



ESTABLISHED IN APRIL, 1856.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY BY THE RAILROAD GAZETTE AT 83 FULTON STREET, NEW YORK
BRANCH OFFICES AT 375 OLD COLONY BUILDING, CHICAGO, AND QUEEN ANNE'S CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER LONDON

EDITORIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE BRITISH AND EASTERN CONTINENTS edition of the Railroad Gazette is published each Friday at Queen Anne's Chambers, Westminster, London. It consists of most of the reading pages and all of the advertisement pages of the Railroad Gazette, together with additional British and foreign matter, and is issued under the name *Transport and Railroad Gazette*.

CONTRIBUTIONS.—Subscribers and others will materially assist in making our news accurate and complete if they will send early information of events which take place under their observation. Discussions of subjects pertaining to all departments of railroad business by men practically acquainted with them are especially desired.

ADVERTISEMENTS.—We wish it distinctly understood that we will entertain no proposition to publish anything in this journal for pay, EXCEPT IN THE ADVERTISING COLUMNS. We give in our editorial columns OUR OWN opinions, and these only, and in our news columns present only such matter as we consider interesting and important to our readers. Those who wish to recommend their inventions, machinery, supplies, financial schemes, etc., to our readers, can do so fully in our advertising columns, but it is useless to ask us to recommend them editorially either for money or in consideration of advertising patronage.

VOL. XXXVIII, No. 21.

FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1905.

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL:		MISCELLANEOUS:	
The Northern Pacific Board.....	571	Railroad Telegraph Superintendents	576
Armour Testimony Before the Senate Committee	571	The Cost of Locomotive Operation	576
British Standard Rail Sections	572	Railroad Decisions in April	577
The Differential Arbitration	572	Railroad Accounting	578
April Accidents	573	Storage Battery for Track Circuits	582
Railroad Stockholders	574	New Locomotives for Baltimore & Ohio	586
High-Capacity Cars in Russia	574	Railway Signal Association	586
New Publications	574	The Yetman Transmitting Typewriter	587
Trade Catalogues	574, G. N. S. 170	Report of the Illinois Railroad & Warehouse Commission	588
ILLUSTRATED:		Kansas Railroad Law	589
The Mississippi River Bridge at Thebes ..	578	Train Accidents in the U. S. in April	590
Acceleration Tests of Steam and Electric Locomotives	584	Philippine Railroads	592
English Gasoline Locomotives	588	GENERAL NEWS SECTION:	
Graphic Method of Calculating Overhaul ..	592	Notes	169
CONTRIBUTIONS:		Meetings and Announcements	171
Richey's Handbook	574	Personal	172
The Function of the Electric Railway	575	Elections and Appointments	172
Car Wheel Tests	575	Locomotive Building	173
Proposed Alliance: "Tech" with Harvard ..	575	Car Building	173
		Bridge Building	173
		Railroad Construction	174
		Railroad Corporation News	176

The abandonment of the community of interest principle, as suggested in a recent editorial in the *Railroad Gazette*, has received perhaps the most striking illustration possible in the changes made last week in the Northern Pacific directorate, which are noted in another column. It will be remembered that at the time of the compromise between the Hill and Harriman parties shortly after the Northern Pacific corner and before the Northern Securities Company was formed, the task of so making up the directorate of the Northern Pacific that all parties interested should be given adequate representation was assigned to Mr. J. P. Morgan. As announced by him on July 18, 1901, five members of the Northern Pacific board, who represented ownership of the property, retired and their places were filled by James J. Hill, president of the Great Northern; E. H. Harriman, chairman of the Executive Committee of the Union Pacific; William Rockefeller, director of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul; H. McKay Twombly, director of the Chicago & North-Western, and Samuel Rea, vice-president of the Pennsylvania. The following express statement of the purpose of these selections was made by Mr. Morgan in his letter nominating the board: "Every important interest will have its representative, who will be brought into close touch with the situation as a whole, and there should be no difficulty in reaching a conclusion that will be fair and just to all concerned and tend to the establishment of permanent harmony among the different lines." The plan

was to remove the Northern Pacific as a disturbing element in the trans-continental situation by giving representation to those interested in the policy of the road as distinguished from those interested in its ownership. Mr. Hill and Mr. Harriman, although large owners, were put on the board particularly because they were at the head of competing trans-continental lines. Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Twombly stood for the granger lines, and each of them in addition represented indirectly the railroad investment of the Rockefeller and Vanderbilt interests. Mr. Rea represented the Pennsylvania and its controlled lines. Already on the board were Samuel Spencer, president of the Southern; Eben B. Thomas, president of the Lehigh Valley, and James Stillman, director, among other roads, of the Baltimore & Ohio, Chicago & Alton and Delaware, Lackawanna & Western. Directly or indirectly, the management of Northern Pacific represented control of a large majority of the country's railroad mileage. In the report of the Industrial Commission, the election of this board was pointed out as "the clearest instance of this new policy (community of interest) in railroad management." The theory is familiar enough, that by the representation of outside interests on a railroad's board, not only would the road itself be well operated because of the large railroad experience of the type of men selected, but, what was more important to the railroad world, would be removed as a potential disturber of the peace. In spite of the complication of Northern Pa-

cific's history by its connection with the Northern Securities Company, it is hard to see in the retirement from the board of Messrs. Harriman, Rockefeller, Stillman, Twombly, Rea, Spencer and Thomas and their replacement by men who are all of them owners or direct representatives of the owners of Northern Pacific, anything else but an open admission that community of interest is a failure. To-day Mr. Harriman represents every trans-continental line in the United States, except the Great Northern and Northern Pacific. Mr. Stillman and Mr. Rockefeller are his allies, and the latter, as at the time of his appointment to the Northern Pacific board, is a director of the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, which is actively threatening to become a trans-continental line by building to a Great Northern-Northern Pacific port. As a whole, the group of retiring members stand for, if anything, a stronger and more representative control of the country's railroad mileage than they did in 1901. These men are the very ones who in that year were selected to establish "permanent harmony among the different lines." The new directors are the owners of the property. There could hardly be a more complete reversal of the argument on which in 1901 Mr. Morgan made his selection. Apparently both he and Mr. Hill have had it proved to their satisfaction that a railroad can be run better for all concerned by men who directly represent its owners than by very practical railroad men from other interested lines.

ARMOUR TESTIMONY BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE.

President George P. Robbins, of the Armour Car Lines Company, testified before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce May 16 that the company had twenty or thirty exclusive contracts with railroads for transportation of fruit, and he acknowledged a monopoly of that traffic in certain localities, specifically in parts of the West and South. He admitted that wherever these exclusive contracts applied producers and shippers of fruit had to accept the rates made by the Armours. He maintained stoutly that his company was a private one, and was not subject to the interstate commerce laws, and did not want to be. He testified that the Armours have 200 articles classified as packing-house products, which are carried in Armour cars. Mr. Robbins declined to testify regarding the earnings of the car lines. He denied that the Armours were interested in any of the fruit companies in California or that they had a monopoly of the transportation of California fruit, but acknowledged that his company had a monopoly of fruit transportation in the Pere Marquette region and in Georgia and Florida. The Armours had exclusive contracts with all the railroads in the South Atlantic coast states, in East Tennessee, on certain roads in Missouri and Arkansas, and on the Southern Pacific. The Santa Fe was a competing line in the fruit business in California.

In this clear and frank statement Mr. Robbins practically threw down the gauntlet for Congress. He said that all other shippers got the same rates in the Armour cars that the Armours did, but he neglected to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the absurd charges for icing, etc., con-