

THE
HOME AND FOREIGN RECORD
OF
THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

No. 12.

OCTOBER, 1862.

VOL. I.

THE CALVINISTIC SYSTEM OF DOCTRINE—MISREPRESENTATIONS
EXPOSED—No. 5.

The Wesleyan organ has noticed our articles, and attempts to reply by shifting entirely the ground of charge, and resorting to what we must designate as gross suppression of the truth, and to misrepresentation. It assumes, on what ground we know not, that our first three articles closed the series. Its so-called reply we notice in the points it takes up.

1. In reviewing a pamphlet from the pen of an Old School Presbyterian in the United States, it had picked out the passage "transgression without freedom of will is no sin," and, on the ground of it, charged the author with *dishonesty*, with *pretending* that Calvinists believe in the freedom of the will, with *deceitfully* using the word freedom in a sense opposite to that in which Arminians understand it, with *intentional ambiguity* and *trickery*. We had accused the *Guardian* of casting recklessly the foulest aspersions; we cited this as an instance, and showed that it had no ground for thus aspersing the author, inasmuch as the Westminster Confession of Faith, which is the confession of the Presbyterian Church in the States, and of the author it was reviewing, ascribes freedom to the will in one of its articles:—"God hath endued the will of man with that natural liberty that it is neither forced, nor by any absolute necessity of nature determined, to good or evil." This is the charge we made, as may be seen in our May number, and it is to our dealing with this matter that the organ of Wesleyanism first refers. And how does it reply? By suppressing the charge altogether, never giving any indication of its nature, and alleging that we advanced an entirely different charge which we never made at all! The particular accusation was that of casting recklessly and unjustly the foulest aspersions at the author of a pamphlet, and the *Guardian*, in referring to the matter, says, "The *Record* accuses us of misrepresenting Calvinists respecting the freedom of the will!" Taking no notice whatever of the subject of which we did treat, it proceeds to deal with us as having treated of a subject on which we have said nothing. And this is a reply! Moreover, it roundly declares that the quotation given above from the Westminster Confession does *not* assert the freedom of the will in man's present state, and that the confession was there speaking only of man in his state of innocency before the fall! Our readers, and especially our clerical readers will be amazed at the