

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The intention of the Government is—and it appears to be the desire of the House to have as short a Session as possible—to ask the House to adjourn on Thursday evening until Tuesday at 3 o'clock.

Mr. VAIL. I hope the Government will arrange so that the House will meet on Monday. We who live a long way from Ottawa suffer great disadvantage by long adjournments. I see no reason why we should not meet on Monday, as we did last year, and as it was done on several similar occasions. It is very convenient for members living within a few miles of the city to have adjournments, but it is inconvenient for members from the Maritime Provinces, and we seem to be sacrificed on every occasion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Monday is a statutory holiday, and, of course, the Government thought that by adjourning on Thursday evening they would meet the wishes of the House and conform to the holidays that have been fixed by law; that is to say, we adjourn over Friday and Saturday and Sunday, of course, and Monday, which is a holiday by law.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). I have no doubt this arrangement will suit a majority of the members, but, at the same time, I think the remarks that have fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) are very appropriate. If there is an adjournment until Tuesday only, it will be utterly impossible for the members from the Maritime Provinces to visit their homes and return in time for the sitting on Tuesday, as they will not be able to return until Wednesday. Therefore, the Easter adjournment will be of no advantage to them, but will simply leave them with nothing to do for four or five days, while those who live near here, and they are the majority, will no doubt be accommodated. Although we living in the Maritime Provinces are in the minority, we ought to be thought of occasionally, and, if possible, the same accommodation should be given to those who live a few miles further away. Let us all work together or all play together.

DOMINION LANDS ACT, 1883.

Mr. WHITE moved the second reading of Bill (No. 94) further to amend the Dominion Lands Act, 1883.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

CAPE RACE LIGHTHOUSE TRANSFER.

Mr. FOSTER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 100) respecting the transfer of the lighthouse at Cape Race, Newfoundland, and its appurtenances, to the Dominion of Canada.

Motion agreed to, Bill read second time, considered in Committee and reported.

WAYS AND MEANS—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Ways and Means:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the following rates of duty shall be assessed and collected on each of the articles hereinafter named, and to repeal all Acts or parts of Acts now in force in so far as they provide for assessing and collecting any different rates of duty than the rates hereby provided, or which are inconsistent therewith:—

Almonds, shelled, a specific duty of 5 cents per pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman intend to make any alterations in any of those duties, because, if so, it would be as well to state them before discussing the items in detail.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. McLELAN. We are going to make some alterations in Nos. 6 and 9; we propose to omit No. 16, and to make some alterations in Nos. 32 and 33. These we propose to allow to stand for the present and take up the others.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that, as each item comes up in detail separately, he would be good enough to inform us of the amount of revenue he expects to receive, and of the reasons which call in each particular instance for a change of duty.

Mr. McLELAN. In introducing the Resolutions, I stated in general terms the reasons for making the change from *ad valorem* to specific duties, so far as it was possible to amend them in that way, and these articles are of that character. The duty on the article at present before the House, almonds, can very well be made specific, and, I think, without greatly increasing the amount we ordinarily receive as duties on those articles. During the past year they have declined in value very much, and the amount received from them has been considerably less than hitherto.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that on this article apparently the increase of duty would amount to about 60 per cent. Now, the total amount of revenue from shelled almonds, it is true, is not very large, but at the same time it is precisely one of those articles which enter pretty largely into the consumption of households that are poor, and it does appear to me that an additional 60 per cent., as it appears to be from the amount we imported, is rather a large addition, considering that it brings very little revenue into the Treasury, and will take a considerable deal more out of the pockets of the consumers than the sum which is represented, as the hon. gentleman knows. Apparently we receive a matter of \$2,400 or thereabouts under the duty as it stood last year, and I understand that this change will raise the duty to some 4,000 and odd hundred dollars, which is quite 60 per cent. additional.

Mr. BLAKE. The object must be to protect the industry of shelling almonds, because I observe that there is 3 cents on the unshelled and 5 on the shelled.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman probably knows, if he has bought them, that there is a difference in the value of the two articles.

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly, the shells are not worth as much as the kernels.

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, we know that, and consequently the duty on the unshelled is not as much as on the shelled. Neither would it be under the *ad valorem* duty, because the shelled would cost 30 cents and the unshelled 10 cents.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Minister of Customs apparently puts 60 per cent. additional on the shelled and 150 per cent on the unshelled.

Mr. BOWELL. No, no.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, that is apparently the result from the Customs returns.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman will bear in mind that I was not discussing that point.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But that is the fact, all the same, and the Minister of Customs does not dispute the accuracy of the statement.

Mr. BLAKE. If the hon. gentleman puts 60 per cent. on the shelled, and 150 per cent. on the unshelled, it still verifies my observation that the hon. gentleman's tariff must be to further protect the industry of shelling almonds.

Almonds, not shelled, and nuts of all kinds, not elsewhere specified, a specific duty of 3 cents per pound.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Under this, taking the first cost, we receive about \$1,300 on about 100,000 lbs. We