

vealing a society pressed by the multiplied needs of nations, longing, and groaning, and praying, and giving both men and money, and consecrated women, too, to the great work. It was a wonderful story, and we thank God we heard it.

"But when we had to tell our story, 'alas what a falling off was there.' The story was told as well as it could be by the brethren who were deputed to do so. They performed their task well. But they had to confine themselves largely by telling about Canada as a country. Of the Congregational churches and their work, there was little to be said. And one could not but cry out in bitterness of spirit: 'Our leanness!' 'What were we among so many?' It was a bitter experience."

Now it is well known that our failures have not been few—that our successes have not seemed great—that many of our churches have died, and some are weak and feeble and ready to die. And history would seem to be a very sad one, *i. e.*, in Canada, but it is a glad one on the other side of the lines, and if our brethren in the United States can record their glorious successes, and tell of sixty new churches every year—their success is ours. They are spreading the same gospel, teaching the same principles, and preserve the same freedom. Some of the men over there are our own countrymen. They work no better since they crossed the lines—they became endowed with no supernatural grace because they made their home under the shadow of the great Republic; but their circumstances are changed; their surroundings are more helpful to success, and we rejoice with them in progress made. If great results have not attended our labours here, it has been otherwise there, and in England, and Australia. If we can rejoice in the prosperity of churches on this side of the line, why have not we the same joy in the prosperity of churches on the other side of the line? and if we feel that in some way or other the work on this side of the line is ours, and we share in the honour of the success, then why should we not feel the same regarding work done across the line? Christ's kingdom is not to be divided into sections by the arbitrary lines of nations.

In an engagement every company may not be able to do the same executive work on the ranks of the enemy, but when victory is proclaimed they rejoice together, and any brave man who faithfully performed his duty has a

right to share in that gladness. There is no invidious distinction made between the few brave ones who occupied a position of peculiar difficulty and were barely able to hold the ground against the attacks of the enemy, and the larger company well equipped and supplied who were able to drive the enemy before them. They all share honour at last; they are one. But why is it in this part of the great field Congregationalism has not made greater progress? or, at least, why is it that in its progress it does not compare favourably with the United States, or other places? It may be noted in the first place that no blame can be attached to the men in the field, as a whole. No doubt there have been failures here—men who seemed to have no qualifications for building up churches, but there have been pulpit failures in the U. S. and in England, and as many in proportion to the numbers as in Canada.

We have tried men both from the U. S. and in England, and whilst some have done noble work for Christ and the churches, others will only be remembered for the mischief they have wrought. We have also had men leave us to take up oversight of churches in the neighbouring Republic, and in the Mother Country, some of whom are much esteemed for their usefulness, and the service they render the cause of Christ in these places. Our men will compare favourably with the men of other lands for devotion to the cause of Christ, self-denying labours and success in saving souls.

Where then is the cause of weakness? 1st. It is owing to the lateness of the time when we entered the field. The first church was organized in Granby in the year 1830, excepting Stanstead which did not properly belong to our Canadian work. In 1832 churches were founded in Danville, Montreal and Cowansville. In 1834 the first churches were founded in Ontario, *viz.*, Toronto, Brantford, followed in 1835 by Burford, Guelph, Hamilton and Scotland. But coming so very late we laboured under special disadvantages. The Wesleyans, Presbyterians, and Episcopalians, were here long before and had taken possession of the country. In the United States the Congregationalists 150 years ago were nearly double the number of any other denomination, but they have been left in the background by the Baptists, the Methodists and the Presbyterians. Now if the Congregationalists of the U. S. could not hold their own when they were first