

*White Report for 1819*

**UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION**

FOR

**PROTECTING**

THE

**Civil Rights of Unitarians.**

---

**REPORT,**

&c.

***AT THE YEARLY MEETING,***

**HELD 22nd MAY, 1823.**

---

**G. SMALLFIELD, PRINTER, HACKNEY.**

---



**REPORT**  
OF THE  
**Committee of the Unitarian Association,**  
TO THE  
**GENERAL MEETING,**  
HELD AT THE  
LONDON TAVERN, ON THURSDAY, MAY 22, 1823.

---

**A**DOPTING the same order in which former Committees have generally noticed the several subjects which have occupied their consideration, your Committee have in the first instance to recall your attention to the state in which the application for relief from the operation of the present Marriage Law of England as it affects Dissenters, came before the last Meeting, and to detail to you what has since occurred.

In the last Report were stated the reasons why it had been found expedient to abandon what, on the whole, the then Committee considered the most desirable and simple plan of relief. It pointed at the same time, to the increasing notoriety and importance which the continued efforts of this Association had given to your claims on the notice of the Legislature, and to the remarkable fact that all the public opposition now given to their views, was confined to a disapproval of the mode of relief, not to the justice or even the expediency of extending it in an early and effectual manner.

It was also stated, that a Civilian of some eminence, (usually advocating high doctrines both in civil and ecclesiastical policy,) was understood to be engaged in preparing a draft of a proposed bill, the basis of which, it was understood, would be the concession to all Dissenters of the free liberty to solemnize their marriages in their own way, providing only for due registration in the parish books by the Ministers of the Established Church. This plan, (it was then observed,) though suggested by the friends of the Establishment, granted even more than the Committee would probably have thought prudent to ask; for it might have been expected that greater opposition would have been offered to any plan of imposing on a minister the duty of registering marriages not solemnized in his church, nor according to its rites, than to a modification of the service, in order to meet particular scruples.

Soon after the present Committee entered upon their office, the draft of this new bill was communicated to them through Mr. W. Smith, to whom the gentleman by whom it was prepared, delivered it; and after several considerable modifications which it appeared to the Committee expedient to make, it was prepared under their direction for the House of Commons, and having been moved by Mr. Smith, was read a first and second time and printed, the late period of the session preventing any further progress in a measure which was entirely new, and therefore occupied some time in preparation and discussion.

This bill your Committee felt it their duty to print and circulate as widely as possible, and particularly to communicate it to the different bodies acting on behalf of Dissenters in general; inasmuch as the measure was one which went to meet the case of all, and was likely to be much facilitated by receiving the approbation and support of individuals, of more extended influence than your Committee could expect to give to their single efforts.

The Society of Deputies immediately on receipt of the bill, adopted it on behalf of the general body of Dissenters, and ordered it to be again printed and circulated amongst its members, with an address recommending and explaining its objects; and thus a useful and efficient co-operation has been, it is hoped, secured in the future progress of the bill.

The bill itself having been long before you, the Committee do not think it necessary to enter very minutely into its details. Its general principles are to preserve the celebration of banns, and the obtaining of licenses in the same form as before; to permit the parties on producing the certificate of banns or their license, to perform the ceremony according to their own rites without any prescribed rite or form, (except that of performing it in a place of worship to be specially licensed for that purpose,) and then to require the minister of the church to enter the marriage in the parish register, on the parties appearing before him with two witnesses, and signing there a declaration and acknowledgment of such marriage having been solemnized between them.

Your Committee was fully aware that this plan was liable to considerable practical objections, particularly to the possible irregularities and certain inconveniences which a double attendance of the sort required would occasion; but on the other hand, it seemed extremely important to adopt a plan which would remove all responsibility from Dissenting ministers, and continue the attention to all civil requisites and formalities, in one common (and generally speaking, well-regulated) class of authorities.

The circumstances which have lately occasioned great uncertainty and perplexity in the general Marriage Law of the country, and have led to its revision, need not here be detailed. A conviction every where prevailed, that the labours of the last session must undergo a complete revision in the present, and it seemed impossible for your Committee to proceed to frame any regulations for meeting their particular case, while no one could divine what would be the general law on which those regulations would have to be engrafted, and they therefore found themselves under the necessity of abandoning (previous to the sitting of Parliament) all idea of entering on the subject for the present; consoling themselves only with the reflection, that the subject was in all its bearings become one of public discussion, that the old law had lost the inviolability which had so long attached to it, and that there would now be less difficulty in getting the Legislature to lend its ear to projects for its reformation.

Unexpectedly, however, an opening was made for the renewal of the Committee's exertions, by the reference of the whole Marriage Law of the country to a Committee of the House of Lords, for the purpose of considering what plan should be adopted for remodelling and reducing it into one consistent code. Your Committee thought that such a proceeding called imperatively upon them to press the case of Dissenters (particularly of Unitarians) upon the notice of the House. If they had suffered the obnoxious basis of the old Marriage Act to be adopted again, without at any rate a protest on their part, they would have felt that they not only passed by a favourable opportunity for advocating their claims, but left themselves exposed to the objection which has been urged against the conduct of the Dissenters, who, when Lord Hardwicke's Act passed, suffered the Jews and Quakers to be the only consistent Nonconformists who raised up their voices against the tendency of the measure.

It appeared obvious (in the words of the Civilian quoted by the last Report) that "the Act (26 Geo. II.) was passed to prevent marriages from being (contrary to the general good of the community) clandestine; that among the means adopted by the Act to prevent Clandestine Marriages, the principal is to compel all persons in England except Jews and Quakers, to be married according to the rites and ceremonies of the Church of England; that this was a provision in no degree necessary to prevent minors from being married clandestinely; that it might indeed tend to produce that effect; but that so might five thousand other measures which it is easy to devise." Your Committee thought that these obvious remarks ought at any rate to

be submitted to the House of Lords while it was remodelling their code, and several petitions were accordingly presented through the Marquis of Lansdown and Lord Holland, to whose prompt attention as well as to their very courteous and liberal communications the Committee feels highly indebted.

These petitions were referred to the Committee sitting on the general question, and formed, it is understood, the subject of considerable discussion; although it appears that so much difficulty was experienced by the members of that Committee in reconciling the various opinions on the more general topics of their consideration, that it was soon determined to refer the cases of exception from the law then before them to distinct and future discussion.

A new body of complainants against the policy and practical operation of the existing law appeared before the House in the petitions of the Roman Catholics, to whom the conformity imposed, is perhaps even more oppressive than it is to Protestant Dissenters, inasmuch as their religious opinions impose on them the necessity of a double solemnization, to comply first with the rites and ordinances of their own church, and next to submit to those of a Protestant establishment, in order to obtain the protection of the civil institutions of the country.

On inquiry your Committee were equally surprised at the extent of irregularity to which the absurd and oppressive regulations of the law had given rise, and the ignorance or supineness with which the authorities of the country had so long passed over so glaring and disgraceful an anomaly. At length attention has been roused to the subject by the manifest mischiefs which the present system occasions, and the Committee have lately seen the resolutions at a parish meeting of St. Luke's, Middlesex, which detail the consequences of the established system in the following resolutions:

"That this parish, containing 40,000 persons, is inhabited by a great number of Irish Catholics, who, from a conscientious regard to religious principles, prefer to be married by Catholic clergymen, and who from similar principles abstain from any subsequent marriage, by clergymen of the Established Church.

"That such marriages of Catholics by Catholic priests, although valid in Ireland and other parts of the British dominions, are illegal in England; that they are dissoluble at the caprice of the parties; that all the children born of such parties are bastards, have no natural guardians in their parents, derive no settlements from them, become chargeable to each of the parishes where they happen to be born, and are not removeable with their parents to Ireland under a recent Act, but, being legal orphans from their infancy, and unblest by relative protection, are exposed to pauperism, seduction, immorality and every anti-social crime.

"That great moral evils, much individual calamity, and many public and parochial injuries result from these circumstances; that thousands of such marriages being annually celebrated, many thousand bastard children are annually born; that those evils and injuries are far more numerous, as well as distressful, than persons not conversant with the subject apprehend or believe; and that, in this parish, and in all parishes and towns where the Irish Catholics chiefly reside, the consequences are painful to the poor, and are, by augmenting the rates, peculiarly oppressive.

"That all these evils would be prevented, morality would be promoted, social happiness would be increased, and just toleration, without any increase of political power, would be afforded, if Catholic marriages by Catholic clergymen were permitted, after such notice and with such registration as are directed by law for Protestant marriages; and, that such freedom of marriage being permitted to Quakers and Jews, may be extended to Catholics without any infringement of the Constitution or any prejudice to the Church or State.

"That a general bill as to marriages being depending in Parliament, an opportunity occurs for the prompt and easy extension of this relief to Catholics, and for the bestowment of a parochial and public benefit.

"That a petition be therefore presented from the churchwardens, overseers, and guardians of the poor, to both Houses of Parliament, requesting that Catholic marriages may thus be legalized, under such regulations as to

the publication of banns and the registrations of the marriages, as the wisdom of the Legislature may suggest."

Your Committee cannot doubt that such a state of things only requires notoriety to meet with proper attention: they look to their Catholic brethren as likely to become useful auxiliaries in the promotion of a common cause; and they can hardly conceive that the patience with which Protestant Dissenters have submitted to the arbitrary requirements of the law, will entitle them to less favourable notice than those will receive, whose more tenacious adherence to their peculiar religious rites, have induced them to overlook to such an extent the policy of complying with the municipal regulations of the country.

Finding that the Committee of the Lords, (although they were understood to entertain no hostility to the views either of the Catholics or Dissenters, when presented in a separate form to their notice,) were not disposed to make their case a branch of the general measure before them, or to adopt any other than the basis of the act of the 26th George II., your Committee were obliged to await the result of their labours, with the intention of embracing the earliest opportunity, which a knowledge of what was likely to form the permanent code of the country would afford, for bringing forward their individual claims in a distinct shape.

This period has not yet arrived, and the Committee has only within a few days seen with some degree of satisfaction, the Report of the Lords, in which their claims are noticed in the following terms:

"The Committee think it not proper entirely to omit, that their attention has been called to many other topics connected with the general subject of marriage, and that they have been laboriously employed in considering them, particularly the cases of Roman Catholic marriages, and those of other Dissenters, especially Unitarians, which latter have been brought under their consideration in numerous petitions referred to them by the House; but after inquiry and discussion, they have thought it more advisable, upon the whole, not to recommend that specific provisions respecting them should be included in the proposed bill; the cases of the various denominations of Dissenters being extremely diversified in their various circumstances, and appearing to require a diversity of provisions much more proper to be suggested by communications of their own to the Legislature.

"The Committee has therefore upon the whole thought that a more satisfactory discharge of their duty would be found to consist in suggesting regulations for the domestic marriages of English subjects, according to the rites and ceremonies of the National Church."

It may be fairly gathered from this that the noble Lords who framed this Report, see no objection in principle to the claims either of Protestant Dissenters or Catholics, and that they are likely to be received with attention when introduced in the form suggested. It may perhaps be not undeserving too of remark, that the Unitarians are in the Report (probably for the first time in any official or legislative document) recognized by that name; and apparently designedly, inasmuch as none of the petitions themselves so described the parties presenting them.

It may be proper to recall to the meeting, that at the last general meeting of this Society, the following resolutions were passed:

"That the Committee be instructed to convey to the Committee of the Deputies and the Committee of the Protestant Society, the strong and decided feeling of this Association, that the present period imperiously calls upon Dissenters of all denominations to concur and persevere in applications to Parliament, for a repeal of the Corporation and Test Acts, and of every other restriction upon the civil rights of Nonconformists.

"That this expression of opinion be accompanied by an earnest request to these bodies to co-operate in agitating the question in Parliament during the ensuing Session, and that, if necessary, the Committee call another general meeting of the Association, previous to the Session, to report progress in pursuance of this resolution, and adopt such measures as circumstances may then require."

Your Committee lost no time in acting upon these instructions, but have not in their power to report any communication of an intention to proceed in so desirable an object from the Protestant Society. From the Deputies, however, they have received from time to time, both through public report and official communication, information of the steps taken to revive public attention to the claims of Dissenters, and to bring them under the notice of the Legislature.

As a matter of general notoriety, the Committee may probably notice that considerable difference of opinion prevailed among the body of Deputies, both as to the expediency of at present agitating the question, and as to the mode of so doing if it were determined to make the attempt. The general opinion seemed disinclined to attempt any thing unless under reasonable prospect of success: and (though your Committee, in common with many of the Deputies, thought the immediate prospect of success a very secondary object of consideration, and that the course of proceeding most honourable to themselves and most likely in the end to prevail, consisted in frequent and temperate appeals to the good sense and justice of the public, through the medium of Parliament, whatever might be the present result,) they did not feel it to be their duty to press pertinaciously for any peculiar mode of proceeding, but to concur zealously in any serious efforts for the common good. It is well known that repeated discussions took place in the Deputies, all concurring so far as to admit the propriety of increased vigilance, and at length your Committee were happy to find that a regular correspondence was directed to be opened throughout the kingdom, containing an explanation of the historical position of the question, requesting communications as to the feelings and wishes of the Dissenters generally, and covering forms of petitions to be used when deemed expedient. This, it is to be hoped, will prepare the way for active and efficient exertions in the ensuing Session of Parliament, which your Committee are proud to have been in any way instrumental in exciting; and they, at their last Committee, came to the following resolution, to be submitted to your consideration, as the result of their exertions in pursuance of the instructions contained in the resolutions of last year:

“That it appears to the Committee that a point of considerable importance has been gained, in the direction of the serious attention of a body representing the general Dissenting public, to so desirable an end. That this Committee relies upon the steady continuance of such exertions, and recommends to their successors to keep a vigilant attention directed towards all proceedings tending to accomplish the wishes of this Association, as expressed at the General Meeting; and particularly not to suffer the next Session to open, without securing from some quarter a suitable application to Parliament, for the purpose of exciting such discussion as may, at any rate, operate to direct public opinion, and awaken the attention of the Dissenting body to questions of so much importance.”

Your Committee have had less business of a private nature than usual before them. [The part of the Report which relates to private cases is as usual omitted in printing for publication, for obvious reasons.]

In several instances your Committee have been called upon for, and in two or three have given, assistance to congregations in the formation of the trust deeds of their property. They have, however, felt (and they believe in common with their predecessors) some difficulty in the course to be adopted under this branch of their duties. They have in several instances been applied to, to prepare, at the expense of the Association, trust deeds for congregations; in some cases, under circumstances of urgency, from the probability of aggression in case every opportunity was not seized to vest the trust in new hands; in other cases, simply on the ground of the poverty of the congregation; and in others, merely from the wish of the parties to have advice and assistance from persons whose peculiar circumstances might be supposed to have made them conversant with matters of this nature.

On the one hand, it seemed difficult for the Committee not to feel that they were often most efficiently preventing the necessity for the legal interference which they might otherwise be hereafter called on to afford, by embracing a favourable opportunity at a comparatively small expense of securing

the property of a congregation; and it seemed also difficult to refuse such an application as was made to them in a recent case, where land was offered by a benevolent individual to a congregation too poor to afford the means of securing the bounty of the contributor; but on the other hand, the Committee have felt that there was a great difficulty in drawing a line, which should prevent the inconvenient increase of calls on them for assistance in this department, and they doubted whether it was the intention or could be within the means of this Association, to become the general resort of congregations, who were unable or indisposed to bear the expense of taking the proper means of securing their trust funds.

They have endeavoured to act upon as fair a discretion as they were enabled to exercise, having a regard to the means placed at their disposal; and they have entered thus fully into the subject in order to afford an opportunity to the general Meeting, if it be so disposed, to give any directions, or to point out any particular principle as a guide to the discretion of future Committees. The Committee beg leave to add, that they have given directions in the last case (which was one in which they were called upon to frame an original trust deed of a new endowment), that the deed should be prepared with a view to forming a proper precedent, to be recommended in future cases of a similar nature, in many of which, probably, the information imparted by the mere communication of the form which this Society recommends for adoption, will supersede the necessary and consequent expense of further interference.

Considering the original object of this Association, your Committee would not, perhaps, be justified in passing over without some notice the proceedings of the courts on the subject of offences against religion punishable at common law. It will be recollected that (though in the Wolverhampton Case a high authority gave some sort of weight to the doubt, whether the impugning of the doctrine of the Trinity might not still fall within the common law jurisdiction, as an offence against the Established Religion of the country, so as to render the relief afforded by the act of the 53d Geo. III. of little value as confined to the repeal of the statutory penalties only,) yet various considerations seemed to shew that the duty of your Committees, and the interests of the Unitarian body, would suggest rather a vigilant attention to the opinions and decision of the courts on any question that might occur, and active assistance to any parties who might be exposed to difficulties or vexation in the mean while, than any immediate application to the Legislature on the subject. It seemed generally felt that the opinion was one unfounded in reason, principle, or policy. To have gone to the Legislature we must, to a certain extent, have admitted our penal liability, and it appeared premature to apply for relief from an evil against the existence of which we ourselves were contending.

It behoves the Committee, however, to watch with care every case in which the same opinion can be expected to come into discussion, and they have hitherto seen an anxiety expressed by the judges before whom imputed offences against religion have been tried, to negative any idea that the common law jurisdiction is levelled against the free discussion of theological questions, confining it to attacks upon religion in general, as the basis of moral obligations, or to injurious and contumelious slanders, tending to molest and irritate individuals, or "break the peace."

In the late case, however, of the King and Waddington,\* one of the judges has thrown out observations which certainly place the liberty of discussion, on the part of *any* branch of Dissenters, on a very slippery foundation: and the Committee will therefore shortly detail the facts, and the opinion of the judge alluded to, with some observations on its statements, the inaccuracy of which will perhaps remove any apprehension as to the additional weight which it might be supposed to add to the doubts before entertained.

It was asserted by the defendant, on moving for a new trial, that the Lord Chief Justice had charged the jury to convict him for a libel denying the divinity of Jesus Christ, whereas the defendant argued that since the 53rd

\* *Barneswall and Alderson's Reports*, Vol. VI. p. 26.

Geo. III. the denying one of the persons in the Trinity was no offence, and the work in question was therefore not a libel. It appeared, however, that the Chief Justice's direction was not correctly stated; and he and two other Judges (Bayley and Holroyd) confined their opinion cautiously to stating, that the language contained in the work in question, "which did not merely deny the godhead of Christ, but stated him to be an impostor and a murderer in principle, was at common law, and still is, a libel."

But Mr. Justice Best, in his judgment, though confining himself as far as direct opinion goes, to stating, "that it was an indictable offence to speak of Jesus Christ in the manner that he is spoken of in this publication," goes more fully into the general question. We will state the whole judgment as given in the Reports:

"BEST, J. My Lord Chief Justice reports to us, that he told the jury that it was an indictable offence to speak of *Jesus Christ* in the manner that he is spoken in the publication for which this defendant is indicted. It cannot admit of the least doubt that this direction was correct. The 53 Geo. III. c. 160, has made no alteration in the common law relative to libel. If, previous to the passing of that statute, it would have been a libel to deny, in any printed work, the divinity of the second person in the Trinity, the same publication would be a libel now. The 53 Geo. III. c. 160, as its title expresses, is an Act to relieve persons who impugn the doctrine of the Trinity from certain penalties. If we look at the body of the Act to see from what penalties such persons are relieved, we find that they are the penalties from which the 1 William and Mary, sess. 1, c. 18, exempted all Protestant Dissenters, except such as denied the Trinity, and the penalties or disabilities which the 9 and 10 William III. imposed on those who denied the Trinity. The 1 William and Mary, sess. 1, c. 18, is, as it has been usually called, an Act of toleration, or one which allows Dissenters to worship *God* in the mode that is agreeable to their religious opinions, and exempts them from punishment for non-attendance at the Established Church, and nonconformity to its rites. The Legislature, in passing that Act, only thought of easing the consciences of Dissenters, and not of allowing them to attempt to weaken the faith of the members of the Church. The 9 and 10 William III. was to give security to the Government by rendering men incapable of office who entertained opinions hostile to the established religion. The only penalty imposed by that statute is exclusion from office; and that penalty is incurred by any manifestations of the dangerous opinion, without proof of intention in the person entertaining it either to induce others to be of that opinion, or in any manner to disturb persons of a different persuasion. This statute rested on the principle of the Test Laws, and did not interfere with the common law relative to blasphemous libels. It is not necessary for me to say, whether it be libellous to argue from the Scriptures against the divinity of *Christ*; that is not what the defendant professes to do. He argues against the divinity of *Christ*, by denying the truth of the Scriptures. A work containing such arguments, published maliciously (which the jury in this case have found) is by the common law a libel; and the Legislature has never altered this law, nor can it ever do so whilst the Christian religion is considered to be the basis of that law."

The drift of the whole argument of the learned judge appears to be this; that the *common law* jurisdiction over religious offences, which are those of *expression* of opinion, has never been touched by the *statutes* on the subject; that the office of the latter has been to repress, not the *expression* of opinion, but *opinion* itself for state purposes; that the Toleration Act repealed these acts as to Dissenters generally, leaving them open as before to punishment for expressing or intreating hostile opinions; that the Trinity Act was one of the same sort, directed against *entertainment of opinion*, not the *expression* of it; that consequently the repeal of it repeals only the stretch which the Legislature had made for state purposes, and leaves the open impugners of the Trinity, as the Toleration Act left the Dissenters, still where they were, liable to punishment, if they opened their mouths against the Established Religion.

This argument, so far as it relates to Dissenters collectively, we may safely

leave to the interest of the general body; observing only, that if the learned judge had looked into the Toleration Act, and the statutes which it repealed, he would have found in it probably much more than "an exemption from punishment for non-attendance at the Established Church, and nonconformity with its rites." But the Committee must be allowed with great deference to remove the whole theory which is set up with regard to the law particularly directed against Unitarians, and the statute repealing it. They must take leave to answer the assertions—that the Trinity law was intended only to give security to the Government, in the nature of a Test law—that the only penalty imposed is exclusion from office—and that the penalty is directed against *any* manifestations of the dangerous *opinion*, without proof of intention to propagate it—by simply stating the real provisions of the Act, leaving it to their constituents to judge what weight they ought to attach to opinions so hastily and crudely formed.

The Act provides, that if any person shall "by writing, printing, *teaching*, or advised speaking" deny, &c., he shall for the first offence be disabled in law from holding office, ecclesiastical, civil, or military, and for the second offence be disabled from suing or prosecuting any suit in law, or being guardian, executor, or administrator of any one, or capable of receiving any legacy or deed of gift, and suffer imprisonment for three years, without bail or mainprize.

Under the circumstances attending the case which they have thus detailed, your Committee do not think that the position in which former Committees have determined to remain, in any way calls for more serious attention than has hitherto been extended to it. The principles on which the arguments of the learned judge rest, appear, if they include any, to involve *all* persons differing from the Established Church equally with the Unitarians, so far as concerns the propagation of their peculiar opinions, and the impugment of those of the Establishment, whose creeds and formularies form the only criterion of that Christianity which is "part and parcel of the law of England." If the religious freedom of this country is confined to the *entertainment* of opinion, leaving the *expression* of it always more or less culpable, and punishable or not, merely according to the more or less liberal construction of a judge or jury; and if, as the learned judge seems to tell us, not even the Legislature is potent enough to make it otherwise; we have one consolation, at least, in hailing it as a new proof of the dangerous laxity, the absurd uncertainty of our criminal law on such subjects, and shall, in common with all Dissenters, have one reason more for joining in the protest which justice, policy, and religion, unite in calling on all the real friends of Christianity to make, against prosecution of any sort of expression of opinion in matters of religion at the tribunals of the law.

At the General Meeting, the following, among other Resolutions, were passed:

That this Meeting has full confidence in the Committee taking every practicable means of procuring the Repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, which are so great a grievance to Protestant Dissenters, and so inconsistent with the liberal spirit of the British Constitution.

That it is desirable to invest at interest such part of the balance from time to time in hand, as shall appear to this Society at its General Meeting, to be beyond its immediate wants; the fund to be at the disposal of the Committee for the time being.

And (with relation chiefly to the decrease in the amount of Annual Subscriptions, the arrears, particularly of Congregational Subscriptions, the great excess of the last year's expenditure above the current income, and the present calls upon the Society) the Committee were directed to urge by such means as they should deem expedient, the increase in number, and the regular payment, of Subscriptions, particularly from Congregations, and the great desirableness of enabling the Society to accumulate a Fund, to which it may be able to look in an emergency without the necessity of a public appeal.

**Treasurer,**

JAMES YOUNG, Esq, 16, 'Change-Alley.

**Secretary,**

Mr. E. TAYLOR, Inner-Temple.

**Committee,**

C. RICHMOND, Esq. Temple,  
 Mr. RICHARD TAYLOR, Shoe Lane,  
 JOHN BOWRING, Esq. Hackney,  
 M. D. HILL, Esq. Boswell Court,  
 THOMAS GIBSON, Esq. Milk Street,  
 IVES HURRY, Esq. London Wall,  
 Rev. R. ASPLAND, Hackney,  
 Mr. HART, Spitalfields,  
 Mr. JOHN WATSON, Holborn Hill,  
 Mr. FERNIE, Leadenhall Street.

---



---

## RULES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

1 This Society shall be denominated "The Unitarian Association for the Protection of the Civil Rights of Unitarians."

2. The Association shall consist of individual subscribers, and of the representatives of congregations making an annual contribution.

3. The qualification of individuals, as members of this Association, shall be an annual subscription of not less than 10s. 6d., or a donation of not less than 5l. 5s.

4. Every congregation contributing annually not less than one guinea, shall be at liberty to send two representative members. Officiating ministers of congregations shall be eligible as representatives.

5. An Annual General Meeting of the Association shall be holden on the Thursday in the Whitsun-week.

6. A Committee, consisting of ten persons, resident in or near London, shall be chosen at the Annual Meeting, to transact the business of the Association, of whom four, viz. those who shall have given the least attendance at Committee Meetings, shall be ineligible for one year. Where in any case the numbers of attendances shall be equal, the person who is to withdraw shall be determined by lot.

7. A Treasurer and Secretary shall also be chosen at the Annual Meeting, who shall be added to the Committee. The Treasurer shall receive subscriptions, and make all necessary disbursements on account of the Association; and the Secretary record its minutes, conduct its correspondence, and summon Committee and General Meetings. Two Auditors shall also be chosen at the Annual Meeting, for the purpose of auditing the Treasurer's account of the current year.

8. In all meetings of the Committee, the presence of five members shall be necessary for proceeding to business.

9. All subscriptions shall be paid in advance, and be considered as due on the 1st of January in each year. And no person shall be allowed to vote at an Annual Meeting until his subscription for the current year be paid.

10. The above Rules shall not be altered except by two-thirds of the members present at a General Meeting. Any alterations intended to be proposed to the Society, must be first notified to the Committee at one of its meetings.

UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION IN ACCOUNT WITH JAMES YOUNG, Esq. TREASURER.

<i>Dr.</i>		<i>Cr.</i>	
1821. Mr. Smallfield printing Reports	£13 9 6	1821. Balance of last Year	£246 7 9
Marshfield Congregation Charges Trust Deed	11 13 10	Interest of £200. at 3 per Cent.	6 0 0
Collector's Poundage	5 0 0	Amount of Subscriptions received	95 5 6
Postages, Carriage, Expenses of Room for Meetings, and Sundries	18 10 1		
Balance	298 19 10		
	£347 13 3		£347 13 3

*London, August 22, 1822.*

Balance as Audited and Approved for last Yearly

Meeting . . . . . £298 19 10

JOSEPH FERNIE,  
JOHN BOWRING,

**THE UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION IN ACCOUNT WITH JAMES YOUNG, Esq. TREASURER.**

*From 1st January, 1822, to 31st December, 1822.*

*Dr.*

1822. Paid Expenses of the Petition presented in the case of the Colchester Meeting, for change of Trustees and transfer of the Fund, which stands referred to one of the Masters in Chancery . . . . .	£87	5	11
Paid Expenses in preparing Petitions on the Marriage Act, and Expenses attending the Bill brought in, the last Session . . . . .	9	3	6
Paid half the Expenses of the Trust Deed for securing the Chapel to the Old Congregation at Hampstead . . . . .	6	14	0
Disbursements by Secretary, Postages, &c. . . . .	8	10	6
Advanced further on Account of the Expenses incurred by the Wolverhampton Congregation . . . . .	50	0	0
Printing 250 Receipts . . . . .	0	6	6
Proportion of Postage of Circulars . . . . .	0	11	9
Postages, Collecting Books, &c. . . . .	0	10	11
Collector's Poundage upon Amount received by him, £43 5s. 6d. at 7½ per cent. . . . .	3	4	6
Error in Subscription of Hackney Gravel Pit Society, in 1820—21 . . . . .	4	4	0
To Balance in hand 31st December, 1822 . . . . .	205	7	3
	£375	18	10

*Cr.*

1822. Jan. 31. Balance in hand from last Account . . . . .	£298	19	10
Interest of 200 <i>l.</i> at 3 <i>l.</i> per cent . . . . .	6	0	0
Amount of Subscriptions received . . . . .	70	19	0
	£375	18	10

*London, May 20th, 1823.*

Examined and approved,

JOHN BOWRING, }  
JOSEPH FERRIE, } AUDITORS.

By Balance in hand on the 31st December, 1822, £305 7 3

*Congregations united with the Association.*

	<i>Minister.</i>	£.	s.	d.
Alnwick - - - -	Rev. W. Probert	1	1	0
Bath - - - -	J. Hunter	1	1	0
Bessel's Green - - - -	John Briggs	1	1	0
Birmingham (Old Meeting) - - - -	R. Kell	2	2	0
Boston - - - -	D. W. Jones	1	1	0
Bradford, Yorkshire - - - -	T. N. Heinekin	1	1	0
Bridport - - - -	G. B. Wawne	2	2	0
Brighton - - - -	Dr. Morell	1	1	0
Bristol (Lewin's Mead) - - - -	J. Rowe & L. Carpenter, LL.D.	2	2	0
Caermarthen - - - -	J. Evans	1	1	0
Chichester - - - -	J. Fullagar	1	1	0
Cirencester - - - -	F. Horsfield	1	1	0
Collumpton - - - -	J. Davis	1	1	0
Crediton - - - -		1	1	0
Deptford - - - -	William Moon	1	1	0
Diss (late Palgrave) - - - -	Ch. Valentine	1	1	0
Ditchling - - - -	Gideon Duplock	1	1	0
Dorchester - - - -	L. Lewis	1	1	0
Dover - - - -	Benjamin Marten	1	1	0
Elland - - - -	J. Beattie			
Exeter (George's Meeting) - - - -	J. Manning	2	0	0
Falmouth, Mr. R. A. Philp - - - -		1	0	0
Framlingham - - - -	S. S. Toms	1	1	0
Gloucester - - - -	Theophilus Browne	1	1	0
Godalming - - - -	John Ellis and T. Moore	1	1	0
Hackney (Gravel Pit) - - - -	R. Aspland	2	2	0
Lancaster - - - -	— Lamport	2	0	0
Leicester - - - -	C. Berry	2	0	0
Lincoln - - - -				
Liverpool (Renshaw Street) - - - -	W. Hincks	5	0	0
Ditto (Paradise Street) - - - -	J. Yates	2	2	0
Ditto (Cross-Hall Street) - - - -		1	0	0
Lutton - - - -	James Smith	1	0	0
Lynn (Norfolk) - - - -	G. Selby	1	1	0
Maidstone - - - -	G. Kenrick	1	1	0
Manchester (Mosely Street) - - - -	J. J. Tayler	2	2	0
Moreton Hamptead - - - -	J. Smethurst	1	1	0
Newport (Isle of Wight) - - - -	Edmund Kell	1	1	0
Norwich - - - -	Thomas Madge	3	3	0
Nottingham - - - -	J. Tayler	2	2	0
Parliament Court, London - - - -	W. J. Fox	1	1	0
Portsmouth - - - -	Russell Scott	1	1	0
Plymouth - - - -	Israel Worsley	5	5	0
Rosendale (Newchurch) - - - -	John Ashworth	1	1	0
Sheffield - - - -	N. Philipps, D. D.	2	0	0
Shrewsbury - - - -	G. Case	2	0	0
Sidmouth - - - -	M. L. Yeates	1	1	0
Stockport - - - -	S. Parker	1	1	0
Swansea - - - -	R. Awbrey	1	1	0
Taunton - - - -	J. L. Fenner and Dr. H. Davies	1	1	0
Tavistock - - - -	W. Evans	1	1	0
Tenterden - - - -	L. Holden	2	2	0
Thomas's Street, Southwark - - - -	Dr. T. Rees	1	1	0
Thorne and Staniforth - - - -	G. Gaskell	3	5	6
Warwick - - - -	W. Field	1	11	0
Wisbeach - - - -	N. Walker	1	1	0
Wolverhampton, J. Pearson, Esq. - - - -		1	1	0
Worship Street, London - - - -	James Gilchrist	1	1	0
Yarmouth, Old Meeting - - - -		2	0	0
Yeovil - - - -		2	2	0
York - - - -	C. Wellbeloved	1	1	0

## SUBSCRIBERS.

	Don.			Ann.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Allen, Mr. Samuel, Stratford	-	-	-	0	10	6
Amory, S., Esq., Lothbury	-	-	-	1	1	0
Amory, W., Esq., Ditto	-	-	-	1	1	0
Arundel, Mr. John	-	-	-	0	10	0
Aspland, Rev. Robert, Hackney	-	-	-	0	10	6
Astley, Rev. Richard, Halifax	-	-	-	0	10	6
Bowring, John, Esq., Hackney	5	5	0			
Brent, John, Esq., Canterbury	5	5	0			
Butler, A. R., Esq.	5	5	0			
Carpenter, Rev. Dr. Lant, Bristol	-	-	-	0	10	6
Carslake, John, Esq., Sidmouth	-	-	-	0	10	6
Carslake, Joseph Henry, Esq., Musberry	-	-	-	0	10	6
Chatfeild, John, Esq., Stockwell, Surrey	-	-	-	0	10	6
Christie, John, Esq., 52, Mark Lane	5	5	0			
Cooke, T., Esq., Isle of Wight	5	5	0			
Cooke, R., Esq., Ditto	5	5	0			
Cordell, Mr. John, Bishopsgate Street	-	-	-	0	10	6
Cordy, John, Esq., Worlingworth, near Eye, Suffolk	5	5	0			
Crompton, A., Esq., Lune Villa, near Lancaster	-	-	-	2	0	0
Davidson, G. M., Esq., Warmley-House, near Bristol	-	-	-	0	10	6
Dyson, T., Esq., Diss, Norfolk	5	5	0			
Ellison, Mr. Henry, Liverpool	-	-	-	0	10	6
Evans, Rev. Dr. John, Islington	5	5	0			
Evans, Rev. B., Stockton	-	-	-	1	1	0
Everet, Mr., Stepney Green	-	-	-	0	10	6
Fenton, Mr. James, Leeds	-	-	-	0	10	6
Fernie, Mr. Joseph, Leadenhall Street	-	-	-	1	1	0
Fisher, Thomas, Esq., Dorchester	-	-	-	1	1	0
Fisher, John, Esq., Ditto	-	-	-	1	1	0
Flower, Benjamin, Esq., Dalston	-	-	-	0	10	6
Fox, Rev. W. J., Ditto	-	-	-	0	10	6
Freeman, Mr. Thomas, Coleman Street	-	-	-	0	10	6
Freeman, Rev. S., Enfield	-	-	-	0	10	6
Fullagar, Rev. J., Chichester	-	-	-	0	10	6
Gaisford, Mr. R., 25, Mount Street, Whitechapel	-	-	-	0	10	6
Gibson, Thomas, Esq., Milk Street, Cheapside	5	5	0			
Gibson, T. H., Esq., Lombard Street	5	5	0			
Gilchrist, Rev. J., Newington Green	-	-	-	0	10	6
Greve, Mr. John	-	-	-	0	10	6
Grey, Mr. Robert, Alnwick	-	-	-	0	10	6
Hardy, Thomas, Esq., Walworth	5	5	0			
Harris, Mr. James	-	-	-	0	10	6
Hart, Mr., Spitalfields	-	-	-	0	10	6
Heinekin, Rev. T. N., Bradford	-	-	-	1	1	0
Hill, M. Davenport, Esq., Boswell Court, Lincoln's Inn	-	-	-	0	10	6
Holden, Rev. L., Tenterden	-	-	-	0	10	6
Hornby, Thomas, Esq., 31, Swithin's-Lane	-	-	-	0	10	6
Hurry, Ives, Esq., London Wall	5	5	0			
Hurry, Thomas, Esq., Great Yarmouth	5	5	0			
Hursthouse, Mr. C., Tydd, Lincolnshire	-	-	-	0	10	6
Jacques, Mr. C. A., Chichester	1	0	0			
Johnson, Joseph, Esq., Edge Hill, near Liverpool	5	5	0			
Johnston, Ebenezer, Esq., Rev. William Johnston, and Rev. Thomas Jervis, (Executors of the late Swan Downer, Esq.)	30	0	0			
Johnston, Rev. Wm., Lewes	-	-	-	1	1	0

	Don.			Ann.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Kentrick, James, Esq., Wrexham	5	5	0			
Leach, Mr. S. F., Well Street, Hackney				0	10	6
Leigh, W., Esq., Salcombe				0	10	6
Lewthwaite, Mr. W., Liverpool				0	10	6
Luckcock, Mr. J., Birmingham				1	0	0
Ludlow, Mr. Joseph, Somers' Town				0	10	6
Mackintosh, John, Esq., Exeter				1	0	0
Manning, W. O., Esq., Chelsea				1	1	0
Marsden, Mr. Thomas, Kingston				0	10	6
Marsden, Mr., Southwark				0	10	6
Marson, Rev. John, St. John's Street, Clerkenwell				0	10	6
Martideau, Mr. Robert, Chiswell Street				0	10	6
Maurice, Rev. M., Frenchay, near Bristol				0	10	6
Middleton, Mr. Jesse, St. Martin's Lane	5	5	0			
Parkes, Samuel, Esq., Mecklenburgh Square				0	10	6
Parsons, John, Esq., Upland House, Bridgewater	10	0	0			
Pawsey, R., Esq., Bury St. Edmunds				0	10	6
Plomer, George, Esq., Canterbury	5	5	0			
Price, William, Esq., Gloucester	5	5	0			
Probert, Rev. W., Alnwick				0	10	6
Rees, Dr. Thomas, Kennington				0	10	6
Richmond, C., Esq., Lamb's Buildings, Temple	5	5	0			
Rickman, Mr. Caleb, Offam, near Arundel	1	0	0			
Roberts, Mr. J., Hoxton				0	10	6
Robinson, G., Esq., 31, Fenchurch Street				0	10	6
Rotherham, John, Esq., Staple Inn				0	10	6
Rothwell, Mr., Manchester				1	1	0
Rowan, Archibald Hamilton, Esq., Leinster Street, Dublin	5	5	0	1	0	0
Rutt, J. T., Esq., Clapton				0	10	6
Simpson, Mr. J., Sen., Leadenhall Street				0	10	6
Skirrow, S., Esq., 4, High Street, Borough	5	5	0			
Smallfield, Mr. G., Homerton				0	10	6
Smith, Mr. W., King Street, Snow Hill				0	10	6
Smith, Mr. Aaron, Alnwick				0	10	6
Sparkes, S., Esq., Crewkerne	5	5	0			
Spyring, Mr. J. S. S., Brighton				1	1	0
Swan, Mr. Edward, Earsden Forest, near Morpeth				1	0	0
Talfourd, T. N., Esq., Temple				0	10	6
Taylor, Rev. J. J., Manchester				1	1	0
Taylor, Mr. John, Norwich	5	5	0			
Taylor, Mr. John, Jun., Bedford Row				0	10	6
Taylor, Mr. Richard, Shoe Lane				0	10	6
Taylor, Mr. Edgar, Temple				0	10	6
Teshmaker, Mr., 4, Rood Lane				1	1	0
Teulon, Mr., Whitechapel				0	10	6
Tifford, Mr. Richard, 50, Bow Lane	5	5	0			
Tifford, Mr., Walworth				0	10	6
Townsend, Mr. John, Shoreditch	5	5	0			
Turner, Rev. W., York				1	1	0
Wainwright, R., Esq., Gray's Inn	5	5	0			
Watson, Mr. John, 56, Holborn Hill	5	5	0			
Wright, Rev. R., Trowbridge				0	10	6
Young, James, Esq., Grove Place, Hackney				1	1	0

Subscriptions, &c., are received by the Treasurer, James Young, Esq., 16, Change Alley; and by the Collector, Mr. Charles Fox, 33, Threadneedle Street.