

into between the Imperial Government and the Government of the United States, and that that measure is now before the Senate of the United States. This is a very important question, considering the character of the mineral discoveries immediately along the boundary, and I think it would be well for the Government to lay on the Table any information they have in regard to this matter and the terms of the treaty which has been entered into. I merely mention the matter now in order that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) may be prepared to lay upon the Table of the House any information on this subject in possession of the Government.

The MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR (Mr. Sifton). The arrangement between the two governments was not an arrangement which involved any departure from what was already understood, but simply laying down of the boundary that had been agreed upon, a scientific determination of the 141st meridian. There is no objection to laying the papers on the Table if the hon. gentleman (Sir Charles Tupper) so desires.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER. I should be very glad if the House were given whatever information is in possession of the Government, because there is in connection with that question a matter of very great importance looking to the value of that section of the country.

BICYCLES AS BAGGAGE.

Mr. McMULLEN. Before the Railway Committee yesterday, a statement was made with regard to the Intercolonial Railway having for some time, carried bicycles as baggage. I would like to know how long it is since that arrangement was made and by whose instruction. It is generally understood that railways charge for carrying bicycles, but here is a railway owned by the Dominion and run by the Government at a loss of about half a million dollars a year to the people, carrying bicycles free, while, in other parts of the Dominion, wheelmen have to pay for the carriage of bicycles. I would like to know under what circumstances and under whose instructions a system of that kind was established on the Intercolonial, when it was not adopted by other railways throughout the country.

The MINISTER OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. Blair). I very gladly furnish the information asked for by the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen). The arrangement referred to has been in existence for some little time. I trust that it will not be assumed, because I do not particularly refer to it, that I accept the hon. gentleman's statement as to the balance against the Intercolonial Railway under the present administration or for this year. The amount, I think, has not run up to anything like what the hon. gentleman says

Sir CHARLES TUPPER.

of late years. Last year the gross deficit on the running of the Intercolonial was about one-tenth of the amount named by my hon. friend. When the hon. gentleman mentioned the matter to me. I wired the general manager at Moncton to give me a statement of the mode adopted by the management in respect of the carriage of bicycles, and how long the system had been in operation that is now in vogue. And he made this reply :

We have not charged, on the Intercolonial, for carrying bicycles. They are carried in the same way as baby-carriages are carried. Bicycles actually in use by passengers are carried free, but carried entirely at the risk of the owner as to injury or loss. If the bicycle and any other baggage of a passenger combined weigh more than 100 pounds, excess is charged for the over-weight. The passenger is required to sign a release freeing the railway from any claim for damages. The use of bicycles has gradually grown, and at first, I believe, all railways carried them without charge. About a year ago, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway began to charge for them, and the question arose whether we should do the same. But I thought it better to wait until arrangements concerning traffic were completed. Of course, we do not find the carrying of bicycles so onerous as railways do that run near large cities and in a thickly-settled country.

DUTY ON COAL OIL.

Mr. DAVIN. I have a notice of motion on the Orders, and I wish to explain to the House and to the country why I think it useless to move that motion. The motion is as to the duty on coal oil. I had, on the same Order paper, a notice respecting the duty on agricultural implements and other matters, and, when it came to the vote, those gentlemen in this House from whom I might have expected support did not support me.

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Mr. DAVIN. Is it necessary to name them? Why, they are known to fame already. But I will name them, seeing my hon. friend asks me to do so. One of them is the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Richardson). He certainly was bound to support me, because he had his constituency placarded with bills, "Vote for Richardson and free implements." And I suppose that when he goes back to his constituency, as go back he will within two or three months, he will have it placarded, "Vote for Richardson who voted for keeping the duty on agricultural implements."

Now, I am not going to impugn the motives of these hon. gentlemen, my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) and other gentlemen who came into this House professing Patronism. I have no right to do it. On the contrary, I assume that they have voted as they have done with the best of motives as they understand it and up to their lights. They seem