

Hon. Mr. WATSON: What is the "trimming" operation? What does that mean?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Trimming it in the boats.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: It does not mean in the elevators?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Oh, no. This has relation to the shipment of grain by water.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: Is not the board in some sense responsible for the cargo and the manner in which it is trimmed?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: The commissioners have been responsible.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: Are they not responsible in some way for the trimming?

Hon. W. B. ROSS: The whole trade is under the control of this Grain Commission, but they are not the persons who trim.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: But I am asking if the Grain Board is not responsible for the trimming in the boat?

Hon. Mr. PRINGLE: My information is quite to the contrary—that there is no responsibility whatsoever attaching to the Grain Commission. The objection to this clause is that the ship is in effect turned over to the trimming gang appointed by the board and paid by the owner of the ship, but under no control whatsoever by the owner. They trim as they please, under the supervision of the board, of course, but not under the supervision of the man who has to take the vessel out of port, and perhaps not in accordance with his wishes.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: What is the object of putting this clause in the Bill, if it is entirely foreign?

Hon. Mr. PRINGLE: I think it is entirely foreign. My view is that the grain should be under the supervision of the Grain Commissioners from the moment it is loaded in the ship's hold, and that from that time the owner of the vessel should be responsible for the trimming of the grain in accordance with insurance requirements and as he thinks proper.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: If my memory serves me rightly, the Act refers to inspection as well as grading. Some years ago the question arose as to grain being damaged in the vessels on account of defective trimming, and if I remember rightly a clause was inserted in the Act because the inspection of the grain and the inspection certificate as to its quality were offset by the bad trimming in the vessel.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: How could the bad trimming effect the quality of the grain?

Hon. Mr. WATSON: I think that was the reason given at that time.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: Well, it would not be a reason, because improper trimming may cause a ship to upset or founder if she goes out in a storm, yet it does not affect the quality of the grain.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: If the grain gets wet or damp, the quality would be affected.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: But it would not get damp. That trimming might upset the ship.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: How is it done at present, does the honourable gentleman know?

Hon. Mr. PRINGLE: The present system is that the various vessel owners at Fort William and Port Arthur have permanent gangs of trimmers who are experts in the trimming of vessels. They are under the immediate control of the captain of the ship. This particular paragraph would in effect turn over every ship as it was loaded to the Grain Commission, who would trim it. I am informed that it is highly objectionable. This is one of the occasions when one deeply regrets the loss of such a man as our friend Richardson of Kingston, who could have explained this matter thoroughly.

Hon. Mr. WATSON: Or Senator Young.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: The weakness I see in the proposal to strike out the paragraph lies in this, that trimming is manifestly an important feature in the shipment of grain; yet apparently it is now in the hands of parties who are in no way responsible to the Government, though possibly they may be responsible to the owner of the ship.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: They are all responsible.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: No, I understand the trimmers now are absolutely independent.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: But the navigation officers, after examining ships coming in and going out, are not going to allow a ship to leave the port unless she is properly trimmed.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I must confess I know nothing about it myself.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: Does the honourable leader think that we should adopt the motion that has been made to strike it out?