

# REVIEW OF THE ROSS REPORT

Engineer Shows How Musquash Power Through Civic Distribution Would Cut Present Prices in Half From First Year and Mean Greater Reduction Later On—Exhaustive Analysis of the Ross Report.

(BY HERBERT PHILLIPS)

Part II. (Continued.)

TABLE "D"

Mr. Ross' table D recites the total capital investment that may be required to install a new distributing plant complete. The second item on this account is the cost of a transmission line from the receiving station to the centre of the city. The portion of this line between the station and the boundary of St. John is provided for in the commission's estimates as part of their transmission cost and we must therefore adjust this item accordingly.

The cost of street lighting equipment now that we have analyzed the Ontario plans, also needs an adjustment. It is seen that at Windsor, a town of only about 32,000 population, no less than \$219,393.18 has been spent for ornamental equipment on the streets. We are certainly not in that class and it will therefore be safer to eliminate this town altogether as far as computing this item is concerned.

Taking the other three towns, with a total population of 160,402, and the cost of regular street equipment to be \$144,883.41, and for ornamental equipment \$45,442.92; therefore on the basis of population our expense under this head should be about:

Regular street light equipment.....\$44,000  
Ornamental equipment.....14,000

Total.....\$58,000

STEAM STATION.

Examination of Mr. Ross' argument in favor of an auxiliary steam plant makes it plain that if his economic argument is good, and should such a plant be used to "sustain" the output of the water power plant at a higher figure than the commission would dare to attempt if it would be the business of the commission to build it, it evidently can be sold to place in our estimates of capital cost of distribution. Omitting the steam plant, then, and substituting our corrected values we have:

TABLE D.1.  
Capital cost distribution lines, apparatus and buildings.....\$706,688.07  
One and a half miles of transmission line.....15,000.00  
Chargable to light and power.....\$721,688.07  
Street lighting equipment.....85,000.00  
Total capital investment.....\$779,688.07

TABLE "E"

A Depreciation.  
This statement sets out in detail the cost of a steam plant. It does not, now, enter into our estimates and yet to comprehend the report, as a whole, it must be studied.

I must confess to perplexity in glibly following the plan of the engineer. "It will also enable the city to accumulate a fund."

TABLE F.1.  
Operating Costs, 1920.  
Sub-station operation.....\$4,402.04  
Sub-station maintenance.....426.66  
Dist. system, oper. and mtc.....3,703.54  
Line trans., maintenance.....513.04  
Consumers' premises, expenses.....321.10  
Meter maintenance.....4,207.07  
Street lighting system.....7,481.18  
Promotion of business.....2,684.93  
Billing and collecting.....3,356.03  
General office sal. and exp.....5,629.11  
Undistributed exps.....5,801.18

TABLE F.2.  
Operating Costs Per Customer.  
Calculated From Above Table.  
Sub-station operation.....1.34  
Sub-station maintenance......32  
Distributing system oper. and maintenance......76  
Line transformers, maintenance......29  
Consumers' premises, expenses......23  
Promotion of business......23  
Billing and collecting......128  
Meter maintenance......74  
General office salaries and expense, 122

TABLE F.3.  
Probable Operating Costs of St. John System.  
Sub-station operation.....\$11,915.38  
Sub-station maintenance.....2,545.44  
Distribution system operation and maintenance.....6,787.92  
Line transformers maintenance.....2,578.68  
Consumers' premises, expenses.....2,756.32  
Promotion of business.....2,046.16  
Billing and collecting.....11,881.76  
Meter maintenance.....6,680.08  
General office salary and expense.....10,848.24  
Total.....\$57,709.08

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

RHEUMATISM vs. T.R.C.'s

Lumbago, Neuritis, Sciatica  
Have you given up? Have you resigned yourself to that old, gnawing pain that nothing seems to relieve? Do you think because you can't go to Hot Springs or take some expensive treatment that you have no other alternative? We have many cases considered hopeless, tried every thing, baths, serums, electricity, who found recovery in using T.R.C.'s (Templeton's Rheumatic Capsules). We have thousands of letters that prove beyond doubt T.R.C.'s to be the most practical and successful Rheumatic remedy sold. At drug stores, \$1.00 per box. For Free Trial write to Tem.

Wasson's, Ross' and Mahoney's Dr. Stores. Perth by Regal Pharmacy.

lie at least as much within the realm of the merchant or manufacturer. From a market condition, such as seems to have been laid out for Mr. Ross, no very cheerful results could possibly be expected.

In the above table of probable cost I have confined consideration to the purchase of 10,000,000 k.w.h. per year so as to remain in line with Mr. Ross. In view of the expense of the unit cost, the high unit cost is mainly due to the relatively small volume of power available, the reason why no attempt was made to figure on 15,000,000 k.w.h. or 21,000,000 k.w.h. is, at first, obscure. On reaching Table "J" however, it appears that either the engineer has been laboring within an arbitrary limit or has given us credit for sufficient intelligence to dig the matter out for ourselves, because this Table "J" in a large measure confirms in brief metre the results I have so painfully sought to bring out.

TABLE "G"

This table expounds the manner in which the N. B. Commission's price is arrived at. It does not concern our present estimate in any way save to suggest that if it could be demonstrated that a steam plant was desirable on any grounds whatsoever its cost would have to be applied here and cover the gross output of the plant. In this case, and taking Mr. Ross' figures as they stand, it would mean an increased price of something less than four-tenths of a cent per k.w.h. even if the capacity of the plant remained as it is, whilst, practically, since the commission would be able to phase the product of a normal year instead of the product of the dry year without in any way increasing the cost at Musquash, therefore the probable additional cost to St. John would not exceed one-quarter of a cent per k.w.h. instead of 1.64c as the report suggests.

TABLE "H"

This is a projected balance sheet of the first four years' operation of the plant. It brings out that even placing the average cost of power at 1.20c per k.w.h. at the end of the four years we should be no less than \$367,018 in debt. To this should be added \$113,000 due to the commission, made up of three years at \$40,000, less \$7,000 which Mr. Ross assumes on this basis in the fourth year, so that our total loss, according to Mr. Ross' computation will be \$480,000.

TABLE "I"

This statement recites the results obtained by (a) Assuming standing charges of \$114,741 when the H.E.P. records on which it is based are used; (b) Provision of steam plant, if desirable, would not be our cost; (c) Total cost of power, fourth year, would be 1.20c per k.w.h.; (d) Unavailable power, 70,800 k.w.h.; (e) Unavailable power third year, 5,900 k.w.h.; (f) Unavailable power, 51,900 k.w.h.; (g) Unavailable power, 39,300 k.w.h.

TABLE "J"

Here we come to the crux of the whole matter, the cost to the consumer in St. John. It is strange that in this important juncture the engineer suddenly departs from approved evidence to speculate about the fixed charges. The engineer still the should compare like with unlike; distribution plant with generating plant; when lines were laid had disastrous financial results. I shall proceed to develop the statement on the evidence approved but not by Mr. Ross.

TABLE "K"

The first item, the cost of the power, I prefer to take at its true cost (1.2c) and consider the temporary concession of the commission as extension of credit to the city, as this is what it really is. To compute on the basis of the reduced cost (0.8c) as Mr. Ross has done is a bad business method, and bad business methods lead to disastrous financial results, as will be demonstrated when we reach Table H.

TABLE "L"

For the second item we return to a study of the Ontario operations.

TABLE "M"

Depreciation Charges, 1920.  
Brantford.....\$12,700.00  
Hamilton.....\$4,365.72  
London.....\$2,593.26  
Windsor.....\$5,717.00  
Total.....\$25,375.98

TABLE "N"

Cost to Consumers in St. John.  
Power—10,000,000 k.w.h. at 1.2c.....\$120,000.00  
Operating expense from Table F.1.....\$7,709.08  
P. records.....29,593.18  
Depreciation from H. E. P. records on basis of reduced cost.....46,781.28  
Interest on capital at 6 p.c.....11,695.92  
Sinking fund at 1 1/2 p.c.....6,989.00  
Total.....\$211,188.56  
Average over all about 3.5 cents per k.w.h.

TABLE "O"

Taxes as paid by Power Co.  
Total cost for 10,000,000 k.w.h. at 3.5c.....\$350,000.00  
Sub-station operation.....\$11,915.38  
Sub-station maintenance.....2,545.44  
Distribution system operation and maintenance.....6,787.92  
Line transformers maintenance.....2,578.68  
Consumers' premises, expenses.....2,756.32  
Promotion of business.....2,046.16  
Billing and collecting.....11,881.76  
Meter maintenance.....6,680.08  
General office salary and expense.....10,848.24  
Total.....\$57,709.08

TABLE "P"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "Q"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "R"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "S"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "T"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "U"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "V"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE H.1.  
Domestic and Commercial Light Users  
London (Ont.)  
1912; 1st year; contracts made 4,643; 65 per cent.  
1913; 2nd year; consumers 6,208; 74 per cent.  
1914; 3rd year; consumers 7,374; 87 per cent.  
1915; 4th year; consumers 8,372; 100 per cent.

TABLE H.2.  
Probable Market in St. John, Light Only.  
1st year; contracts made, 4,642.  
2nd year; 6,228 users take 2,140,000 k.w.h.  
3rd year; 7,363 users take 2,659,000 k.w.h.  
4th year; 8,440 users take 3,526,000 k.w.h.

TABLE "G"

This table expounds the manner in which the N. B. Commission's price is arrived at. It does not concern our present estimate in any way save to suggest that if it could be demonstrated that a steam plant was desirable on any grounds whatsoever its cost would have to be applied here and cover the gross output of the plant. In this case, and taking Mr. Ross' figures as they stand, it would mean an increased price of something less than four-tenths of a cent per k.w.h. even if the capacity of the plant remained as it is, whilst, practically, since the commission would be able to phase the product of a normal year instead of the product of the dry year without in any way increasing the cost at Musquash, therefore the probable additional cost to St. John would not exceed one-quarter of a cent per k.w.h. instead of 1.64c as the report suggests.

TABLE "H"

This is a projected balance sheet of the first four years' operation of the plant. It brings out that even placing the average cost of power at 1.20c per k.w.h. at the end of the four years we should be no less than \$367,018 in debt. To this should be added \$113,000 due to the commission, made up of three years at \$40,000, less \$7,000 which Mr. Ross assumes on this basis in the fourth year, so that our total loss, according to Mr. Ross' computation will be \$480,000.

TABLE "I"

This statement recites the results obtained by (a) Assuming standing charges of \$114,741 when the H.E.P. records on which it is based are used; (b) Provision of steam plant, if desirable, would not be our cost; (c) Total cost of power, fourth year, would be 1.20c per k.w.h.; (d) Unavailable power, 70,800 k.w.h.; (e) Unavailable power third year, 5,900 k.w.h.; (f) Unavailable power, 51,900 k.w.h.; (g) Unavailable power, 39,300 k.w.h.

TABLE "J"

Here we come to the crux of the whole matter, the cost to the consumer in St. John. It is strange that in this important juncture the engineer suddenly departs from approved evidence to speculate about the fixed charges. The engineer still the should compare like with unlike; distribution plant with generating plant; when lines were laid had disastrous financial results. I shall proceed to develop the statement on the evidence approved but not by Mr. Ross.

TABLE "K"

The first item, the cost of the power, I prefer to take at its true cost (1.2c) and consider the temporary concession of the commission as extension of credit to the city, as this is what it really is. To compute on the basis of the reduced cost (0.8c) as Mr. Ross has done is a bad business method, and bad business methods lead to disastrous financial results, as will be demonstrated when we reach Table H.

TABLE "L"

For the second item we return to a study of the Ontario operations.

TABLE "M"

Depreciation Charges, 1920.  
Brantford.....\$12,700.00  
Hamilton.....\$4,365.72  
London.....\$2,593.26  
Windsor.....\$5,717.00  
Total.....\$25,375.98

TABLE "N"

Cost to Consumers in St. John.  
Power—10,000,000 k.w.h. at 1.2c.....\$120,000.00  
Operating expense from Table F.1.....\$7,709.08  
P. records.....29,593.18  
Depreciation from H. E. P. records on basis of reduced cost.....46,781.28  
Interest on capital at 6 p.c.....11,695.92  
Sinking fund at 1 1/2 p.c.....6,989.00  
Total.....\$211,188.56  
Average over all about 3.5 cents per k.w.h.

TABLE "O"

Taxes as paid by Power Co.  
Total cost for 10,000,000 k.w.h. at 3.5c.....\$350,000.00  
Sub-station operation.....\$11,915.38  
Sub-station maintenance.....2,545.44  
Distribution system operation and maintenance.....6,787.92  
Line transformers maintenance.....2,578.68  
Consumers' premises, expenses.....2,756.32  
Promotion of business.....2,046.16  
Billing and collecting.....11,881.76  
Meter maintenance.....6,680.08  
General office salary and expense.....10,848.24  
Total.....\$57,709.08

TABLE "P"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "Q"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "R"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "S"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "T"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "U"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "V"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE H.1.  
Domestic and Commercial Light Users  
London (Ont.)  
1912; 1st year; contracts made 4,643; 65 per cent.  
1913; 2nd year; consumers 6,208; 74 per cent.  
1914; 3rd year; consumers 7,374; 87 per cent.  
1915; 4th year; consumers 8,372; 100 per cent.

TABLE H.2.  
Probable Market in St. John, Light Only.  
1st year; contracts made, 4,642.  
2nd year; 6,228 users take 2,140,000 k.w.h.  
3rd year; 7,363 users take 2,659,000 k.w.h.  
4th year; 8,440 users take 3,526,000 k.w.h.

TABLE "G"

This table expounds the manner in which the N. B. Commission's price is arrived at. It does not concern our present estimate in any way save to suggest that if it could be demonstrated that a steam plant was desirable on any grounds whatsoever its cost would have to be applied here and cover the gross output of the plant. In this case, and taking Mr. Ross' figures as they stand, it would mean an increased price of something less than four-tenths of a cent per k.w.h. even if the capacity of the plant remained as it is, whilst, practically, since the commission would be able to phase the product of a normal year instead of the product of the dry year without in any way increasing the cost at Musquash, therefore the probable additional cost to St. John would not exceed one-quarter of a cent per k.w.h. instead of 1.64c as the report suggests.

TABLE "H"

This is a projected balance sheet of the first four years' operation of the plant. It brings out that even placing the average cost of power at 1.20c per k.w.h. at the end of the four years we should be no less than \$367,018 in debt. To this should be added \$113,000 due to the commission, made up of three years at \$40,000, less \$7,000 which Mr. Ross assumes on this basis in the fourth year, so that our total loss, according to Mr. Ross' computation will be \$480,000.

TABLE "I"

This statement recites the results obtained by (a) Assuming standing charges of \$114,741 when the H.E.P. records on which it is based are used; (b) Provision of steam plant, if desirable, would not be our cost; (c) Total cost of power, fourth year, would be 1.20c per k.w.h.; (d) Unavailable power, 70,800 k.w.h.; (e) Unavailable power third year, 5,900 k.w.h.; (f) Unavailable power, 51,900 k.w.h.; (g) Unavailable power, 39,300 k.w.h.

TABLE "J"

Here we come to the crux of the whole matter, the cost to the consumer in St. John. It is strange that in this important juncture the engineer suddenly departs from approved evidence to speculate about the fixed charges. The engineer still the should compare like with unlike; distribution plant with generating plant; when lines were laid had disastrous financial results. I shall proceed to develop the statement on the evidence approved but not by Mr. Ross.

TABLE "K"

The first item, the cost of the power, I prefer to take at its true cost (1.2c) and consider the temporary concession of the commission as extension of credit to the city, as this is what it really is. To compute on the basis of the reduced cost (0.8c) as Mr. Ross has done is a bad business method, and bad business methods lead to disastrous financial results, as will be demonstrated when we reach Table H.

TABLE "L"

For the second item we return to a study of the Ontario operations.

TABLE "M"

Depreciation Charges, 1920.  
Brantford.....\$12,700.00  
Hamilton.....\$4,365.72  
London.....\$2,593.26  
Windsor.....\$5,717.00  
Total.....\$25,375.98

TABLE "N"

Cost to Consumers in St. John.  
Power—10,000,000 k.w.h. at 1.2c.....\$120,000.00  
Operating expense from Table F.1.....\$7,709.08  
P. records.....29,593.18  
Depreciation from H. E. P. records on basis of reduced cost.....46,781.28  
Interest on capital at 6 p.c.....11,695.92  
Sinking fund at 1 1/2 p.c.....6,989.00  
Total.....\$211,188.56  
Average over all about 3.5 cents per k.w.h.

TABLE "O"

Taxes as paid by Power Co.  
Total cost for 10,000,000 k.w.h. at 3.5c.....\$350,000.00  
Sub-station operation.....\$11,915.38  
Sub-station maintenance.....2,545.44  
Distribution system operation and maintenance.....6,787.92  
Line transformers maintenance.....2,578.68  
Consumers' premises, expenses.....2,756.32  
Promotion of business.....2,046.16  
Billing and collecting.....11,881.76  
Meter maintenance.....6,680.08  
General office salary and expense.....10,848.24  
Total.....\$57,709.08

TABLE "P"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "Q"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "R"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "S"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "T"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "U"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "V"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE H.1.  
Domestic and Commercial Light Users  
London (Ont.)  
1912; 1st year; contracts made 4,643; 65 per cent.  
1913; 2nd year; consumers 6,208; 74 per cent.  
1914; 3rd year; consumers 7,374; 87 per cent.  
1915; 4th year; consumers 8,372; 100 per cent.

TABLE H.2.  
Probable Market in St. John, Light Only.  
1st year; contracts made, 4,642.  
2nd year; 6,228 users take 2,140,000 k.w.h.  
3rd year; 7,363 users take 2,659,000 k.w.h.  
4th year; 8,440 users take 3,526,000 k.w.h.

TABLE "G"

This table expounds the manner in which the N. B. Commission's price is arrived at. It does not concern our present estimate in any way save to suggest that if it could be demonstrated that a steam plant was desirable on any grounds whatsoever its cost would have to be applied here and cover the gross output of the plant. In this case, and taking Mr. Ross' figures as they stand, it would mean an increased price of something less than four-tenths of a cent per k.w.h. even if the capacity of the plant remained as it is, whilst, practically, since the commission would be able to phase the product of a normal year instead of the product of the dry year without in any way increasing the cost at Musquash, therefore the probable additional cost to St. John would not exceed one-quarter of a cent per k.w.h. instead of 1.64c as the report suggests.

TABLE "H"

This is a projected balance sheet of the first four years' operation of the plant. It brings out that even placing the average cost of power at 1.20c per k.w.h. at the end of the four years we should be no less than \$367,018 in debt. To this should be added \$113,000 due to the commission, made up of three years at \$40,000, less \$7,000 which Mr. Ross assumes on this basis in the fourth year, so that our total loss, according to Mr. Ross' computation will be \$480,000.

TABLE "I"

This statement recites the results obtained by (a) Assuming standing charges of \$114,741 when the H.E.P. records on which it is based are used; (b) Provision of steam plant, if desirable, would not be our cost; (c) Total cost of power, fourth year, would be 1.20c per k.w.h.; (d) Unavailable power, 70,800 k.w.h.; (e) Unavailable power third year, 5,900 k.w.h.; (f) Unavailable power, 51,900 k.w.h.; (g) Unavailable power, 39,300 k.w.h.

TABLE "J"

Here we come to the crux of the whole matter, the cost to the consumer in St. John. It is strange that in this important juncture the engineer suddenly departs from approved evidence to speculate about the fixed charges. The engineer still the should compare like with unlike; distribution plant with generating plant; when lines were laid had disastrous financial results. I shall proceed to develop the statement on the evidence approved but not by Mr. Ross.

TABLE "K"

The first item, the cost of the power, I prefer to take at its true cost (1.2c) and consider the temporary concession of the commission as extension of credit to the city, as this is what it really is. To compute on the basis of the reduced cost (0.8c) as Mr. Ross has done is a bad business method, and bad business methods lead to disastrous financial results, as will be demonstrated when we reach Table H.

TABLE "L"

For the second item we return to a study of the Ontario operations.

TABLE "M"

Depreciation Charges, 1920.  
Brantford.....\$12,700.00  
Hamilton.....\$4,365.72  
London.....\$2,593.26  
Windsor.....\$5,717.00  
Total.....\$25,375.98

TABLE "N"

Cost to Consumers in St. John.  
Power—10,000,000 k.w.h. at 1.2c.....\$120,000.00  
Operating expense from Table F.1.....\$7,709.08  
P. records.....29,593.18  
Depreciation from H. E. P. records on basis of reduced cost.....46,781.28  
Interest on capital at 6 p.c.....11,695.92  
Sinking fund at 1 1/2 p.c.....6,989.00  
Total.....\$211,188.56  
Average over all about 3.5 cents per k.w.h.

TABLE "O"

Taxes as paid by Power Co.  
Total cost for 10,000,000 k.w.h. at 3.5c.....\$350,000.00  
Sub-station operation.....\$11,915.38  
Sub-station maintenance.....2,545.44  
Distribution system operation and maintenance.....6,787.92  
Line transformers maintenance.....2,578.68  
Consumers' premises, expenses.....2,756.32  
Promotion of business.....2,046.16  
Billing and collecting.....11,881.76  
Meter maintenance.....6,680.08  
General office salary and expense.....10,848.24  
Total.....\$57,709.08

TABLE "P"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "Q"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "R"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges:

TABLE "S"

For the total of depreciation we find that the following amounts were set aside by our comparable plants. In this connection it might be noted that the delicacy of the meters, so frequently dwelt upon by Mr. Ross, is apparently well taken care of by a quite large block of the operating charges: