

"MACLEOD, ALTA., 6th August, 1891.

"COL. AMYOT, M.P.,  
Ottawa.

"DEAR SIR.—I see by *Honour* of 27th July that, during the debate on Mr. Davin's motion asking for an enquiry into Commissioner Herchmer's conduct, you read from a letter published in *L'Etendard*, and translated into the *Macleod Gazette*, in which it was stated that Col. Herchmer said to Inspector Starnes that all Frenchmen were b—ds, sons of b—s, and sons of w—s. I also see that Sir John Thompson remarked that 'of course no officer could remain in the service of the Government an hour who has used such language as the hon. member has read from that paper.'

"He then goes on to say that 'I did not understand Col. Herchmer had ever been charged with using that language. I understood that the charge had applied to another officer of the same name, who, not only emphatically denies it, but tenders his oath in denying it. As to Col. Herchmer, although I understand that the charge was not made against him, he is ready to testify under oath before any tribunal that he never used such language.'

"Sir John Thompson has evidently confused Mr. L. W. Herchmer, Commissioner, with Lt.-Col. Wm. Herchmer, Assistant Commissioner. I have written by this mail to Sir John Thompson, distinctly charging Lt.-Col. Wm. Herchmer, Assistant Commissioner N.W.M.P., with having made use of such language to Inspector Starnes at this post. I have also offered to prove it by five witnesses who were there.

"I have also stated to him that Col. Herchmer admitted to Mr. Fred. White that he used that language, giving as his excuse that he was drunk at the time.

"Mr. Fred. White is in full possession of the facts in connection with the matter.

"Now that Sir John Thompson has stated that an officer who made use of that language could not remain in the service of the Government an hour, and that the proof that Col. Herchmer did make use of it is at hand, there is only one course open to the Government.

"I mentioned to Sir John Thompson that I was writing to you.

"Although I mark this envelope 'Private' I give you leave, as I gave Sir John Thompson, to make whatever use of it you may see fit.

"Yours truly,

"C. E. D. WOOD.

"Editor, *Macleod Gazette*."

Do the Government intend to take any action in the matter? What action do they intend to take?

Sir JOHN THOMPSON. I have received the letter referred to in that letter, from the editor of the *Macleod Gazette*, making that charge. It is not correct, as stated by him, that I confused L. W. Herchmer, Commissioner, with Lieut.-Col. W. Herchmer. On the contrary, I insisted that, on the charge being made in the House as it was against the Commissioner, confusion had been made by the gentleman making the charge, or by the newspaper from which he read, and I stated then: that the charge was not true as far as the Commissioner was concerned, and had been very emphatically denied by the Assistant Commissioner, who stated that he was prepared to deny it upon oath. As soon as I received the letter from the editor of the *Macleod Gazette*, which is referred to in the letter on the Notice paper, I sent his letter to the First Minister who has charge of the Mounted Police, and he immediately caused the officer referred to, Mr. Herchmer, the Assistant Commissioner, to be called on to answer the charge. Mr. Herchmer's answer is an emphatic denial of the truth of the statement. He says that in relation to certain officers of one of the battalions from Quebec, he made use of very strong language, in consequence of insults and outrages which he alleges were perpetrated on him and his family by them; that he made no such allusions to the French Canadian race, or people, or officers as a whole class, and that in relation to that language

he apologized immediately to a representative of the Province of Quebec who was present, and that his apology was accepted. But, in consequence of the explicitness of the charge, and the offer to prove it, the First Minister has directed that that matter shall be investigated with other matters relating to the Mounted Police, when the investigation takes place next fall.

#### PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TUNNEL.

Mr. WELSH (for Mr. DAVIES, P.E.I.) asked, Does the Government intend to take during the present summer any, and what, action with respect to the report made by Sir Douglass Fox on the proposed tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland? Is it proposed that any further surveys or borings should be made or had with respect to such tunnel, or any other and what steps taken to obtain accurate data upon which reliable estimates of the cost could be based?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government does not intend during the present summer to take any further action with respect to the report made by Sir Douglass Fox on the proposed tunnel between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, other than to consider it. The matter referred to in the second part of the question is also under the consideration of the Government.

#### CARRIAGE OF MAILS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, 1. Who has the contract for carrying the mails between Ashcroft and Barkerville, and Ashcroft, Clinton and Lillooet, in British Columbia? If the contract is held by a corporation, what are the names of the directors and corporation? 2. What amount is paid for the service under the respective contracts? 3. The service given and the distance travelled? 4. Was the contract let by tender? 5. Was the lowest tender accepted? 6. When does the contract expire?

Mr. HAGGART. 1. The British Columbia Express Company. The names of the directors are not known. 2. There is only one contract for these services. The rate of payment was \$24,000 from 1st of July, 1888, to the 30th June, 1890, and \$23,500 for the rest of the term, which ends on the 30th of June, 1892. 3. Tri-weekly each way between Ashcroft Station and Clinton, a distance of thirty-two miles. Weekly each way between Clinton and Barkerville, a distance of two hundred and fifty miles. Weekly between Clinton and Lillooet, a distance of forty-seven miles. 4. The contract was let by tender. 5. The lowest tender was accepted. 6. The contract expires on the 30th June, 1892.

#### THE KEEWATIN.

Mr. TROW (for Mr. MURLOCK) asked, Was a vessel known as the *Keewatin* in the service of the Government at any time since the 30th June, 1889? If so, what was the nature of such service and what was paid for the use of the vessel?

Mr. DEWDNEY. The Police Patrol boat *Keewatin* was built at Selkirk in winter of 1888-89 for Government of Keewatin; received and paid for in spring of 1889 by Government; has been in service in