

Year ending Aug. 31, 1922—	
Receipts.. . . .	\$1,263,253 47
Expenditures.. . . .	847,186 90
	<hr/>
	\$416,066 57
Year ending Aug. 31, 1923—	
Receipts.. . . .	\$1,433,984 32
Expenditures.. . . .	972,631 16
	<hr/>
	\$461,353 16

This makes a total of \$1,146,782. Will the minister please explain those figures to the extent of telling us just what is covered in the expenditures? Is he now trying to give the House the impression that there are other expenditures that are not shown in this statement?

Mr. LOW: The item covers the salaries of the Grain Commissioners, weighing inspection services, contingencies of all kinds, temporary staff, and research laboratory, with the exception of the chief chemist.

Mr. COOTE: The minister admits that there is a surplus in the last three years of some \$1,147,000.

Mr. LOW: Why does not my hon. friend go back a few years? The year immediately previous to the first one that he has given showed a deficit of \$215,993 and the year previous to that a deficit of \$221,415; and for six or seven years prior to that, again, there were deficits. If the hon. gentleman will include those figures he will find that the amount I gave him of \$94,000 of a surplus for the thirteen years and ten months is correct.

Mr. COOTE: Is the minister prepared to recommend to the Board of Grain Commissioners this year to reduce the fees in view of the surplus of \$461,000 odd which was shown last year?

Mr. LOW: I should be glad to recommend that reduction to the government if we were sure that we should have the same amount of grain to be inspected in the coming year. In the nature of things we are obliged to keep a permanent staff, and it is quite possible that through some misfortune we might have a deficit instead of a surplus. If we were sure that there was going to be a surplus each year I should be very glad to recommend to the government that there be a reduction in the fees; but in view of the uncertainty that necessarily prevails I cannot do that. The surplus this year up to January 31, 1924, is \$242,036.

Mr. COOTE: I would suggest to the minister that he consult the Minister of Agri-

culture (Mr. Motherwell) who is very strong on faith; if he did that, perhaps he would be inspired with enough faith to risk the consequences of a reduction in the fees.

Mr. McMASTER: Faith without works is dead.

Mr. COOTE: Let me draw the attention of the minister again to the fact that last year there was a surplus of \$461,000, the previous year a surplus of \$416,000 and in the year 1921 a surplus of \$269,000. How long does the minister expect to wait before he recommends the reduction, or how big a surplus must there be in order that the fees should be reduced?

Mr. LOW: It all depends on the amount of grain we have to inspect. If we were sure that the quantity would be the same this year as last year I would have no hesitation in making a recommendation to the government. We are anxious to help the farmers in every way possible, and I have no doubt that before this session is over the farmers will receive as much benefit from other services as they would get by a reduction in the fees.

Mr. COOTE: Does the minister think that this board was established as a money-making proposition?

Mr. LOW: If my hon. friend will glance over the figures for the past thirteen years I think he will be satisfied that the government that organized the Grain Board had no such thought in mind.

Mr. COOTE: They did not expect that it would be a paying proposition the first year, surely.

Mr. LOW: For ten years there was a continuous deficit, but the government always made provision for it in the hope that some day things would come out even; and in thirteen years and ten months there has been the surplus which I have already mentioned.

Mr. BROWN: Any deficit that might be incurred in this particular branch would be offset by a surplus in some other direction.

Mr. COOTE: I would call the minister's attention to the suggestion which the hon. member has just made. Although we have a great many kinds of agricultural products in Canada which are graded by the government, grain is the only product for the grading of which we make any charge; it is the only product in the grading of which the government secures a revenue. I want to ask the minister now whether he would have any