

The Presbyterian Review.

Issued EVERY THURSDAY, from the office of the Publishers, Rooms No. 23, 21
3, 25 Aberdeen Block, South-East corner Adelaide and Victoria Streets.

TERMS, \$1.50 per annum.

All communications for either Business or Editorial Departments should be
addressed PRESBYTERIAN REVIEW, Drawer 2161, Toronto, Ont.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Under 3 months, 15 cents per line
per insertion; 3 months, \$1.00 per line; 6 months, \$1.75 per line;
1 year, \$3.00. No advertisement charged at less than five lines.
None others than unobjectionable advertisements taken.

Toronto, November 8, 1894.

The Inerrancy Question.

THE position taken by the General Assembly in the case of Professor H. P. Smith of Lane, has been the cause of no small dissatisfaction to the defeated minority on whose behalf persistent efforts have since been made to keep their views before the public. A convention was held at Cleveland at which concerted action was discussed. It would seem that the outcome of this conference has been the overtures in Presbyteries bearing on the subject of which that offered by Dr. Lampman to the Presbytery of Newark is probably the most notable. It reads as follows:—That the Presbytery views with apprehension the attempt of the General Assembly to make new definitions of dogma by deliverance and by judicial decision, and expresses its conviction that no doctrinal statement which is not explicitly contained in the Confession of Faith and catechisms of the Church is binding on her office bearers." This overture was not carried but the following by Dr. Paul F. Sutphen was agreed to: "While judicial decisions by the General Assembly are binding upon the Church, unless and until reversed by a subsequent Assembly, its doctrinal declarations, until indorsed by a constitutional number of Presbyteries throughout the Church in a regular and constitutional manner, are not of the nature of formulated law but are only expressions of the opinion or advice of the General Assembly, and have no binding force whatever, except as they appeal to the individual conscience 'n the sight of God." From this finding an appeal was taken by Dr. C. T. Haley to the Synod which met the other day. The terms of the appeal were very interesting covering many points of Presbyterian polity and practice. The case was referred to a judicial Commission on whose report the Synod adopted this deliverance: "The Commission unanimously sustains the complaint so far as it refers to the first part of resolution one. That is to say, the Presbytery of Newark erred in informing those under its care that judicial decisions by the General Assembly are binding upon the Church unless and until reversed by a subsequent Assembly. The phrase "unless and until reversed by a subsequent Assembly" ought not to have been adopted by the Presbytery, for the reason that an Assembly cannot reverse the judicial decision of a previous Assembly, as all jurisdiction in a given case ceases with the dissolving of the Assembly which tries the case, yet Assemblies have corrected probable errors of process when such have been shown. With regard to the matter of doctrinal declarations or deliverances, the Assembly is the highest judiciary in the Church, and

its interpretations of the doctrine of the Confession of Faith are to be received with obedience due to the body, but such deliverance become law only when approved by the General Assembly in the regular and constitutional manner, or when embodied and set forth in a judicial decision by the Assembly. The doctrine of inerrancy declaration by the General Assembly, which declaration prompted the Presbytery of Newark to adopt the paper complained against, is now the law of the Church, having been judicially settled in the Briggs case, and is, therefore, binding upon every minister and elder of the Presbyterian Church."

Declares for Prohibition.

What is clearly entitled to be regarded as a remarkable and indeed an important document has been issued by Bishop Labrecque with respect to the abolition of the Scott Act in Chicoutimi, Quebec. The conclusions are worth reprinting in full:

First, the civil authorities having established certain laws concerning the granting of licenses for the sale of intoxicating liquors, municipal councillors and other officers having charge of such licenses will have to answer before God, some day, for the negligence and weakness they may have shown in the accomplishment of their duties.

Second, it is a mortal sin to grant licenses where they are liable to introduce or increase disorders that produce the ruin of souls and of bodies.

Third, it is a mortal sin to unnecessarily multiply licenses, with a view to create revenues for the municipal corporation.

Fourth, it is a mortal sin for municipal councillors to grant licenses to persons who are unable or unworthy to fill the position.

Fifth, those citizens sin grievously who by their votes, their writings or otherwise, contribute to introduce and propagate, without any necessity, the sale of intoxicating liquors and its accompanying disorders, with a view to personal or public interest.

Sixth, it is a solemn duty for all the pastors of souls to see, by all the means at their disposal, that the number of licenses be limited as far as possible.

Seventh, those who have in their possession stills for distilling intoxicating liquors, contrary to the disposition of the law, sin against charity by exposing themselves to the heavy fines imposed upon offenders; those for whom the use of such instruments is a proximate occasion of sin, sin "grievously," and they must be refused absolution, if they continue to use them.

Event upon event is occurring in the Roman Catholic Church to show that those in high places are alive to the duty of the hour, and it is safe to say that if Bishop Labrecque follows up his mandement vigorously more will be effected for temperance than by loosely administered civil laws.

Drs. Warfield and Smith.

One of the ablest articles and of the most serviceable on the Smith question, which has appeared is published in *The Presbyterian and Reformed Review* from the pen of Dr. B. B. Warfield. The article is very long and is a well-sustained effort throughout. Dr. Warfield's purpose is not to criticise or refute Dr. Smith's positions, but to give an exposition of his teachings. Dealing with the article the *Presbyterian Messenger* says:—