

committee to investigate his "complaints against the Conference or any of its members," and gave him a choice in that committee, a majority of whom, were in fact, virtually of his own choosing. That after the mass of evidence on the subject of his being "concerned in the circulation of the circular;" so careful were they, not to criminate a member, where they judged the charge was *fully and pointedly* supported, and with a *sufficient* number of evidences to *criminate an Elder*; we say after all the evidence, (see page 11) on the subject, they decided that the charge was not supported by evidence. Does this look like persecution or oppression? what *jury* would have said the charge was not supported by evidence?

A compliance with Mr. Ryan's proposals would involve a direct violation of our Discipline, neither can it be said that a new tribunal is necessary, where the provision is so ample, as that of the "trial of men by their Peers," and especially with the right of appeal which our Discipline provides for in all cases.

If Mr. Ryan says that he was not able to meet the expense of attending the General Conference, we would observe, that Mr. Ryan is not a poor man. He is in comfortable and easy circumstances, more so than any of his travelling Brethren, *with one exception*, and forty dollars would have covered the whole expense, even by public stage. To concede to Mr. Ryan's proposals, would establish a dangerous precedent, and open the way for endless confusion in the Church. Every dissatisfied person, (for Mr. Ryan's case is not peculiar;) might refuse to abide the decision of his brethren, whether of *Conference or Class*, make his Conference of Class a "party in a quarrel," and then wish to call them to account before a *new and unknown* tribunal. Whoever heard of business done in such a manner, either by Parliament, or Conference?

He complains that Mr. Madden was "allowed to keep his seat in the Conference while they made up their decision." Well, and this the Conference acknowledged, that he had cause of complaint. But how did *this* effect his case? Nothing at all, for Mr. M. neither spoke nor voted on the subject. Mr. M. *did* indeed insist on his right to keep his seat, and how far he was right in this may be perceived, when it is well known that the example is found in the most popular and best appointed assemblies. Evidence is even called from among the members of the House of Commons, and afterwards are allowed to retain their seats, and vote too in the same case.

Mr. Ryan complains that one item in a charge was "thrown out." Was this of such importance? An item is thought of little consequence, and is therefore "dismissed from the Conference!" Where is the criminality in this?

He complains that the Conference of 1826 "passed resolutions on the Circular signed 'A Methodist,' without any proof." No such thing—see this subject in page 7.

Mr. R. complains that a charge was allowed to be brought a-