

I apprehend, be but trifling, for all the good lands have been already sold, and what remains unsold is either of a very inferior quality, or altogether worthless. The hon. member from Flinty Glen is, for once, right; and I would require no better way of trying the concern than by the method he has proposed; for fully and clearly, I think, would it establish the correctness of my views concerning it, as I have already avowed them. Well, according to the plan proposed by the hon. member from Flinty Glen, I would first debit the concern with the £20,550 due from it, together with the interest on that amount; then with the expenses of management, which annually equal, if they do not exceed, the returns made by it; next, with loss by land-tax; and lastly, with the loss sustained by the plunder of the estate by pretended or alleged purchasers: and then, on the credit side, I would place the gross amount of receipts on account of lands sold; also the amounts due on bonds and deeds; and lastly, at a fair valuation, the wilderness lands or lands remaining unsold; and when I had done this, and struck a balance, it would either be on the wrong side, or else, if in favour of the concern, of so trifling and doubtful a character as clearly to prove, to every man of understanding mind, the utter impossibility of its ever proving any thing but a losing speculation, or of its resulting in any thing but the total loss to the country of the amount at present due from it. This, from the data before us, it is not difficult to divine. In the first place, the expenses exceed the receipts on account of the past year, as appears even by the statements with which the managers of the lands have themselves furnished us; and I hesitate not to say that these statements are not such as we can implicitly rely upon. When we consider in how questionable a manner they have foisted into the credit side of their account 938 acres, on which no deposit has yet been paid; and when we regard the altogether unjustifiable insertion in the receipts of £380, paid on account of sales of Crown Lands; much reason, indeed, does there appear to be for suspecting a falsification of their statements, wherever it was found practicable. And, besides all this, they have carefully left out of sight the fact that £6000 are yet due, with interest thereon, to the vendors of the Worrell Estate. To return to the mode of settling the accounts, so aptly suggested by the hon. member from Flinty Glen, if the Government are to have credit for the goods on their shelves, it must first be determined whether they are to have credit for them at the selling prices at which they are ticketed, or at cost, or perhaps loss on account of damages. With respect to the goods on the Government shelves—the lands yet unsold—large tracts of which are almost wholly worthless as the swamps and bogs on Lot 11, of which I bought 100 acres, but gave them up, as I found they were not worth even the land tax—it would certainly be a great error to give the Government credit for them at prime cost. But even granting it were true that, as they state, there is an amount of about £15,000 due on account of sales of the public land, I think it is pretty clear, taking the expenses of the past as a guide for the computation of those of the future, that £20,000 would be spent in collecting it. The management of the Worrell Estate has, since it came into the hands of the Government, cost over £2000 a year; and I believe, may, I durst venture to stake my life upon it, that every farthing of what is now due, and of whatever more may yet become due, on account of sales of that Estate, will be spent or absorbed in the collection of it; and the Colony will, in the end, have to pay the whole amount of the debt incurred by the purchase of the Worrell Estate and Lot 11.

(To be continued.) R. B. IRVING, Reporter.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

DEAR SIR,—A few weeks ago I made, through the columns of the Examiner, a few remarks on the late would-be-monster Protestant Meeting, and on the Rev. Mr. Fitzgerald's apparent sympathy with the Nestorians and other heretics. The Rev. gentleman named has since written two letters for the Protector, the one giving his reasons for considering the Nestorians good Protestants, and the other professing to give an account of the doctrine of the other heretics mentioned in my letter. I shall confine my present observations to his first letter; on a future occasion I may take some notice of his second.

I have not the least inclination nor intention of entering into a newspaper controversy on religion with Mr. Fitzgerald, as I do not think that any good would result therefrom, either for ourselves or for the community at large; on the contrary, perhaps such a controversy would tend to embitter the feelings of Catholics and Protestants towards one another, and thus get up a religious strife, to effect which the Protector has hitherto happily failed. But, sir, when infidelity and blasphemy are publicly extenuated, if not warmly maintained, by a religious minister in high standing, I think it would be disgraceful to the common Christianity of Catholics and Protestants to let such impious teaching pass unnoticed. Every Clergyman is at liberty to think and believe as he pleases; but he should not, I presume, conceal his real belief under a mask; he should not be a wolf in sheep's clothing; he should teach the doctrine of that Church of which he professes himself a Minister, and for the expounding of whose morality and tenets he is paid. If some of the Anglicans of Charlottetown willingly allow their Pastor to contaminate the minds of their children with doctrine that has an immediate tendency to sap the very foundation of Christianity, I do not deem it my duty to interfere in the matter; but I consider it very proper, if not necessary, to expose to the public, for their unqualified reprobation, the blasphemous doctrine and pestiferous errors of Nestorius, who endeavoured to rob our Divine Saviour of His Divinity. It is not at all probable that the public will put implicit confidence in the soundness of the doctrine of Nestorius on the exceedingly slender evidence that Mr. Fitzgerald has; and it is quite likely that they will take at their true worth the *ipse dixit* of biased, not to say lying, historians. However, for the information of those who have not had an opportunity of knowing who Nestorius was, and what he taught, and in order that they may be able fully to appreciate the seemingly warm sympathies of Mr. Fitzgerald for that arch heresiarch, I will give a brief outline of his career.

Nestorius was brought up at Antioch, and practised the monastic life in a monastery near that city. He was ordained priest by bishop Theodotus, who appointed him to explain the faith to the catechumens, and to defend it against the heretics. He appeared to be very zealous against the Arians, Apollonians and Origenists, and professed to be an admirer of St. John Chrysostom. He had a very fine voice, and spoke fluently; but his eloquence was not solid. He endeavoured only to please and merit the applause of the people, whose attention he attracted by his pale visage, and by his slow gait when walking. He was consecrated bishop of Constantinople in 428. After his consecration, addressing himself to the Emperor, he said: "Give me the earth purged of heretics, and I will give you heaven in recompense; exterminate with me the heretics, and I will exterminate with you the Persians." People perceived, from these expressions, that Nestorius was a vain and violent man. Five days after his consecration, he undertook to level with the ground the church belonging to the Arians, who, in despair, set fire to it themselves. After this, Nestorius was called the incendiary, not only by the heretics, but also by the Catholics. He also persecuted with implacable hatred the Manicheans and Quartodecimans. It is worthy of remark, *en passant*, that certain parties, whom it is not difficult to divine, seem to have imbibed some of the persecuting zeal of Nestorius, for they appear determined to put down *popery* at any cost and by any means.

Nestorius soon began to teach the most grave errors and doctrine, which attacked the very foundation of Christianity.

He divided the person of Jesus Christ into two persons, the one the person of the man Christ, the other the person of God the Word. Whence it followed that Jesus Christ was not God, but a man more intimately united to God than others; that the Son of God the Word did not become man, but that He united to Himself a man more intimately than He united others; that the Blessed Virgin was not the mother of God (*Theoticon*), but only of the man named Christ (*Christicon*), and to whom God the Word had united Himself. He also taught that the communication of idioms could not be admitted, that is, that it could not be lawfully said that God was born, suffered, died, &c. This doctrine destroyed, with the Divine Maternity of the Blessed Virgin, the mystery of the Incarnation and the Divinity of Jesus Christ. Nestorius at first advanced this doctrine under obscure, ambiguous and equivocal terms; at length he openly preached it. The people of Constantinople, accustomed to adore Jesus Christ as God, were moved with indignation and horror at hearing such blasphemies, and they immediately withdrew from his communion.

St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, energetically opposed these errors, and wrote against them. Pope St. Celestine, in a council held at Rome, condemned the errors of Nestorius, and charged St. Cyril to excommunicate and depose him, if, after ten days' notice, he did not retract his impieties. The Patriarch of Alexandria then proposed twelve anathemas for the heresiarch to subscribe, one of which was, "If any person should not confess that Emmanuel is truly God, and that consequently the Blessed Virgin is Mother of God, since she has engendered according to the flesh the Word of God made flesh, let him be anathema." Nestorius, swelling with pride and vanity, refused to retract his errors; on the contrary, he pronounced anathema against "any person that would say that Emmanuel is true God, or that after the Incarnation the Son of God is one."—(*Apud Mercat.*, ser. 12 et 13, *Labbe* 423.)

A general council was then held at Ephesus, in the year 431, in the first session of which the blasphemies and errors of Nestorius were condemned. The sentence of the council is in the following terms: "Nestorius having, among other things, refused to obey our citation and receive the bishops sent from us, we have been obliged to enter into the examination of his impieties, and having convicted him, as well by his letters as by his other writings, and by the discourses which he lately held in this town, proved by witnesses, to think and teach impieties: we, obliged by the holy canons and by the letter of our holy Father and fellow Minister, Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church, have come, of necessity, after having many times shed tears, to this melancholy sentence:—Our Saviour Jesus Christ, whom he blasphemed, has defined, by this Holy Council, that he is deprived of every episcopal dignity and cut off from every ecclesiastical assembly." After this, the Emperor Theodosius exiled Nestorius to the Oasis in Egypt, where he died a very miserable death.

It has been said that the only difference between Nestorius and the Church was: that the former maintained that the Blessed Virgin was only mother of Christ—whereas the Church styles her "Mother of God." "It is clear this is not to be understood as if she could be in any sense mother of the Divinity; the very thought whereof would imply contradiction and blasphemy; but by reason that she conceived and brought forth that Blessed Man, who, subsisting by the second divine person of the adorable Trinity, is consequently the natural, not the adoptive Son of God, which was the Semi-Nestorian error broached by Felix and Elipandus. In the Incarnation the human nature of Christ was assumed by, and hypostatized, that is intimately and substantially, united to the person of God the Son, so that the actions done by this nature are the actions of that Divine Person whose assumed or appropriated nature this is. Hence we truly say with Saint Paul, that we are redeemed by the blood of a God, and with the Church, that God was born of the Virgin Mary, suffered and died on the cross—all which He did in that human nature which He had wonderfully taken upon Him."

Any person that should maintain that the above difference is not a material one, is, I must say, most unfortunately benighted in the regions of pitiable ignorance, and shows that he is not possessed of intellect sufficient to enable him to deduce a consequence from a principle; for from the principle laid down by Nestorius evidently follow the blasphemies:—"That there are in Christ two persons, no less than two natures, the divine and human united; not intrinsically, but only morally, by the Divinity dwelling in the humanity of Christ, as in the temple"—that there are "Two Christs, the one God and the other man." I regret very much that, in this age of enlightenment, there should be found in our midst any person, professing himself a minister of the Christian Church, who has had the hardihood, unblushingly, to come forth the apologist, if not the defender and admirer, of the extravagant and shocking impieties of Nestorianism; and the fact, that a clergyman has published to the world his profound ignorance of ecclesiastical history, reflects no great credit on the cloth.

I fear that I have already taken up too much of your valuable space, so I must conclude this letter, by observing, that the apology of Nestorianism comes with a very bad grace from the quarter from which, not long since, were impudently proposed to yourself, Mr. Editor, certain exceedingly impertinent questions respecting articles of religious belief, and *latitudinarianism*; and from which another editor was lately tauntingly upbraided with being a Unitarian. Hoping that you will give the above a place in the next issue of the Examiner, I am, with respect,
Queen's County, April 14, 1858. LECTOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

DEAR SIR:—Will you be so kind as to permit me to offer a few remarks, through the medium of your popular journal, on the article which prefaced Mr. Kenny's letter in the last issue of the Protector.

Without noticing the vindictiveness that characterizes the production referred to, I will proceed to analyze that portion of it which denies the truth of Mr. Kenny's statement in reference to certain "shadowings forth" that appeared a few weeks ago in the Protector. Let the extracts speak for themselves. The following is from Mr. Kenny's first letter:—"These gigantic schemes [referring to Mr. Lockhead's speech] are like other giants, purely imaginary. They have been called into existence to serve a purpose. That purpose it is difficult to divine, unless it be to deprive the Catholics of this Colony of their civil and religious rights, as recently shadowed forth in the Protector."

To which the Protector of the 7th inst., thus replies:—"We made the quotation from Mr. Kenny's letter to repel the accusation that we shadowed forth any attempt to deprive the Catholics of this Colony of their civil and religious rights. The Protector has shadowed forth no such injustice, and we therefore deny Mr. Kenny's accusation."

These quotations are plain and distinct enough. It remains, however, to be seen, whether Mr. Kenny had any foundation for the accusation contained in the above extract from his letter, and whether the following equally plain, deliberate language, taken from the leading editorial in the Protector of the 10th February last, has any meaning or not:—"Our empire is professedly a Protestant empire. It is based on Protestant principles,—it protests against Popery. For any officials, governors, or inferior rulers in any part of the empire to favor that against which the empire protests in its very constitution, is *bold disloyalty, that ought to be punished by immediate removal from office.*"

"The sooner, then, that the rulers of this Island throw off all favor to Popery, the sooner shall we have peace; for Protestants will never rest while the enemies of their faith and freedom are allowed to prevent them from enjoying their just rights."

Can any person, let me ask, possessed of the smallest share of common sense, put any other construction upon this extract, than that put upon it by Mr. Kenny? No, no!—Catholics are not quite so stupid as the hydra-headed Editor of the Protector would fain believe. His object and meaning are too apparent to be glossed over by any sophistry he may now employ. The rancorous and bigoted spirit by which he was apparently actuated, no doubt led him to overstep the bounds of prudence, and unwittingly expose the *cloven-foot*, which he now labors to conceal by violent and senseless denials of the palpable meaning of the extract above quoted. I think I have sufficiently demonstrated the correctness of Mr. Kenny's remarks, and the falseness of the Protector's. Nor was Mr. Kenny the first or only individual who accused the Protector not only of shadowing forth, but earnestly advocating the right to deprive Catholics of their religious, civil and political rights. This can be proved by consulting the pages of late Nos. of the Examiner and Islander Newspapers. The following extract from an editorial written by a Protestant, and published in the latter journal of March 5th, in reference to the celebrated politico-religious pledges printed some time previously in the Protector, will suffice for the present:—"3. It is rather unfortunate that the political rights of Roman Catholics should have been omitted; and that their civil and religious rights should be only on sufferance, in so far as their enemies may vote them 'consistent with the well being of the state.' Of course, without any pledge, we and all Protestants will resist 'Romish aggressions,' if attempted; but until then we will not raise giants for the purpose of quelling them." Enough for the present of the shadowing forth.

With respect to the Editor's criticism on the "grammar, style and construction" of Mr. Kenny's letter, I have very little to say, being fully aware that Mr. Kenny is well able to deal with him, should he deem it worth while, and time permit. I may, however, observe, that owing to the haste which, of necessity, Mr. Kenny had to employ in replying to the slanders of Messrs. Lockhead and Murray (being a few moments snatched from the time necessary for the discharge of his onerous duties), a slight grammatical mistake might easily escape detection. Such mistakes are common to some of the best English writers,—Gibbon, Goldsmith, Cobbett, &c., whose literary productions are otherwise models of diction and style. The "construction or style" is a mere matter of taste, and any other person's opinion of it is more likely to be correct than the Editor of the Protector's. Upon the whole, the criticism is rather favorable than otherwise, as it leads to the conclusion that the substance or matter of the letter was decisive and incontrovertible, and well calculated to rise the gall of those white-chokered gentry who succeeded in what is called in vulgar parlance, "making fools of themselves" at the great Protestant meeting.

I must, however, inform the Editor, that a grammatical, or any other criticism, comes with an exceedingly bad grace from him; and that he ought to feel particularly obliged to "Free Churchmen" and others, for their praiseworthy efforts in endeavoring to impress upon him the absolute necessity of studying Lindley Murray. But instead of being so, the mere mentioning of their names excites his unbounded rage. And although this endeavour has not been, by any means, thrown away, the Editor still requires to be goaded to the study of Syntax before he can properly assume the title of critic. Nor has he yet made sufficient progress in English composition to be able to punctuate and paragraph his stupid productions. For were I, a mere pupil of Mr. Kenny, to criticise the criticism under consideration, I might make some painful exposures of the grammar, style and *travesty* of a production emanating from the Editor of the Protector, and a Minister of the Gospel withal. The grammatical purity of the following may be well doubted:—"If there is any truth in the Bible." The orthography of the following would entitle him to the pedagogue's birch:—"Were we to criticize, &c." "With a distinct and idiomatic pronunciation." Those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. Eh, Mr. Editor of the Protector?

In fine, Mr. Kenny's acquirements and talents are too well known to suffer the least diminution in the estimation of the public by the slanders of George Sutherland.

The scurrilous and rabid effusion of "A. S." is hardly worth noticing. I will merely remark that if "A. S." be the Rev. Alexander Sutherland, as is generally believed, his flock may well feel proud of him. With respect to what he says about the use of the Douay Testament in the Academy, it is simply false. But any thing at all, I suppose, will do to serve the good cause. Were it not that he is a Clergyman, and that the cause of Religion must not be made suffer on account of the misconduct of its professors, he should be compelled to wear "all round his hat" the following inscription:—

"New London's column, pointing to the skies,
Like a tall bully, lifts its head and lies."

Feeling, Mr. Editor, that I have already trespassed too much on your valuable space, I will conclude by stating, that these remarks have been called forth in justice to Mr. Kenny's grammatical knowledge; for to his able instructions am I indebted for any proficiency I possess in that highly useful branch of study, and which enable me to pronounce the Editor of the Protector a Quack. Yours, in truth,
April 9. A PUPIL.

The Examiner.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., APRIL 19, 1858.

CONTEST FOR CHARLOTTETOWN.

Those of our readers, who reside in Charlottetown and its vicinity, are aware that the Candidates for the representation, on the Tory side, are the present members, Messrs. Palmer and Longworth; and that the Liberal party has decided to put forward, as their nominees, Stephen Swahey and John Rigg, Esquires. In noticing the claims of the above named gentlemen to the favorable consideration of the constituency, whose suffrages they seek to obtain, far be it from us to depreciate the merits of those first named. To them we gladly accord the merit of unswerving consistency. The advocates of the old system by which the people were studiously and systematically excluded from all voice in the management of their own affairs—the bitter opponents of the introduction of Responsible Government—the men who would fain have precluded any man from exercising the elective franchise, who could not approve himself possessed of three hundred pounds, clear of all incumbrances—the men who, to the last, withstood the Free Education Act—the Act prohibiting the landlord from receiving 1s. 6d. per acre for rent, and compelling him to take 1s. 1d. instead—in fact, the men who have uniformly opposed any measure calculated to increase the rights of the people, and to relieve them from the thralldom which a bastard aristocracy had succeeded in imposing, years ago, on poverty and ignorance, appear naturally enough as the representatives of the party whose faithful servants they have ever been. When so great an outcry is made by some of their supporters about officials holding seats in the Assembly, it is really amusing to observe that the very elite of the champions they put forward happen to have held seats in the House of Assembly, when they filled respectively the offices of Attorney General and Provincial Secretary. Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the columns of the Islander, that the Hon. Edw.

Palmer and T. H. Haviland, Esq., will be deprived of all the emolument of the Attorney and Solicitor Generalships, if the cruel kindness of their political and personal friends should force upon their reluctant favorites the fatal boon of legislative honors. We advise their admirers, in mercy to those gentlemen, not to place them in a position which will most effectually preclude them, if they are honest in the expression of their opinions, from reaping those professional honors to which they are so pre-eminently entitled, for which they are so admirably qualified, and from which they have been so unjustly debarred.

That Mr. Longworth would resume the Colonial Secretaryship, we cannot allow ourselves, for a moment, to believe. If, therefore, his friends, and personally he has many, should put him into the House of Assembly, we ask them—Would they be doing him a favor by placing him in a situation in which he must refuse what he wants, or become false to his publicly declared principles? The Liberal candidates—Messrs. Swahey and Rigg—require no recommendation at our hands. One is a gentleman of independent means, the other an active and enterprising merchant—neither seeking office, nor probably willing to accept one if offered—coming forward not to gratify any selfish desire for power and place, but merely because they have been the chosen of their party, and chosen solely on the grounds of public recognition of their ability and honest attachment to their principles. Such are the men whom the Liberal party opposes to the two most prominent Tories in the Island, and we entertain no fear as to the result.

In fact, when we consider that men of all shades of political opinion now profess a very great deal of affection for the pure administration of Responsible Government—when we reflect that the party to which Messrs. Palmer and Longworth do and have always belonged, and of which they might be considered the chiefs, always and most strenuously denounced that system—we can but admire the facile credulity of any Liberal who may be simple enough to believe their protestations in favor of it. According to those worthies, they are sincerely anxious to carry out, in more pure integrity than is exhibited by its parents and consistent friends, that system against which they strove with all their strength—which they denounced as a curse upon the land, and which, so long as it is not committed to the guardianship of false friends, will continue to keep all public offices and honors as gifts at the bestowal of the people, instead of being the hereditary right of a dirty little oligarchy, possessing more pride than wealth, and more wealth than brains.

Let them mouth their vows of fealty to constitutional government as they may, they are not of those who should administer it.

The wise man committed the care of the child to her who was its natural guardian. He soon discovered that the rival claimant to its parentage had no real love for the alleged object of her affection, that sooner than that she whose heart yearned with all a mother's love, and who had experienced all a mother's woe on account of the disputed babe, should have the uncontrolled possession of it, she was willing that it should be destroyed, that the true parent's situation might be reduced to the level of her own.

When Northern Europe poured its barbarian hordes into the "Eternal City," what cared the ruthless invaders for the beauty and symmetry which they had not known before, and which it was not their mission to preserve and improve? All that met their eyes of the grand and of the beautiful they hated as a reproach to their own ignorance and rude institutions, and so with right good will did they undertake the work of destruction.

Just about so much love for Responsible Government have the Tories, and in a similar mode would they deal with it, if they but had the power.

PUBLIC MEETING.

We understand that it is the intention of the Central Liberal Society to hold a public meeting at the Temperance Hall on Tuesday evening, the 27th instant, at half-past seven o'clock, for the purpose of preparing the electors of Charlottetown for the approaching contest in this City, and making such other preparations as may be deemed necessary to secure the return of the Liberal Candidates.

HIGH SHERIFFS FOR THE CURRENT YEAR.—We understand that the following gentlemen have been nominated High Sheriffs for this Island, for the current year:—
Queen's County—William McGill, Esquire.
Prince County—Elisha Hooper, Esquire.
King's County—William Clements, Esquire.

PUBLIC MEETING IN CHARLOTTETOWN.

A Public Meeting of the electors of Charlottetown and Royalty was held in the Temperance Hall, on Wednesday evening last, the 14th instant, for the purpose of nominating Candidates for the representation of the City and Royalty in the next House of Assembly.

James Duncan, Esq., opened the business of the meeting by moving that the Hon. Edward Palmer and the Hon. Francis Longworth be again nominated as Candidates for the representation of the City and Royalty; and, after having briefly, but forcibly and justly, complimented those two honorable gentlemen on their past parliamentary fidelity to the interests of their constituents, he commenced—evidently enough with much right good will to the task, but certainly with only a very scanty supply of facts on which to depend upon as resources—a direct assault upon the Government, vaguely and indefinitely charging them with a lavish, but useless expenditure of the public moneys; and, at the same time, accusing them of neglect of public improvements in general, but especially with neglect of the public highways.

The Hon. Col. Secretary (Mr. Coles) then rose, and replied to and refuted the accusations preferred against the Government by Mr. Duncan, in that ready, clear and successful manner, in which, frequently so much to the admiration and satisfaction of his friends, and so greatly to the confusion and discomfiture of his opponents, he at once exposes and rectifies the misstatements and errors into which the enemies of the Government, in their envious longings after power, and their malignant desire to lessen and tarnish public worth and merit which they cannot rival, allow themselves to be betrayed. The hon. gentleman took up the comparison, instituted by Mr. Duncan, between the revenue and expenditure of the years 1845 and 1849, and those of the years 1856 and 1857, and showed unanswerably, first, that in furtherance of the greatest boon that any human Government can possibly bestow upon a country—a complete system of popular education—the party at present in power had expended £51,000 in the same period—five years—in which their predecessors, in the administration of public affairs, had appropriated only £8,000 for a like purpose! He then adverted to the very large sums which under the present rule, have been expended in the construction of wharfs and bridges; instancing the great improvements which, with respect to the Charlottetown Ferry, have been made on both sides of the Hillsborough; the bridges at New London and Rustico, and the great and very important one at Souris; besides many minor works, which although, comparatively, of but little magnitude, are yet highly serviceable in the promotion of the agriculture, trade and commerce of the country. As to the state