

It is of no use to talk about tendencies on one side or the other. We must have palpable infidelity or immorality. I have heard no charges against the paper that some gentlemen, wish to proscribe. I am not an Unitarian, but I do not believe, that Unitarians are infidels. I hope, gentlemen, by their votes will not violate those wide principles on which our Institution was founded, and as an old member of the Association, and office bearer, I would implore them to pause before giving a vote that will attach to it a sectarian character.

HENRY LYMAN, Esq., said, that he would venture to make a few remarks upon the question before the Chair, principally to explain why he had thought it his duty to call the gentlemen who had introduced the business of the meeting to order. He did so, because he thought that he was wandering from the point, in the reference he made to the Association at Cincinnati. He was extremely desirous of allowing every possible latitude to that gentleman, so long as he kept to the point; but he was not willing to allow him to extend his peregrinations indefinitely; especially when those remarks did not touch the precise point at issue. Much had been said about the *expulsion* of the *Christian Inquirer* from the Reading Room, and the terms bigotry, intolerance and proscription were freely used; this was a matter of course, and to be expected, especially when a particular impression was to be made; but he thought that the matter would resolve itself into a very simple point upon examination. When divested of all extraneous circumstance, it would be found that the paper had been received temporarily, and afterwards declined. The terms, in which the decision of the Board of Directors was conveyed, were offensive. It appeared that on all hands this point was conceded, and the Board were ready to make the most ample apology. So far there was little or no diversity of sentiment, but that was not sufficient to satisfy the requisitionists; they insist upon the reception of that paper and nothing short. Now he did not think this was reasonable, considering that had the paper been taken and paid for, as other papers, and subsequently discontinued, no one would consider himself entitled to complain. There was only one other point to which he would direct their attention, it was to the allusion made by the first speaker to the benefactions of Unitarian gentlemen. He did not mean in the slightest manner to disparage their liberality, but it had been said with emphasis, in effect that the Association were willing enough to receive their money, but at the same time did not scruple to proscribe their religious sentiments. He did not believe the statement to be a fair one. He believed the things were entirely dissimilar; it was one thing to receive a gentleman's money for a purely secular or mercantile object, and quite another to endorse his religious belief. He did not think the statement a fair one, as relating to those gentlemen he did not believe that they offered their money with the view to the introduction of their peculiar views in matters of religion. Pecuniary contributions under such circumstances might be too dearly purchased. He might extend his remarks to much greater length did the lateness of the hour permit, but as he believed enough had been said, he would not further occupy their time.

MR. TAYLOR—I have promised to detain you not above five minutes and I will redeem the pledge, but this will oblige me to pass over several points which I would like to notice. I shall first grapple with the ingenious and eloquent speech of my friend Mr. Winn. He said that the resolution expelling the *Inquirer* was not intended to be made public, and has cast censure on the Secretary who communicated it to Mr. Workman. "Not intended for publication"—was this thing done in a corner? Has the Board of the Mercantile Library Association passed a resolution of which they are ashamed? Under the circumstances, the reflection cast upon the Secretary who has resigned his membership and is not in a position to defend himself—under these circumstances, the reflections are contemptible and unjust. I was for several years Secretary to this Association and I have been Secretary to kindred Societies, and if I understand the duties of a Secretary, it is his business to conduct the correspondence, and communicate resolutions without instructions. The Resolution was a reply to Mr. Workman's letter and the Secretary only did his duty in communicating it to that gentleman. (A voice—He was not the Corresponding Secretary.) I am aware of that, but by the Rules and Regulations, the Recording Secretary is to do the duties of the Corresponding Secretary in his absence, and in this case he had been absent for some time, and his duties had been performed by the Recording Secretary, who was right in communicating the resolution.

MR. MORRIS rose—He had been Secretary to many Societies, and it was the invariable practice to instruct the Secretary to communicate resolutions when it was intended to promulgate them.