

letter, or nearly so, from the first, and at present seems to be unknown. A code of laws cannot be effective without a judiciary to expound them, and an administrative department to enforce them. We have only to fancy a civil code in India, with every plaintiff and every defendant assuming the function of advocate, judge and jury, in order to see how absurd it is to propose a code of laws which can neither be officially interpreted nor enforced. This explains why it is that nearly all attempts in this direction seem to foment discord rather than allay it. How could it be otherwise when both plaintiff and defendant attempt to pass judgment on the case in dispute?

A close and faithful study of human nature will greatly assist us in considering this question. Missionaries are very much like other people, and will continue to be like other people. When any two human beings differ warmly over any question, it is amazing how clearly each one can see his own side of it and how blind he is to the merits of the other side. As a matter of fact, has not the average missionary this infirmity in common with other men? And if so, what possible use is there in laying down a law for him which he will be sure to interpret in the light of his own interests? For instance, a missionary is asked to intervene in a neighbor's quarrel, and allows his feelings to lead him into the dispute. He is reminded of a rule forbidding such meddling, but at once replies, "This is a case of gross injustice. I am merely helping the weak," etc. Or, a discarded helper comes to him for service. He accepts him, and when reminded of the rule against such procedure, replies, "Yes, but *this case* does not come under that rule. *This man* is in the right," etc.

It has been suggested that a committee of reference might be appointed, and that all disputed questions might be referred to this body, but this would only be adding to the difficulties of the case. Could such a committee enforce its decisions? And would all missionaries be willing to submit their cases to such a body? Would not a certain class of men always be ready to show special reasons why each one's own particular case should not be sent up to such a committee? In important cases a reference to such a committee might seem fitting enough, but it is extremely probable that many trifling differences would be magnified by such a reference, and in this way a dignified committee would be made to figure in a

ridiculous light by being made the frequent recipient of undignified complaints.

If then we are to have no code of rules and no mission boundaries, can nothing at all be done to promote a proper spirit of comity among missionaries? Beyond all doubt something can be done, but not on the old lines.

First of all, there should be a radical change of policy. We should forever discard the notion that missionaries cannot dwell together in love and harmony. Instead of saying, How good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell apart in comity, let us boldly and firmly maintain the ground that it is a good and pleasant thing for brethren to dwell and work together in amity. As a matter of fact we all have reason to know that brethren of different societies who live and work side by side have fewer differences than those who live far apart. We ought to be ashamed to proclaim to the world that we cannot work side by side. In October last I saw Christians of the London and the Methodist Episcopal Societies in a common assembly day after day, taking council together, and waiting on God together, and it was impossible to distinguish between them. How much better this than to keep them separated as if they belonged to separate castes! We need not plant our stations in the same towns for the mere sake of exhibiting our fraternal love, but let us no longer shun one another's presence, and thus almost ostentatiously proclaim to the world that we cannot live together.

2. As far as possible both missionaries and converts should co-operate in their common work, especially in meetings for the promotion of their spiritual life. Instead of having a committee of reference for the settlement of disputes, two or more societies might have a joint committee for the promotion of their mutual interests. In former years the London and the Methodist Episcopal missionaries in Kumaon had such a committee, and the plan worked admirably. It is infinitely safer for us to attempt to legislate in the direction of practical amity, than to attempt deliberately to make provision for the demands of future discord.

3. For the correction of unfraternal conduct, and of all conduct which may be hurtful to our common cause, we must depend chiefly on the power of public opinion, with now and then a reference to the home authorities. We may as well assume, once for all, that