

CONTROVERSY AT HUNTINGDON, C. E.—A Series of Lectures on doctrines disputed between Calvinists and Anti-Calvinists has been commenced in St. Andrew's Church of this place. This series is to embrace such subjects as the Decrees of God, the Creation and Fall of man, Atonement, Justification, Imputation, Regeneration, Election, and Perseverance. The first of the series was delivered by the Rev. Daniel Anderson of Durham, C. E., (Canada Presbyterian,) on the evening of Sabbath the 10th ult. His subject was the purposes or decrees of God. After a number of preliminary remarks, by way of introducing the subject and clearing the ground, the lecturer proceeded to consider, first, that God has purposes or decrees. Under this head he adduced the passages usually quoted to prove that God has decrees. His second head of discourse was: when were God's purposes formed, what is their character, and to what have they reference? Under the first of these particulars, when were God's purposes formed, he showed that they are and must be from eternity. Under the second he showed they must be in accordance with the Divine goodness, holiness and wisdom, and that he believed the doctrine of decrees as taught in the *Westminster Confession* to be consistent with the love, purity, and wisdom of God, and on that ground was prepared to defend them. Under the third, To what have God's decrees reference? he stated that he believed them to have reference to "whatsoever comes to pass." He read the statements of the Catechisms Larger and Shorter, and of the *Westminster Confession* on the point. He avowed it as his belief that God has foreordained unchangeably and infallibly whatsoever comes to pass, inclusive of the most atrocious crimes of men or devils. He thought that this doctrine of universal foreordination was proved by the universality of Divine foreknowledge, that Socinus and Dr. Adam Clarke were driven, by the force of it, to deny *universal* foreknowledge. His text was one proof of this doctrine, Eph. i. 11., God "worketh all things after the counsel of his own will." Rom. ix. 36 another, and some other passages. He, in the third place, proceeded to notice some objections to this doctrine. Among others he noticed the objection that it makes God the author of sin. He asserted that it did not, and proved that it did not from the *Westminster Confession of faith*, and, of course, all who acknowledge that formulary of doctrine as an infallible authority will regard his argument as conclusive. He also introduced the statement in 2 Sam. xxiv., 1, as a proof that God cooperating with the devil, makes men to sin. But he asserted strongly that notwithstanding this God is not its author. He stuck to the words of the confession that God has "unchangeably foreordained whatsoever comes to pass," and that "in relation to the foreknowledge and decree of God all things come to pass immutably and infallibly." Another objection he noticed was that it destroys the free-agency of man. He proved this objection to be nugatory as well as the former from the *Confession of Faith*. He was careful to say that he believed in the free-agency of man, and that this agency consisted in freedom to *do as he wills*, which, he thought, was the highest freedom which could be conceived of. He closed with some practical remarks which we need not particularize.

We must give the lecturer credit for the admirable spirit which he