

Inspection of Cattle.

ber last, which account you did not certify to as I made out, and I returned it and explained why I made the charge of \$66.67 for extra service, instead of \$16.67 as formerly, and I herewith return the one you certify for the present month for the same reason.

I never made any arrangements with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to do Sunday and night service for \$16.67 per month, and as I learn from the inspector at Point Edward that the department have certified to his accounts regularly every month for the same charge of \$66.67 for extra work, I assume the department will not consider my services for the same work worth less. A nominal professional fee for such services would be double the amount. I have not been paid now for nearly two months, and unless I am paid I will not continue to do the extra work any longer than to give an opportunity to comply with my demand to be paid the same as the other inspectors.

Yours respectfully,

J. B. WRIGHT.

P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, OTTAWA, 27th January, 1883.

WM. WAINWRIGHT, Esq., Asst. Manager, G. T. R., Montreal.

DEAR MR. WAINWRIGHT,—I send to you herewith a copy of a letter which I have this day received from Professor Andrew Smith, who is our general veterinary superintendent in Ontario. You will see what he says with respect to the complaints against Dr. Wright and on this point I should say to you that we wrote some time ago to Dr. Wright, to tell him that we did not want to receive any excuses, on whatever ground they might be placed, for the absence of inspection at the proper time, but that we should insist upon the fact. I think, however, that having told Dr. Wright this much, it is only fair that you should take note of the kind of complaint in Dr. Smith's letter, and tell your people not to stand upon forms or "dignity" in any matter relating to the effectiveness of the service.

Believe me, etc., yours truly,

J. LOWE,

Secretary of Department of Agriculture.

P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, 9th February, 1883.

Professor A. SMITH,
40 and 42 Temperance Street, Toronto, Ont.

MY DEAR SIR,—On my return to town I find the enclosed letter from Dr. Wright. What he asks to have done is certainly impossible and I have not filed the letter, as to push the issues which he states to a conclusion would imply a break.

There is also some misapprehension. We never did anything more than sanction an arrangement which might be made between the railway company and the inspector for extra work, and the department does not require work other than that contemplated in the first departmental letter to which Dr. Wright refers. There is, however, the question of facilitating the transit by arrangement between the inspector and the railway company, but this must be purely a matter of arrangement.

I don't think the tone of Dr. Wright's letter is such as is calculated to lead to an arrangement.

I do not send the certificate which he requests at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, and certainly I shall not till I hear further from you. But if such certificate is sent in, Dr. Wright is very much in error in thinking that he would have any claim on the railway company, for nothing of that kind could exist. He is supposed to look to this department and not to the railway company for his payment, the arrangement.