

Denver Gas and Electric Company Reorganization.

Vice-President and General Manager Frank W. Frueauff, of the Denver Gas and Electric Company, has arranged for a reorganization of the company. He confirms the already published statement that there will be a \$25,000,000 bond issue this fall for the purpose of taking all the underlying and subsidiary companies of the Denver Gas and Electric Company into the new corporation. These underlying companies include the Lacombe Lighting Company, the Denver Highlands Electric Company, and the Denver Consolidated Gas Company.

Prior to the reorganization, lien bonds of the Denver Gas and Electric Company to the amount of \$452,000 will be called in.

Reorganization plans also include an increase in capital stock from \$3,500,000 to \$10,000,000, and a stock dividend which will give shareholders in the present company about three-and-one-third shares in the new company for their old stock.

The first use of the new bonds, which will be secured by a general mortgage and all the rights and properties of the company, will be used to retire such former bond issues as can be legally accomplished.

There are outstanding now \$250,000 of seven per cent interest notes, due in 1910; prior lien bonds of the Denver Gas and Electric Company amounting to \$458,000, bearing six per cent, and due in 1918; Denver Consolidated Gas bonds amounting to \$936,600, bearing six per cent, and due in 1911; general mortgage bonds amounting to \$5,691,000, bearing five per cent interest and due in 1849.

The 1911 bonds cannot be called until due.

A portion of the new bond issue will also be set aside to carry forward about \$2,500,000 worth of improvements and extensions.

St. Paul Electrification Plans.

The Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, it is learned, has temporarily given up its plan to electrify fifty miles of its Pacific Coast extension, including the tunnel through the mountains.

It has been found that one of the water-power stations proposed by the road would not be sufficient to supply power the year around, and the management does not care at this time to undertake the construction of two waterpower plants. Later on, it is expected, the use of electric power will be resorted to in order to in-

crease the efficiency of the mountain section of the line.

An Interesting Freight Classification and Rate Decision.

The Interstate Commerce Commission at Washington, D. C., has handed down its decision in the complaint of the Otis Elevator Company against the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company and others, which was filed on December 1, 1908, but also involved a complaint offered informally to the Commission in 1907. In the last case the company shipped from Yonkers, N. Y., to San Francisco, Cal., a carload of electrical hoisting machinery and elevator controllers, weighing an aggregate of 35,500 pounds. The originating carrier was the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad Company and the delivering line the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway. The initial carrier billed the entire shipment under Class A at a rate of \$1.40 per hundred pounds, but when the shipment arrived at its destination the delivering carrier compelled the complainant to pay a rate of \$1.40 on the hoisting machinery, which weighed 33,250 pounds, and \$3 per 100 pounds on the elevator controllers, which weighed 1,980 pounds, the latter being the first-class rate on less-than-carload shipments of electrical appliances and supplies not otherwise specified, and when shipped in boxes or barrels. The complainant alleged that the Class A rate of \$1.40 per 100 pounds should have been applied also to the elevator controllers, as they were parts of the hoisting machinery and were shipped therewith, and reparation was asked for the difference.

The other case involved similar shipments, but in that case the hoisting machinery weighed 43,200 pounds and the elevator controllers 2,685 pounds. This shipment was delivered by the Southern Pacific.

The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe asserted that the lawful tariff rate was applied to the shipment, while the New York Central & Hudson River Railroad and the Southern Pacific agree that the elevator controllers were parts of the hoisting machinery and were entitled to the same rate.

Western Classification No. 41, effective October 1, 1906, and in force on the date of the shipment involved in the latter case, names Class A rate on hoisting machines, freight and passenger, s. u. or k. d., also parts thereof as named and parts, n. o. s., straight or mixed carloads,

weight to be a minimum of 24,000 pounds. Western Classification No. 42, effective April 1, 1907, and under which the first shipment moved, carried the same provision. The classifications referred to on the dates of the respective shipments involved rated electrical controllers and parts thereof in carloads (subject to Rule 21-B), as Class A. Rule 21-B of the classification is as follows:

"The carload ratings shown in the classification for articles subject to Rule 21-B will not apply to straight carloads of the articles named. In such case the amounts of the articles so designated which may be included shall not exceed 33½ per cent of the minimum weight provided for the mixed carload."

These classifications at the time of said shipments rated electrical appliances and supplies in less than carloads, n. o. s., in boxes or barrels, as first class.

Rule 21-B applies to this case as far as the weight of the shipments is concerned if there is any provision for the mixing of hoisting machines with elevator controllers. It is the opinion of the Commission that the mixture was provided for in the provisions of Classifications 41 and 42, relating to the rating of hoisting machinery and parts thereof. The following provision is also found therein:

"Dynamos and motors forming an integral part of machinery may take the same rating as the machines of which they form a part."

The hoisting machinery comes under the general heading of machinery, and if dynamos and motors form an integral part of any kind of machinery, they certainly would form a part of electrical hoisting machinery. And if dynamos and motors form an integral part of electrical hoisting machinery it necessarily follows that electrical controllers are an integral part of hoisting machinery because they all have to do with generating, applying, and controlling the electrical current.

Therefore, the elevator controllers involved in these cases were part of the hoisting machines with which they were shipped, and under the classification could have been shipped in mixed carloads with elevators or hoisting machinery.

From the record it is the opinion of the Commission that the rate which should have applied to the total weight of each shipment was \$1.40 per 100 pounds, and that, therefore, complainant is entitled to the reparation asked for with interest, and an order has been made.—A. F. T.