

forth by Unitarian writers. At a meeting of the friends of the Association, held on 12th February last, a committee was appointed to carry into execution the proposition, and it is understood that this committee should report at the adjourned meeting, to be held on the afternoon of March first, at the Freeman Place Chapel, Boston. We hope they will be abundantly successful in carrying out this noble object.

---

THE "LIBERAL CHRISTIAN" AND ITS CRITICS.—The *Liberal Christian* commenced its course with very moderate expectations from the Montreal Press. If its appearance should be noticed at all by the secular prints, it relied on simple justice being done. Nor has it been disappointed in this. With scarcely an exception, we believe, it has been noticed by the English portion of the press, and dealt with fairly,—one of the papers, indeed, (the *Pilot*,) though its writer stands on the "orthodox" side of the line in theology, was even laudatory. But we have a religious press as well as a secular; and, strange to say, we had less confidence in the justice of the former than in that of the latter. The Catholic journal, however, in its notice, certainly gave us no reason to complain. It was left to the journal of Protestant orthodoxy to form the exception to the general candor of the press. In its Supplement for February, the *Montreal Witness*, while noticing the *Liberal Christian*, takes a sling, of course, at the Unitarians, and as a farther matter of course, becomes very puerile—we should rather say in this instance, quite anile. Here is the burden of the criticism:—1st. The Unitarians have "a phraseology," and "phrases." [Could they not in some way be deprived of the use of language?] 2nd. That "they are welcome" to them. [A concession which ought to be duly appreciated.] 3rd. That Trinitarians perform their duties to God and man "more faithfully" than Unitarians. [A very comfortable assurance certainly for the Trinitarians,—“Lord I thank thee,” &c. &c.] Next come two points about which, it seems, Unitarians "ought to know," and "understand;" and which they do know and understand very well. Then the critic returns to his first trouble—the "phraseology," and the "phrases;" and winds up by declaring that Unitarians "have nothing positive to teach," and rather decline any "attempt to disprove" Evangelical views; thus at once indicating his extensive acquaintance with controversial theology, and by denying them either a positive or negative position, leaving the luckless Unitarians on a point of space in the theological world rather more minute than even the needle's point of the Schoolmen. Surely it is a wonder the mute types do not rebel against the fingers of the compositor, when set up to imprint such anility.