

crime was "not having exercised sufficiently severe discipline on Mr. Kaye, the proprietor of the *Wesleyan Times*."

"Another related to the complaint of a member of Society in the Bradford West Circuit, that his ticket had been withheld by Mr. Edward Walker, on a trial by the Leaders' Meeting. The justice of this complaint had been sanctioned by a Minor District Meeting, which had decided that the ticket should be given to him; and against this decision of the Minor District Meeting Mr. Walker now appealed to the Conference." On Wednesday this case was finally disposed of, Mr. W.'s appeal being rejected, and the decision of the Minor District Meeting thereby confirmed. This is a most important decision to the body of Reformers now within the pale of the Wesleyan Church."

The principal items in the business of the three following days, are cases wherom preachers were called upon to explain their conduct with regard to the non-enforcement of discipline. These cases appear to have been managed, to say the least, in a manner extremely inquisitorial. The expression of sentiments, which it was admitted a man might *silently entertain*, was deemed an aggravated offence. Among the parties arraigned before Conference for charges of this character, was the Rev. Mr. Rowland, to whose case we have already alluded. The resolutions show the position of the Conference relative thereto:—

1. "That the principles advanced in the nine reasons presented by Mr Rowland to the Minor District Meeting and to which he still adheres, are utterly inconsistent with the constitutional principles of Wesleyan Methodism.

2. "That Mr Rowland is bound and required to make an apology to this Conference for the publication of sentiments so objectionable.

3. "That he be removed from the Yarmouth Circuit, and also from the Norwich District.

4. "That he may not be entrusted with the charge of a circuit, until he has given assurance to the Conference, that his views have undergone a change.

5. "That he be solemnly admonished from the chair of the Conference.

6. "That for two years he be deemed ineligible to be elected a member of any minor district meeting."

Mr Rowland was then asked by the President if he was prepared to make the apology to the Conference which was required of him?

Mr Rowland replied; I am not!

The President: Mr Rowland, will you take a little time to consider of it?

Mr Rowland: I wish for no postponement.

The President: Mr Rowland, the Conference will give you a little time to consider of it, whether you wish it or not.

"To enable the reader the more impartially to weigh the justice of this sentence, we append Mr Rowland's reasons of dissent from his colleagues, in the Minor District Meeting, as published in this journal, but without his knowledge or consent:—

"I cannot concur in an act which will lead to the expulsion of these christian gentlemen, from the following reasons: Because.

1st I believe Jesus Christ himself would not expel such persons,

2nd Because the appeal to a Minor District Meeting was not made by their own pastor, who must be the best judges to whether they deserved expulsion.

3rd Because they were unanimously acquitted by their own juries.

4th Because, if the seventeen trustees and leaders who tried them were all wrong in their judgment, we five may be so.

5th Because the work of God would be seriously injured, and many precious souls probably perish through such expulsions—souls for whom Christ died.

6th Because their expulsion may lead to the most awful consequences in my own circuit, and in other circuits.

7th Because Wesley, though he condemned and agitated the Established Church, remained in it; and when he expelled any one from the Methodist Society, he did it only in accordance with Methodist rules.

8th Because the wrong-doings of brethren prominent in the agitation have been occasioned, I believe, by the expulsion of Messrs. Everett, Dunn, and Griffith; and at the proper time and place I am prepared to show that, in our zeal to put down the 'Fly-Sheet' evils, we unintentionally violated the laws by which we are governed; so that every minister among us, concerned in the matter, ought to do the penitent!

9th Because in regard to what may be erroneously promoting the agitation amongst us—as it began among ourselves, we ought at least to regard our Saviour's injunction, to 'Let both grow together,' &c."

Another party called upon to give explanation in matters pertaining to character, &c., was Dr. Alder. We copy the following from the *Wesleyan Times*:—

On Dr. Alder's name occurring, he entered into a defence of himself against the imputations which had been cast upon his character.

Dr. Bunting said that he had fully investigated all those charges which related to the voyage to Canada, and Dr. Alder's conduct while there; and, if there was truth

in man, he declared that those charges were totally false.

The Rev. Joseph Hargreaves stated that the young man who had brought forward, in a place of worship, a string of charges, in the shape of a series of accusations against Dr. Alder, had expressed regret for what he had done.

The same journal observes editorially:—

THE REV. DR. ALDER.—For this gentleman the Rev. D. Bunting, it appears, has assumed sponsorial responsibilities. What he failed to do in the Missionary Committee, he takes upon him in Conference. The remembrance of similar good offices performed for such men as P. C. Turner and John Stamp, with their results, is not flattering to Dr. Alder. All that has been said of him may be untrue; we should rejoice were it proved so; but why has he resigned his office of secretary to the Wesleyan Missionary Society? Mr Gibbons may have expressed sorrow for having asked a series of questions relative to the doctor at a public meeting, but we venture to doubt notwithstanding the Rev. Joseph Hargreaves so asserts. It does, however, appear, that charges were made which the Dr. deemed it necessary to investigate, and these, too, came from Canada! It is an old saying, that "where there is smoke there is fire," and it will be more than strange if there be nothing but smoke in this case. We have letters in our possession from Toronto, Hamilton, and Montreal, which we have carefully kept from the light, but it will be matter for consideration whether the retention of them be for the interests of truth and righteousness. We should not wonder if the sponsorial act of Dr. Bunting brings from Canada some crushing and convincing testimony.

The most striking case brought before Conference, so far as the report has reached us, is that of the Rev. Dr. Beaumont, to which in consequence of its furnishing a specimen of the *modus operandi* of the Conference in such cases, we devote a large portion of our columns.

CENSURE ON DR. BEAUMONT.

On Dr. Beaumont's name being called over.

The Ex-President said, there was in the District Minutes an entry, having reference to Dr. Beaumont.

It was read; and it was found to relate to the case of Mr Grosjean.

Dr. Beaumont: I must inform the Conference, first, what I have done. I stated to the District Meeting, that I did not believe that Mr Grosjean had related an absolute falsehood. I further stated my doubts as to whether Mr Grosjean had gone into other circuits to carry disturbance into them. I thought that one of my colleagues (Mr Strachan) ought to bring that accusation against Mr Grosjean if it was to be preferred against him. Dr. Beaumont having here related the course of events preceding and accompanying Mr Grosjean's trial, said: When Mr Strachan felt some delicacy at the thought of becoming the personal accuser, I endeavoured to relieve him from the difficulty by furnishing him with the charges. But at length Mr Strachan absolutely declined to have anything to do with the matter. I think I had a right to look to my colleague for his assistance in the case. ("No no.") My other colleague (Mr Clegg) then expressed his willingness to help me. But he met with considerable difficulty. The time of trial arrived. No one brought any accusation against Mr Grosjean. I had a private interview with him; and the District Meeting required me to take prompt and prudent measures to put him on his trial. I did so; no one, on that trial, would allege anything against him. I found myself obliged, afterwards, to put Mr Grosjean on his trial before the Local Preachers' Meeting and that meeting was adjourned. Mr Grosjean was subsequently suspended as a local preacher and remains to this time suspended.

The Rev. Thos. Jackson stated that he had thought it right to give some advice in the morning chapel that the brethren should keep their eye on the principal offenders, and call them to account for their conduct. Immediately Dr. Beaumont got up and protested against the sentiments which he (Mr Jackson) had uttered; and said that God, who had spoken to us in His word, and latterly by the cholera, was now speaking to us by the people. He (Dr. Beaumont) was astonished at the amount of ability which many of the people displayed, and he thought that their voice was worthy to be attended to. Mr Jackson proceeded at some length to unadvisedly on the principle that "the voice of the people is the voice of God," and illustrated his objections to it by referring to the clamor of the people of Ephesus, and the rebellion of the people under Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.

Dr. Beaumont thought it rather unfair of the ex-President to refer to something said some months ago, and which he had almost forgotten. But he still adhered to the words he had uttered. Was it to be supposed that he referred to the voice of people like those at Ephesus, or like those assembled under Korah, Dathan, and Abiram? No. He referred to our own people.

Several questions were asked of Mr. Arthur, (one of Dr. B.'s colleagues).—First, if Dr Beaumont had taken the sense of the meeting as to whether a reporter should be admitted. He replied in the affirmative. Secondly, did Dr. Beaumont say that he had taken the highest counsel (meaning legal advice) as to whether it would be safe for him to evade the determination of the District Meeting as to bringing Mr. Grosjean to trial? The reply was, that there was no reference to legal advice, no mention of a wish to evade any duty, and that Dr. Beaumont always expressed his conviction that the decision of the District Meeting was binding upon him. Thirdly, whether the terms ascribed to Dr. Beaumont about "sweeping the streets for evidence," had been used by him? He replied that terms of a similar import were used. Fourthly, did the reporter who was introduced into the meeting remain in it to the end? He replied in the affirmative.

Innumerable other questions were asked both of Dr. Beaumont and his colleagues; and after these had proceeded to a most unprecedented length,

Dr. Beaumont referred to two or three points which had been insufficiently explained. He referred to the introduction of the reporter into the meeting, a thing which he did not like in itself, but he thought he was following Mr Scott's example in proposing it to the meeting for their decision. He then went on to give a view of the state of the circuit, observing that he had obtained the approbation of Mr. Reece on the whole of the proceedings with reference to Mr. Grosjean. That venerable man always entertained hopes that Mr. Grosjean would be brought to a right mind, and it was worthy of observation that Mr. Grosjean had always been a kind friend to the preachers, as many of them could testify. Upon the whole on reviewing all that he had done in these most trying circumstances, considering the disposition of the men of most weight in the circuit, and the circumstances which (occurring a few years ago) had led them to look with discriminating eyes into every part of their discipline; considering, moreover, the approbation of his own conduct which he had always received from the late lamented R. Reece, he could not but conclude that upon the whole, whatever firmities might have marked it, it was the best he could have pursued. "If it does not meet," said Dr. Beaumont, "with your approbation, I am sorry for it."

This last sentiment was received with considerable cheering by the Conference.

The Resolutions proposed by the Rev. M. Keeling condemnatory of Dr. Beaumont's conduct having been read seriatim, —

"Dr. Dixon said, that having been prevented from attending the Conference that morning, he had perhaps no right to address them on the present occasion. They would, however, permit him to request of them to pause before they passed a vote of censure on Dr. Beaumont. There were such things as grace, mercy, and love. He needed grace and mercy from them, and from One greater than them. He, therefore, implored them to consider whether, instead of passing censure on Dr. Beaumont, it might not be sufficient to express their regret with reference to his conduct in the matter of Mr. Grosjean.

Dr. Newton said he might now be considered one of the fathers of the Connexion. He had never been so impressed with the solemnity of any act performed by the Conference, as he was on the present occasion. The present insurrection, he believed, chiefly directed against the District Meetings. Now, after the London District Meeting had issued its decision with reference to the Hind-street Circuit, that decision was for a long time almost entirely disregarded. He denominated those who had taken no action against the Reformers, "do-nothing preachers;" and said that from solemn conviction he was in favor of the resolutions.

Mr. Thomas Jackson dwelt on the many delinquencies of Mr. Grosjean, and on the defects attending his trial. Much had been said about a show of mercy; but he agreed with others that some mercy was due, and ought to be extended, to the society at large.

Dr. Bunting concurred in what had been said by Dr. Newton and Mr. Jackson. They owed much to their people, who had been told that because Dr. Beaumont did not believe the things alleged against Mr. Grosjean, he would not put him upon his trial. He (Dr. Bunting) called, not upon the aged ministers of the Conference, but upon the younger members of it, to confirm the discipline of the Society by the vote they were about to give."

DR. BEAUMONT'S DEFENCE.

On Saturday the tenth day of Conference, the President called upon Dr. B. to enter on his defence, Dr. Beaumont responded.

"There are averments in the document Mr Keeling has presented which are not correct. The document is voluminous. I wish you would let me have a sight of it, and allow me to hold it in my hand, while I attempt to answer it.

This was conceded.

The Doctor read the first clause, and proceeded to remark upon it. He contended that he had been prompt and prudent in attending to the decision of the District Meeting. But as to the assumption that he should be required to charge Mr. Grosjean with telling a falsehood, why should he do so when in his conscience he did not believe that that individual had done so? Now, as he could not do it himself, what more prudent means could he use than to devolve it upon Mr. Strachan, especially as he understood that Mr. Strachan had voted for the resolutions of the District Meeting? He (Dr. Beaumont) had had no communication with Mr. Grosjean, except to send him the charges. He (the Doctor) was willing to relieve Mr. Strachan from the difficulty and delicacy of the position in which he felt himself placed; but Mr. Strachan's retirement placed him (the doctor) in very great difficulties. Mr. Clegg then volunteered his services. "I (continued the Doctor) was unwilling that he should be placed in this position, but he was willing to lend me all the assistance he could. Mr. Arthur made no such offer: yet he is let off, and Messrs. Strachan and Clegg are blamed. If you wished me to expel Mr. Grosjean, why did you not tell me so, plainly? In the second clause of this document, it is said G. "I proceeded in this matter with great reluctance, so as to make the interposition ineffectual. This I deny altogether. Where is the evidence that I proceeded unwillingly? I repudiate and deny it in every form of language that can be used. Of course, as this proceeds on a mistake, the corollary that "I proceeded in such a manner as to ensure the failure of the attempt to bring Mr. Grosjean to trial," is also a mistake. The third allegation is, that in putting Mr. Grosjean on his trial as a local preacher, on charges that ought to have affected his membership, I have failed in my duty as a superintendent. Now, I differ from those in this Conference who do not think that the de-

posing of a local preacher is an act of equal magnitude with the taking away of membership. I think the local preacher is above the private member, and is above the leader. The act of discipline exercised on a local preacher is one of the highest. I have acted in this matter on my own individual judgment. My guide, in the first instance, is the Word of God, my second is, the Minutes of Conference. I maintain that I have gone far enough as a first disciplinary act. I must look to the example of holy men in times gone by to guide me. I have done so; and that you should regard this as a failure of duty, I am sorry. The next paragraph says that my conduct in the matter rendered the duty of my colleagues increasingly difficult, and discouraged them in the performance of duty. I deny this, too. There was no difference of opinion between me and my colleagues; and what obstruction did I ever throw in the way of the action of my colleagues? The next clause states that my colleagues, after having collected the evidence, were not justified in giving up the case, and suffering it to go to the Leaders' Meeting without being sustained. Now, do not blame my colleagues. If censure must fall, let it fall on me. On the whole, so the paper concludes, (and what a whole!) you proceed to censure me! I am there corrected by Mr. William Bunting, who says that the document states that my conduct 'merits censure;' but this is worse than my version! That you should censure me, might be the result of mistake. It might proceed from misapprehension of the case. But that you should determine that I have deserved punishment, this is the worst of all! But you seem to ground this censure on the basis of my having so conducted myself as to injure the interests of religion in my circuit. Let me see how the matter, in this respect, really stands."

The Doctor then entered into a minute detail of the affairs of the Hind-street Circuit, showing that there was an increase of members, an increase of collections, an increase in the building of chapels, and various other signs of prosperity. "Have I not," said he, "attended to my own circuit? Look, again, to the Connexion! Dr. Newton has intimated that there are many eyes upon you, and he seemed also to intimate that those eyes were looking for my condemnation. You must not suffer those eyes to influence you. There are also other eyes which may look at me with other sentiments. In preaching Christ's gospel, in all my journeyings, I have injured no man's character; I have gathered up no scandal; I have never meddled with Connexional matters in my intercourse with our people. My wish has been to promote the cause of my Saviour, and this motive has actuated me in the government of my circuit. I believe I have promoted its best interests. If you think the contrary, I regret it. Mr. Prest, in his anxiety to obtain my condemnation, has thought it right and seemly to refer to the times of Dr. Warren. Yet he has produced nothing definite. I was in Edinburgh at that time. What complaint has Mr. Prest to urge against my conduct? To throw out dark hints—to allude to indistinct rumors for the purpose of damaging my case—is this the part of a brother? It is said that I pronounced a eulogium on Mr. Grosjean. And did not the Rev. Mr. Sherman the same? Why do you not blame Mr. Sherman? As to Mr. Rattenbury, whom I must here call 'grand inquisitor'—" (cries of "order, order!")

The President interposed, and said that language of this sort was disorderly.

Dr. Beaumont: "Then I recall it; and as to Mr. Rattenbury, I pass by his numerous accusations as having little bearing on the case. Mr. William Bunting has said that the platform must decide the question now at issue; but Dr. Bunting, on the other hand, has referred to the younger members as the proper persons to come forward and settle it. Now, to all parties, in conclusion, I appeal. I appeal to their justice. Allusion has been made by Dr. Dixon to mercy and grace. I appeal not for mercy, I leave my case to the justice of the Conference. I believe I have done my duty, and I shall be glad if the Conference should decide that I have done so."

"Dr. Dixon: I feel what I believe every brother in this assembly must feel, in reference to this case as to its importance. But I think the resolution now before the Conference is somewhat too minute and particular. It states a great many particular facts, some of which Dr. Beaumont clearly denies. Dr. Beaumont was left great part of the year, like myself, to act according to the best of his judgment. But when you interposed, and determined that your discipline should be carried out, he endeavored to comply with your will. I propose the substitution of the word 'disapproval' in the resolution, for the word 'censure.'"

"Mr. Samuel Jackson hoped it would be henceforth understood that "Methodism expected every man to do his duty." He argued strenuously for "strict justice," against Dr. Dixon's views of mercy. He thought that the Conference ought not to entrust the care of a circuit to men of Dr. Beaumont's disposition of mind. That he should imagine that he had carried out the decision of the District Meeting, was most surprising. That he should still insist, that he needed no mercy from the Conference, showed that there was about him a great peculiarity of mind."

The Resolutions presented were in substance as follows:—

"1.—That the Conference learns with regret, that the decisions of the London District Meeting, which were so necessary for the maintenance of our discipline, have not been carried into effect.

"2.—From the evidence now received, it appears in particular, that Dr. Beaumont so exaggerated the difference of judgment between himself and the other brethren on one part of the case, as to make this difference the ostensible reason for acting in the case with reluctance, and by this means, ensuring the failure of the attempt to carry out our discipline.

"3rd That in bringing Mr Grosjean to trial before a Local Preachers' Meeting, for matters which belonged to