

planation would do away with any ill-feeling that might exist, and if all was not right then suitable instruction could be given by the members unitedly that would make it satisfactory if not to all at least to the majority, and release the Board of any responsibility they might feel. I am perfectly willing that the majority should rule. I am, further, of the opinion that the views of a minority should not be wholly disregarded. I am also, notwithstanding all the odium that that gentleman would attach to it, and he has deprecated it in very strong language I am one of those who are to a certain extent governed by expediency, and I will show in explanation how my conduct was based on that ground from the first, though I admit my feelings of opposition to the *Christian Inquirer* were as strong as those of any man could be. At the time when the last annual report was read for my approval, I suggested that its reception should not be mentioned in the report, because I feared that it would disturb the harmonious working of the Association; and this suggestion was carried unanimously. After this at a subsequent meeting of the Board at which I was not present, it was thought that as they were ashamed to acknowledge its reception, they had better not receive it, and it was decided accordingly. As the question really stood, it amounted to this, whether one, two, or half a dozen members should force on the rest of the Association a paper they did not want. The Board thought not; the Board had been elected on account of their past character for good management in other affairs, and in order that they should use their best discretion in the management of the affairs of this institution. They were all Trinitarians; and if Unitarian papers were wanted, some Unitarians would have been, he supposed, placed among them.\* I would repeat it is a question whether one or two shall rule the Board as they please, or whether the Board shall rule for the interest of the Society for the year they are elected. If the Directors conduct does not please the members the remedy in their own hands, let them not re-elect, let them put others in power. I for one am quite willing to make way for one more pleasing to the majority, if my past conduct be displeasing. But I cannot sit down without urging upon all the necessity of union, and in doing so I would, without hesitation, state my intention of continuing a member of the Association without any reference to the decision that may be arrived at this evening, because I am firmly of the opinion that this institution may be made a very powerful instrument for good or for evil. I will endeavour to do by it as much good I can, and in furthering that endeavour will keep to the Association so long as they keep together.

Mr. JOHN LOWE rose amidst interruptions. He said, it is my intention, Mr. President, to maintain the floor. I have a few words to say, and mean to say them; and I am sure that gentlemen will not facilitate business by interrupting me. It is not my intention to detain the meeting many minutes, as I do not believe that any eloquence at 20 minutes past ten o'clock at night in this hot room will change the opinions of gentlemen on a subject so exciting as the present. I do not however say that if I could bring into the field such eloquence as that my friend Mr. Winn gave us a specimen of, and which I am sorry was not enlisted on the other side, that I should not be tempted to detain gentlemen a little. Some gentlemen have been at great pains to discuss and excuse the conduct of the present board, and also that of its predecessor. I cannot but think such discussion irrelevant to the issue on which we are assembled to decide this evening. It has been stated that no offence is meant to the board. I mean none, nor do I want to discuss its conduct. It is enough that I say, I have confidence in the gentlemen who compose it. A different issue has now arisen, and we the supreme legislators have met to decide it. I think it is of no use talking about the right we have to turn out a paper. We can turn out any or all the papers we have, there is no doubt about that, and there is no use of taking up time to discuss it. The question is if we now exclude the paper in question, as it is asked to be admitted, and in the manner in which it is asked to be admitted, shall we not give our Institution a sectarian character? I believe that we shall, and on this principle I shall vote against the exclusion of the paper, and I trust that the majority of gentlemen here will support the same principle. I think that any thing which would have the effect of giving our Institution a sectarian character would be very much to be deplored. I believe it to be unsectarian in its foundation, and that its objects are wide, and the reverse of sectarian. The only ground on which I can see that a paper can be proscribed in the manner that the one in question is sought to be, is on that of infidelity or immorality.

\* One Unitarian, a merchant, of this city, was elected by the Directors as an honorary member of the Board, but he was not present at any of its meetings when this subject was under consideration.