

age is due to truth, and respect to authority; yet I have not been able to discover that I was wrong in reprehending in such strong terms as I did, the interference in question. If I did not know the independence of mind and principle which actuates the editor of the Spectator, I should be inclined to have considered this paragraph (and certainly should have done so, had it appeared in any other paper,) as having been penned in consequence of his excellency *having expressed his disapprobation*, that any of his acts should be canvassed in the public prints; and I should, in any other case, have been inclined to call the praises here bestowed upon lord Dalhousie, nothing but *flummery*. At all events I will say that it appears to have been written in a hurry, without due deliberation or accurate information, and with an evident struggle between a desire of making an *amende honorable*, and that of vindicating the justice of the blame before thrown on the transaction.

No other paper in Canada has taken any notice of it. The Agricultural Society have not deemed it proper to publish any detail, or retraction of their implied reflection on the governor-in-chief. The statute under which the money in question was granted to the society is not quoted, (query: is it yet printed?) The suspicious deficiency of funds in the public chest is notorious. All these things leave the matter yet in a most unsatisfactory state of doubt; so that I can not yet subscribe to the absolution from blame which lord Dalhousie probably expects I shall follow the Spectator in. I have not access to the act, granting the money to the Agricultural Society, but I will take it for granted it is as stated in the Spectator, although the editor does not appear to have examined it himself, or else he would not have said *it seems*. The notice that has been given of that grant in the parliamentary reports states it to be one of a sum of £2100, "for the encouragement of the agricultural societies of this province during the present year." Under these general terms, there is of course no restriction as to how the money is to be expended; but, if, in the clauses of the bill, it be stipulated that the whole sum shall be laid out solely in "premiums for rural productions," then, certainly, the legislature have most injudiciously gone into minutiae which ought to have been left to the discretion of the societies, and have even entered their veto against any premiums being given for the exhibition of cattle, for ploughing, for manuring, in short for any thing but the mere crop. This I can not believe, unless I see the act and find it so. The next question is, has that money been paid out of the public chest? I believe not, and that it is not intended to be paid, being a sum appertaining, according to the new-fangled nomenclature of the chateau, to *local* purposes and establishments, and not part of the perquisites of the privileged orders, who are to be paid in the first instance, and let all oth-