

ency, has a majority of three-fourths in the House of Bishops, and perhaps nearly as large a majority in the Lower House, has absolute control of the entire machinery of the General Convention, and, as a party, is thoroughly organized, flushed with victory, and going on conquering and to conquer. The other party is in a hopeless minority, thoroughly disorganized, dispirited by defeat, uncertain what to do, and like a man who cannot find his hands in the day of battle.

And more than this; *in the Church*, the struggle is hopeless for another reason. The High-Church has on its side the *great educational power of the Church*. It uses readily and easily, for the inculcation of its views, the catechism, and the Baptismal and other services; and these are read and heard read, many times a year, by parents, and sponsors, and children, and the congregation generally, and that, too, on the most interesting occasions, and when they make the deepest impression. While the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church, which were designed to be the standard of doctrine for the Church, and which sustain the Low-Church party in its teaching, and prove conclusively that it holds to-day the doctrines held by the framers of the Prayer-book, cannot be used efficiently either in the education of the young or the instruction of the congregation generally, and, as a matter of fact, are not read, or heard read, by one Episcopalian in ten, more than once in ten years.

With the parties thus unequally matched, and with the contest to be waged on these unequal terms, I can see nothing in the future for the Low-Church party, if it continue in the Church, but further defeat, further disintegration, and in the end the surrender of what it has ever held to be the truth of God.

But even if the contest were not so hopeless, my honest convictions are that *it had better be ended*. There is no necessity that the two parties should fight out their differences in the Church. Where no Divine law compels co-existence, separation is surely better than discord. Where two persons or parties are not agreed, they had better not walk together. And where they cannot do the Lord's work together, they had better, for the present, do it apart. So thought Barnabas and Paul at Antioch, and so they decided to act. Their separation was a painful necessity and a most humiliating occurrence; but *the wrong* of it was in their *disagreeing*; *the wrong* was in their *sharp*