

I could on the ground of expediency (and without the violation of any principle) vote not to receive the paper.

Gentlemen, I am not a sectarian or bigoted, I advocate "Free and Religious Liberty" as much as the gentleman who has opened the proceedings this evening. I am not an Unitarian, I am not a Roman Catholic, neither am I a Church of England man, I am a Dissenter, but I wish the Unitarians to enjoy the same privileges as myself, consequently, I voted against the *Christian Inquirer*, not because it was an Unitarian paper, but simply on the ground that its reception would not better the Association. It appears to me that the wording of the resolution proposed by the gentleman (Mr. Taylor) that he impugns the principle and motive upon which the new Board had acted, he wants to make the present Board responsible for the conduct of last years Board. This I cannot admit, for I have and do now denounce the resolution passed by the old Board, I have never agreed to it. I think he has put the saddle upon the wrong horse. For the present Board are not responsible for the action of last years Board.

I think, gentlemen, the better course would be (and one as regards myself and which I should like the best) to approve of the principle of expediency, upon which the present Board have acted, and then propose a resolution to have the paper received, and if the majority of the meeting are in favor of its reception, I pledge myself that I am prepared to bring in motion after motion before the Board at every meeting until the paper be received,—this I am convinced is the proper course. We, the Directors have a right to keep in view, in every matter the interests of the Association, we have a right to consult the wishes of the members, and thus fulfil that for which we have been put into office. I therefore trust that the members of the Association will decide this evening, that the Directors have acted conscientiously, not in a bigoted or sectarian manner. I conclude by again repeating, that I never voted against the *Christian Inquirer*, because it was a Unitarian paper, but because its reception would injure (at the time I voted) the interests of the Association.

W. C. EVANS, Esq.—In rising upon the present occasion I cannot say that I feel the same pleasure that some of the speakers who have preceded me give expression to, because, I am aware, that my ability in this respect will not enable me to give the subject that justice which it merits; but, I cannot allow the question to be taken or the mover in this evening's business to reply to what has been advanced against him, without setting him right in regard to some of his facts—such of them as have come under my own knowledge. The gentleman stated that the paper had been originally received by the deliberate opinion of the board: now the fact was it had been received only by the casting vote of the Chairman, at a meeting called an hour before the usual time. He (Mr. Taylor) further stated, that the resolutions prohibitory of the paper were passed by a bare majority of a fractional part of the Board of Direction. Now, how stands the facts; at the meeting where the reception of the paper was decided upon there were eight members and the Chairman present, and at the meeting expelling it there were just the same number, with one additional member who did away with the necessity of the chairman's giving his vote upon the matter; and, at the subsequent meeting when the question was again brought up, its reception was deemed inexpedient by a vote of 10 to 2—the chairman and another member not voting. This certainly does not look like carrying the measure by a fractional portion of the Board. He also endeavoured to lower the Association in the eyes of the public by contrasting it with sister institutions in the United States. He said that the Cincinnati Association was much more liberal than the Association of Montreal, because they had given praise to an Unitarian minister. But it appeared that the Montreal Association were not behind the others in liberality, since their reports showed that they likewise had bestowed praise on Unitarians. The gentleman whom the last annual report of this institution, eulogised, is an Unitarian. He deserved the eulogy and we gave it to him. The gentleman who had moved the resolution would lead the meeting to believe that he knew the hearts of the entire community; yet he wanted to make it appear in another part of his speech that there had been a great deal of secrecy. Now one of those two things must be wrong, there was an inconsistency between them. He (Mr. Taylor) tells us of all that happened at the meetings of the Board of Directors, which suited his purpose, and withholds that which does not, displaying a deficiency either in knowledge or candour. I must say that I feel pleasure in being permitted here to give reasons that influenced my conduct at the Board of Direction. I think it is a good plan for the members to ask for an explanation, when the conduct of the Directors is such as to call for it, for if all was right then our ex-