

framed their instructions to the missionaries and estimated their ordinary expenses. The style of living is generally in accordance with those instructions and within the designated appropriations. And it is perfectly well known to all intelligent contributors, for it is described and illustrated over and over again, in our missionary addresses and publications.

3. Whether or not their style of living should be called luxurious depends wholly upon our definition of that word, and upon other styles with which we compare it. Everything in such matters is relative. Compared with the natives in all Eastern countries, our missionaries do undoubtedly live in luxury. Compared with European and American merchants and officials in those countries they do not. The casual observer might not distinguish between the British officer in India and the missionary. They both are well dressed, well housed and well fed. That is evident. But if you compare the expense of living, you will find that the former spends \$5000 or \$10,000 a year, and the latter, perhaps, \$1000. This is often overlooked.

4. Some unreasonable and unsympathetic travellers have reported that missionaries live like nabobs; keep servants, horses and carriages, and fare sumptuously every day, far better indeed than the average contributor to the Board, who ignorantly supposes that his missionary is undergoing the greatest privations all the time. The inference is that we must call for a reform, and order our agents to spend less money, to "live more like the people among whom they labor," and to make those commendable sacrifices which harmonize so well with the name of a missionary. Some critics in England are even demanding that celibacy should be required as being a less expensive and more efficient means of propagating the gospel.

5. Before joining in this cry, let us ourselves critically inspect our own well-tried and long-approved methods, and see whether reason or experience require any radical change to avoid the charge of luxury. That charge must relate to one or more of the following details, viz., the house the missionary lives in, the clothing he wears, the food he eats, the servants he employs, the conveyance he uses, the vacation he gets, or in general the married life which is permitted him. And, in the last analysis, the whole question, to a practical man, must turn upon the salary which is paid.

(1) We have always provided that the missionary should have a decent house to live in. This we consider essential to his health, comfort and efficiency. But such a house as he needs puts him far above the Asiatic and the Polynesian. Do the critics know what they are saying, when they ask that our missionaries should "live as the natives do?" That means in a dingy, smoky hut, with a cow, donkey, fowls and vermin for domestic companions. How can the preacher of a pure religion, which requires that he keep himself "undefiled," conform to the filthy usages of Oriental natives? No, we send our representatives to teach those poor people how to live as well as how to pray. We want to show them a Christian house as well as a Christian Bible. In fact, the Bible will soon create the house, if we do not. Such a house may be of any style you please, but it may have rooms adapted to the common necessities of eating, sleeping, bathing, studying, and, perhaps, teaching and preaching. It must have a thick roof to keep out the sun and rain; and in hot countries, a wide veranda and spacious grounds, if possible, for air and shade trees and a few flowers, and very likely, also for schools, hospitals or orphanage, all under the eye of the missionary, and enclosed by a suitable wall. You may take down your walls as much as you like in America, but you dare not do it in Turkey or China.

(2) We certainly want our missionaries to wear proper clothing. But if they lived "like the natives" they would often wear nothing but a waist-cloth and turban. Should we want them to do that? Are not personal cleanliness and self-respect a part of our religion, wherever we live? In truth the matter of clothing seems more expensive than it really is in the East. Our missionaries often dress in white flannel which is very becoming and very cheap, and easily washed for a trifle. The cork or pith helmet is considered a great protection from the sun, and they all wear it just as other foreigners do. It may seem a luxury in the eyes of a cooly, but it is nothing more nor less than a necessity for the men of our race in that climate.

(3) The missionary is expected to provide an abundance of good and nourishing food for himself and family. But this costs money. He cannot live on rice alone, and that often is so dear that millions of Hindoos and Chinamen cannot afford it and have to be content with cheaper grains like millet and sorghum. Many articles of food, such as our people require, have to be obtained from Europe or America. In a certain sense they are luxuries, just as tea and coffee and sugar are luxuries to us. Yet most civilized people call them necessaries, and use them freely. Shall we grudge the missionary his American flour and butter, his Oregon salmon, and Chicago bacon if he craves them, as he certainly does when he is in a healthy working condition? His wife will probably have some delicacies, perhaps the gift of kind friends, reserved for some special occasion, like an annual meeting of the mission, or the visit of some stranger. How unkind, how unjust, in such a stranger to go away and report that the missionary lives luxuriously, has elegant table service, and rare dishes and many courses, when the fact is that the table at which he was a guest was furnished in quite an exceptional way, with those articles which had been carefully kept perhaps since the wedding day in the dear homeland, and were brought now as a mark of courtesy to the welcome visitor. Ordinarily the herald of the cross in those lands studies economy in his food as in everything else. He has to, and he wants to, as a matter of principle, wherever he might happen to live. But pray let him not starve himself or his children. We never sent him out to do that. If we listened to the critics and required our brethren to avoid the appearance of luxury by adopting the native practice, let us see for a moment what such a menu would be. Bean-curd soup, rotten fish, boiled seaweed, fricassee do bow wow, rissoles of donkey, and, in some missionary lands, lizards, snakes and maggots.

(4) As to servants. In order that the missionary and his wife may have as much of their time as possible to devote to the official work for which they were sent, we have always advised them not to burden themselves personally with the heavy work of housekeeping, but to employ native labor in the matter of cooking, washing, sweeping, stabling, etc., and when we know that servants can be had for ten, five and even three cents a day, and board themselves, we think we shall continue to give the same advice. Yet, it is said, many of our givers at home do their own work and could not afford to hire servants. Very likely. But that is not the point. The question is not whether the missionary shall work hard, but what kind of work he shall do. Shall it be cooking food, or preaching the gospel? He cannot do both, which shall it be?

(5) As to equipage. Our missionaries generally have some kind of conveyance to ride in when they go on their preaching tours from village to village, and when they inspect schools or visit the sick. These conveyances vary according to the locality. There are bullock-bandies, pony tongas, ekkas, gharris, saddle-horses, house boats,