

founding, and the name of the founder, beginning with "The Church of the Living God," founded A.D. 29, introduced into Great Britain 66, and founded by our Lord and His Apostles. For 1500 years after this the Catholic Church continued unbroken in England (and Ireland). The first sect or schism represents the Independents or Congregationalists (1568), founded by R. Browne and R. Fitz. Then come in succession the following:—English Romanists (1570), the Bishop of Rome, Pope Pius V.; Presbyterians (1572), sundry Puritan and Calvinistic priests of the Church of England; General Baptists (1633), Mr. Spilsbury, and other Independent ministers; Particular Baptists (1633), Independent ministers; Friends, or Quakers (1648), George Fox; Seventh Day Baptists (1650),—; Unitarians (1651),—; Reformed Presbyterian (Cameronians) (1680), Richard Cameron, a Scotch minister; Glassites (1730), John Glas; Wesleyan Methodists (1739), Rev. J. Wesley an English priest. The Methodists did not leave the Church till 1795. Welsh Calvinistic Methodists (1739), Howell Harris; Inghamites (1740), Joseph Ingham; Calvinistic Methodists (1741), George Whitefield, an English priest; Sandemanians (1760), Robert Sandeman; Scotch Baptists (1765),—; Methodist New Connexion (1787), Alexander Kilham; Independent Methodists (1810),—; Primitive Methodists (1810), Hugh Bourne and W. Clows; Bible Christians (1815), W. O'Bryan; Hicksite Quakers (1827), Elias Hicks; Mormons (1830), Joseph Smith; Catholic Apostolic (1832), Edward Irving; Wesleyan Methodist Association (1835), Dr. Warren; Plymouth Brethren (1835), John Darby.—*Irish Ecl. Gazette.*

CLERICAL SECESSIONS FROM ROME.

According to a letter from the Rev. J. P. Bacon Philips to the *Brighton Gazette*, the following is a list of the clergy formerly in Roman Orders who are now admitted to the English priesthood:—[1] Anton Leopold Becker, licensed preacher, diocese of Norwich; [2] Joseph Francis Bossy; [3] Leon Checkerman; [4] Michael Angelo Camerilleri, now Vicar of Lyford; [5] John Cross; [6] John Philip Dalton, now Vicar of Withington; [7] Edward Giannini Edwards, now Vicar of Llandawake; [8] Dr. Fuhrer, formerly Professor at the Jesuit College, Bombay; [9] Henry Flintoff; [10] Vicenzio Genua; [11] John Francis Joseph Grandjean, now Assistant-Curate of St. Andrew, Nottingham; [12] Francis Hogan, now Assistant-Curate of Yoxall; [13] Peter Septimus Leonini; [14] John Bernard McGovern, now Assistant-Curate of All Saints', Chorlton-on-Medlock; [15] Donald Andrew Mackay; [16] Ernest W. Maitland, formerly R.C. Chaplain at St. Marylebone Union; [17] Jeremiah Murphy; [18] Francis Felix Mazachelli, now Vicar of Felmersham; [19] Francis Moverley; [20] Jeremiah Percy Neville, Assistant-Curate of St. Michael, Southwark; [21] Thaddeus O'Callaghan; [22] Patrick Phelan; [23] Constant Prosperi Marie Poirier, now Assistant-Curate of St. Peter's, Guernsey; [24] John Schulte; [25] Louis Napoleon Seidan; [26] Charles F. Godbold Turner, now Assistant-Curate of Normacot; [27] Jules Xavier Willman; [28] William Ernest Youngman, now Assistant-Curate of Ryde, Isle of Wight.

Mr. Phillips adds: Each of these names may be verified from "Crockford," or other accredited sources of information. I have not included the names of the Rev. R. B. Hodgson and one of Lord Bute's chaplains, because, although they have been received into the English Church, they do not appear to be licensed to officiate.

Hope is a very beautiful Christian grace. It makes the spirit very bright and peaceful. The hopeful Christian is a blessing to himself and all around him. He seems to live in the sunshine, his thoughts are glad and happy thoughts, his words are cheering and inspiring; his very look is sunny.—BISHOP WALSHAM HOW.

WHAT BRITISH STATESMEN HAVE SAID ON HOME RULE

MR. BRIGHT

"My sympathy with Ireland, North and South, compels me to condemn the proposed legislation. I believe the United Parliament can and will be more just to all classes of Ireland than any Parliament that can meet in Dublin under the provisions of Mr. Gladstone's Bill. If Mr. Gladstone's great authority were withdrawn from these bills, *I doubt if twenty members outside the Irish party in the House of Commons would support them.* The more I consider them, the more I lament that they have been offered to the Parliament of this country."

MR. BRIGHT IN 1872.

"To have two representative Legislative Assemblies or Parliaments in the United Kingdom would, in my opinion, be *an intolerable mischief*, and I think no sensible man can wish for two within the limits of the present United Kingdom, who does not wish the United Kingdom to become two or more nations entirely separate from each other."

MR. CANNING.

"Repeal the Union! Restore the Heptarchy! Can there, I ask, co-exist in this kingdom, without imminent hazard to its peace, an assembly constituted as the House of Commons is, and another assembly invested with a representative character as complete as that of the House of Commons itself, though not conferred by the same process?"

SIR ROBERT PEEL.

"The security of the Empire depended on the maintenance of the Union, without which England would be reduced to the condition of a fourth-rate power in Europe, and Ireland to the desolation of a wilderness. To preserve the existence of these islands as a leading power of Europe it was absolutely necessary that they should be governed and directed by *one* supreme head and one supreme Legislature. A separate Legislature could not alleviate the poverty of Ireland. The establishment of a really independent Legislature in Ireland would do *incalculable evil* in the administration of the affairs of the country. The one Executive and Parliament of the Empire would be continually coming into collision with the other. It could not safely be left to Ireland to fix her own proportion of the public burdens of the two countries, and, on the settlement of the commercial system, or on the subject of foreign relations, the very existence of two independent Legislatures would involve both countries in inextricable difficulties."

MR. BURKE.

Mr. Gladstone has described the words of Edmund Burke as a mine of gold to be explored with profit at the present crisis. A writer in the *Globe* says:—"Here is a nugget dug from his 'Letter on the Affairs of Ireland,' written in the year 1797:—'My poor opinion is, that the closest connection between Great Britain and Ireland is essential to the well-being—I had almost said to the very being—of the two kingdoms.....I think, indeed, that Great Britain would be ruined by the separation of Ireland; but, as there are degrees of ruin, it would fall *most heavily* upon Ireland. By such a separation, Ireland would be the most completely undone country in the world; the most wretched, the most distracted, and, in the end, the most desolate part of the habitable globe. Little do many people in Ireland consider how much of its prosperity has been owing to, and still depends upon, its intimate connection with this kingdom.' Surely these pregnant words are as pregnant now as when they were written."

LORD MACAULAY.

Lord Macaulay's answer to those who proposed the repeal of the Union and a separate Legislature for Ireland was, "Never, never, never!"

EARL RUSSELL.

"I fear, if an Irish Parliament is set up in Ireland, all her energies will be wasted in *political contention*. I therefore wish to divert the forces, which might give heat and comfort, instead of concentrating them in a manner to produce a conflagration. This is the more necessary as the Irish nature is so very inflammable that it prefers a bonfire to the warmth of a moderate fire."

LORD BEACONSFIELD.

"I am opposed to this motion [Home Rule] because I think there are involved in it the highest and dearest interests of our country. I am opposed to it for the sake of the Irish people as much as for the sake of the English and the Scotch. I am opposed to it because I wish to see at an important crisis of the world—a time that, perhaps, is nearer arriving than some of us suppose—because I wish to see a united people welded into a great nationality, and because I feel that if we sanction this policy, if we do not cleanse the Parliamentary board of all this 'perilous stuff,' we shall bring about in disintegration of the kingdom and the destruction of the Empire."

MR. FORSTER.

Lastly, Mr. Forster, in a debate on Mr. Shaw's motion in favour of Home Rule in the session of 1890 said:—

"The method of pacification now put forward seems to me to be *full of difficulties, absurdities, and unworkable proposals.*"

LIGHT ON CHURCH MATTERS

From The News London England.

FOUR REASONS AGAINST DISESTABLISHMENT

"To Disestablish the Church would be to strike a blow at the supremacy of the religious ideal in national government, and would assist in the development of a democratic secularism and of a beatant atheism.

"Disestablishment, if accompanied by Disendowment, would impoverish hundreds of districts in cities, towns, and villages, where voluntary free churches cannot at the present moment sustain themselves in any measure of efficiency.

"Disestablishment would leave the cathedrals in a sorry plight as national centres, so far as worship is concerned. Left destitute of a distinctly religious ideal, they might become lounges or lecture-halls.

"Disestablishment would be welcomed by all infidels, all secularists, and all sorts of men who wish to destroy the Church because they dislike religion."—*W. Mann Statham, Independent Minister.*

LORD SELBORNE AND CHURCH ENDOWMENTS

A Nonconformist minister of Bridport having stated that Lord Selborne had described the endowments of the Church as State property, his lordship, under date May 31st, 1886, wrote to an elector of that town as follows:—

"Nothing can possibly be more contrary to the fact than to represent me as having ever said or thought that the endowments of the Church of England are State or National property, or that they can justly be taken away by Parliament. I am, and always have been, of exactly the contrary opinion. Unless for some just cause of forfeiture, I hold that they could no more be taken away from that large part of the people which under ancient and legal titles, not even originally conferred by any public act of the State, is now in practical enjoyment of them, than any property held in trust under the protection of public law for the religious purposes of any Nonconformist denomination could be."

DISESTABLISHMENT AND THE POOR.

Let us consider the ruin which Disestablishment means to our country villages, and to the