

Justices concurring: McKenna, Holmes, Hughes, Van Devanter, Lamar, White, C.J.
Justice dissenting: Lurton

Accord: Southern Ry. v. Reid & Beam, 222 U.S. 444 (1912).

Accord: Southern Ry. v. Burlington Lumber Co., 225 U.S. 99 (1912).

25. *Chicago, R. I. & P. Ry. v. Hardwick Elevator Co.*, 226 U.S. 426 (1913).

Congress, by enactment of the Hepburn Act (34 Stat. 584 (1906)) having preempted the field of regulation pertaining to the duty of carriers to deliver cars in interstate commerce, a Minnesota Reciprocal Demurrage Law imposing like regulations was void.

26. *Accord: St. Louis, I. Mt. & S. Ry. v. Edwards*, 227 U.S. 265 (1913).

Arkansas Demurrage Law of 1907 penalizing carriers for failure to notify consignees of arrival of shipments was similarly held void.

27. *Adams Express Co. v. Croninger*, 226 U.S. 491 (1913).

A Kentucky law which precluded an interstate carrier from contracting to limit its liability to an agreed or declared value was void as conflicting with the Carmack Amendment, which preempted the field of regulation pertaining to the liability of interstate carriers for loss and damage to interstate shipments.

28. *Accord: Chicago, B. & Q. Ry. v. Miller*, 226 U.S. 513 (1913).

An Iowa law and a provision of the Nebraska Constitution were held to have been superseded by the Carmack Amendment.

29. *Accord: Chicago, St. P., M. & O. Ry. v. Latta*, 226 U.S. 519 (1913).

A Nebraska constitutional provision was held to have been superseded by the Carmack Amendment.

30. *McDermott v. Wisconsin*, 228 U.S. 115 (1913).

A Wisconsin food labeling law was invalid insofar as it exacted labeling requirements, as to articles in interstate commerce, that conflicted with those required under the Federal Pure Food and Drug Act, imposed an invalid burden on interstate commerce.

31. *Missouri, K. & T. Ry. v. Harriman Bros.*, 227 U.S. 657 (1913).

Because the federal Carmack Amendment preempted the field of regulation pertaining to determination of an interstate railroad's liability for loss or damages to goods in transit, Texas law outlawing contractual stipulations specifying a period of limitations for filing of claims by a shipper which was briefer than that sanctioned by the federal law was unenforceable.

Justices concurring: Lurton, McKenna, Holmes, Hughes (separately), Day, Van Devanter, Lamar, White, C.J.