

Generally, regulation of a utility's service to commercial customers attracts less scrutiny²¹¹ than do regulations intended to facilitate the operations of a competitor,²¹² and governmental power to regulate in the interest of safety has long been conceded.²¹³ Requirements for service having no substantial relation to a utility's regulated function, however, have been voided, such as requiring railroads to maintain scales to facilitate trading in cattle, or prohibiting letting down an unoccupied upper berth on a rail car while the lower berth was occupied.²¹⁴

Imposition of Statutory Liabilities and Penalties Upon Common Carriers.—Legislators have considerable latitude to impose legal burdens upon common carriers, as long as the carriers are not

²¹¹ Due process is not denied when two carriers, who wholly own and dominate a small connecting railroad, are prohibited from exacting higher charges from shippers accepting delivery over said connecting road than are collected from shippers taking delivery at the terminals of said carriers. *Chicago, M. & St. P. Ry. v. Minneapolis Civic Ass'n*, 247 U.S. 490 (1918). Nor are railroads denied due process when they are forbidden to exact a greater charge for a shorter distance than for a longer distance. *Louisville & Nashville R.R. v. Kentucky*, 183 U.S. 503, 512 (1902); *Missouri Pacific Ry. v. McGrew Coal Co.*, 244 U.S. 191 (1917). Nor is it "unreasonable" or "arbitrary" to require a railroad to desist from demanding advance payment on merchandise received from one carrier while it accepts merchandise of the same character at the same point from another carrier without such prepayment. *Wadley Southern Ry. v. Georgia*, 235 U.S. 651 (1915).

²¹² Although a carrier is under a duty to accept goods tendered at its station, it cannot be required, upon payment simply for the service of carriage, to accept cars offered at an arbitrary connection point near its terminus by a competing road seeking to reach and use the former's terminal facilities. Nor may a carrier be required to deliver its cars to connecting carriers without adequate protection from loss or undue detention or compensation for their use. *Louisville & Nashville R.R. v. Stock Yards Co.*, 212 U.S. 132 (1909). But a carrier may be compelled to interchange its freight cars with other carriers under reasonable terms, *Michigan Cent. R.R. v. Michigan R.R. Comm'n*, 236 U.S. 615 (1915), and to accept cars already loaded and in suitable condition for reshipment over its lines to points within the state. *Chicago, M. & St. P. Ry. v. Iowa*, 233 U.S. 334 (1914).

²¹³ The following cases all concern the operation of railroads: *Railroad Co. v. Richmond*, 96 U.S. 521 (1878) (prohibition against operation on certain streets); *Atlantic Coast Line R.R. v. Goldsboro*, 232 U.S. 548 (1914) (restrictions on speed and operations in business sections); *Great Northern Ry. v. Minnesota ex rel. Clara City*, 246 U.S. 434 (1918) (restrictions on speed and operations in business section); *Denver & R.G. R.R. v. Denver*, 250 U.S. 241 (1919) (or removal of a track crossing at a thoroughfare); *Nashville, C. & St. L. Ry. v. White*, 278 U.S. 456 (1929) (compelling the presence of a flagman at a crossing notwithstanding that automatic devices might be cheaper and better); *Nashville, C. & St. L. Ry. v. Alabama*, 128 U.S. 96 (1888) (compulsory examination of employees for color blindness); *Chicago, R.I. & P. Ry. v. Arkansas*, 219 U.S. 453 (1911) (full crews on certain trains); *St. Louis I. Mt. & So. Ry. v. Arkansas*, 240 U.S. 518 (1916) (same); *Missouri Pacific R.R. v. Norwood*, 283 U.S. 249 (1931) (same); *Firemen v. Chicago, R.I. & P.R.R.*, 393 U.S. 129 (1968) (same); *Atlantic Coast Line R.R. v. Georgia*, 234 U.S. 280 (1914) (specification of a type of locomotive headlight); *Erie R.R. v. Solomon*, 237 U.S. 427 (1915) (safety appliance regulations); *New York, N.H. & H. R.R. v. New York*, 165 U.S. 628 (1897) (prohibition on the heating of passenger cars from stoves or furnaces inside or suspended from the cars).

²¹⁴ *Chicago, M. & St. P. R.R. v. Wisconsin*, 238 U.S. 491 (1915).