

U. N. R., Jan. 26, 1920.

SPEECH
OF
HON. JUSTIN S. MORRILL.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont, said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am quite aware that any one who undertakes to discuss this grave matter of the reciprocity treaty with the Canadas ought to feel some confidence that he can shed some little light upon the subject; but I am ready to confess that I expect the chief interest in the subject will be in the change made from the topic that has so long been under discussion in the Senate. I ask the Secretary to read the two first resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Vermont.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives. That, having an intelligent regard for the best interests of Vermont, as well as the whole country, it is the duty of our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their influence against the consummation of any treaty relating to reciprocity in trade with the Dominion of Canada, and to insist that the subject of trade and commercial intercourse with Canada, as well as with all other foreign countries, is not a proper matter of treaty stipulation, but belongs to Congress, and should be wisely regulated by judicious legislation.

Resolved. That in common with the Canadian people we earnestly desire and hope for the early completion of the ship-canal connecting the waters of the Saint Lawrence and Hudson Rivers with Lake Champlain, as forming an important line of communication between the great cities on the Atlantic sea-board and the grain and lumber regions of Canada and the Northwest, and in this work we invite the co-operation respectively of the governments of the Dominion of Canada and the United States.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont. These resolutions being public resolutions, and the proposal for the treaty with the Canadian Dominion having been made public, or the injunction of secrecy removed from it and from all the papers in relation thereto, I feel that I shall not transcend the proprieties of the occasion in discussing the proposal for a reciprocity treaty with Canada. I shall in the first part of my remarks refer to the effects that such a treaty would have upon the question of annexation, then to the fact that we have no revenue to spare, to the effect that it will have upon our national power if we should agree to a treaty that would bind us to keep the peace for twenty-four years. Then I shall endeavor to discuss the constitutional question, so far as it relates to the right of Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States and with the Indian tribes," and the power of the President and Senate to interfere with the prerogative of the House of Representatives to originate revenue bills. I shall then refer to the effect it will have upon the agricultural interests of this country, the fisheries, manufactures, and smuggling; and from all of these points I hope to be able to show that the treaty would be a very bad bargain.