

cause the church is only one department of the kingdom. The whole includes any and all of the parts, but no one part can stand for the whole. Those who hold the views for which Dr. Goodwin contends, make, among others, these two serious mistakes: 1, That of supposing that Christ's reign is yet to begin; and 2, that of limiting Christ's present sphere of influence to the church. On the contrary, the New Testament teaches that our Lord began to reign when he ascended on high. "Him hath God exalted as a PRINCE and a Saviour." Jesus reigns *now*. He is not yet "Lord of all," in actual sovereignty, though he is in right, and he is ordering all the events of providence with a view of bringing about this ultimate and glad consummation. Christ reigns now in the kingdom of grace, which has ramifications and territories outside the church, and operates in all the forms of moral influence on the consciences and hearts of men. Under the rule and governance of the Lord Jesus, preparations are being made on a vast scale for the final and complete conversion of the world; a result not to be brought about by physical omnipotence or a display of visible glory, but by a series of mighty outpourings of the Holy Ghost such as characterized the day of Pentecost, and will become simultaneous and world-wide at the ushering in of the millenium.

Dr. Goodwin distinctly denies that the Lord Jesus is exercising kingly prerogatives now. At present, he tells us Christ is at the right hand of the Father as our "High Priest and Advocate." "But," he adds, "when the end of this ministry is come, THEN he will assume his full kingly prerogatives, which, as concerning this world, may now be said to be held in abeyance, and in literal fulfilment of prophecy will come in glory and power, set up his own throne in this world, and with his church associated with him as his bride, reign forever King of Kings and Lord of Lords." "This" visible, future, earthly kingdom,—"this" affirms Dr. Goodwin is what our Lord meant his disciples to pray for when he taught them to say, "Thy Kingdom Come."

Now we take exception to this whole paragraph. In the first place Christ is more than High Priest and advocate in his relations to his people now. He is "Prophet, Priest and KING." There is not a truly converted heart that does not recognize his regal relation and sing right loyally:—

"All hail the power of Jesus' name,
Let angels prostrate fall,
Bring forth the royal diadem
And crown him Lord of all."

The saints recognize this regal character of Christ, not only in regard to themselves but the world at large. If Christ were not actually reigning, how could sinners

be in rebellion against him? Christ's "kingly prerogatives are" not "held in abeyance *now*" either by himself or his people. "His own throne is not to be set up in this world at some future time." "Thy throne oh! God is for ever and ever." It stretches through all eternity, past as well as future. That this kingdom may come to every human heart, and be set up there, in harmony with the great truth "The kingdom of God is within you," is what we are taught to pray for in the Lord's prayer, and not the setting up at some indefinitely distant day of a visible earthly kingdom with all the paraphernalia of court and government after the manner of worldly kingdoms. It is not the least of the practically bad influences of the pre-millennial theory that it eviscerates the deep and precious meaning of the most important petition in the Lord's prayer, and sets people thinking, not of a present loyal doing of the will of God, as angels do it in heaven, but of being exalted on visible thrones, wielding golden sceptres, and revelling in all the magnificence of a carnal kingdom. It was the aim of Christ in all his teaching to draw away the mind from the carnal and visible to the spiritual and the unseen. The apostles of pre-millennialism evidently are not working along the same lines as the Master.

C.

Guelph.

PROHIBITION *VERSUS* MORAL SUASION.

MR. EDITOR.—Will you kindly insert in the next number of CANADIAN INDEPENDENT the enclosed quotation from an address, delivered by Mrs. Lathrap, before the Michigan W.C.T.U., May, 1885, as a reply to the ground taken by Rev. W. Allworth in your issue of Aug. 15th, on the question of Prohibition *versus* Moral Suasion, and commended by yourself. I live in a village of about 1000 inhabitants where prohibition has been enforced for the past seven years, "not by proxy", but by persistent self-denying effort on the part of a few "practical Christians, who *rote*, and *work*, as they *pray*. The result has been most gratifying, and those who at first opposed prohibition are now heartily in favor of it. Christian temperance women have no doubt where the true remedy for the evils of intemperance lie, viz: in prohibition, and as a result, protection for innocent children, also for those husbands, grown up sons and brothers, who morally are unable to protect themselves from the allurements of drink. I know of one christian mother, loving, tender, true, who, while her heart was breaking with anguish at the death of her beautiful little boy, said, as she closed his eyes, "thank God he will never die a drunkard." She knew by sad experience, as thousands of other mothers know, of how little value are "loving persuasions" to