

Mr. TAYLOR—I do not so comprehend the duties of the office, but in this case the resolution was a reply. The point, however, is trifling, and I will not dwell upon it, but I would ask again if this thing was done in a corner? Were the Directors ashamed of what they had done? It would seem so. "It was drawn up hastily"—why it had been before the Board three several times and twice voted down. There was no haste in drawing it up. I understood Mr. Winn to object to the *Inquirer* because it was a foreign paper; and he intimated that we took only local religious papers. He kept back that we pay large sums for several English Religious Journals. It has been said too, that this paper is more calculated to stir up strife than a local religious journal. I hold to the very contrary. The questions treated of in the *Inquirer* are general questions, and do not move that local and partisan feeling which the *Church* and *Witness* excite. It is pleasant to read the thoughts of a writer who generalizes—there is nothing particularly exciting in it—but local questions are irritating and engender bad feeling. The meeting has been told by some of the speakers that if my resolution is adopted, the destruction of the Association may be looked upon as *un fait accompli*. From whom did these threats proceed? Not from the tolerants—we are going to stand by the Association—we cannot be driven out of it. Are the gentlemen sincere in their threats? Do you (to Mr. Roe) do you (to Mr. Winn) intend to desert the institution if you are beaten? If not, why do you regard your neighbours as more intolerant and illiberal than yourselves? You should have greater confidence in your friends. One speaker has asserted that all the Religious journals came into the Room when the junction was formed between the Association and the Religious News Room, and contends, therefore, that we are bound to receive only those papers. The statement is incorrect. Religious journals have been taken by the Association since its foundation. I am an older member than the gentleman who makes this assertion, and I appeal to you Mr. President, in support of the correctness of my statement.

All of the speeches in defence, have put this expulsion on the ground of expediency. I must repeat that is never expedient to be unjust. Expediency! it is the excuse invariably offered for injustice. Expediency! from the young mercantile men of Montreal. I am horrified to hear them speak of expediency. What will they become when the world has worn off the generous enthusiasm of youth? when they are old and hardened? Expediency from old and *effete* men, from political haeks is natural enough, but it sounds strange indeed in the mouths of the young and intelligent men of Montreal. Expediency! let us repudiate it altogether. Let us shew that we have confidence in the immutable principles of eternal justice. Let us shew that we appreciate the beautiful and complete system of morals taught in the Book of Life, in which we all believe. Let us "do unto others, as we would be done by," and shew that our reading of the Testament has not been fruitless. The amendment offered to my resolution tenders an apology, makes sundry excuses, but it leaves the injustice untouched—it sanctions it on the miserable ground of expediency. Shall we sanction the proscription of any respectable class of our citizens. Those in favor of equal rights will vote against the amendment and for my resolution.

The motion of amendment was then put, 71 voting for it, 70 against it. Messrs. Young and Leeming, scrutineers, had not voted. Mr. L. would rather not do so, but pair off. Mr. Y. would decidedly vote. Mr. L. then voted for the amendment, Mr. Y. against it. Loud cheering here arose from the majority, and confusion followed.

Several members called upon the President to put the original motion as amended. The confusion increased. Mr. Taylor thought they had been fairly beaten, the amendment was a substantive motion. The President amid shouts for the amended motion, and much confusion, declared the meeting adjourned.

Mr. LEEMING gave notice that at the Semi-Annual Meeting in May he would move the expulsion of all the religious journals from the News Room.