, in some way or other, must pay. Now, to make these contributions most equitable, least burdensome, and most beneficial to the entire community, and have their proceeds placed in the Treasury at the smallest expense, should be the object of the statesman.

Whether the revenue be raised by taxing imports, or by direct taxation, are grave questions. As the legitimate result of free trade would lead to the latter, it is well to examine them; and, in doing so, I will refer to the doctrine laid down in the Cincinnati platform on this subject, which is as follows:

"Resolved, That there are questions connected with the foreign policy of this country which are inferior to no domestic question whatever. The time has come for the people of the United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and PROGRESSIVE FREE TRADE throughout the world, and, by solemn manifestations, to place their moral influence at the side of their successful example."

How far the Cincinnati platform may be considered authority with the Democracy, it is not for me to say. The ambiguity of its terms has caused endless disputes and dissensions, whilst a strict adherence to its doctrines has cost many an official his head. But I regret to say that, on this question of PROGRESSIVE FREE TRADE, so far as I have been able to observe, there is a very general acquiescence by that party; and thus the means and manner of supporting the Government are made, or attempted to be made, mere questions of party politics—a course to be regretted by all fair and candid men. So far as I may discuss them, I will endeavor to treat them as questions of political economy, and not of party politics.

We have an extensive country, and greatly diversified interests, all to be governed by the same law. It should, therefore, be so framed as to confer its blessings upon all; or, in other words, add to the prosperity, enterprise, industry, and value, of the whole country; to make us wealthy and happy at home; respected, honored, and feared, abroad. How can this be done? If I can say anything that will contribute to produce this result, my purpose will be accomplished. I will, at least, give my views upon what I consider equal in importance to any subject that will engage the attention of the present Congress.

We buy too much from abroad; and, I was going to say, sell too little; but I will not say that. We sell enough, perhaps too much; for it would greatly enhance our wealth and prosperity if we consumed our products at home, instead of sending them abroad to feed foreign labor; and then buy the product of that labor in the shape of manufactured articles, as I will endeavor to show more fully hereafter.

There has been much discussion and variety of opinion on the subject of a *protective tariff*, or a *revenue tariff*—a mere difference of terms, as the opponents of protection have, until recently, favored a revenue tariff, with discriminations in favor of the manufactures of our own country. It matters not by what name a tariff is called—call it what you please; but it does matter that its principles should be such as to add to the prosperity and happiness of the people.

Providence has dealt most bountifully with us as a nation and a people. We have great agricultural resources, mineral wealth of all kinds, and in immense quantities. Commerce has spread her wings from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and that upon our navigable rivers and lakes has no parallel on the face of the globe. Our free and liberal form of Government is inviting to our shores the emigration of the

world; and, having the means to feed and support them, and the material upon which to employ their labor, why should we not make the most of our own resources, and become the wealthiest, the happiest, and the greatest, nation on the earth?

Why should we permit so humiliating a record to be laid before this House as that exhibited by the financial report now on your table. I say, sir, it is the result of bad legislation—miserable legislation; legislation to foster and protect the manufacturers, laborers, farmers, and artisans, of other countries, whilst you bring ruin, distress, and starvation, upon the same classes at home. What is it? Why, here it is, sir:

	1859.
Total importations, exclusive of specie.....	\$332,398,427
Total exportations, except specie.....	292,902,951
	39,496,376

Yes, sir, the balance of trade against us to the amount of \$39,496,376, and that paid by draining our precious metals (which are the heart's blood of a nation) from us, at a rate equal to the product of the California mines. It requires no prophetic vision to see that this must lead to national bankruptcy, and that that point would have been reached ere this, but for the fortunate discovery of valuable gold mines in our own country.

The most humiliating aspect in which this picture can be examined, however, Mr. Chairman, is that presented by the Secretary of the Treasury. We find him highly delighted with large importations; exulting over the fact that the revenue from that source has exceeded his estimate, and congratulating the country upon this great evidence of prosperity. Why, Mr. Chairman, it reminds me of the fable of the frogs: "Whilst it is sport to you, it is death to us;" and so, surely, in this case, whilst it may be sport to Mr. Cobb, whilst it may for the present bring money into the Treasury, and keep the wheels of Government in motion, it is death to the best interests of the country.

And now, sir, this very fact of the large amount of revenue received from these excessive importations is to be used as an argument against a revision of the tariff. No matter how the country groans and suffers, so that we have revenue to carry on the Government; no matter how little demand there is for labor, how utterly prostrate the manufacturing interests of the country may be, how many thousands of our industrious citizens may be turned idle, and driven to starvation; so that we have money to pay the office-holders, the contractors, and various expenses of Government, all is well. Away with such doctrines. Out upon such a policy as this. Give us such revenue laws as will foster and protect our own manufactures and give employment to labor at home. Enable us to develop the resources that we have in such abundance, and that are entirely

without value whilst buried in the earth, but by the talismanic touch of labor become gold. Let this labor receive aid and support, by a wise and just policy, and not crush it to the level of the down-trodden foreign labor. Why require protection? is a question frequently asked. Why can you not manufacture iron as cheaply in this country as in England? I answer: it is true, we have the raw material in abundance; we have the requisite skill; we have the labor-saving machinery, and we have the labor; but that labor should be encouraged, and not crushed to the earth. It is the glory of our country that the road to fortune and to fame is open to all, and is travelled by all. We have no special classes or grades here. We frequently find the laborer of to-day becoming the employer of to-morrow; and this can only be the case when labor is remunerated. We cannot employ labor at the prices paid in the old countries; we should not wish to; and when the day arrives, if it ever should, (which Heaven forbid,) that the laboring man of our country is reduced to the wages paid in foreign countries, then indeed will our glory as a nation have departed.

Let us, on the other hand, encourage home products. Stop this miserable policy of forcing our provisions abroad to find a market, and having them returned to us in the shape of manufactured articles, we paying some sixty or eighty per cent., in addition to their original value, for transportation, &c., to the middle men through whom they have passed; but let us apply *our own labor* to our *own raw materials*, and thus provide a home market for our own breadstuffs, for the product of our own farmers; supplying ourselves with the manufactured articles; saving transportation, commissions, and various expenses, and feeding and supporting our own labor in preference to foreign. If the power and greatness of a State or country depend upon the number and prosperity of its population, then it follows, as a matter of course, that, by combining manufacturing with agriculture, you can increase the population to the extent that the products of the soil would supply with nourishment; or, in other words, you could employ as large a population in manufacturing and trade as the agricultural productions of the soil would feed, and by this policy you would bring the producer and the consumer together; you would have a home market for the agriculturist, who would, in exchange, receive the domestic manufacture instead of the foreign, and thus add to the wealth of our own country by developing its great natural resources.

Why should any portion of our Union object to this policy? The argument is, that some States of the Union are consumers, and not producers, of these manufactured articles; hence they must buy as cheap as they can, and sell their own products as dear as possible. Let us examine this. At the formation of our

Confederation, when the great experiment of a Republic was about to be tried, and a republican Government to be put in operation, the wise men of that day, knowing that the eyes of the world were upon them, and that the predictions of the monarchists and absolutists of the Old World were, that this was a Utopian scheme that would not be carried into practice, and that the then infant Republic would soon crumble to atoms, endeavored to guard and protect every interest, and prevent internal strife and division. The manner of raising revenue for the support of the new Government was a matter of great concern. Various propositions were made, and fully discussed. Should there be a tax upon land? Should the tax be on imports, or should they tax *exports*?

The principal discussion was between the two latter propositions. Tobacco was then an article of considerable export? Cotton had not yet assumed any importance as an article of trade; in fact, it was about the year 1790 that the planters of the Southern States began to turn their attention to raising it, and not until 1795 that Mr. Whitney invented the cotton gin. In 1784, eight bags of cotton from one of our Southern States, consigned to Mr. Rathbone, an American merchant in Liverpool, were seized by the custom-house officers, on the allegation that it could not have been grown in the United States—so insignificant and unknown was the production of this great staple at that time, although now denominated KING. I refer to this for the purpose of showing that, had the cotton interest then been what it is now, one section of our country having an entire monopoly of its production, that vast interest might have decided differently the question of taxing exports; and the producers of cotton, who now object so strenuously to taxing imports, so as to protect the American manufacturer, might have been paying tax upon their exports.

What did the great men who framed the Constitution say on this subject? In volume three of the Madison Papers, page 1339—

“Mr. Mason urged the necessity of connecting with the powers of levying taxes, duties, &c., the prohibition in article six, section four, ‘That no tax should be laid on exports.’ He was unwilling to trust to its being done in future. He hoped the Northern States did not mean to deny the Southern this security. It would hereafter be as desirable to the former, when the latter should become the most populous. He professed his jealousy for the productions of the Southern, or, as he called them, the staple States. He moved to insert the following amendment:

“*Provided*, That no tax, duty, or impost, shall be laid by the Legislature of the United States on articles exported from any State.”

“Mr. Gouverneur Morris considered such a proviso inadmissible anywhere; it was radically objectionable; that it might cost the whole system the support of some of its members. He contended that it would not, in some cases, be equitable to tax imports without taxing exports; and that taxes on exports would often be the most easy and proper of the two.

“Mr. Madison. First, the power of laying taxes on exports is proper in itself; and as the States cannot with propriety exercise it separately, it ought to be vested in them collectively. Secondly, it might with particular advantage be exercised with regard to articles in which America was not rivalled in foreign markets; as tobacco, &c. * * * Fourth-

ly, the Southern States, being most in danger, and most needing naval protection, could the less complain if the burden should be somewhat heaviest on them. And, finally, we are not providing for the present moment only, and time will equalize the situations of the States in this matter. He was, for these reasons, against the motion."

On page 1384, Gouverneur Morris says :

"The state of the country, also, will change, and render duties on exports, as skins, beaver, and other *raw materials*, politic, in the view of encouraging American manufactures."

Mr. Fitzsimmons, on page 1386—

"Was for giving the power to lay the tax when a proper time may call for it. This would certainly be the case when America should become a manufacturing country."

On page 1388, on the question, "No tax shall be laid on exports," it was carried in the affirmative—seven States voting yea, four voting nay—General Washington and Mr. Madison, of Virginia, voting no.

With such authority as Washington and Madison in favor of taxing exports, it cannot be denied that withholding the power to tax them was a concession to the South, and one that would probably not have been made, had the production of cotton to any considerable extent then existed. Now, we do not ask for a tax upon exports, but we do ask our Southern friends, who enjoy the exemption, to give us such duties upon imports as will equalize our condition and encourage American manufactures. We ask that the duties shall be so laid as to afford incidental protection, and not as recommended by the Secretary of the Treasury in his report on the finances, made to Congress at its last session. In that report, the Secretary says :

"I do not deem it proper to enter into any extended discussion of the theoretic principles on which a tariff act should be framed. They may be briefly stated. Such duties should be laid as will produce the revenue required, by imposing on the people at large the smallest and most equal burdens.

"It is obvious that this is most effectually done by taxing, in preference to others, such articles as are not produced in this country; and among articles produced here, those in which the home product bears the least proportion to the quantity imported, are the fittest for taxation."

Such is the language, such the recommendation, of the financial officer of the present Administration. I regret that it was reserved for the Administration of a native (and once "*the favorite son*") of Pennsylvania to recommend the raising of revenue by taxing articles *not* manufactured in this country, and, of course, exempting from taxation those articles that come in competition with our own labor and products. How does this correspond with the doctrines of Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson? I will not encumber my argument by quoting from their different messages; it has been done so frequently, that their doctrines of protecting and fostering the manufactures of our own country are like household words, known to all intelligent minds. I will, however, give an extract from the message of President Monroe to Congress, December 2, 1823 :

"Having communicated my views to Congress at the commencement of the last session, respecting the encouragement which ought to be given to our manufactures, and the principle on which it should be founded, I have only to add that

those views remain unchanged, and that the present state of those countries with which we have the most immediate political relations and greatest commercial intercourse, tends to confirm them. Under this impression, I recommend a review of the tariff for the purpose of affording such additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture, or which are more immediately connected with the defence and independence of the country."

What different language from that used by Mr. Secretary Cobb! This, the enlarged view of an American statesman; that, a blind and narrow policy, destructive to American interests. But would such blind policy promote even the sectional interests intended to be benefited? I contend not, sir. We are members of one great family; when one suffers, the other must sympathize to a certain extent; and when one prospers and flourishes, the effect is felt by all.

Mr. Chairman, why will we not be admonished by experience? Why not derive wisdom from the past? What has been the result of high tariffs and of low tariffs, in this country and in other countries? This information is accessible to all. It has been spread before Congress very frequently and very ably, and I almost shrink from the effort of again reciting it; but, in the language of the late Mr. Benton, "that the truth of history may be vindicated," I will briefly refer to it. The result has been, that, under protective tariffs, the country has been prosperous, money plentiful, labor fully employed and compensated; the industrious, frugal mechanic, artisan, or laborer, not only subsisting himself and family, but becoming the freeholder; building his own house, and residing in it with his family; cultivating his own soil, and perhaps in turn becoming the employer, the capitalist, the manufacturer, and finding labor and sustenance for the scores of human beings that would gather around him. On the other hand, low or strictly revenue tariffs have flooded the country with foreign goods, foreign iron, foreign everything; have drained us of our precious metals to pay for them; have put out the fires of our forges and furnaces; stopped the shuttle and the loom; sent consternation, poverty, distress, and even starvation, into our manufacturing districts; and the hardy, able-bodied laborer, after spending wearisome days and nights in vain search of employment, has been doomed to penury and want, and forced to beg or starve. The value of all property, real and personal, has been greatly reduced; and few or no buyers at the sheriffs' sales, which are the legitimate result of this course of policy. Has this not been the case? Is it not a true picture of the past? And will not the same course produce the same effect in the future?

From 1812 to 1815, during the war with Great Britain, when our foreign commerce was suspended, and it became a necessity for us to manufacture and produce at home what would supply our wants, we became a nation of exchangers or barterers. The manufacturer turned out his iron, glass, salt, cotton, and woollen goods,

which he exchanged for labor, mechanical skill, and the products of the soil. The farmer had a home market; the producer and consumer were "enabled to take their place by each other's side;" the laborer had constant employment and good wages, and at the close of an expensive and tedious war with the most powerful nation on the globe, we were prosperous and happy, with a revenue that was fast diminishing the public debt. The tariff of 1816, which superseded the double or war duties of 1812, (which were continued to June 30, 1817,) was essentially a revenue tariff only, without protection. Under its operation, foreign goods flowed into the country; the product of foreign labor was substituted for our own, whilst our own labor was doomed to languish and seek employment in vain; the products of our farmers, instead of feeding labor at home, were sent to Europe to nourish foreign labor, and be returned to us in manufactured articles; whilst our minerals were lying dead and useless in the hills, and the laborers starving for want of bread.

The tariffs of 1824, and then of 1828, by their protective principles, again restored us to prosperity. This continued until we began to feel the depressing influence of the compromise tariff of 1833, as it approached the *free-trade* standard. The period now under consideration is not so remote but that the majority of this House can well remember it. The suspension of specie payments by the banks occurred in 1837; and the general depression and bankruptcy that pervaded every branch of business, and the large majority of business men, was such, that Congress found it necessary, in 1841, to pass a general bankrupt law, that the large number of useful, active business men, who had been carried into bankruptcy by that "irrepressible conflict" against labor, might be restored to position and usefulness.

There was no relief to the country, no improvement in commerce or manufactures, until the protective tariff of 1842 gave us a new impetus, and prosperity again shone upon us.

From 1843 to 1847, our exports and imports of specie were:

	<i>Imports.</i>	<i>Exports.</i>
1843.....	\$22,390,559	\$1,520,791
1844.....	5,890,429	5,454,214
1845.....	4,070,242	8,606,495
1846.....	3,777,732	3,905,268
1847.....	24,121,289	1,907,021
Total.....	60,190,251	21,393,792

Making the imports exceed the exports by \$38,796,459, or nearly three dollars imported for one exported.

The tariff of 1846 found the country in a high state of prosperity. Its baneful effects were not felt immediately, but, like the slow and sure poison, it has been quietly and regularly sapping the foundations of our prosperity, reducing the amount of our manufactures, increasing the amount of our importations, robbing us of our precious metals, and again re-

ducing us to a state of dependency, or rather despondency—I might say both. One evidence of the extent of this blight upon our prosperity is the fact that from 1848 to 1859, inclusive, twelve years, our exports of coin and bullion exceed the imports \$371,750,884, or an average of more than thirty million dollars per annum:

<i>Years ending 30th June.</i>	<i>Imported.</i>	<i>Exported.</i>	<i>Excess imported.</i>	<i>Excess exported.</i>
1848.....	\$6,360,224	\$15,841,616	—	\$9,481,392
1849.....	6,651,240	5,404,648	\$1,246,592	—
1850.....	4,628,792	7,522,904	—	2,894,202
1851.....	5,453,592	29,472,752	—	24,019,160
1852.....	5,505,044	42,674,135	—	37,169,091
1853.....	4,201,382	27,486,875	—	23,285,493
1854.....	6,958,184	41,436,456	—	34,478,272
1855.....	3,659,812	56,247,343	—	52,587,531
1856.....	4,207,632	45,745,485	—	41,537,853
1857.....	12,461,799	69,136,922	—	56,675,123
1858.....	19,274,496	52,633,147	—	33,358,651
1859.....	6,369,703	63,887,411	—	57,517,708
	85,731,900	457,489,714	1,246,592	373,004,476

Proving conclusively that under the operation of the protective policy of the tariff of 1842, specie was flowing into the country; and under the *ad valorem*, *progressive free trade* tariffs of 1846 and 1857, it has been rapidly flowing out, at an average of more than thirty million dollars per annum; the last year the excess of specie exported having reached the enormous sum of \$57,517,708, and this to pay for articles that we can and should manufacture at home.

Having shown that the operations of the present tariff are fast reducing the manufacturing interests of the country to a state of embarrassment and dependence, let us now for a few moments examine the remedy. The tariff of 1842 was admitted to be protective; it was in operation only four years, yet in that short space of time gave such an impetus to our prosperity and wealth, as no nation ever received in the same period. The main feature of that tariff was *specific* duties, which were abandoned altogether for the *ad valorem*s of the tariff of 1846. This was done against the protestations of the best men of our Government, and their prophecies that ruin and disaster would follow. The objections to *ad valorem* duties are two-fold:

1. Undervaluation, or fraud, by which an invoice is made out below the real value, and upon this *undervalue* the duty is calculated and paid, thereby defrauding the Government, and bringing ruin upon the honest home manufacturers who cannot contend against this fraudulent competition.

2. When protection is most needed, this *ad valorem* principle does not afford it. For instance, take iron as an example, and suppose that the average price for ten years was fifty dollars per ton. At the present *ad valorem* duty, twenty-four per cent., that would make the duty per ton \$12. The fluctuations of prices during that period might vary from a maximum of seventy dollars per ton to a minimum of thirty. The result would be, duty on seventy

dollars per ton, \$16.80; duty on thirty dollars per ton, \$7.20; showing, that when the price of foreign iron is high, from a home demand in Europe, or other prosperous causes, the duty is so high as not only to protect, but to amount almost to prohibition. When iron is depressed in value at home and abroad, when our manufacturers are struggling against adversity and endeavoring to keep their works in operation without any expectations of profit, but merely to furnish labor and food for the operatives who are employed by them, and dependent upon their labor for bread, where is the beneficent protection of the Government at such a time as this? It is, Mr. Chairman, a miserable mockery, although in strict conformity with the doctrine advocated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Under such depressions of price, the foreign article flows in upon us; our market is overstocked, and the home manufacturer is crushed out. When prices are high, and little or no duty is required, we have high duties; when prices are low, and protection necessary, the duties are totally inadequate.

This system of valuation is in fact a *bounty* in times of distress to the foreign manufacturer, and a *reward* for his competition with our own manufacturers. Why not adopt a system that will operate exactly the reverse of this, namely: afford protection when it is needed; and when the price is so high that protection is not necessary, let the foreign article come in free?

Such a scale my colleague, the able member of the Committee of Ways and Means, from Pennsylvania, will, I hope, introduce; and I trust the good sense of this House will lead to its adoption. Let us at any rate abandon this miserable *ad valorem* system, and restore specific duties.

In examining the discussion on the tariff, at the time the bill of 1846 was urged through the Senate with such indecent haste, I was struck with the remarks of Colonel Benton on this branch of the subject. Although he was opposed to the tariff of 1842, and voted for the tariff of 1846, yet he foresaw the evil of *ad valorem* duties, and said, as follows:

"In Great Britain it was found, upon experience, that *ad valorem*s, even to the limited extent there used, were so subject to fraud, and to frauds which could not be proved, that it was necessary to have recourse, in addition to all other penalties, to the extraordinary remedy of converting the Government into a merchant, and taking the goods on its own account."

Mr. Webster also said:

"Public sentiment is excited on this subject. I venture to say, that on two points public opinion is settled: first, as to the utter folly of the *ad valorem* principle in the imposition of duties—and I do not believe that there are at this moment five gentlemen in the Senate who, if left to their own choice, would prefer that mode, nor indeed can I persuade myself that there is a man in the whole Executive Government who, if the bill were now to come for the first time from the Treasury, would have it in its present form. All the industry of the land is against it; the manufacturers are against it; the importers are against it; the ship-owners are against it; no man cries, God save it! it is against the sentiment of the land. The great principle of a just discrimination in fa-

vor of such articles as the general interest requires, is the principle which commands the approbation of the American people. I here tell gentlemen we shall have henceforward no more *ad valorem* tariffs. We shall never go on the principle of horizontal tariff. This bill cannot stand. It will not stand. It is a house built upon the sand; and no intelligent man will think himself safe beneath its roof; it will fall on him, and crush him."

President Buchanan in his messages has also advocated specific duties; and during his term of service in the Senate, he always did so. He says:

"No statesman would advise that we should go on increasing the national debt to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government. This would be a most ruinous policy. In case of war, our credit must be our chief resource, at least for the first year; and this would be greatly impaired by having contracted a large debt in time of peace. It is our true policy to increase our revenue so as to equal our expenditures. It would be ruinous to continue to borrow. Besides, it may be proper to observe that the incidental protection thus afforded by a revenue tariff would, at the present moment, to some extent, increase the confidence of the manufacturing interests, and give a fresh impulse to our reviving business. To this surely no person will object.

"In regard to the mode of assessing and collecting duties under a strictly revenue tariff, I have long entertained, and often expressed, the opinion that sound policy requires this should be done by specific duties, in cases to which these can be properly applied. They are well adapted to commodities which are usually sold by weight or by measure, and which, from their nature, are of equal or of nearly equal value. Such, for example, are the articles of iron of different classes, raw sugar, and foreign wines and spirits.

"In my deliberate judgment, specific duties are the best, if not the only means of securing the revenue against false and fraudulent invoices; and such has been the practice adopted for this purpose by other commercial nations. Besides, specific duties would afford to the American manufacturer the incidental advantages to which he is fairly entitled under a revenue tariff. The present system is a sliding scale to his disadvantage. Under it, when prices are high, and business prosperous, the duties rise in amount when he least requires their aid. On the contrary, when prices fall, and he is struggling against adversity, the duties are diminished in the same proportion, greatly to his injury.

"Neither would there be danger that a higher rate of duty than that intended by Congress, could be levied in the form of specific duties. It would be easy to ascertain the average value of any imported article for a series of years, and, instead of subjecting it to an *ad valorem* duty at a certain rate per cent., to substitute in its place an equivalent specific duty.

"By such an arrangement the consumer would not be injured. It is true, he might have to pay a little more duty on a given article in one year; but if so, he would pay a little less in another; and in a series of years these would counterbalance each other, and amount to the same thing, so far as his interest is concerned. This inconvenience would be trifling when contrasted with the additional security thus afforded against frauds upon the revenue, in which every consumer is directly interested."

Believing, as he does, in the justice and propriety of specific duties, particularly as applied to the great staple of his own State—iron—it is exceedingly unfortunate that his *own* financial officer should be permitted, in a State paper, to produce an elaborate argument against it. The Democratic party endorse the doctrines of the Secretary of the Treasury as the true creed of the party; and we therefore have the anomaly of the President of the United States being opposed to the Administration on this question.

Mr. Chairman, the district I have the honor to represent on this floor is deeply interested in this subject. I have collected, from a late statistical work—Lesley on Iron—which was prepared with great care, and is considered

good authority, some interesting and startling facts.

The increase of population in the United States from 1840 to 1850 was thirty-six per cent.

Increase in domestic production of iron from 1846 to 1856 was but ten per cent., or less than one-third the ratio of increase of population.

The average annual importation of foreign iron was:

Under the tariff of 1842.....	77,328 tons.
Under the tariff of 1846.....	373,864 "

Average annual increase being.....296,536 "

or three hundred and eighty-three per cent. The increase in the import is more than ten times the increase in the population, and thirty-eight times the increase in the domestic production.

Product of rolling mills in the United States, 1856.

Pennsylvania.....	91 mills,	241,484 tons.
All other States.....	118 "	253,597 "
Total.....	209 "	498,081 "

The Pittsburg district contains twenty-five rolling mills, which produce annually about 100,000 tons of rolled and bar iron, sheet iron, nails, &c. In Lesley's work, before referred to, he places the product at 91,302 tons; other statistics that I have examined give the production thus: 3,212 tons boiler iron; 67,100 tons bar iron; 5,600 tons sheet iron; 20,000 tons nails. In converting the pig metal and blooms into bar iron, nails, &c.:

Number of men employed amount to annually.....	4,623
105,333 tons pig iron, equal to the annual labor of.....	5,266
27,267 tons blooms, " " " ".....	2,726
4,931 tons scrap iron, " " " ".....	400
6,187,515 bushels coal, " " " ".....	838
118,000 bushels coke, " " " ".....	18
5,040 tons fire clay, " " " ".....	20
2,095,000 tons fire brick, " " " ".....	63
9,258 tons ore, " " " ".....	60
Total number.....	14,014

Here you have more than fourteen thousand men employed in the production of bar and rolled iron, and the different items consumed by the rolling mills, in one Congressional district. Now, supposing these men to be the heads of families, or otherwise have persons dependent upon their labor for sustenance—say five each—and you have a population of seventy thousand and seventy, dependent upon and supported by this one branch of manufacture. All those persons are to be fed, clothed, reared, and educated—consuming the products of the soil, and thus giving the farmer a home market. The merchant, shopkeeper, mechanic, artisan, teacher, are all brought into requisition, stimulating every branch of business, and adding to the real wealth, industry, and prosperity, of the country.

The argument that protection increases the price of an article, and makes the consumer pay more for it, is plausible; but wherever any article has received the protection of the Gov-

ernment for a series of years, until capital and skill could be fairly embarked in its production, the result has always been a reduction of price, brought about by home competition. For instance, the article of nails requires no protection now, because the skill and ingenuity of our mechanics, fostered by former protection, now enable us to beat the world in the manufacture of that article. Assorted cut nails can now be purchased at about the price of common bar iron; say \$2.60 per one hundred pounds. This has been the result of protection and home competition. This fact of itself demonstrates the wisdom of a protective policy.

The policy of the English and French tariffs is to protect *labor*; and as the value of an article is increased by labor put upon it, they increase the duty, to protect that labor. This is wise and prudent; but the tariff of 1846 appeared to be especially devoted to the protection of foreign labor, as against home labor, and has, I think, with great propriety, been denominated the British tariff. Certain it is, that the report of the then Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. R. J. Walker, was highly applauded and published by authority of the British Government; and it was believed by many that the British Minister aided essentially its passage. Under its operation, the British manufacturers have prospered, whilst the reverse has been the case at home. For instance, whilst the duty on iron of all kinds—namely, bars, blooms, bolts, loops, pigs rods, slabs, or *other form*—was thirty per cent., we find *no increase* in the duty on manufactures of iron; and steel, in bars, cast, shear, or German, is placed at FIFTEEN PER CENT., or just one-half the amount of duty upon iron. Thus, instead of protecting labor against foreign competition, the discrimination is made, and made largely, against our own labor. With all these disadvantages, our manufacturers are struggling to supply our country with steel. Give them, as they should have, the fostering care of the Government, and before many years we will be able to supply ourselves with that important article.

The home competition which will spring up under proper protection will be a sure guaranty against any excess of price; and, as in the article of nails, the day may not be far distant when we will be able to compete with the world in the manufacture of steel. Let us, Mr. Chairman, by the encouragement of our own labor, increase the production of iron, steel, and all articles made from our own minerals, and not hereafter, as has been the case heretofore, have English railroad bars laid down in our own country, over the iron-ore beds and coal deposits that exist in such abundance. Let us remove *that* reproach from our country at any rate; and as the history of the world has developed the fact that the countries that encourage and sustain the manufacturing interests became great and wealthy, let us seek prosperity in that direction, and show our protection

of labor by increasing the duty upon all articles as their value is increased by labor put upon them.

Let us, in this particular, learn from the English and French tariffs; and I challenge any gentleman to show a single instance in either of them where the rate of duty has decreased upon any article as its value was increased by labor, as I have shown to be the case in the article of steel under our tariff. No, Mr. Chairman, you will find the case to be exactly the reverse, as a few examples will show. The following, from the English tariff, shows clearly that it is a protective one:

Silk :	
Raw, (free)	
Satin, plain	\$2.42 per lb.
Thrown, dyed	44 "
Figured or brocaded	3.50 "
Gauze, figured	6.60 "
Velvet, figured	6.60 "
Dresses	12.00 each
Tobacco :	
Unmanufactured	66 per lb
Snuff	1.32 "
Cigars	2.00 "

See also how the French tariff protects French labor:

Schedule showing the duties levied by the French on the raw material and on the manufactured article.

Brass :	
In pigs, bars, or blocks	\$5.50 per ton.
In plates, sheets, or rolled	102.85 "
Hammered	160.14 "
Wire, polished, (prohibited)	
Wire for cords for musical instruments	201.30 "
Cooking utensils, common	201.38 "
Fire cooking utensils	397.85 "
All other manufactures of brass, (prohibited.)	
Brimstone :	
Crude	2.79 "
Purified	10.20 "
Calf skins :	
Untanned	2.30 "
Tanned, (prohibited.)	
Copper :	
Ore	1.86 "
In blocks, bars, &c.	5.58 "
Rolled in sheets	102.93 "
Hammered	160.18 "
Wire	201.30 "
Manufacture, simply turned	201.30 "
Manufacture, simply fine	397.85 "
All other manufactures of copper, (prohibited.)	
Cottons :	
From French colonies, free.	
From foreign countries	64.80 "
Yarn, No. 141, and under	1,420.00 "
All other cotton threads, (prohibited.)	
All manufactures of cotton, except Nankeens, (prohibited.)	
Hair :	
Camel's, raw	2.03 "
Shawls	15.51 each.
Carpets	102.09 per ton.
Harness :	
Coarse pack saddles	9 each.
All other harness, (prohibited.)	
Hemp :	
In stalks, raw	74 per ton.
Hacked	16.29 "
Combed	30.55 "
Cordage	50.95 "
Hides :	
Raw, dry, or salted	8.33 "
Tanned for sole leather	150.37 "
Iron :	
Cast in blocks not weighing less than 500 pounds	14.25 "

Ore	46 per ton.
Purified cast iron	24.44 "
All other cast iron, (prohibited.)	
Forged in blocks, (prohibited.)	
Slabs and bars, according to size, from \$30.55 to	67.29 "
Sheet	81.50 "
Sheet, tinned	140.70 "
Wire	122.65 "
Leather :	
Raw hides	8.33 "
Sole	150.37 "
Boots, (prohibited.)	
Logwood :	
In sticks	11.16 "
Ground	40.76 "
Extracts of, (prohibited.)	
Marble :	
Crude	20.46 "
Sculptured, or otherwise worked	81.40 "
Silk :	
In cocoons	2.40 "
In carpets	599.00 "
Spermaceti :	
Raw	40.70 "
Pressed	51.10 "
Refined	150.00 "
Candles	432.00 "
Tallow :	
Raw	14.80 "
Candles	20.40 "
Tin :	
Ore	1.89 "
In bars (crude)	9.30 "
Beaten, or laminated	122.65 "
Pots	201.20 "
All other manufactures thereof, (prohibited.)	
Wool :	
Raw, 20 per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> .	
Combed, 30 per cent. <i>ad valorem</i> .	
Blankets	397.95 "
Carpets, half wool	468.16 "
Carpets, knotted on one side, face of linen	587.90 "
All other carpets, (prohibited.)	
Lace work	374.00 "
All other manufactures of wool, (prohibited.)	
Zinc :	
Fused into ingots	2.80 "
Drawn and laminated	102.00 "
Manufacture, (prohibited.)	

Let us therefore, Mr. Chairman, remodel the present tariff. Let us return to *specific* duties on all articles where it is at all practicable. Let us protect the products of our own country, the iron, coal, glass, steel, wool, salt, sugar, and the numerous articles that are the products of the soil, and of the skill of our mechanics and manufacturers. Let us improve our rivers and harbors, build one or more railroads to the Pacific, giving employment to thousands of laborers, binding our Union together with bands of *American Iron*. Let us give a homestead to every citizen who will become an actual settler upon the virgin soil of our Western States and Territories. Let us put down all sectional issues, strifes, and jealousies, and act as one great, happy, and independent nation or people. Let us spread and diffuse manufacturing skill and industry throughout all the States, North and South, so that we may rely more upon ourselves and less upon foreign nations, and we will soon find that sectional discord, dissension, and all thoughts of disunion, will disappear, and we will occupy the position among the nations of the earth that God and nature intended we should.