

for part of the Canadians view it. I believe that but a few of them will be inclined to maintain that there is either folly, indecency, or immorality in it. The reverse appears to be the case; but on this subject I refer to my last number.

L. L. M.

The editor of the Canadian Spectator, has done me the honour of extracting from No. 38, some of my observations on the subject of the late interference of the governor-in-chief, in the internal management of the Agricultural Society of Montreal, taking the occasion likewise to express his approbation of the soundness of the principles they contain. It is always gratifying to have the good opinion of constitutional and independent minds, and the more so, in the present instance, as we have differed, and still differ, on some shades of the question. I can not, however, avoid adding that he much mistakes my meaning, if he thinks I intended to insinuate that he had been biased, in retracting what he had previously said on the subject, by any intimation from the higher powers. I thought I had sufficiently, in the article alluded to, disclaimed any such inference; and I take this opportunity of unequivocally declaring that, convinced as all the Canadian people, and their rulers, must be, of the independent spirit he possesses, I firmly believe that no person, "how high soever his station might be," would venture to attempt to tamper with, or influence, his principles, or his judgment.

The particulars he has given of the several provincial acts bearing upon the question, are peculiarly welcome to me, not having the means of consulting the originals; and enable me to pursue my observations on the subject and to adhere to the original impression upon my mind arising from the transaction, namely that the approbation or disapprobation of the governor has nothing to do legally with the purchase of the bull Eclipse, that consequently it was a stretch of his authority beyond its due limits to interfere in the business, and that the agricultural society have been guilty of a dereliction of their public duty in allowing themselves to be dictated to on the occasion.

In the first place, although it appears that the late act, granting £2100, for the encouragement of agriculture, does not expressly direct that the mode in which that sum is expended shall be accounted for to the legislature, yet, since it refers to two former acts as to the division and expenditure thereof, and those acts both contain clauses that the agricultural societies shall account to the legislature for the expenditure of the monies granted them, it follows as a natural consequence that the present £2100, must be also accounted for to the legislature alone; for how could the legislature ever judge whether their injunctions as to the mode of expending money had been fulfilled, if the