

bers in their churches, showed that the Moravian brethren stood *first* in that noble position, while the Congregationalist came *second*: the calculation was based on the idea of one Missionary for so many members. Even in Canada "apart from cities, towns, and villages," Congregationalists can point to growing churches, centres of light in their several localities, so that it need not be asked, "what has Congregationalism done, and what is it doing for Upper Canada?" The statement that "its members appear to have declined in the United States one hundred thousand during the last hundred years," is one of the most extraordinary we have ever met with in ecclesiastical statistics. We should like to know the authority on which it is made. The United States had no existence a hundred years ago; but of the colonies of Britain in America, the population was then too small to allow the supposition that such an enormous Congregational membership existed.

Keeping in mind that the membership of such Churches has always been proverbially select (for purity of communion is one of our principles), we fail to believe that the statement made in the *Christian Guardian* is correct.

We can fortunately, give our readers a few particulars illustrative of this point. On the 23rd of April, 1760, Rev. Ezra Stiles, D.D., subsequently President of Yale College, but then Pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Newport, R. I., preached a sermon before a convention of Congregational Ministers of that colony, assembled at Bristol, wherein he states—"The present state of our denomination, as to numbers, for the year 1760, is nearly this: in Massachusetts" (Maine was then a part of Massachusetts, and Vermont had no existence) "are about 300 Congregational churches; in Connecticut, 170; in New Hampshire, 43; which, with those in this colony (Rhode Island), form a body of about 530 churches." What an immense membership these 530 churches must have had, to admit of one hundred thousand members over and beyond the two or three hundred thousand now forming the membership of the churches! The *Congregational Quarterly* for January, 1860, gives the following statistics: "In 1858, as printed (corrected) January 1, 1859, there were 2,555 churches; in 1859, 2,676 churches,—in neither case including those not reported by Associations, or those connected with Presbyteries. In 1858, there were 239,586 members; in 1859, 257,634. In Sabbath Schools, in 1858, so far as reported, 162,815; in 1859, 206,441.

As to the *age* of churches, 89 were organized previous to 1700. In 1700 and prior to 1800, 617. Since (including 1800), 1,970. Within the last ten years, 403, without including Ohio, Michigan, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, or Jamaica, none of which report the years of organization." Our readers can draw their own conclusion from these data. There are new countries in which the aggressiveness of the system has been displayed: in Illinois and Wisconsin, the almost spontaneous springing up of hundreds of Congregational churches attests the vitality of the system. But we have something further to say in favour of the system in which "there is nothing aggressive." In a debate in the English Methodist Conference of 1859, the Rev. W. Arthur said—

"I am indebted to my friend, Mr. Osborn, for statistics of a startling character. In our ten Conference towns we added about thirty per cent. to the number of our ministers—we had ninety at the former period, from the year 1834 to 1837—about 124 now. What is the result? We have there *twelve thousand less Methodists now than we had then; thirty-three more ministers; twelve thousand fewer members!* I know the effects of divisions. ('Hear, hear,' and sensation.) I make