

### Selections.

**AMERICAN HEBREW CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION.**—A meeting has been held in this city for the organization of an American Hebrew Association. The Rev. W. Gallatin presided on the occasion, and the following resolutions were read and passed:

*Whereas*, There exists in the United States several hundred highly respectable and intelligent Christian Jews, many of whom reside in New York city and places contiguous to it; and whereas, it is the firm belief of many of these Christian Jews, that the present signs of the times are such as call upon them to abandon their now isolated position, and organize an association consisting of sincere and long tried converts, having for its object the promotion of the spiritual members, the relief of those of their brethren who for confessing Christ are suffering want and distress, the stirring up of the dry bones of the house of Israel, and the arousing of the Christian Church to more earnest prayer and increased effort for the salvation of Judah; and,

*Whereas*, The annual meeting and public testimony of such a body of witnesses to the Messiahship of Jesus, and the setting aside by them of all the sectarian formula of the present day, knowing nothing about themselves save Jesus, their common Redeemer, and cherishing love to all that bear his image, by whatever name they may be called, would lead many of our Jewish brethren to examine the religion we profess.

The Rev. John Neander adverted to the prevailing desire for the reclamation of their Jewish brethren, in which this organization had originated, the appropriateness of the time, and the immediate and lasting benefits that would accrue from any exertion made.

Mr. Morris Franklin, of Union College, dwelt on the "signs of the times," and combatted those arguments which, if accepted, would incite inaction. On behalf of the Jews who were Christians, it was absurd to style them apostates. They cherished the same faith which inspired Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their descendants, the Apostles. Nor was there any reason why Christian Jews should be dissociated from one another. There was reason to believe that if they were thus fraternally combined, and Christian efforts well directed, the Jews will come over to Christianity in great numbers.

G. K. Ledger, Esq., made reference to the vast number of eminent converted Jews in foreign countries.

The Rev. Mr. Harris was not disposed to regard the division among Christians as seriously interfering with the conversion of the Jews, the Hebrews themselves being divided into sects, such as the New School Talmudists and anti-Talmudists. He adverted, as did the preceding speaker, to the great number converted during the last quarter of a century.

After nomination of officers, the meeting adjourned. —*New York Paper.*

Juggernath, a notorious robber, has just been caught and tried for all his atrocities in Central India. The following horrible instance of his crimes is related by the *Calcutta Englishman*:—A little while previous to his arrest, Juggernath seized and carried off to the fortress (the pandemonium where the worst excesses were enacted) the child of a mahajan who was reputed to be rich. He offered to ransom the boy for a sum of money so exorbitant as to be out of his father's power to pay. The robber, determined not to be outdone in his nefarious scheme of extortion, put in force a diabolical threat, which he had previously communicated to the child's parents. He cut off the unfortunate lad's ears and nose, and placing them in a brass dish covered with red cloth, sent the hideous spectacle as a gift to the father, with an intimation that in event of the amount demanded being not forthwith remitted, he should be greeted with a sight of the other members of his son's body. As no blood can be knocked out of a stone, and the sum was far beyond the parent's means, he earnestly implored for his son. The inexorable Juggernath was as good as his word; the fingers and toes followed next, and finally he dashed out the boy's brains against the wall of his fort.

**PETER THE GREAT'S LEGACY.**—There is still standing, at No. 48 Great Tower Street, an old-fashioned public house, with the sign of the "Czar's Head." This ancient hostel is well known to antiquarians as being the identical house that at the commencement of the last century, was frequented by no less a personage than the Czar Peter the Great, from whom its sign is evidently derived. Peter the Great arrived in this country in January 1698. His chief object in coming to England was to learn the art of ship building, and crowds for a long time assembled to see him

in the dock-yards. The Marquis of Carmarthen was appointed by William the Third to attend upon the Czar, and they are said to have passed their nights together in hard drinking, pepper and brandy being represented as the Czar's favorite potation. Peter spent much of his time at Rotherhithe, where a ship was building for him. After his day's work, he and his companions would retire to a public house near Towerhill, [the Czar's Head] to smoke and drink beer and brandy.

When the writer last visited the tavern indicated—a locality interesting for its associations with the greatest of all the Czars of Russia—it possessed a curious heirloom or curiosity, in the shape of a mouldering, dusty chart, imprinted with a series of rules or clauses, purporting to have been written or dictated by Peter the Great, and headed "Peter's Legacy." In this curious document the Czar expresses, with even a prophetic spirit, the course of Russian policy he commenced, and which he required to be followed out by his successors to the Crown. He prognosticates, clearly enough, that the Crimea would be conquered and annexed to Russia, and that a system of aggrandizement would be persisted in by successive Czars, that would ultimately cause Russia to become the most powerful empire, and the greatest military and maritime power on the globe.—*London Paper.*

### News Department.

From Papers by R. M. S. America, June 23.

#### RELIGIOUS WORSHIP BILL.

The Lords were engaged on Tuesday, June 12, in discussing the Religious Worship Bill proposed to be reported with amendments. The *Earl of Shaftesbury* argued at great length in its favour, contending that the repeal of so much of the Act of George III., c. 52, as prevented the assembling of more than twenty persons for religious worship, except in a registered building, was necessary for the exigencies of the present day. If persons might assemble in numbers for balls, parties, and meet for a hunt, surely they might for religious worship. His Lordship then recited several cases where fines had been inflicted for so doing, and others to show the law was in operation, instancing the Secretary of War as having violated it himself only last Sunday, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, when he opened the Crystal Palace with prayer. But he spoke chiefly for the London City Mission, which he declared had been the means of preventing disorder in the metropolis in 1848, when all the crowns in Europe were in peril. The society had 400 agents, and had held 25,318 meetings—22,000 of which were illegal. Every ragged school opening with prayer, and open-air preachers were equally guilty of violating the law. It was only in private houses that there could be union between Churchmen and Dissenters, and if registered houses are to be devoted solely to Church services all the advantages which might be expected to result from efforts in which Dissenters were joined with Churchmen would be lost. He appealed to the Bishops if the present wholesale connivance at breaking the law was consistent with their Christian dignity, and to the Government whether it was desirable to retain a law so pertinaciously, constantly, and wilfully violated. The *Bishop of London* could not consent to the total repeal of the law. Some modification might be necessary, but it would be a great evil to the Church if any gentleman who took offence at the conduct of the clergyman of a parish were to be permitted to establish an altar in his own house, and thus withdraw a large portion of the congregation of the parish church. The *Bishop of Oxford* said that at a meeting of the Bishops in London yesterday it had been determined unanimously to oppose the bill. The law was intended to prevent surreptitious meetings, and not such as the noble earl had described. There was no difficulty in the licensing system, which cost only half-a-crown:—

"But the question was, whether there ought to be a power in every parish in this country for every person who chose—still claiming himself an attached member of the Church of England—in direct opposition to the desire of the clergymen and Bishop, to open a place of public worship in full communion with the Church of England. If the bill passed he believed there would be nothing to prevent the clergyman of any parish being called into the parish of his neighbour, and giving opposition services to him in any hall, barn, or cottage which might be offered to him for that purpose. In certain parishes it had been proposed to establish a Free Church of England in opposition to the parish church. At present these free churches were obliged to be licensed, and were so distinguished from the true

Church of England. If this bill passed that distinguishing mark would be done away, and a serious injury done to the cause of religious unity, peace, and truth, in this country."

The bill was supported by Ministers, the *Duke of Argyll*, the *Lord Chancellor*, and the *Earl of Harrowby*, with *Earls Chichester* and *Roden* supporting it. The *Bishop of St. Asaph*, *Lord Lyttelton*, and the *Earl of Carnarvon*, speaking on the other side; the latter noble lord making an eloquent protest against it. He said—

"By this bill all the lines of demarcation that now existed between the Established Church and Dissent would be swept away. All the visible and external distinctions that now separated them would be removed, and temptations would be opened to the people to attach themselves to no particular religion or creed. This bill would enable any person who took an objection to a particular clergyman or doctrine, and who might wish to act upon the basis of the Prayer-book, to set up a congregation of his own, and in this way the whole of our parochial system might in time be destroyed. When the line of demarcation between the Established Church and Dissent was obliterated, there could remain only a tangled wilderness of shadowy and vague Christianity, professed by those who belonged, in fact, to no Church or sect. He hoped their lordships would not exert their influence to augment the discord which now prevailed in the Church. He believed that the Established Church was founded on the most comprehensive principles at the time of the Reformation, though differences soon grew up in her bosom, and he deprecated any measure by which those differences would be embittered. By this bill the sections within the Church would find themselves put in possession of weapons far stronger than any they had ever before possessed. Whatever room there had hitherto been for a division of opinion, there had always been a neutral ground on which men of all parties within the pale of the Church had met, and that was the Prayer-book; but the essence and intention of this bill was the mutilation of the Prayer-book. Modifications and alterations, perhaps slight in themselves, would at first be made, but by degrees new prayers would be introduced and old ones expunged—changes of the most vital importance would be made, and the result would be that we should see many not merely with their own places of worship but with their separate forms. The Prayer-book, which was the pledge of the continuity of the Church and its bond of unity, would retain its name, but for that reason it would be all the more dangerous, and their lordships would, perhaps, find themselves at last driven to the alteration of the Prayer-book itself. He would, therefore, oppose the bill, because he was satisfied that, while it would infringe on the rights and privileges of the Church, it would give no additional liberties to Dissent."

#### RELIGIOUS WORSHIP BILL.

This measure reported as having been rejected by a majority of one, was discovered to have been carried by that number. The *Earl of Derby* took occasion to revert to the circumstance on Thursday, and gave notice that he should move the reference of the bill to a select committee. On Friday evening, on the order of the day for the recommittal of the bill.

The *Earl of Shaftesbury* said he wished to state that the bill did not in the least affect the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of Bishops of the Established Church, but, as some apprehensions appeared to exist that such would be the effect of it, he proposed to introduce a clause reserving to the Bishops and inferior clergy of the Church of England the full ecclesiastical authority which they now possessed. The following was the clause which he proposed to introduce:—

"Provided that nothing in this act shall prejudice or affect the liberty of worship of churches or chapels of the Church of England, or places duly licensed by the Bishops of such Church, notwithstanding that service for baptism, marriage, or burial may be performed therein; nor shall anything herein contained in any way abridge or affect the discipline of the said Church, or the enforcing thereof, by the Bishops or other ecclesiastical authority."

If that clause should not, however, be considered sufficient, he was willing to accept any words or clauses which might be considered necessary to attain the required object. With regard to the proposition about to be made by the noble earl near him (the *Earl of Derby*), he should feel bound to oppose it even if he stood alone in so doing.

The *Earl of Derby* then rose and addressed the house as follows:—"I rise to move, on the motion for the recommittal of the Religious Worship Bill, that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the