

The Watchman.

"I HAVE SET WATCHMEN UPON THY WALLS O! JERUSALEM THAT SHALL NEVER HOLD THEIR PEACE, DAY NOR NIGHT!"

VOL. I. TORONTO, CANADA WEST, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 1850. No. 35.

Poetry.

PREACH THE TRUTH.

Fear ye not the face of clay—
Preach the truth—
It will spring another day,
If you're faithful,
And the holy word obey.

What if scolding men oppose i
Preach the truth,
To your friends and to your foes,
If you're faithful,
These will yield as well as those.

With the message from the skies,
Preach the truth,
To the foolish and the wise—
If you're faithful,
Vice will sink and virtue rise.

If men hear or men forbear,
Preach the truth;
Truth is never lost in air;
If you're faithful,
You a crown of life shall wear.

Ecclesiastical.

WESLEYAN AFFAIRS IN ENGLAND.

Proceedings of Conference, continued from our last.

The 12th 13th and 14th days of Conference were occupied with the examination of character, and revising the stations. Several Preachers were called to account for want of stringency in the enforcement of Discipline. During the evening of the 12th sitting, the Rev. Dr. McClintock of the Methodist Episcopal Church, United States, was introduced to the Conference. The following day the Stationing Committee was engaged in a final revision of the Stations, at which time several committees presented their Reports to Conference.

On Wednesday the 14th, Mr. Rowland's case was again taken into consideration and called forth a good deal of discussion. His case excited a good deal of interest.

"Dr. Beaumont said it was necessary that he should repeat the remarks which he had made when the resolutions in that matter had been brought forward last week. As he disapproved of those resolutions, he, of course, disapproved of that attempt to carry one of them out for such reasons, on such grounds. But, as to degree, that measure was, of course, far more open to objection than the former one, as it was more severe to a great and shocking amount. He could not approve of any method of carrying out any resolutions so objectionable in themselves as those in Mr. Rowland's case were, but extreme was his animosity to so hardy and severe a measure as was then proposed. It was a terrible punishment which they proposed to inflict; one sufficient for almost any ministerial crime; and to inflict it for refusing to sacrifice independence to a very objectionable resolution, was most unwarrantable and dangerous. He could not too earnestly oppose it, and remind the Conference of the arguments which he brought forward against the resolutions of last week. He must make a remark upon an inexcusable attack by Mr. Waddy upon Mr. Rowland. He had said that the latter "could not, of course, yield to the Conference, as he was pledged elsewhere—bound to another party."—That assertion Mr. Rowland had very properly, and, he (Dr. Beaumont) was convinced, truly and sincerely, denied; and he (Dr. Beaumont) thought it incumbent upon Mr. Waddy to retract his word.

Mr. Waddy was surprised that Dr. Beaumont should venture upon such an observation. He appeared affronted in him, under the censure of that body, to make such a requirement.

Dr. Beaumont had had some idea of the object of the vote to which Mr. Waddy so gratuitously referred, but it required, indeed, the effrontery of Mr. Waddy to venture upon the declaration he had just made.

The sentence of condemnation which had been passed by the Conference against the Rev. Thomas Rowland having been read by the Secretary. [We gave it in our last.]

Mr. Rowland was called upon to make the required apology. He spoke as follows:—"Mr. President,—As may well be imagined, I now speak with no ordinary emotion—an emotion produced by the sentence which has been read. My emotion increases when I look round, and think that that sentence has been passed by some who were the guides of youth; by others, who have been the companions of my riper years; and by many with

whom I have often taken sweet counsel during the thirty seven years that I have been in this ministry. Nor is the emotion lessened when I view you all in connexion with that bleeding Cross, which is the grand theme of our preaching, and the only foundation of our dearest hopes. Had the sentence which you have passed against me been only half what it is—or only one quarter, or even half a quarter what it is—yet then I should have felt it to be a serious thing. But you have passed the whole of that sentence! What then? My soul still throbs in warm affection and high esteem towards you! My heart's desire and prayer is, that every one of you, with myself, may find mercy of the Lord, at that day when we must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ!—But allow me, sincerely and heartily, to thank those few brethren who, I understand, held up their hands against the sentence. May their deed be no discomfort to them on reflection, amidst the vicissitudes of future life, and when they come to lay their heads on their dying pillows, I think it will give them no pain, nor excite a blush, to remember, that they held up their hands against that sentence upon a Brother Minister of thirty seven years' standing, who is without a stain on his moral character. Still, after all, in my conscience, I cannot do otherwise than adhere to the principles which are contained in my Nine Reasons, that were partly written in the Minor District Meeting at Yarmouth, and every one of them revised there, after the whole of the evidence had been received. As to the publication of those reasons I hardly need to repeat what has been already so explicitly stated, that that was done without my sanction or knowledge. *Consider also, that the right of private judgment is seriously involved in this affair.* Besides, I think that if the sentence pronounced against me had been drawn up on purpose to render it impossible for me to make the required apology, I know of nothing so calculated to effect that purpose. Under these circumstances, and others that might be mentioned, while I wish to avoid everything which is contrary to the respect which is due from me to you, Sir, in your high office, and to the members of the Conference, yet I must say, that I have no apology to offer—*nor do I intend to make one!*

During the delivery of the above the most breathless silence prevailed throughout the Conference."

Several curious cases were disposed of on the 15th day, to which we forbear devoting any space, that we may be able to give more extensive information on other matters. The case of the venerable Bromley was, after considerable discussion finally disposed; and as his case has so largely occupied public attention we make lengthy extracts from the Report given in the *Wesleyan Times*.

EXPULSION OF JAMES BROMLEY.

"Upon the reading of the minutes of Mr Bromley's committee, which recommended the expulsion of that minister,

Dr Bunting proposed the *dilution* of the term *expulsion!*

After a few merciful words from Mr Lomas,

Dr. Beaumont said that he considered that it would be extremely unseemly in the Conference, at that late hour of the night, to enter upon a case so full of importance and solemnity as this was made by the course which had been, and which was proposed to be, pursued. It was then already half an hour beyond the ordinary limit of their sitting; the assembly was in a most disordered state; members dropping off one after another; those who remained were evidently fatigued; he, for his part, was wearied and harassed, and felt deeply the solemnity of considering such a report, and such recommendations, as were now before the Conference. It was a weighty and an awful matter which was to be brought before them; it required the most solemn and profound attention; and he accordingly was most unwilling to entertain it, and still more so to speak to it on that evening. He therefore proposed that the consideration of the report of the committee which had considered Mr Bromley's case, should, as a measure of imperative justice, be postponed till the morning.

This did not suit the purpose of the Conference. They had got rid of Mr Budden, so that Dr. Beaumont would probably stand alone in his opposition, and the Conference was in a state in which the most powerful speech would lose part of its effect,—the discussion moreover must be short,—a night's reflection, a few pillow thoughts and feelings, might be dangerous with men, justice might possibly be attained by delay—and upon the whole to lose so favourable an opportunity could not be thought of.

It was not easy to find an executioner. Mr Waddy, upon whom that grateful office at first devolved,—the *stupant* Waddy (who was particularly violent against postponement) shrank—and said that when he considered the standing of Mr Bromley, he felt that a *father in the connexion* ought to deal the blow! And, accordingly, the paternal Naylor rose and moved that Mr Bromley, having resisted the Legal District Meetings in general,—having refused to appear before that summoned at Bath to adjudicate his case—having violated pledges given to the last Conference, and having written a letter that day to the President, indecent and unbecoming in tone and contumacious in spirit, *should be expelled from the Wesleyan body*. Where are these pledges, of which we hear so much? Why are they not forthcoming? We do not believe in their existence!

A long, long panic ensued, fierce eyes scanned certain dubious countenances, and at last up sprang two headsmen, trembling at their awful task, and each other most fraternally anxious to yield precedence to his brother. Mr Scott's resignation in favour of Mr Corbett Cooke, was accepted, and the latter minister seconded the resolution, saying that he considered Mr Bromley had been a very injurious man in the Connexion, whatever good qualities he might have.

Mr Scott *could cordially support* the resolution, thinking it requisite to show that the Conference and the District Meetings must not be set at naught.

Dr. Beaumont then rose, and regretted that the Conference had persisted in proposing so momentous a resolution, at such an hour more especially. He felt the solemnity of the occasion extremely: he shrank from the consideration of such a proposal as was before the house; but, as a member of that Conference, as a minister of the gospel of peace, as a christian man, he could not be a party to that matter, either as opponent or supporter, without declaring his opinions. He should feel silence an inexcusable neglect of duty. He had three grounds for most strenuously opposing the resolution before the house. First, he mentioned Mr Bromley's conscientious opinions upon District Meetings and the law of 1835, as a ground for the severe course proposed. This he thought was an untenable and invalid ground. For many years it had been well known that Mr Bromley repudiated, and persisted in repudiating the resolutions of 1835. He was allowed to do so year after year, in private, in District Meetings, in Conference, and in print; and now, after fifteen years permission of that course, after fifteen years liberty had been allowed, after for fifteen years he had been allowed to fortify himself with the permission of the Conference and the right of habit, were those permitted acts and feelings to be brought forward as a ground for ministerial and Methodist death with decency and justice? How could they with any consistency act thus; punishing in the most solemn and awful manner, in which it was in their power to do, so esteemed, and devoted, and aged a minister of Christ, in contradiction and condemnation of their permission of years? If this was just, how culpably negligent must have been their former conduct! Secondly, as to Mr Bromley's refusal to attend the Minor District Meeting at Bath, the considerations he had already urged came again into force here, and above and beyond these considerations, weighty and conclusive as they appeared to him to be, he remembered, and he called upon them to remember, the punishment which Mr. Bromley had already suffered—the anxiety of mind, the degradation of position, the deprivation of that most precious trust—the preaching of Christ's gospel: this surely was enough, and far more than enough, for such an error of judgment!—It was an awful penalty, to be put out of the pulpit, to be debarred from the exercise of the ministerial office even for a week. How much more for months! How fearful for ever!—Thirdly, as to the tone of Mr Bromley's communication of that day, doubtless it was not perfectly humble, nor perfectly moderate—Could it be expected that it should be so? Had they deserved that it should be so? Had Mr Bromley been treated in a manner to warrant the Conference in claiming his full respect and consideration? Must he not have become excited under the torture to which he had been subjected? After months of punishment, anxious and painful as they must have been, he had been treated by that house very carelessly, very harshly, very inconsiderately. When his appeal was ungraciously denied, he had not been informed of the decision for days, each of which must have been wiredrawn by the heat of his anxiety, and then had not been informed of it, he (Dr. Beaumont) feared, in a fitting manner. After a fortnight's suspense, so perilous and

harrowing, it surely was not to be wondered at, or severely reprobated, if the sorrow of such a period had made Mr Bromley exhibit somewhat of a wayward feeling, even more than in that letter he had done. Such was the natural consequence of the ordeal through which he had passed. That letter was a most unfitting and unsubstantial ground for so severe a course as that proposed. He could not, then, find himself justified in supporting such a resolution as was before them, and he entreated his brethren not to do so. Dr. Bunting had, indeed, said something about inserting a periphrasis for *expelled*—something about *separated from his brethren*. The Conference itself revolts from the awful word *expulsion* with horror! But, do not let them deceive themselves, they were aware that the effect would be the same. Their act would be *expulsion* still—would have all the melancholy and terrible effects of that melancholy and terrible act. They would, by acting on Dr. Bunting's suggestion, only be deceiving themselves. He (Dr. Beaumont) then had but one course for himself to take. Had any milder method been taken with Mr Bromley, it would, of course, have depended upon its peculiar nature, whether he (Dr. B.) would have sought to modify it by amendment, or have supported or opposed it, but as it was he could not, in any way, be a party to the resolution; the consequences of it must lie elsewhere than on him; and he accordingly must vote against it. (Dr. Beaumont was very much interrupted, and Dr. B. did not profess to speak his sentiments.)

Dr Bunting: Dr. Beaumont had said that the Conference had acquiesced in Mr Bromley's conduct as to the laws of 1835. This was quite a misrepresentation. More especially, some years ago, the Conference decided that Mr Bromley's annual protest should not again be received by the District Meeting.

Dr. Beaumont admitted this fact, but that did not alter the case. The Conference had, through a series of years, acted up to a certain point, and never beyond that, and accordingly it acquiesced in Mr Bromley's conduct thus far—that it waived any further proceedings against him, and yet it was proposed of a sudden to go all lengths with him!

Dr. Bunting observed that Dr. Beaumont had taken up three grounds in favor of Mr Bromley. There was, however, a fourth recital in the resolution, and that Dr. Beaumont had left untouched. He referred to Mr Bromley's having violated the pledges which he gave to the last Conference.

Dr. Beaumont: "I could not imagine that such an assertion could be put forward as an actual ground for the proposed act. I know that it is often made, but I want to see it proved.—I cannot condemn a man unheard; how much less can I sentence him! I call upon you not to take such a responsibility upon you. It is alleged that Mr Bromley bound himself not to agitate against the law of 1835, and, further, that he has broken that pledge. Taking the pledge and the violation as granted, I protest against his punishment on that ground, until he has been heard in explanation. For anything I know, all these assertions and charges may be susceptible of being completely cleared up by him. He may be able to explain away all suspicion; and until he has failed to do so; I cannot condemn him.

Mr. Lomas said a few words, regretting (so we understood) Mr Bromley's course, and regretting, further, that his appeal had not been heard.

The resolution was then put and carried, with only one hand held up against it! That hand was Dr. Beaumont's.

The President then declared Mr Bromley to be expelled from the body!

On Saturday the 17th August Mr Rowland's case was finally disposed of; a communication having been presented by him, the substance of which may be learned from the following extract—

Mr Rowland, in his letter, begged to know whether the Conference would permit him to live anywhere, say in any of a certain list of places which he named, including Liverpool, Merthyr Tydvil, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Manchester, &c.; whether he might be permitted to travel out of his circuit, to visit Yarmouth, in case a friend should be sick, and very sufficiently implied a contrast between the freedom of a Methodist preacher and a clergyman of the Church of England, referring to the last act of the case of Mr Gorham, a single-handed conscientious man, who had been able to set at naught a legion of proud and haughty prelates and churchmen, and to call up the nation of the defence of justice. The Conference immediately

Continued on page 275.