RELIGIOUS.

DR. CHEEVER ON THE RIGHT OF SUFFRAGE.

The Guilt and Peril of Withholding It from the Blacks.

Congress and the President Pronounced Thieves and Moral Assassins.

SERMONS BY OTHER EMINENT DOCTORS.

&c. &c. &c.

Last evening the congregation who attended the Church of the Puritans, Union square, were treated to a political sermon by the reverend pastor, Dr. Cheever, on "The Right of Suffrage from God, and the Guilt and Peril of Withholding It." The text selected for the occasion was from the second chapter of Malachi and tenth verse:—

"Have we not all one father? Hath not one God created? Why do we deal treacherously every man against his brother, by profaning the covenant of our fathers?"

UNIVERSAL SUFFRAGE IN THE DAYS OF THE PROPHET.

The earliest account is in the first chapter of Deuteronomy, verse 13:—"Take you wise men, and understanding and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you. Choose them for yourselves according to your knowledge of them. Judge righteously between every man and his brother, and the stranger that is with him." The stranger is placed on a footing of equality with all the people as to all the people's rights. "And the stranger that is within thy gates." The wrath of the just God is laid definitely upon those who turn away the stranger from his right. The stranger is such an one as the negro in our country. "Ye shall not respect persons in judgment, but ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man, for the judgment is God's." So likewise (Deut. xvi., 18—20):—"Judges and officers shalt thou make thee," &c. The choice and making of their officers was with the people; and there is no conceivable mode of choice but by expression of their judgment and will, and that is suffrage.

Besides all this, there was provision made for the change of government by the choice of the people, if they should be so foolish as to change from the republic to the monarchy. Deut. xvii., 14:—"When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, 'I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are round about me,' thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee whom the Lord thy God shall choose." The expression and sovereignty of the popular will are admitted in the change of the form of government; and as to the personal selection of the king, if God had not expressly ordered that they should receive that from Him by Divine choice and appointment, that also must have been by suffrage—the expression of the popular will. And so with us. Having no appointment of our chief magistrate from God, it is God's arrangement that the appointment of the ruler be by the suffrage, by the choice, of the people. This right and obligation of suffrage, therefore, is as manifestly from God as the right and duty of having a king if God appointed him, and of establishing whom God appoints. When God does not appoint, then it is equally God's arrangement that the people shall appoint for themselves, shall make their own selection. And selection can only be made by choice, and for choice there must be the expression of the choice, and that is suffrage, and it must be suffrage of the people, or it is not the people's appointment. So that, take whatever ground you will, it is still evident that suffrage is from God, the right of suffrage is a right from God, and unless God himself by a divine revelation indicates whom the people shall choose, they are under divine obligation to exercise for themselves what is a divinely conferred right and a divinely appointed duty, the right of suffrage.

THE DEMOCRATIC THEORY OF THE PRESENT DAY.

But the argument of these modern democrats who deny the right of suffrage to the people, is that God made Saul and David kings over Israel, and therefore the right of suffrage does not belong to the people of the United States as a right from God. A wide step of democratic logic, indicating a greater faith in and submission unto the Old Testament as a divine revelation, of equal authority in government now as among the Jews, than we had supposed existed among that class of politicians. This goes far towards genuine Christian radicalism. It would certainly be a sign of the millennium were it not that it is packed for a purpose, just as suffrages themselves are bought and sold as of supreme authority, by those very persons who deny the divine right of suffrage as a right of man. It is a right of wealth, a right of purchase, a right of despotism, a right of party corruption and rule, but not a right of manhood, intelligence, justice, man.

Because God made Saul and David kings over Israel, therefore no person in the United States has any right from God to vote. Equally clear it is that because God made David king, therefore we have no right to any but a kingly government; and it is evident that this party regard a monarchy as the only divinely appointed form, and of course a republic is a violation of God's authority, and an intrusion upon it, just as the claim of suffrage for the people is such a violation. For if suffrage is not a right from God, because a king was appointed of God for the Israelites, then a republic, which is the creation of suffrage, is not a right from God, but a monarchy is. To this practical result the denial of the divine and natural right of suffrage travels; and this, perhaps, is the secret purpose of the democratic denial of right to prepare the way for a *coup d'état*, changing the republic into an absolute monarchy. A more adroit postscum, a better bridge all ready to be thrown across the gulf between freedom and despotism, could not be conceived than this democratic denial of the right of suffrage as inferior to the right of kingcraft, of absolutism—a contrivance by which the people may be drawn across the Rubicon, and transferred from the freedom of a republic to the despotism of an absolute monarchy, in the hands of conspirators against suffrage, almost before they know it. The people lay down one night in France republicans and freemen and woke the next morning monarchists and slaves, by a contrivance less adroit, less permanent, less subtle and far reaching than this. The denial of the right of suffrage from God as being a blasphemy, and the appeal to the divine right of kings as established in the Bible, is a phenomenon of democracy which the people cannot fail to ponder.

It does not lessen the significance nor the danger of such a phenomenon that it is pure ignorance and a perversion of Scripture. But it is well to note that there is no such thing in the word of God as the kingly form of government by Divine choice and right, but by popular suffrage or personal ambition and violence. The people in their folly demanded a king, that they might have the grandeur and absoluteness and imperialism of the idolatrous despotisms round about them. They had grown weary of the simplicity, and freedom and independence of living with God only for their king, and demanded that the government should be changed from the republican theocracy into the monarchical style and substance. And God informed them that the kingly government was in essence a usurpation, and would prove the substitution of despotism instead of freedom, for that their king would rule by his own will, and proclamations and authority, and would serve them and do with them, in spite of all their good laws from God, just as he pleased. Nevertheless, notwithstanding this reproof and remonstrance, they insisted on their demand, and God ordered his servant Samuel to yield to this expression of their will and give them a king, according to their choice. So far, then, from the establishment of the kingly form of government being a denial of the right of suffrage, it was the result of the exercise of that right, though in a wrong way. It was the popular demand, the expression of the will of the Hebrew people, which God so far recognized, even when this particular exercise of it was an offensive rejection of His own kingship, as to give it way, and appoint a king in answer to it. He would let them try this experiment, and they did try it, and perished in consequence of it. For it was their kings—a succession of wicked kings and despots, denying the right of suffrage and herein making common cause with the modern Confederate rebel democracy and compelling the people to obey impious and unconstitutional decrees, and to receive as State institutions oppression, caste, class despotisms, idolatries and forms of slavery, and to obey the statutes of the house and administration of Ahab, and to walk in the counsels of Cain instead of the laws of Jehovah; it was their kings, and their kingly government in the hands of oligarchies of State villains and God-defying priests and prophets, that destroyed them. The God-given right of suffrage would have saved them had they continued to exercise it according to the law of God. They were destroyed because, in fact, they gave up their right of suffrage, which connected themselves directly by obedience with the will of God, and made them superior and unconquerable in His righteousness, and substituted in its place the claims of an impious State sovereignty, which they said they were bound to obey as the highest law. That was their ruin—the renunciation of the gifts of freedom and independence bestowed upon them from God, the highest of which was the right of suffrage in accordance with the law of God and for the purpose of allegiance to Him, and the choice of human kings and oligarchs and their statutes of State expediency. Just so our State sovereignty is the despotism of Ahab and Omrie, and the renunciation of our right of suffrage into their hands, to be disposed of by them, and overridden and taken from the people at their oligarchical pleasure. The denial of the right of protecting the right of suffrage for all the people is a fraudulent assignment of power over into the hands of a special partner in the fraud. The States are the special partner, withholding the right or suffrage from such millions of the people as they please, though citizens of the United States government and entitled to representation by suffrage. The general government refuses protection, affirming that it is the prerogative of State sovereignty to exclude from suffrage whomsoever it chooses. The general government thus creates the State sovereignty supreme over itself, and commits to the States as a sovereign right of injustice and of despotism its own power of protection and of justice. It renounces the right of interference in behalf of its own citizens, although their freedom be taken away and a serfdom established in its stead, which is so destructive of the rights of human nature that our fathers called it slavery, and rose to armed rebellion rather than endure it. At the very same time the democracy which thus denies the right of representation for our own citizens, and forbids the government from interfering to protect them, calls upon the same government to interfere with armed force for the protection of foreigners, and even of Americans caught in the act of attempting the overthrow of a friendly government. Our government can interfere to protect persons not yet naturalized from the oppression of a foreign power; but it cannot interfere to protect the freedom of its own native citizens from whom it claims allegiance, when that freedom is taken away and sovereign States trample them down by millions into the slavery of caste. This is such shameful abnegation of the power, and denial of the purpose, for which God has appointed governments on earth, it is fraud and hypocrisy so impious towards God, and so cruel, oppressive and demoralizing towards men, it is such a scheme for evading responsibility and obligation to God and justice, and setting up as the rule and necessity of the State the will and pleasure and class interests of a set of rebels and tyrants, announcing and teaching such statesmanship as of religious obligation and authority, that it is evidently essential to the advancement of God's kingdom upon earth that it be destroyed. It is as essential now as it was three thousand years ago.

THE REVOLUTION IS FROM GOD.

According to these men the right of revolution against a bad government is from God, but the right of choosing and establishing a good government is not from God. The maxim that resistance to tyrants is obedience to God is true religion. Resistance to tyrants is a God-given right and duty. This doctrine is orthodox and religious; but the assertion of the right of choice as to the nature of your government and the character of your rulers—the assertion of the right of suffrage as a right from God is profane to the verge of blasphemy. Now, if the obligation of supporting government for the sake of justice is from God, how can it be otherwise than that the right of choosing such a government and choosing to support it is from God? But the right of choosing and sustaining it is the right of voting for it, the right of representation in it for the purpose and from the necessity of sustaining it. The right of suffrage for it is certainly as natural and divine as the right of resistance against it when it becomes subversive and destructive both of God's government and man's interests and welfare. The right of suffrage is equivalent to the right and duty of obedience. Certainly the right and duty of sustaining a good thing by suffrage is as natural as the right of resisting a bad thing by violence. The right of suffrage is as natural as the right of self-defence. The right of suffrage is the right of self-defence by moral means, by peaceful means, by means which will forever prevent and preclude the necessity of resorting to violence. The right of suffrage, therefore, is profounder, deeper, more original, comprehensive and unalloyed than any right of physical defence by power can be. It is not till the right of suffrage—the moral right—be tried, or rejected and destroyed, that the right of self-defence, and of vindicating justice by violence, by revolution, takes place. As of old, the robbery of an oppressed race is against the constitution as well as against God. The constitution declares that the people of the State shall elect representatives. The rebel democracy affirms that not the people of the State, but only a ruling class shall elect representatives. By universal laws of interpretation the constitution cannot be interpreted as requiring or sanctioning an injustice or a wrong; and if such a thing were possible it must be expressed in the clearest manner. If there could be such a thing as the constitution permitting any of the citizens to be excommunicated, as not being a part of the people, it must appoint the clan with the most definite and unmistakable precision. Now when the constitution says that the House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, it does not say that people with a colored skin are not the people. And if any State undertakes to disfranchise and excommunicate that portion of the people, it violates the constitution. Under the plea of appointing qualification for electors, the State might exclude all white persons of German and Irish origin. Suppose that this were done in South Carolina. Would the democracy regard this as constitutional? Would this be permitted under the plea of State sovereignty? Would the United State government permit a State to denaturalize and disfranchise Irish and German citizens on the plea that the constitution provides that "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature?" Suppose that there were half as many emigrants from Germany and Ireland in South Carolina as there are colored American citizens, and that the State should determine that among the qualifications of electors for its House of Representatives there should be the condition of not being either of Irish or German extraction, would that be permitted for a moment on the pretence of its being constitutional, a right of State sovereignty? Would any State be permitted to wring out of the provision in the constitution giving to the electors of United States representatives the same qualifications as of State representatives the authority and right to disfranchise a million of Irishmen and Germans? No more can it be permitted to wring out of the same provision the right to disfranchise a million of American citizens on account of the color of the skin. It would be to change that article of the constitution from a declaration of rights into a bill of attainder. It would be authorizing the State to pass a bill of attainder, and making that bill of supreme authority over the United States government, compelling the United States to sustain the attainder of the State against the citizens of their own government. The application of that clause to the disfranchisement of millions by the color of the skin makes a bill of attainder without crime. It has been argued by the democracy in Congress that the proposition to keep out the rebels for only four years from the right of United States suffrage on account of their treason is an attainder forbidden by the constitution. But the same defenders of the rights of rebels argue the attainder of millions of loyal citizens on account of color as a right of State sovereignty. For the United States to keep the rebels out of suffrage for four years is a crime of attainder. For a sovereign State to debar loyal citizens from suffrage forever is a right of attainder, belonging to its sovereignty. Attainder of white rebels for four years by the United States government on account of treason is a crime. Attainder of innocent and loyal colored persons for life by the State on account of color is a sovereign right, with which the United States cannot interfere. This surrender of United States justice and right of protection to State injustice, for the sake of a compromise with rebels, for the sacrifice of the colored race, is the most demoralizing confusion and amalgamation of right and wrong, with wrong as the supreme authority and expediency, that can be imagined. It is an act of political sodomy. What can fitly illustrate this treachery and hypocrisy? When you are required to do justice to the blacks, you have not the power; you have conveyed it away to the power of State sovereignty. But for the purpose of restoring the rebels, you can order the State at your pleasure. It is a fraudulent assignment for robbing a third party. Suppose a man sold, or pretended to sell, to you the patent right of an invention, and in his description of what he conveys he mentions everything save only a valve, or spring, or pulley, or ingredient, on which the whole command and benefit of the patent depends, but that he has reserved to himself. Confiding in your right you proceed to build a factory, but find that the article is worthless, and that all your rights in it are unavailing for want of the element or article withheld. But the cunning rascal that has outwitted you tells you that you have got all that he ever intended you should have. You have got the lock, but the key is his own. He sold you the right of a lock, but he did not mention the key. It is not in the bond. He sold you a pound of flesh, but a drop of blood. You may have all the civil rights secured by his contract with you, but the thing withheld is political and belongs to his partner, and is not his to give. Just so with the arrangement between our government and the rebel States. Our government is fraudulently assigning over its property or protection, its patent right of justice, into the possession of State sovereignties. Our government defrauds those whom it ought to protect by the averment that suffrage is political, and therefore does not belong to the colored race. The crime is bad enough as base injustice; but the trick, the fraud, makes it still worse. The iniquity is barefaced. It is just as when the old Jews, after their crimes of impiety, wiped their mouths and presented themselves before God in the temple, saying, We were delivered to do these abominations.

THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION.

The present proposed amendment to the constitution, leaving the rebel States at liberty to disfranchise the colored race, is at sword's point with the just amendment which forbade slavery. And it was added that Congress shall have power to enact and execute such laws as are necessary to secure their freedom. On this ground we have passed the Civil Rights bill. But it that bill was necessary for security from slavery; if what are called civil rights were necessary to be secured by special law in order that the constitutional amendment against slavery might be carried out, much more was it necessary, for the same purpose, that the right of suffrage be secured by special law. It is not imagined that for white men there is any security against slavery but in possession of the right of suffrage. No more is there for black men—nor so much. But instead of adding that security you have deliberately taken it away, and forbidden it from being added. Instead of securing to the blacks for their protection the same right of suffrage that the whites have, we have actually proposed a second amendment securing to rebel sovereign States the right to take away that right from the blacks, leaving them at the mercy of the whites, and more absolutely at their mercy than if they had been expressly counted in as material for white representation. This amendment is a provision for evading and nullifying the first. It is as if General Grant, having got the rebel army at a river in the necessity of surrender, should have sent his own soldiers to throw a bridge of pontoons by night for their escape the next morning. The amendment forbidding slavery is pontoned—is bridged for the rebels—by the amendment giving them the power to take away suffrage. We have amended the constitution against slavery, and now further amend it in behalf of the rebels, giving to them the right to put back the negroes into slavery. For we judge the Congress and ourselves who do this deed by our own estimate in regard to whites. Merely the depriving white men of suffrage for four years is a punishment. A life disfranchisement is a felon's treatment. It makes white men slaves. Our fathers said that it did, and acted out that saying with the bullet and the bayonet. Virginia said that it did. The slave States in their bills of rights said that the taking away of the right of suffrage made them slaves. And now we propose by amendment or the constitution to confer upon those States the sovereign right and power to make such slaves of all the colored race. We propose to make that slavery constitutional and perpetual for black men, which would justify an armed revolution for the whites. The act of conferring on the States the right of disfranchisement also nullifies, practically, the provisions of the Civil Rights' bill, putting it out of the power of the colored citizens themselves to protect themselves in those rights. The white race would regard themselves as unprotected and insecure if they had not the right of suffrage wherewith to secure their own inalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Civil rights are insecure for whites without political power to secure them. Where is the white community that would permit the Congress or any State in the Union to deprive them of the right to vote on the pretence that that right was political, and that no rights could be allowed to the people but civil rights? What are civil rights? Who shall have the authority to define them, or to take them away under pretence of their being political? But where began the doctrine that political rights belong to the government, not to the people?

THE COMPROMISE BILL.

Next, the Compromise bill. The country have danced about their idol, the negro prejudice, and the white man's government, even at the foot of Sinai, and while the thunders of God's wrath against slavery were still reverberating. They have compromised with the sacrifice of justice, and out of all their offerings there has come forth this calf. And this is offered to the people as the method of reconstruction. Everything but justice. Anything offered to the country but justice. Justice without respect to persons is God's demand. Justice for the whites, but not the blacks, is our answer. Justice with respect of persons. Justice founded on and governed by respect to persons, and respect in the lowest, most degrading and insulting form; most impious towards God, most scornful and oppressive towards man; respect of persons by the race and the color of the skin. A violation of the Divine law, a perversion of justice, the administration of cruelty and outrage instead, not on a passing generation merely, but, as in the case of slavery itself, on posterity. Color determined by race and race by color, and millions consecrated to insult and injustice, by means of that stigma, from parents to children, generation after generation. And you can imagine, in the intoxication of your white war dance around this golden calf of compromise, that Sinai's God will let you dance on in prosperity. They say, "How doth God know?" This is our sovereignty. We have made a political contract that the States shall have supreme control of suffrage, and who is the Almighty that he should interfere with state sovereignty? We know not the Almighty, neither will we let the colored race have the benefit of the white man's government. The one superiority of the form of government adopted by our fathers above that of Great Britain was in the universality of representation, a government based on the right of suffrage as belonging to all the people, and not merely to a ruling class. That is republicanism, the right of manhood, of free agency, of personal conscience and accountability, the correlative of allegiance, the safeguard of allegiance from going into despotism. It is the central law, the discovery of which and construction of governments accordingly is as the discovery of the law of gravitation, and the adaptation of our philosophy and practice accordingly; as the discovery of the circulation of the blood, and the correspondent certainty and progress in the art of medicine. An intuitive inevitable urgency and effort of the human mind towards this law, towards the obedience of society under it, and there never can be peace till this harmony be attained, till men's artificial political arrangements are brought into submissive correspondence with this demand and necessity of human nature under the controlling necessity of government as ordained of God. The throes of empires, revolutions, anarchies, desolations, destructions, are the efforts of humanity in its blindness struggling towards the realization of this undiscovered law, the acknowledgment and enthronement of this primal right of man. How simple and how plain is everything, and how easily worked is all the machinery of government when that law is acknowledged and obeyed, when every class and every individual possesses in that right and in the fundamental law securing it a power of self-protection and defence; a right that, when universal, makes the interests of all the interests of each, and the inviolate secured rights of each the interest and common bond and compulsion of all. It is said to be an outrage to force suffrage upon the people. Are your rights or my rights forced upon the people of this State because the law compels you to respect them as your own? Because I as well as you am permitted to hold property, and you cannot steal it from me without the penalty of the law for that crime, is that the forcing of the right of property on the State or on the people? Colored persons are permitted to hold property, and the laws protect them in it. Is that a forcing of the right of property on the people of the State? When colored persons are permitted by law to vote in this State on a freehold consideration, is that a forcing of suffrage on the people? Because black laborers receive wages for their labor, is that a forcing of the right of wages on the people? Because other persons are not prohibited by law from the right of buying a house and holding it in fee simple as well as yourself, is that a forcing of the right of purchase upon you or other householders, or on the people of the State? In thine eye evil because I am good? Because other classes as well as your own enjoy the privileges of life and the protection of the constitution, are those privileges therefore to be regarded as the exercise of despotism forced upon the State? Because your neighbors are permitted to enjoy the same liberty of speech and opinion, of eating and drinking and believing and domestic arrangements that you enjoy, is that the forcing of the rights and privileges of freedom upon you? Yet we have heard the proposition of suffrage as a possession of the colored race, described by Christian men, yea, ministers, as being the unjust and oppressive enforcement of suffrage on the people of the State, the cramming of suffrage down their throats. Because you are prevented from stealing from your neighbor that is the cramming of honesty down your throat. Men speak of thrusting or forcing negro suffrage upon an unwilling State as if it were some despotic, tyrannic violence put upon them. But who is forced? Whose rights are meddled with? The Roman Catholics might as well complain of violence and force because Protestants are protected in the right to vote. Protestants might as well say that Roman Catholic suffrage is a thing forced upon the State, crammed down men's throats. Whose throats are seized? On whom is any violence committed? The trouble is that one class is not permitted to lord it over another class. Suppose that the burglars in a community should denounce a law giving to bankers and householders the right to protect their own property and families against robbery, as being a violent aggression on the burglars' rights, a violence thrust upon them, a violation of their liberties. The trouble is that rogues are not permitted freely to oppose honest men by violence. There are persons so strenuous for free trade, that they extend it to free trade in other people's rights; and they hate protection to such a degree, that they declaim against the protection of black people from robbery and slavery as a despotism. If the government proposes to give over a million of its subjects into the power and will of another million, to be beaten by them and deprived of every liberty, that is all right—that is free trade, which the government is bound to protect. But if the government proposes to protect a million of its subjects from being beaten and robbed by another million, that is a despotism. A government with the power and purpose of a personal protection, is, in the view of these men, a consolidated despotism. But a government bound and pledged to protect and guarantee each state in the right of oppressing and trampling down the colored race if the ruling class please, is a free democracy. Propose a law defending and protecting the oppressed class, and bestowing the same right of protection on all, with a bureau for its execution, and instantly that is denounced as despotic, and it is pretended that it confers too much power on the President to make him the executive of such a law. If he vetoes it for the sake of keeping down the black race, and bringing back the rebels into power, he is held as the savior of his country. The veto clothes him with the power of oppression but takes from him the power of protection, and that is the essence of the slaveholding democracy. Such a President can, by proclamation, take away the right of suffrage from millions; but there is no dangerous power in that—no approach to despotism in that. That is all right, because it is against personal liberty only of the blacks, and it protects the liberty of the whites to oppress them. But pass a law making it the duty of the President to protect them, and giving him the power to do this, and that is despotism. Let the President veto that, and instantly the press and the pulpit shout hallelujah. The government may protect the State in the privilege of class representation and of oppression, and so far is a democratic, free government; but the instant it undertakes to protect the individual from such oppression, as a citizen shielded by the constitution, that instant it is despotic. The free traders go in for protection of State rights as the grand business of the general government; but the protection of individuals and of personal rights, so that no State can trample upon them or sell a monopoly of them to a class they abhor. We witness a party defending for States fresh from rebellion the liberty to take away others' rights as the most sacred heritage of republican freedom. Any law passed forbidding that outrage they denounce, because the rebels themselves are not represented, and it is contrary to republican freedom to enact laws which the persons concerned have not themselves had a voice in passing. The colored race have no representation; yet it is no violation of republicanism to deprive them of their rights without any voice of their own in the matter. But to deprive the rebels of the right to rob the colored race by law is a wicked despotism, because the rebels themselves are not represented. Thieves and murderers not being represented in the General Assembly, it is a despotism if that legislative body presume to pass a law restraining the right of theft and murder, or forbidding theft and murder as public crimes. But millions of loyal citizens, innocent of any crime, may be punished as if they were felons, because, being blacks, they have no rights that white men are bound to respect.

THE CIVIL RIGHTS BILL.

The President, the Congress, the administration, the government, the people, are acting on the principle that black men have no rights that white men are bound to respect. All their legislation, all their measures in regard to the colored race, are on that basis. It is not admitted that the colored race have any rights which they themselves are entitled to, irrespective of the gift or allowance of the government, or which they themselves are entitled to protect for themselves by self-protection and defence. Whatever rights the colored race receive they receive and hold at the mere will of the white race, as the grant of the white race, to be withheld or bestowed at their pleasure, through the working of a government which is solely the government of white men, and by their own legislation secured as solely theirs, against the possibility of black men having any part in it. The Civil Rights bill itself is on this basis. It is passed on the assumption that the negroes have no other claim to what are called civil rights than white men give them in and by such a bill. It is framed on the assumption that the colored race are wholly in the power of the white race, as not a portion of the independent, self-governing citizens of the country, but dependent on the bounty of the white citizens for whatever place and protection in society may be accorded to them. It is passed on the assumption that whereas the white race have the right and the power to make their own laws for themselves and for all others, and for this purpose the inalienable right of representation by vote, the black race have no such right nor power, and even for their civil rights are dependent on just what the white race may please to throw them from the great white table, as a master throws a bone to his dog. It is not meet to take the children's bread and cast it to the dogs. The vote is the children's bread; not one of these dogs shall have it. They shall only have the crumbs that fall from their master's table. The inhumanity and bigotry of Jews that crucified the Savior of the world rather than admit Gentile dogs to a participation in their own rights, which Christ came to put at the disposal of all, is renewed in this republican cruelty, this trampling and torture of the black race into a caste for perpetual exclusion by the color of their skin. You may judge the Civil Rights bill by transposing the tables, and supposing it based as a grant of protection to the whites. What white man would not feel insulted and oppressed if informed that all the rights that he possesses under this government are in that bill confined by that bill, existing only because that bill has been passed as a boon by the government to the white objects? What white man would bear to be told that the government cannot and will not give him the rights of white men, he is white; that his right of representation does not belong to him, but that he must be thankful to receive as a grant the civil rights which are enumerated in the bill? What white community would endure the doctrine that all the rights which are not granted and guaranteed in that bill are taken from them and reserved as the property of government, to be withheld at pleasure? What white community will endure to be told that the State can at its pleasure take away their rights as citizens of the United States, destroy their representation, and the possibility of representation, in the government of their country, by local laws against their race, their parentage, their stature, or their girth about the waist?

A SCENE IN BALTIMORE.

We recently saw the record of a scene in the cars in Baltimore, a colored woman entering and none forbidding, none looking offended, or surprised, or indignant; on the contrary, men and women inviting her to a seat beside them, moving to make convenient room for her. What was the secret of this wondrous courtesy? She had a white babe in her arms; that was the talisman. Her courteous reception was the testimony of the supremacy of the white race. As a servant in the family of freedom, and in homage to the white babe—for the sake of the white babe; illustrating the advice of President Lincoln, that suffrage might be given to a few, inasmuch as they might help to preserve the jewel of liberty in the family of freedom. Though not of the family, they might be admitted into it for the sake of defending the privileges and rights of its aristocracy as the reigning family of freedom. For the sake of keeping the fee simple in possession of the family they might be admitted as tenants at will.

THE OBLIGATIONS OF STATESMANSHIP.

No admission of any right of suffrage in them; the white race alone are presumed to possess the right, and theirs alone is the right of conferring the right, if they please, on any of the blacks, or of withholding it altogether. And, even now, if it is asked it is asked for the sake of the white nation; pure, selfish expediency. We demand it in the name of God and justice. Statesmanship is not of mere expediency, but is a province of religious obligation and wisdom, attaching us directly to the will of God. The object of government as ordained of God is the protection of the innocent and the security of their rights; and the punishment of the wicked here is expedient for the sake of the justice of preserving and protecting the rights accorded of God to them that do well, and the freedom of well doing and conscience to God. The Civil Rights bill is a bill sanctioning the exclusion of the colored race from the right of representation, the right of self-protection by suffrage, and throwing them helpless on the government for those rights which the white race need no laws to grant or protect, holding them irrespective of the government. The Civil Rights bill announces that those rights which the white race hold inalienable by virtue of citizenship and representation, the colored race can hold only by special permission of the white men's government. In other words, the Civil Rights bill, leaving out the right of suffrage, and taken in connection with Colorado, is a product of the Dred Scott decision; I say, taken in connection with simultaneous legislation of Congress admitting Colorado with the word "white," excluding the colored race from representative citizenship, thus positively legislating against them in this particular, and so assuming the right to have legislated in their favor had it pleased. Assuming the entire sovereignty over the subject, and having the opportunity offered, unquestionable, absolute, of giving the right to vote to the colored inhabitants, the white representatives have deliberately taken it from them, have voted away the right to vote in an unrepresented clan. By exercise of a power which they receive only from the votes of the people they vote away from a portion of the people that right and power of voting to which they owe all their own legitimate authority to vote at all. And this public robbery they exercise on the ground of the color of the skin, as qualifying and designating a portion of the people to be thus disfranchised and robbed by the people's representatives. They are legislative thieves. But worse than that, the theft being of that which constitutes the vital essence of republican freedom, they are moral assassins. They stab the life of political manhood, which in this country is a part of the moral life of every citizen. They do this for posterity. In England John Stuart Mill has recently distinguished himself by appealing to the sense of justice and glory; the life of national glory among empires on earth and statesmen who have elevated them; in behalf of suffrage for the people of England, as an obligation to posterity, for that every government and age, and Christian people are bound to live for posterity, and if they do not, they degrade and deny their own immortality and manhood.

OUR REPUBLICAN LEGISLATION DENOUNCED.

But here in this country, we have a nation, government and administration, whose statemanship is to degrade posterity, whose highest legislative work in the reconstruction of foundations of many generations, is providing for the perpetual degradation and moral assassination of many millions; statesmen who teach the infamy of legislation on the ground of the color of the skin, and transmit to their posterity that record and example of their own infamy. And the ingratitude and execrableness of this maddess is accepted by multitudes in the church, and men in high place and influence as Christian teachers, do not hesitate to denounce the efforts of leading friends of justice to the colored race, as proving them devoid of true statesmanship, because, they aver, that all statesmanship is mere expediency, and what Mr. Sumner denounces as injustice is the highest expediency, for it is not expedient to give the colored race suffrage, and no man can be called a statesman who puts suffrage on the ground of moral right. All this only shows to what a depth we have sunk. There ought to have been an uprising of the church against this iniquity so spontaneous, and a convocation and a voice of reprobation so strong and incessant and stormy, that it would have swept all before it. There is no protection, no stay, no insurance against the self-destructive madness of human depravity except God, justice, or some regard to it be adopted and held on to as the rule in human society. Whoever expects to apply justice to place by permission of the penalty against transgressing, and severity of exactions towards innocent and loyal and submissive citizens, is as much mistaken as if he should undertake to feed his household with pills of arsenic or loaves of fulminating powder instead of bread. This impious reversal and confusion of all divine truth and injunction, administering injustice to the worthy and license to the wicked, penalty to the loyal and impunity and reward to the rebellious, under pretence of generosity and forgiveness, cannot prosper. There must be in it the causes and insurance of anarchy and ruin. There are combinations of human prejudice and passions, occult, stealthy, unobserved, unexplicated, impossible to be measured, that, occurring at suitable conjunctures in human affairs, may tear empires asunder, may heave up, disintegrate and scatter the best apparently constructed States in explosions of which the terrific earthquake power of such a compound as that of nitroglycerine is but a symbol. But as such a long-working and seemingly blind congregation of elementary forces in nature may thus be of omnipotence enough to rend in pieces the solid globe, if occurring at its centre, so may the forces of human depravity enter into a conspiracy perfectly unintentional, the result of which may uplheave the foundations of society, and tear asunder and scatter the firmest institutions.

THE QUESTION OF THE HOUR.

The question is whether the American government is God's plan of government for all the people, without respect to persons, or the white man's government, for the white man's rule, for the white man's rights, as sole and supreme, to the subjection and exclusion of the black man's—a government of the whites, with supreme and exclusive respect to persons by the color of the skin, as the ground and method of legislation, as the rule of practical wisdom and reconstruction—in fact, the ultimate principle of statesmanship, the compass and helm, chronometer and Bible of captain and mates. Have the blacks in this country, under this government, any rights that white men are bound to respect? It is not, have they any rights? but, any that white men are bound to respect, in case their own interests are supposed to stand in the way? Justice Taney never denied that black men have rights, but only affirmed, as a principle of justice and practical legislation, that they were not equal to the white men's, but must give way if the white men pleased, or if white men's rights and black men's came in competition. If white men chose to enslave black men, then blacks had no right to freedom. And white men alone must determine every question of rights, not the blacks. The whole government must be in their hands, with supreme reference to their own interests, and if those interests, in the judgment of the whites, should require the taking away of the rights of the blacks, then in all those respects the blacks have no rights that white men are bound to respect. Since the admission of Colorado this is our national legislation.

This closed the sermon, and with the benediction the congregation was dismissed.

Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Omley.

BAPTIST CHURCH, MACDOUGAL STREET.

Service commenced at half-past ten yesterday morning at the Baptist church in Macdougal street. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Mr. Omley. In the course of his address he dwelt forcibly upon the fact that mere enthusiasm or the impulse of the moment did not by any means constitute true religion. Religion should be so thoroughly engrafted upon the heart of man as to withstand the wear and tear of this world. Those who were carried away impulsively by any one of the numerous religious theories were like those who would plunge madly into a contest without making sufficient preparation. Such religion was sure to pass away as soon as the impulse ceased. Religion was in a great many instances the creature of circumstances. For instance, men were led into it by those by whom they were surrounded and for whom they entertained feelings of love and respect; but the real heart and soul of religion enabled a man to go alone and think for himself and not allow others to think for him. The reverend gentleman also referred to religion of form, and dwelt forcibly upon the holiowness or hypocrisy of men who outwardly would observe the Sabbath most rigidly and oppress the poor during the remainder of the week. Such conduct was unchristian, such religion merely a form. He also said that there was a great deal of that religion of form in Mexico. With its magnificent temples and churches there was still an absence of true religion, and consequently the country was downtrodden and oppressed—the victim of every unholy and vile foot that might choose to tread upon her soil. Here, in New York, the city might be full of churches and gorgeous temples, and yet be entirely empty of Christians. A good and holy life was the best religion after all, and no matter what differences might exist with regard to forms, a good life was a better gospel than any minister could preach, and holiness was the most convincing sermon of all.

Sermon by Rev. Thresham Gregg.

THE FUTURE OF THE IRISH RACE.

An eloquent and singular discourse was preached last evening at 100 West Twenty-fourth street, by Rev. Thresham Gregg, on "The Relation of the Irish Race to the Future and the Full Development of Religion." He said that he did not express private statements on individual opinion. There have been great intellects in the world who have mocked the Bible; but there have been greater intellects, such as Sir Isaac Newton, who sat at the feet of Jesus. He has stated that the great had which was to destroy men, spoken of in Revelations, referred to the improved artillery of the present day. This opinion of Sir Isaac settles the point of fanaticism. Babylon means the ungodly world in general. The Euphrates supplied it with water, and the drying up of the great river Euphrates means that the spirit of infidelity will be exhausted. The kings of the East mean the Jews, and their way being prepared means their return to Jerusalem. The dragon means the devil; the beast means political power, and the false prophet means the Church of Rome, which claims to represent true Christianity exclusively. The three unclean spirits, like frogs that came out of them, means the ambiguous and mild language which is now current in the world. The fetter is no longer used, nor the faggot, but a soft and pliant spirit is now adopted. This creates indifference and is "working miracles" by bringing on a universal war of opinion. After that we may look for the coming of Christ in his glory. The reverend gentleman went on to say that he is a messenger to expound the passages referred to in this remarkable year. He felt the humiliated condition of his countrymen, the Irish people, and he saw it was because they are Roman Catholics. The abomination that maketh desolate is in the Roman Catholic Church, and until that is taken away "the daily sacrifice" will not be restored. In this very year the sacrilege was prophesied to be discovered and the daily sacrifice restored. In this very year—I am as sure of this as I am a living man. The Irish race will be united as one man to Protestantism this very year, and they will be the most stern advocates of Christ alone, and in the day of their conversion they will give the death blow to despotism throughout the world. This will be the last triumph of Christianity. They are the most inflexible in their religious opinions, and their miraculous conversion in one day will be the greatest triumph of Christianity. A nation so astute, so intellectual and so full of genius naturally, cannot be forever enslaved, either in politics or religion. The stone that is to strike the image and become a mountain to fill the whole earth is the conversion of the Irish race as one man in one day. The preacher considered Puseyism as a bastard form of Romanism, and that the prayer-book of the Episcopal Church was cold, indefinite, and wanted to breathe more the spirit of living Christianity. He concluded by calling upon his hearers to maintain the truth of Christianity above all things.

Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Hildreth.

JOHN STREET METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

This time-honored place of worship was crowded yesterday with the members of its congregation on the occasion of a sermon on the Divinity of Christ, delivered by Rev. Dr. Hildreth. In the evening another sermon was preached. This church has no regular pastor at present, but on Thursday night a clergyman will be appointed to it. Dr. Hildreth's sermon, expatiating on the graces bestowed on mankind by the redemption and giving an elaborate argument on the subject of Christianity, was listened to with marked attention.

The National Game.

A BUSY WEEK OF BALL PLAY—THE FIRST REGULAR MATCHES OF THE SEASON.

The admirers of our national game will have plenty of sport afforded them this week on the several ball grounds of the metropolis and its vicinity. To-day the noted Mutual Club, the leading organization of the city, will play their first nine against a strong field at 3 P. M.—the nine, including Jewett, Thorn, Goldie, McMahon, Waterman, Martin, Zeller, Hunt and McSweeney, we learn, with a field of the remaining strong players of the club. To-morrow the Gothams play a similar match at 3 P. M. with a nine including George Wright, Law, Beadle, Goodspeed, Vancott, Courtney, Bierman, Connell and Stokers. On Wednesday the cricketers of the St. George Club play their return game—married vs. single—at noon, and on Thursday the first