The Protector.

AND CHRISTIAN WITNESS.—A FAMILY JOURNAL.

"RIGHTEOUSNESS EXALTETH A NATION: BUT SIN IS A REPROACH TO ANY PEOPLE."—Prov. xiv 34.

Vol. 2. Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Wednesday, May 12, 1858. No. 11.

The Protector and Christian Witness,

GEO. T. HASZARD, PUBLISHER.

Edited by a Committee of Protestant Gentlemen. Terms: 12s. per annum, in advance; otherwise 15s. will be charged.

Advertisements inserted at the usual rates.

KIRWAN'S LETTERS TO BISHOP HUGHES.

SECOND SERIES.

LETTER V.

Marks of the Papal being the true Church considered—Unity—Sanctity—Catholicity—Apostolicity—Infallibility.

Reverend and Dear Sir,—In the present letter I wish to place before you another of my reasons for not returning to the Church of my fathers, drawn from *the exclusive claims of your Church*—claims which, if well founded, consign to eternal damnation all who refuse to believe its doctrines or to submit to its authority. That these claims are put forth, you will not deny. You glory in them. Milner and Butler assert them, and seek to sustain them by Scripture and reason.

"The Poor Man's Catechism," from which I like to quote, because it is the channel through which you seek to impress the common mind, says, "Those who submit not to the doctrine and authority of the Holy Catholic Church are all out of her communion; as pagans, infidels, Turks, Jews, heretics, and schismatics." And by the Holy Catholic Church is meant that church whose head is the Pope. This is sufficiently explicit. So that, in your estimation and in that of your Church, the Protestant churches around you are no better than Jewish synagogues or pagan temples; the people that worship in them are no better than Turks or pagans; and such men as the late excellent Milnor, as Spring, Knox, Bangs, Williams, Wainwright, Skinner, your contemporaries, and equals, and fellow-citizens, are no better than Hume, Voltaire, Gibbon, or, at least, than Jewish rabbis, Turkish muftis, or Hindoo priests who mingle their blood with their sacrifices. That such is your belief is apparent in your conduct. You and your priests so treat them. The belief of your people is, that all beyond the pale of your Church are devoted to destruction. I remember the day when I had no more doubt of it than of my own existence. If there are papists who believe otherwise, and who exercise a charitable hope as to the salvation of Protestants—as I believe there are many—so far forth they are not papists. That the number of such is rapidly multiplying in our country should prove to you how rapidly your terrible system is falling to pieces.

The process by which you reach this terrible dogma is a very short one. There is no salvation out of the true Church; the Roman Catholic is the true Church; therefore there is no salvation out of the Roman Catholic Church. Here is your logical and theological guillotine, by which you sever the hopes which bind millions of your race to God and heaven, who serve one and deserve the other at least as well as you do. And, then, the marks of yours being the true Church you parade before us with as much confidence as if they were true, and with as much assurance as if they were never, instead of being a thousand times, refuted. Permit me, in the briefest manner, to consider each of these marks. They are Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, Apostolicity, and Infallibility.

Your first mark is *Unity*. Has your Church this mark? In what one thing are you united? Not in the head of your Church. You have a Pope; some say, others deny, that he is the head. One goes for the Pope, another for a general council, a third for both united. Is this unity? But, if we admit your unity, what follows? Does the agreement of numbers in maintaining error and superstition prove that in which they are united true? Then paganism, Mohammedanism, and Budhism may be proved divine. These systems have more followers than you can boast.

You are not agreed as to the authoritative councils of your Church. You are yet agitated by controversies on the subject. Nor are you agreed in the doctrines of the Bible. Never were Arminians and Calvinists more widely separated on these matters than you are. Look at the fierce contentions of your Jansenists and Jesuits, unsettled to the present hour. If united, what meant the fierce controversies of your Scotists and Thomists? of your canonists and schoolmen? of your Nominalists and Realists? But I can not weary you and my readers on this matter. You talk about the difference among Protestants; they are not to be compared to those among papists. You put into my hand Bossuet's "Variations of Protestants;" I put into yours "Edgar's Variations of Popery." Where Protestants differ in one point, papists differ in five; where they differ in minor matters, you differ in the veriest essentials. Protestants agree as to the Head of the Church, Christ, and as the rule of the Church, the Bible. You differ as to both.

True, you have an apparent external unity, but how have you gotten it? What is it worth? You set up monstrous claims, and all who do not admit them you cast off. Milner's "Apostolical Tree" shows how the work of lopping off has progressed. You have laid the axe upon every green and fruitful branch, and the old stump and withered branches remain, a unity! And what is your unity worth? If I return to your Church, "I must believe whatever the Holy Catholic Church believes and teaches." This I must do without knowing, and without ever being able to know, *all* that she believes and teaches. I must put myself into your hands, and give you power to think and believe for me, and then I must believe and swear to what you thus think and believe for me, at the peril of being cut off and cast into the fire. Sir, this is horrible slavery. Do you think men will long submit to it?

Your boasted unity is a fable, your apparent unity is slavery. You present a united front in your opposition to Protestants, but never where the bowels of the victim of the Asiatic cholera more terribly convulsed than is the bosom of your Church by distracting controversies. Your priests, and bishops, and people may fight as they may, but they are a unity as long as they remain within the same organization. If one of them secedes, if you can not kill him, you dam him for the sake of unity.

Your next mark is *Sanctity*. I admit that sanctity, or holiness, is a mark of a true disciple and of a true Church. The people and Church of Christ should be holy in all manner of conversation. Sanctity you claim for your Church as one of its distinguishing marks. But in what is it manifested? You reply; first, in her doctrines. But what doctrine of the Bible has not your Church corrupted? What institution has it not perverted? And so conscious is your Church of this, that it witholds the unadulterated word from the people. You reply again *in the means of holiness*. By these you mean *the sacraments*. But you have grievously perverted the only two sacraments instituted by Christ, and you have added to them five which have no divine authority, and whose only object is to give you power, and to obtain for you "the alms and the suffrages of the faithful." You reply again, *in her fruits of holiness*. By these you mean the virtues practiced by papists. I could not, for a moment, deny the true piety of many papists, the exalted piety of some; but will you sir, assert that the piety and virtues of your people are so much more resplended than those of any, or all other people, as to mark yours as the true Church? If so, it seems to me that you would assert that Jupiter surpasses the moon, and the moon the sun, in brightness. The evidences to the contrary are no more apparent in the one case than in the other. Look at the mass of your clergy in the sunniest days of your Church, and what were their fruits of holiness? Your own historians being witnesses, what were the fruits of your nunneries, your monasteries, your monks, and your other orders, when there were no Protestants to unveil their enormities? What are now the fruits of your religion in the states of South America? Have you seen the testimony of Mr. Thompson, our late minister to Mexico, as to the papal clergy of that country? As the fruits of holiness, compare Spain, Italy, with Scotland or New England.

But I will not proceed with the comparison farther than to ask you to compare the Protestant ministry of New York with the papal—the congregation of St. Patrick's with any large and wealthy Protestant congregation in the city, as to the fruits of holiness, and you yourself will be astonished at the difference. The general rule is, that purely papal countries are those most debased and immoral, and purely Protestant countries are those most enlightened, and most abounding in every good work. The tenth century, the noonday of popery, was the midnight of our race. Nor does the history of the world present such evidences of unbridled, overgrown depravity as does the history of your Church.

Your next mark is *Catholicity*. You claim this title for your Church as to time, persons, and places. As to time, your Church rose upon the ruins of that founded by Christ and his apostles, and centuries after their death. The peculiar doctrines and ceremonies of popery were derived from the heathen, and were ingrafted on Christianity. Instead of your Church, as you claim, being identified with that of Christ and his apostles, there is not an essential particular in which it is not in opposition to it. I admit, as to persons, that yours is a very numerous Church; but it never formed a third part of Christendom. Is the standard of truth the numbers that profess it? Then Christianity was a lie while in the minority; and, so it is a lie yet, because, taking our whole race together vastly in the minority. So I admit, as to places, that popery is very widely diffused. But is not Protestantism also? Where has a papist gained foothold where there is not a Protestant? So that your claim to this mark is as absurd as it is groundless. Your catholicity is a vain and empty boast. There is a catholic Church, but it is not yours.

Your next mark is *Apostolicity*—that is, a regular succession from the apostles in the chair of St. Peter. Now, sir, this claim is put forth by other churches as strongly as yours, and on foundations even stronger than yours. I now refer to the Armenian, Nestorian, and Syriac churches, which were founded before the Gospel was preached at Rome. It is beyond the power of man to establish this claim. If established, must we receive as a true minister every man coming to us in the regular line, whatever be his doctrines or morals? What is the test of apostolicity? Is it succession or doctrines? Most obviously doctrines. "If there come any one unto you, and bring not *this doctrine*, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." Standing upon this one text, I would turn you away from my door, even had I seen the hands of all the apostles upon your head, unless you preached their doctrines. Why, the strong language of Paul would even warrant me to curse you, coming to me with your claim of succession, without apostolical doctrine. Read it: "But though *we*, or an *angel from heaven*, preach any other Gospel unto you than that we have preached, let him be accursed." Sir, if I try your succession by your doctrine, the true test of succession, I could soon place you among those who said they were apostles, and were not. From what apostle, save Judas, many are descended who are crying out apostolical succession! apostolical succession! I cannot conceive.

Your next mark is *Infallibility*. Under all the circumstances of the case, this claim is truly ludicrous. Where is the seat of infallibility? Some say it resides in the Pope. But how is he made infallible? The Pope dies, and an election for a new one is ordered. He is to be elected from the cardinals—all fallible men, if no worse. After endless intrigue, and boundless corruption, and numerous ballotings, the lot falls upon a fallible cardinal. Will you tell me how such an election makes him infallible? But others say that the Pope is not infallible, and that he may be deposed for heresy; so that here you are divided.

Some say the seat of infallibility is a general council; but how is this? Here are three hundred fallible men assembled in general council! how do they become infallible? Will you tell me the process? How do finites make an infinite? Heap them up as you may, are they not a heap of finites? and crowd together as many fallible men as you may, are they any thing else than a crowd of fallibles? But by what chemical or alchemical process can you deduce the infallible from the fallible?

Nor is this the worst. We find one general council denouncing another—the Church of one age contradicting the Church of another. The seat of infallibility is thus undetermined by you, while the proofs of your Church's fallibility fill the world. It is infallibly certain that your Church is fallible.

Thus is your Church utterly destitute of every mark of being the true Church, which you claim for it. Its unity is discord or slavery—its sanctity is corruption—its catholicity is assumption—its apostolicity and infallibility each a lie. Could I speak of your Church in the masculine and feminine gender, as do some of your writers, instead of admitting her to be the one holy, catholic, apostolical, and infallible Church, I would call her the mother of harlots and the father of lies—the man of sin fully revealed, with "powers, and signs, and lying wonders."

And yet, while common sense rejects your claims, and common reason disproves them, and the Bible denies them, unless in the case of invincible ignorance, you cut off all beyond your pale from all communion with God—from all hope of heaven! I regard this as simply wicked. To gain your point, you rob the Father of us all of his goodness; man you drive to despair, and you convert God into a tyrant. If a boat were as rotten as I believe your Church to be, I would not trust it to carry me across the North River; and yet it claims the entire monopoly of carrying to heaven all the souls that ever enter it, and for no reason, human or divine, that I can see, unless it be for the freight and the toll!

My Bible tells me, sir, that whosoever believeth in the Lord Jesus Christ shall be saved. The sincere believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, whether in your Church, or other churches, or in no church, form a part of that church which Christ will present to the Father without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. By setting up its claim to be the only true Church—by denying salvation to all but your own members, with the exception of the invincibly ignorant, you deny this doctrine of the Bible and of my faith; you lay down a principle, unsustained by sense or Scripture, from which the mind of the world revolts, and from which my soul turns away as from a thing the most offensive. Your exclusive claims must be proved or abandoned, from their Alpha to their Omega, before I can return to your Church.

With respect, yours, KIRWAN.

REPORT ON THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

(Condensed from the Journals of the House of Assembly.

At an early part of the Session, as is usual, a Committee was appointed to report on the Public Accounts. The Report was not made until near the close of the Session, and when presented to the House was only signed by the Chairman, as the Committee could not agree to an unanimous report. This report was debated on in a Committee of the whole House, on Wednesday, March 30, and on motion of Mr. Coles two clauses, as hereafter shown, were struck out. The report, as adopted by a majority of the House, was reported from the Committee, and having been again read at the Clerk's table, the report as agreed upon by the minority was moved in amendment, but was lost on the following division: For the amendment—Honbles. Haviland, Longworth, Montgomery, Palmer; Messrs. Yeo, Pope, H. Haviland. Against it—Messrs. Macdonald, Dingwell, Munro, Clark, Laird, Cooper, Macgill, Muirhead, Perry; Honbles. Coles, Warburton, Wightman, Mooney, Whelan.

We have not space to give the report and amendment entire. The latter was similar to the report in most respects, and as we have it in type from the Journals, we print it in our paper, and shew by notes where it differs materially from the original.

Your Committee find the General Account of the financial state of the Colony, charging against it all the Debentures issued under the authority of 16th Victoria, cap. 18, and all Warrants and Treasury Notes afloat, and giving credit for cash in Treasury and Bonds for Duties in Treasurer's and Attorney General's hands, to have been, at the end of the financial year, as follows:—

Government of Prince Edward Island.

Dr.				Cr.			
To Warrants unpaid 31st Jan. 1858,	£30,594	1	9¼	By Bonds in treasury, - -	£25,156	13	3¼
Treasury Notes, - -	11,500	0	0	Bonds in the hands of the Attorney General, - - -	3,067	2	11
Debentures issued under 16 Vic. cap. 18, - - -	20,550	0	0	Cash in Treasury, - -	4,550	1	4¾
				Balance,* - - - -	29,870	4	4¾
	£62,644	1	9¼		£62,644	1	9¼
To balance against the Colony, 31st January, 1857, - -	£22,803	14	0	By Receipts at Treasury, in the year ended 31st January, 1858,	£41,456	2	0¾
Expenditure during the year ended 31st January, 1858, -	48,522	12	5½	" Balance, including all Debentures and Treasury Notes, -	29,870	4	4¾
	£71,326	6	5½		£71,326	6	5½

* This amount is lessened in the Report adopted, by giving the Island credit for £14,226 14s due on land sold.

The Revenue of the past year exceeds that of the previous year, by the sum of £793 5s 3d, as will be seen by reference to the accompanying Tabular statement, and may be accounted for by the additional impost of 1¼ per cent., levied under the Act 20th Victoria, cap. 1, upon certain goods, wares and merchandize imported into the Island, the general importation of Dutiable Articles being less in amount than those of the previous year:

TABULAR STATEMENT of REVENUE for 1856 and 1857.

ARTICLES.	Amount for 1856. £	s.	d.	Amount for 1857. £	s.	d.	Increase. £	s.	d.	Decrease. £	s.	d.
Impost, - -	£30,091	2	0¾	£30,822	2	7¼	£731	0	6			
Light and Anchorage, - -	744	18	6¾	857	13	8	112	15	1¼			
Land Assessment, - -	4,845	4	6¼	4,626	0	4				219	4	2¼
Post Office, - - -	1,132	0	0	1,198	0	0	66	0	0			
Licences, - -	284	10	0	325	10	0	41	0	0			
Fees Secretary's Office, -	216	8	10	198	8	5				18	0	5
" Registrar's " -	342	15	6	340	2	3				2	13	3
Customs, - - -	73	11	9	71	17	0				1	14	9
Juries, - - -	21	12	0	45	12	0	24	0	0			
Fines and Penalties, - -	83	7	6	109	19	0	26	11	6			
Public Lands, - -	1,863	13	4	1,936	13	6	73	0	1			
Crown Lands, - -	269	2	4	371	12	7	102	10	3			
Interest on Bonds, -	376	9	5	331	10	4				44	19	1
Wharfage, - -	19	13	2	8	5	5				11	7	9
Head Money, - -	37	2	9	29	4	0				7	18	6
Sales of Books, - -	98	14	5	99	2	4	0	7	11			
Wrecked and unclaimed Goods,	3	17	1	34	10	10	30	13	9			
Rent of Warren Farm, -				27	15	6	27	15	6			
Return of Land Assessment Fees,				5	1	3	5	1	3			
Surcharges, - - -	0	4	0	3	19	0	3	15	0½			
Seizures, - - -	19	13	6	13	1	11				6	11	6
Sundries, - - -	138	16	0							138	16	0
	£40,662	16	9¾	£41,456	2	0¾	£1,244	11	0½	£451	5	9¼

The following Table shews a comparative statement of the Public Expenditure for the two past years, under its different heads:—

NAME.	Expenditure for 1856. £	s.	d.	Expenditure for 1857. £	s.	d.	Increase for 1857. £	s.	d.	Decrease for 1857. £	s.	d.
Roads, Bridges and Wharfs, -	11,468	8	0	9,893	14	0¼				1,574	13	11½
Education, - -	13,554	11	11¾	13,982	0	9½	427	8	9¾			
Legislature, - -	2,877	5	8	2,779	6	8				97	19	0
Salaries, - -	4,214	5	4½	4,267	10	0	53	4	7½			
City of Charlottetown, -	275	1	8½							275	1	8½
Mails and Packets, -	2,769	0	7	4,646	2	1	1,877	1	6			
Lights, Buoys and Beacons, -	1,240	13	9½	1,120	17	4½				119	16	5
Coroners' Inquests, -	106	14	0½	139	9	3½	32	15	3½			
Royal Agricultural Society, -	1,216	12	2	1,000	0	0				216	12	2
Province Building, -	659	6	10	385	13	1				273	13	9
Government House, - -	517	17	6	467	15	8				50	1	10
Lunatics and Asylum, -	800	12	6	903	4	1	102	11	7			
Boards of Health, - -	55	0	0							55	0	0
Protection of Fisheries, -	25	0	0	25	0	0						
Jails, - - -	1,122	14	4¼	1,188	2	4	65	7	11¾			
Public Printing, - -	1,037	12	3	739	15	8½				297	16	6½
Stationery, - - -	123	15	6	152	14	9	28	19	3			
Crown Prosecutions, -	423	18	5½	471	2	8½	47	4	3			
Post Offices and Public Postage,	817	7	8½	930	15	6½	117	7	10			
Public Lands, - -	4,336	2	3	1,703	3	4				2,632	18	11
Military, - - -	11	10	0							11	10	0
Treasury Notes, - -	56	19	10½	114	8	0½	57	8	2			
Drawbacks, - -	130	7	7½	204	16	5½	74	8	10			
Poor, - - -	676	15	0	691	7	6	14	12	6			
Land-waiters and Excise, -	226	1	0	355	9	1	129	8	1			
Interest, - -	844	7	8	1,084	18	3	240	10	7			
Small Disbursements, - -	138	8	0	194	10	0	56	2	0½			
Bears and Loupcerviers, -	17	0	0	8	10	0				8	10	0
Telegraph Company, - -				520	9	5	520	9	5			
Election, - -				37	16	2	37	16	2			
Ferry House, Lot 48, - -				156	0	0	156	0	0			
Reciprocity Treaty Duty returned,	96	7	5							96	7	5
Indians, - - -	40	0	0	85	16	2	45	16	2			
Miscellaneous, - -	488	15	5½	272	3	10½				216	11	7
	£50,364	12	8¼	£48,522	12	5½	£4,084	13	0½	£5,926	13	3½

The Light Duty Revenue from the year 1852, has been, at the different Ports, as follows:

PORT.	1852.			1853.			1854.			1855.			1856.			1857.		
Charlottetown,	£362	3	6½	£281	17	6½	£406	10	4½	£386	18	0	£348	2	2	£412	1	8
Georgetown,	98	4	6	120	6	5	173	13	2½	201	16	4	121	0	3½	216	3	1
Bedeque,	20	19	0½	33	15	10	30	17	0	21	19	2½	39	6	10	20	2	7½
Souris,	21	15	2½	22	13	3½	20	7	4½	18	17	2½	25	4	8½	19	9	9½
Richmond Bay,	62	8	8	29	15	9½	28	0	3½	12	5	4	91	2	2	74	6	2
Cascumpec,	121	14	10	82	0	11½	56	7	4	45	3	9½	67	16	0	58	13	2½
Grand River,	6	11	7½	14	14	2½	12	2	7½	6	8	1½	5	1	4	0	4	6
Orwell,	4	10	2	2	16	6	2	5	10	5	9	3	13	19	3	2	10	5
Tignish,	0	8	10	5	7	10	0	10	8				2	17	10	0	17	7
Flat River,				1	17	6	0	9	3									
Saint Peter's,	9	7	11½	4	15	3	8	8	0	9	14	11	5	12	6½	7	10	11½
New London,	8	5	7½	6	9	6	4	7	8	4	4	8	6	16	2	16	0	3
Crapaud,	0	19	11	2	9	11½				5	3	1½	5	12	4½	9	8	7½
Murray Harbour,	6	8	2	4	19	10½	8	9	11	10	9	9	6	6	4	8	15	2½
Rustico,	2	3	6	2	7	7½	6	13	3½	2	11	7½	1	16	9	5	17	1
Tracadie,	3	2	10	1	3	3½												
Pinette,													2	19	9½	5	12	6
Covehead,													1	4	0			
	£729	4	5	£617	11	4½	£759	2	10	£731	1	4	£744	18	6½	£857	13	8

The Committeee remark that the amount of Light and Anchorage Duty collected at Georgetown is larger than that collected at all the Ports on the North side of the Island, and consider that from the number of American vessels calling into these Ports being larger than the number calling at Three Rivers, the amount of Duty, if properly collected and accounted for, should exceed the amount at present paid in; and recommend that the Government take such measures as will secure the prompt collection and correct return of Light and Anchorage Duties at these Ports, in future.

Your Committee have minutely examined the Accounts of the Commissioner of Public Lands, from which they learn that there remains due upon securities and for Lands sold under the authority of the Act of 16th Victoria cap. 18, as under, viz:

Bonds, - - - - - - - -				£775	7	1
Amounts due upon Deeds issued, - -	£4052	13	3½			
Amount due upon Deeds not issued, - - -	1165	12	5			
Amount due for which there are no vouchers, -	9008	8	3½	14,226	14	0
				£15,002	1	1

Your Committee beg to observe that in the statement of sums due, under the last enumerated head, several instances occur in which no amount of deposit has been paid by the alleged purchasers; and, in other cases, a very trifling amount has only been paid, bearing a very small proportion to the amount required to be paid by the 28th section of the Land Purchase Act.

Your Committee would call attention to the great discrepancy between the above amount of Bonds, and that in the return furnished by the late Commissioner of Public Lands, in which it was stated that there were then in the Prothonotary's Office Judgment Bonds representing £3320 9s 3¾d, with £232 2s 8d costs, of which he considered that at least £1,400 would be recovered of them, besides interest and costs; yet, after payments on account of said Bonds, during the past year, of £60 0s 5d only, the balance due appears to be reduced to £775 7s 1d, by Bonds being cancelled prior to 1st May, 1857. (See Note 2.)

The Account of Public Lands for the last year will stand as follows:—

Dr.		Cr.	
By gross amount of receipts on account of Lands sold during the year,	£1,957 3 6	To 1 year's Interest on Debentures for payment of Lands,	£1,027 10 0
		" Lost by Land Tax,	210 0 0
		" Commissioner's Salary,	300 0 0
		" Surveyor General's Salary,	250 0 0
		" Woodrangers,	57 0 0
		" Assistants Surveyors,	29 10 0
		" Mileage,	20 13 4
		" Printing and advertising,	17 16 6
		" Stationery,	9 19 1
		" Balance,	34 14 7
	£1,957 3 6		£1,957 3 6

By the Accounts of the Commissioner of Public Lands it also appears that he has sold Crown Lands during the past year, principally in Georgetown and Royalty, to the amount of £710 10s, and that he has received, on account of such sales, and on balances due on former sales of Crown Lands, the sum of £381 2s 7d, and paid the same into the Treasury under the Act of

(There were no clauses in the original similar to the two following:)

Note 1. The amount of Six Thousand Pounds with Interest is still claimed by the Vendors of the Worrell Estate, to be due to them, for the balance of the consideration money of their Deed of Sale to the Government, which, however, is retained until certain points in dispute shall be adjusted.

Note 2. There appears to have been 84,254 acres of Public Land, of which 38,850¾ acres sold for the sum of £19,256 16s 6d, and there remain still unsold 45,403¼ acres.

The Committee recommend that in future the Accounts for the purchase and sales of Public Lands be kept separate and distinct from the General Revenue Accounts, and that the Debentures issued for the purchase of those Lands be a charge against them.

(In Committee clauses similar to the following were sturck out of the original Report, on motion of the Col. Secretary.)

Your Committee observe that the sum of Two hundred and Seventy Pounds has been paid to the Clerk of the Executive and Legislative Councils, for his services for the past year, as also Twenty Pounds to an Assistant; while the Act 14th Victoria, cap. 3d, expressly declares that the salary to that Officer of £120 shall be in lieu of all fees of office, allowances and emoluments.

It appears from the Warrant Book that the sum of £67 7s 6d has been paid to John Doirant for superintending the erection of Oyster Bed Bridge, and other services, and a further sum of £115 5s, to the same person for superintending the erection of Prince Street Wharf in Charlottetown. Your Committee are of opinion that the latter service should have been chiefly discharged by the Superintendant of Public Works.