

we have the *type*; in the interpretation of the parable the antitype. Again, Bro. H. would infer that all the tares are in the church. What about the goats spoken about in Matt., xxv). Do you think they will be all church members. Does it not strike you that all evil is the work of the devil, and the fruit of his seed sowing. Don't you think that the tares will comprise the class on the left hand of God. Do you not see in this company all who have rejected the counsel of God; and gone down to the grave regardless of the future. Those who were never in the church will be tares in the last great day. But does not Christ say He will gather them out of His Kingdom? Yes! When? At the end of this state or reign of Heaven. How do we know this? Because He says He will send forth His angels to do the work; hence it will be after the resurrection. What Kingdom shall he gather them out of, the type or the antitype? Then shall the Kingdom, etc., (Matt. xxv. 1.) At the end of this state, the period stretching from the establishment of the *reign* at Pentecost until the resurrection morning. Christ in the parable was holding up to the human mind a type of the real, and as such I view it. We understand a King must ascend his throne before he reigns in power. When Jesus finished His work on earth He ascended to His throne in Heaven. Glorified and crowned He sits in His reign. I would like to ask Bro. H., if Christ is not Lord of all (Acts. x. 36). As Christ sits in His reign to day He is over the entire destiny of the world—*The Reign of Heaven*. Therefore at the end of this reign there will be found more tares who were never in the church, than that were. Bro. H. tells us at his writing he had before him six authors. Well that should be sufficient authority to define the term Kingdom of Heaven. But with all these he did not answer one of my questions. He does not say the tares are the product of the good seed or not. He makes two distinct sowers, but gets all the products into the church. He seems to be oscillating, and I cannot contrive on which side of the subject he is. Now it is evident if I sow oats I will reap oats, if I sow wheat I will reap wheat. If I sow tares I will reap tares. If I sow to the flesh I will reap corruption. If I sow to the Spirit I will reap spiritual fruit. If we sow spiritual seed the yield will be spiritual. But where the tares come in, is where the seed of the *word* takes no root, and therefore the same evil remains, the tare if you please. All evil men are tares before hand, and unless the good seed enter and take root the old seed remain, If the good seed takes root, it will purge out the bad. *A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump*. Look at the parable of the sower; can you say those who bore no fruit were in the Kingdom? How are tares produced, by feeding upon the seed the Devil has cast out. The Devil sowed the first crop of tares in the Garden of Eden, and the tares has been growing ever since, and he is still sowing. But Christ in His death has bruised His seed, and where the seed of Christ takes root the seed of the Devil must die. If man will receive the good seed the result will be good. If Bro. H. will get his mind as clear from gloom as when he reported the additions at Westport, he will not require so many authors to support him in the definition of the term Kingdom of Heaven, and also to be able to tell us where the skins were imported from to clothe our first parents, and what amount of duty paid on them (*ad valorem*.) I am afraid Bro. H. has got out of his adjustment with his natural environments, and it is he that has gone speculating, and he has not as much as found a shadow, save a stock. Now Bro. H., I would not strike so quick and hard as you did at Wilson. Let us look before leaping. Wilson may have believed the world was made of brass, but that would not throw us off the track in finding the interpretation of the term Kingdom of Heaven. The only difference I see, he renders the term

Heaven in the *plural*—*Heavens*. Well I find Paul speaking of three Heavens; perhaps Wilson had reference to this. What does Bro. H. make of the false prophets and teachers spoken of by Peter? I find he makes them tares in the church. Here he strikes another death blow at the very proposition he is endeavouring to vindicate. Bro. H., do you get all systems of so called religion into the Church of Christ, if so you have a conglomeration to perfection. But does not Christ say, let both grow together, proving that they are in the Kingdom. No indeed, but growing in the *field*. Therefore, if the tares are growing in the church that Bro. H. designates Kingdom, the field and the Kingdom are one. Now I see the tares growing in the field, and they were growing so close together (all the difficulty was under the soil) to root up a tare would be to spoil the wheat. So if the tares are in the church, and the church and the Kingdom are one, the field and the Kingdom are one also. Now to conclude, if the tares and the wheat are growing in the field, and you say they are in the church, please discriminate between the Kingdom and field. I view the field as being identical with the Reign of Heaven, in which the church is growing *wheat* side by side with the *tares*. But, if you make the Reign of Heaven identical with the church of Christ, then the field and the Kingdom are one.

H. E. COOKE.

#### MAJORITIES AGAIN.

I see that Bro. Ford, in the May number, has accepted my rule in regard to majorities but thinks there are exceptions to the rule. He thinks that in some cases a measure may be lawful but not expedient. He in this agrees with Paul that whatever is expedient is right to follow; that there may be some things lawful but not expedient, and such things we should not follow. This we think is sound. But the main question is, *how and who* are to settle what things are expedient. Bro. Ford thinks that in some of these expedients it should be left to the wisdom that is from above, that is, in our hearts, and to the common sense in our heads. But a second thought will show that this does not settle the difficulty, for the question, who has this wisdom and common sense? must be settled. What I consider wisdom and common sense may not seem so to others. Suppose a good Bro. considers it wise and sensible to have communion in the evening, but quite a number of other brethren think it unwise, who is to settle which is wise and sensible? Here is where we say the only possible way to settle the question is by a majority. We are therefore left to our former rule and conclusion, i.e., there is no way to settle the question that is expedient but by the majority. There are of course differences that do not involve a question—cases where the persons, few or many, are willing that others should have their own way, in such cases majorities are needless, but in cases where our differences form an issue then there must be a settlement and we have never seen or heard tell of a case of like nature settled in any other way than by the minority submitting to the majority.

H.M.

#### WHY YOUNG CHRISTIANS SHOULD WORK.

When a young Christian first feels "the new-born joy of sins forgiven" and enters the service of Christ, the first great desire is, How I would like to get others to accept this glorious salvation that is open to them. Their heart is aflame with love to the Saviour who has so mercifully forgiven their sins, and the selfishness of the human heart is so overcome by the love of Christ as to lead them to earnestly wish for the salvation of others. This is as it should be. This heaven-born desire should be cultivated by exercise and prayer. Give it free

course. Engage earnestly in the service of that Master whose whole work was the salvation of men. Do not put this feeling down as "an ill-timed enthusiasm brought on by excitement," but use it to the glory of God. "Herein is my Father glorified that ye bear much fruit. Christians should all be active workers for Christ.

1st. Because He worked for them. This is the motive from which should spring every effort put forth for God. It is the love of Christ which should constrain us, not the hope of heaven nor the fear of hell.

2nd. Because it is such a help, particularly to young Christians, to be actively engaged in the work of the Master. It strengthens their Christian character. It causes them to take a deeper interest in the Lord's work generally, and consequently greater good is done, both in the vineyard and to themselves.

3rd. Because there is such pressing need in the conflict for every soldier of the cross.

And O! brethren and sisters, is not this sufficient reason for active work. When thousands are dying around us every day, dying the eternal death, dying unprepared to meet their God, how feeble and insufficient are our mightiest efforts! The harvest is ripe all around us, and so few to help gather it in. We cannot all be preachers, but we can all be workers in some other way. And shall we see any friends die, to rise up in judgment to condemn us, when we might have saved them by our prayers, entreaties and Christian example? If we keep our light shining before men they will see our good works and glorify our Father who is in heaven. Does anyone say they can save no one? Can they not pray? Can they not at least ask some of their friends to be Christians, and then pray and water the good seed? What earnest, faithful continued prayer, coupled with faithful work, was ever unsuccessful in the salvation of a soul? None! "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name He will give it you." O, if Christians were only as active as the devil, how different would be the state of the church and world! It was while men slept that the enemy sowed the tares; therefore Christians, for God's sake, for the sake of your own soul and the souls of others, *don't go to sleep* in the harvest time. Get in your work ahead of the devil, ask God's blessing on that work and He will give the increase. If you save only one, and that one save a dozen, and those dozen a hundred, then indeed will the good seed sown in your heart bring forth fruit, thirty, sixty or an hundred fold.

C. E.

#### THE CHURCH—HER PECULIAR MISSION.

In the eyes of some, who are wise in their own conceits, and dogmatic in their profound ignorance, the church now exists without excuse. They profess to have discovered that humanity no longer needs her blessing. In other words, the world has outgrown the church as a child outgrows its garment. As modern naval inventions have rendered useless more ancient armament so has modern political, social and moral facilities rendered useless the church. Their reasons for so claiming are legion, but we shall at present mention these.

1. It is claimed that the government insures us freedom and protection in our political life; this the church cannot do, therefore we do not need the church in order to secure our political liberties. But they have overlooked the fact that as men obey the teaching of the Bible they are protected in these privileges. These rights did not originate with the laws of government, nor in man's brain; they originated with God. The teaching of Christ, which is the true teaching of the church, has been and is the leaven that is changing the kingdoms into governments where rights are respected. The most favored government on earth has not, as yet,