up and you warn him that he will be burned to death. "I don't want to burn to death", he says, "because I love my treasures and I might loose them." He has his choice. He can stay with his treasures and be burned to death. He can walk out of the building and be saved but he looses his treasures within the building where they are burned. You have a choice between alternatives. You can affect alternatives to some extent, but to a far greater extent you have to take them as they are and you have here your choice of wagesthat which comes inevitably as a result of that which you do; that which you earn and on the other hand you have the gift which is freely offered. The two are not exact opposites by any means but they are alternatives and with in the range of alternatives there is a king definite freedom of choice.

Now we turn our gem over a little and we look at the next facet which is of interest to us. One that is not explained in the verse but that which is certainly taught elsewhere in Scripture and which is referred to in the verse and necessary for the understanding of the verse. "For the wages of sin is death". What does this mean! The wages of sin is death. This certainly suggests to us the nature of sin and requires a re-examination of just what is sin in order that we may understand what the verse means. The wages of sin is death. The nature of sin we might entitle our second point. What is sin? First, we have to think a little about what God is. God is the Creator. He is the being, the Personality who established everything in accordance with His own righteous plan. He has established it so that all His creatures may live in harmony and peaceably. He has established it in order that His glory might be shown and that we all may live and enjoy Him forever. He has established this wonderful universe -- this universe in which there is order and \_ and unlimited possibility for enjoyment. But in anything which you establish written rules are necessary. God is tecessarily the Ruler--the righteous Ruler of that which He has established. As long as we had no automobiles traffic laws were not necessary. Two people came along in a horse and buggy -- one this way and one that way, and one could drive off through the fields if one needed room to get by and if the other one stopped, the trouble was not very great. It came about that in England people got into the habit of going on the left hand side of the road and in France they kept to the right hand side of the road in their horse and buggy but it didn't particularly affect their lives. It wasn't specially important. And then automobiles were produced. The possibility of getting