

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further questions to be put by any member of the committee?

Mr. EUSTIS. Do you think the amendment you propose will accomplish the object in view?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir. It would protect American railroads in the first place, and it would be the severest pressure we could put upon the Canadian Government. Its tendency would be to force her into a political union with the Government of the United States as the best possible means of protecting her local interests, and in that case her railroads would be necessarily subjected to the control of the Interstate Commerce act, just as our present railroads are. The Canadian railroads, as already stated, have no traffic to amount to anything except what they get from us, and the amendments I suggest would simply cut off that free and easy practice they now enjoy of crossing our border and picking the pockets of the American railroads, while the hands of the latter are tied by the Interstate Commerce act. The question with them would be, after the adoption of the amendments I have suggested, How shall we avoid their provisions? There is only one way, and that is to come in under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

Mr. EUSTIS. Suppose there is no duty on these cereals, how would your amendment affect it?

Mr. WILSON. I should not permit it anyhow. If my amendment is not broad enough to prohibit the running of sealed cars and carrying of freights from any point in the United States through Canada by rail or by water and rail, and redelivering it at any other point in the United States or for transshipment abroad, it should be made so. If it is not already so, it is easy enough to correct the language and make it broad enough to accomplish the object in view. My purpose was to cut off all railroad transit through Canada for freight except under the operations of the tariff laws. But I do not suggest any radical changes in the latter, because that would violate the fundamental principle of comity between nations.

Mr. HISCOCK. Anything that did not come within the tariff laws of the United States you would let go?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir; I would let that go.

Senator HISCOCK. Would not that cover about all the freight there is?

Mr. WILSON. I could not answer that question; but if it does, I would go a step further, and either prohibit all transit trade or lay a heavy tariff on such trade.

Mr. REAGAN. That which would go through and pay a duty would be uninterrupted. But the point of the amendment is, that it requires freight originating in the United States to keep within that territory until it gets to the sea-board and not allow it to go into Canada.

Mr. HISCOCK. It only provides, then, for such things as are dutiable?

Mr. WILSON. I have written it in that way: "And nothing in this act shall be construed to allow any common carrier to receive any freight in the United States to be carried in sealed cars or in bond by railroad through a foreign country to any other place in the United States *free of duty*, and all laws and regulations thereunder which have been construed to permit such practice are hereby repealed."

The CHAIRMAN. So that goods not dutiable could be carried, I suppose?

Mr. WILSON. My idea was that the duties levied by existing laws would cut them off entirely, but if the language is not broad enough I would make it so.

Mr. EUSTIS. That is the point I was getting at, whether you could accomplish the purpose in view by the amendment you propose.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not quite do it then?

Mr. WILSON. Then I propose to make it so that it shall absolutely prohibit the running of sealed cars from the United States, and the carrying of freight over the Canadian railroads to be redelivered into the United States.