

fathers." "Let the children first be filled," as St. Mark adds to St. Matthew's account. The apparent repulse, however, only adds to the woman's importunity. She forthwith approached and worshipped Him, still begging His help. But "He answered and said, 'It is not meet to take the children's bread, and to cast it to dogs.'" There are not many for whom this would not have been sufficient; but this heathen woman, like the centurion, was mighty in faith; and from the very word which would appear to make most against her, draws with the ready wit of faith an argument in her own behalf. She takes the sword out of the Lord's own hand, wherewith to overcome Him, with the remarkable answer: "Truth, Lord; yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from the Master's table." Our translation does not give the force of the original, which has been thus paraphrased:—Truth, Lord; saidst thou dogs? It is well: I accept the title and the place, for indeed the dogs have a portion of the meal; they eat the crumbs which fall from the master's table. In this putting of the case, Thou bringest me within the circle of the blessings which the great human family receive from the Divine Householder. We also belong to His household, though we occupy but the lowest place therein. "O woman! great is thy faith; for this saying, go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter." The apparent bitterness of the Lord was manifested because He knew that her faith could stand the proof; and He doubtless desired to give His disciples a lesson they would not soon forget, as well as to teach the woman herself, from her own experience, "that men ought always to pray and not to faint," and that when God delays a boon, He does not always deny it.

"THE MIDDLE KINGDOM" UNDER ANOTHER ASPECT.

While the subject of keeping the Chinese out of the United States and British Columbia is agitating the entire northern continent, it is remarkable that the Chinese ambassador at Washington is represented as by no means displeased with the action of the two Houses of Congress in passing the Anti-Chinese Bill, but on the contrary is believed to be positively gratified, because should the bill become part of the United States' law it will furnish the Government of China—"The Middle Kingdom," as they term it—with just the excuse they desire for a similar line of proceeding. That government cares very little about the comparatively small number of Chinese that emigrate to Canada and the United States, and has no particular wish that their number should be increased. It is far more concerned about the Europeans and Americans that enter their own country, and would much prefer to have them all stay at home. With the greatest reluctance, and only at the cannon's mouth, has it yielded to "barbarians" the privilege of visiting and settling on their sacred soil. For ages its policy has been that of isolation; and this policy has never been abandoned, except from the coercion of superior force. It has never sought commercial relations with other nations, and probably never will. It is jealous of their interference, and wishes to have as little to do with them as possible. This is not only the theory of the Chinese Government, however ridiculous and short-sighted it may be; it is its settled principle, rigorously put into practice, as far as possible; and the Congress of the United States, in passing the Anti-Chinese Bill, has furnished an admirable opportunity for

applying it to the citizens of the United States. And the same may be said of Canada should the wishes of British Columbia be carried. It is indeed remarked in the United States that should the Emperor of China abrogate all the treaties between them and close every Chinese port to their trade, he would be perfectly justified in doing so after what Congress has done. If they can break treaties so can China. If treaties do not bind one party to the contract, why should they bind another? Should China follow the example of the civilized and Christian people who inhabit the land south of us, not a word could be said in the way of protest. It would be only on the principle that "one good turn deserves another."

The United States President vetoed the Anti-Chinese Bill, and Congress failed to carry it afterwards by a two-thirds vote, so that the question is for the present dropped in the United States Congress. The subject will no doubt, however, be a long time before it will have received a final solution either in the United States or in the western part of the Dominion.

✓ THE TORONTO BISHOPRIC.

The following letter which we print verbatim from the *Globe* and *Mail* of the 4th inst. speaks for itself:—

SIR,—The continuance of the struggle which has thus far marked the efforts of the Synod to elect a Bishop for this Diocese forces the friends of the Ven. Archdeacon Whitaker to the following observations:—

Being anxious to act on the distinctive principles of the Church of England, we have no desire to see the Bishop become the head of any party in the Church, and are adverse to his countenancing the adoption of opinions or observances for which no distinct sanction is found in the Prayer Book; and we should earnestly hope that he would act in a spirit of courtesy, justice, and impartiality towards all the clergy and their congregations, to whatever school of thought they might happen to belong.

We are induced to support Archdeacon Whitaker for the office of our Bishop by the strong conviction which we entertain that he would more than fulfil these requirements.

When in addition to this we recognize in him conspicuous abilities, large attainments, Christian consistency, and moderation of opinion and practice, we feel that there is no one among the ranks of the clergy who is so pre-eminently fitted for the high position of a Bishop.

Those who lead the opposition to his election are for the most part men who have generally stood apart from him, who have misunderstood and misinterpreted his views, and have allowed their religious and other differences to prejudice them alike against his acts and his teachings. This has led to the most cruel and unjust misrepresentations, repeated with a persistency amounting to persecution.

The main objection so long urged against the Archdeacon, viz., that he has been teaching extreme and Romanising doctrines, has been at length formally withdrawn by one of the most prominent members of the Church Association; as witness the following statement officially read on Saturday, 1st inst., in the Cathedral, under the instruction of the Very Rev. Dean Grasett, Chairman of the meeting:—

"2. I also wish to add, most explicitly, that I not only did not speak of the Provost as preaching Romish doctrine, but I do not believe it. On the contrary, I believe the Provost to be a Christian gentle-

man, incapable as a member of the Church of England of doing so.
(Signed)

"DANIEL WILSON."

It is now said that, though his moderation cannot be questioned, Archdeacon Whitaker would never be an efficient Bishop, because in consequence of former controversies it would be difficult for him to conciliate those who are opposed to him or heal the division which unhappily exists among us. Why should any such difficulty be apprehended? For years past the Provost of Trinity College has had members of his staff who have held opinions and convictions diverse from his own both in matters of doctrine and administration, but no charge has ever been made against him of discourtesy or unfairness towards those who did not accept his views, and the same remark is equally applicable to the clergy at large.

While we thought it right to make these statements in justification of our action in inducing the Archdeacon to allow us to put him forward as our nominee, we claim that we on our part have reasonable ground of complaint.

We constitute a large majority of the whole Synod, the lay votes being nearly equal, while the clerical majority is overwhelming, being nearly four to one.

Who can be better judges than the clergy themselves as to the necessary qualifications of him who is to preside over them? Surely it cannot be supposed that they would select one who would be likely to subvert the principles of the Church? In a matter so immediately pertaining to themselves, and so vitally affecting their own comfort and the spiritual welfare of their respective flocks, the clergy cannot be charged with unreasonableness in claiming that the expression of their opinion on the subject given by a large majority of their number, and supported by nearly half the laity, is entitled to the greatest consideration.

Contrary to all principles of fair play, a small majority of one order takes advantage of a peculiarity in the constitution of the Synod to oppress and dictate to a very much greater number—one-fourth of the Synod can effectually frustrate the action of the remaining three-fourths, although they may be wholly unable to carry their point. We appeal with confidence to any fair-minded man whether a support won, as it has been, by a character which has undergone a long and trying ordeal, which has been weighed in the balance and not found wanting, ought not to have a controlling influence with those who are attempting to force upon us a gentleman who is a stranger to the diocese.

The struggle has not been, as represented, between the laity and the clergy, nor between Church parties, properly so-called, but it has been on the one hand between men loyal to the Church of England, men generally of most moderate opinions, although by no means strictly of the same views, still men recognising the comprehensiveness of the Church; and, on the other hand, by a body of men who persistently refuse to contribute to the maintenance of the clergy generally, and only recognise those whose views are in accordance with their own. Such a policy, if generally introduced, could result only in the starving out of a large majority of the clergy, and practically in the ruin of the Church of this Diocese.

We feel that we should be faithless to the solemn trust committed to our charge as clergymen, and as lay guardians of the Church of England, were we not determined to maintain our present firm attitude. The responsibility of the present state of affairs, which causes great inconvenience to individual members and threatens