

Equipment Ratio—Con.*

<i>Year</i>	<i>C.N.R.</i>	<i>C.P.R.</i>
1925..	19·93	18·21
1926..	19·08	18·67
1927..	18·87	19·57
1928..	17·92	18·97
1929..	19·34	18·90
1930..	19·84	16·68
1931..	21·91	14·11
1932..	19·77	14·06

These figures are fairly comparable from 1924 to 1929 but differ sharply after that date. Why?

(6) A newspaper article lately made this claim: "General expenses on the C.N.R. on a mileage basis are double the C.P.R. Does this difference exist—if so, why?"

"Are the accounts of General Expenses on a comparable basis on the two roads?"

"Are pensions treated in the same way in this account in both roads?"

"Is there any difference in accounting methods *re* taxes?"

Question 1: Is this change due to a decline in the relative volume of total business handled by the C.N.R.?

Answer: The relative proportions of total business handled by the all-inclusive Canadian National Railways System as compared with the Canadian Pacific System, including its Canadian rail subsidiaries for the years 1923-1933 inclusive, are as follows:—

<i>Year</i>	<i>C.N.R.</i>	<i>C.P.R.</i>
1923..	56·7	43·3
1924..	56·6	43·4
1925..	57·3	42·7
1926..	57·4	42·6
1927..	57·2	42·8
1928..	56·4	43·6
1929..	57·3	42·7
1930..	57·0	43·0
1931..	57·6	42·4
1932..	56·6	43·4
1933..	56·6	43·4

Question 2: Or to a relative increase in expenditures?

Answer: The relative proportions of railway operating expenses (with certain qualifications) for the Canadian National all inclusive system and for the Canadian Pacific System, including its Canadian rail subsidiaries for the years 1923 to 1933 inclusive, are as follows:—

<i>Year</i>	<i>C.N.R.</i>	<i>C.P.R.</i>
1923..	59·8	40·2
1924..	60·2	39·8
1925..	60·1	39·9
1926..	59·4	40·6
1927..	59·0	41·0
1928..	58·4	41·6
1929..	59·6	40·4
1930..	60·9	39·1
1931..	62·8	37·2
1932..	60·9	39·1
1933..	61·5	33·5