

Mr. GORDON: I will be glad to provide you with that if you would like me to put it on the record.

Mr. HAHN: Yes, I wish you would.

Mr. GORDON: Just so that I understand you, you wish to have the total tonnage hauled in each of these past five years and also the amount of grain tonnage hauled in those same five years.

Mr. HAHN: Yes, that is right.

Mr. GORDON: And perhaps the percentage.

Mr. HAHN: And the net profit—which is in the report now—that is the deficit or the surplus.

Mr. GORDON: For the system?

Mr. HAHN: Yes—for the system.

The CHAIRMAN: Well of course that is already on the record—the question of the profit position.

Mr. HAHN: Yes I realize that, but we have not got the three together.

The CHAIRMAN: It seems to me we are mixing up a number of different matters.

Mr. JOHNSTON (*Bow River*): Pretty important ones.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes but the way the question is being put, it seems to suggest that there is a connection in the mind of the witness, necessarily a connection between the items which are covered in the statement.

Mr. HAHN: I do have some other questions not relative to this matter.

Mr. BYRNE: Mr. Chairman, I have some questions relative to this.

The CHAIRMAN: All right, Mr. Byrne, we will hear your question.

Mr. BYRNE: In paragraph 5 the report states that the "Canadian National carried 99 million tons of revenue freight an average distance of 423 miles" and then in the next sentence it says "revenue ton miles, the product of these two factors, rose by 17.5 per cent to a new high". Now I was going to ask the actual tonnage increase but I presume that the revenue ton miles have been increased by 17.5 per cent?

Mr. GORDON: You will find that on page 36, I think, the figures you are talking about. Revenue ton miles, I might just explain to you, we regard it as being the best measure of production of the railway because they take into account the distance. That is why we always refer to it. Revenue ton miles is the tonnage we handle multiplied by the respective miles it moved. And, if you will look at page 37 you will see the revenue ton miles are shown at 41 million. You could call it 42 million but in exact figures it is 41,935,388 as against 35,677,183 in the previous year. There is your comparison I think.

Mr. BYRNE: I was just wondering if there was anything significant in this other figure for grain tonnage as increased by 37 per cent. The overall revenue ton miles has increased by 17.5 per cent and yet the average return has dropped from 1.51 to 1.46.

Mr. GORDON: Yes that is right that simply means that the quality of the tonnage, the composition, or the mix of the traffic has been affected by the rise in the lower value traffic and the reduction of the higher value traffic. You will see that average figure drop in our revenues there which means that the lower price traffic, the big volume traffic, and specifically in this case wheat, showed an increase on the average of the system and that proves, as I am saying, that the average return from handling wheat is much less than it is from handling other tonnage. This is why it pulls the average down.