

Milton C. Work's Bridge Lesson is printed on the Editorial Page today.

Partly cloudy tonight and Tuesday; somewhat warmer tonight with lowest temperature 25 to 30.

MERGER IS NOT LEGAL, BIAS HINTED AT TRIAL OF CONTENTION FALL, DOHENY

Matson, Before Commission, Denies Petitioning Firm Is Utility.

JURISDICTION ATTACKED 'REVELRY' GETS NOTICE

Case Which Body Followed Is Cited.

Electric utility officials are not following the law in their attempt to merge the Indianapolis Light and Heat Company and the Merchants Heat and Light Company, Frederick E. Matson, representing the Chamber of Commerce, charged at the hearing on the merger this morning before the public service commission. The petitioner in the \$55,000,000 merger case, the Indianapolis Power and Light Company, has not commenced operation, has no assets or property and therefore is not a public utility within the meaning of the law, Matson declared.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

Cites Case

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Says They Are Identical

It was Matson's contention that the Flat Rock case is identical with the present case in legal import.

The entire commission heard arguments this morning on a motion made by Matson Friday attacking jurisdiction of the commission. The arguments continued this afternoon.

If the commission overrules the jurisdiction motion, it will take up petitions of the Chamber of Commerce, Federation of Civic Clubs, and large power users that the merger hearing be continued to allow those opposed to prepare their cases.

Samuel O. Dowden, representing the civic federation, also argued in favor of Matson's contention. William Bosson, representing taxpayers, and Charles Mendenhall, in behalf of the city, were to present arguments.

(Turn to Page II)

GIVES 'PEACHES' REDUCED ALIMONY

Court Allows \$300 a Week—Asked \$4,000 Monthly.

By United Press WHITE PLAINS, N. Y., Nov. 22.—Mrs. Frances Heenan Browning was awarded \$300 a week alimony and \$8,500 counsel fees by Justice Morschauer in Supreme Court today in the suit for separation filed against her by Edward W. Browning, wealthy real estate man, and her counter-suit.

Browning's suit and the counter-suit of his wife have been consolidated so the case may be tried together.

Browning's young wife, the former "Peaches" Heenan, asked \$4,000 a month alimony and \$25,000 counsel fees.

She said her husband had an income of \$300,000 a year and owned real estate worth \$10,000,000.

Justice Morschauer said the suit probably would be heard in January.

COLDEST THIS SEASON

18 Mark Today—Should Be Warmer Tonight and Tuesday.

After reaching 18 degrees, lowest temperature of the season, at 7 a.m. today, the mercury is due to rebound a bit tonight, and register between 25 and 30, according to the United States Weather Bureau. With a warm sun overhead the temperature climbed to 35 at noon.

Tuesday will see somewhat warmer and partly cloudy weather, under the prediction, but there is no indication of decidedly higher temperature.

PUBLISHER FALLS DEAD

Apoplexy Ends Life of C. P. J. Mooney at Memphis, Tenn.

MEMPHIS, Tenn., Nov. 20.—C. P. J. Mooney, publisher of the Memphis Commercial-Appeal, dropped dead here today. Death was due to apoplexy.

Mooney went to his office this morning apparently in good health and followed his usual morning routine. Shortly before noon he complained of feeling badly and went into his private office, where he was stricken and died before medical aid could be called. He was 61 years old.

He was president and managing editor of the Commercial Publishing Company and was one of the most widely known newspaper men in the South.

Recently Mooney announced he would start an afternoon edition of the Commercial-Appeal. He had been working on plans for this new edition, and it is believed that strain and overwork caused his death today.

BIAS HINTED AT TRIAL OF CONTENTION FALL, DOHENY

Defense Asks Prospective Jurors About Political and Religious Points.

'REVELRY' GETS NOTICE

Questions Relate to 'Oil Scandal' Book.

Electric utility officials are not following the law in their attempt to merge the Indianapolis Light and Heat Company and the Merchants Heat and Light Company, Frederick E. Matson, representing the Chamber of Commerce, charged at the hearing on the merger this morning before the public service commission.

The petitioner in the \$55,000,000 merger case, the Indianapolis Power and Light Company, has not commenced operation, has no assets or property and therefore is not a public utility within the meaning of the law, Matson declared.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to supply light, heat and power does not make it a public utility and that therefore the public service commission had no jurisdiction.

Commissioners John W. McCordle, Samuel M. Artman, Frank Wempler and Oscar Ratts, following the ruling of Lesh on the Flat Rock case, denied the petition for lack of jurisdiction.

Therefore the commission has no jurisdiction to authorize the merger, he asserted.

In support of his contention, Matson cited the case of the Flat Rock Hydro-Electric Company decided by the commission in 1924.

Attorney General U. S. Lesh at that time ruled that the mere incorporation of a company promising to