POETRY.

From the New-York Recorder.

DREAMLAND.

3. In Dreamland once I saw a church;
Amid the trees it stood,
And reared its little steeple-cross
Above the sweet greenwood;
And then I heard a Dreamland chime
Peal out from Dreamland tower,
And saw how Dreamland Christian-folk,
Can keep the matin hour.

* * * * *

7. I saw the Dreamland minister
In snowy vestments pray:
He seemed to think' twas natural
That prayer should ope the day:
And Dreamland folk responded loud
To blessings in God's name,
And in the praises of the Lord
They had no sense of shame!

* * * * *

10. I saw a Dreamland babe baptized,
With all the church to see,
And strange as 'twas—the blessed sigh,
'Twas beautiful to me!
For many a voice cried loud Amen,
When o'er its streaming brow
The pearly cross was charactered,
To seal its Chritian vow.

11. I learned that Dreamland children all,
As bowing sponsors swear,
To bishop's hand are duly brought,
To Eucharist and prayer:
And Dreamland maids wear snow-white veils
At confirmation hour:
For such—an old apostle wrote—
Should cloth their heads with power.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE GROUND OF PROHIBITORY LAWS.

Those who have watched attentively the progress of questions of reform in this country, cannot have failed to notice the phases under which objections to prohibitory laws have been set forth. These objections have been urged most strongly and most remarkably against the passage of laws prohibiting the sale of intoxicating drinks. It has been said—this traffic has been allowed as legitimate and proper for a good citizen, equally so with any other departments of commerce; now if the government assumes to adjudge this traffic to the immoral and pernicious, and to prohibit it by penal laws, it steps aside from its legitimate sphere, and violates both the moral and the civil rights of the citzen. The government; it is argued, cannot legitimately adjudge moral questions, much less can it enforce upon all, with convictions of a portion of the community. To do so is an impertinent interference with the rights of conscience and of trade.

The objections here raised against prohibitory laws very plainly imply that such laws are based upon what is termed by Dr. Arnold, the moral theory of government, and so take one step towards the union of Church and State. A step in that direction is justly deprecated by all true Americans and even the possibility of it is enough to awaken distrust of any measure which is even suspected of involving it.

The practical importance of ths question in our times, considered not alone with reference to the traffic in intoxicating liquors, but with reference to several other matters which are under discussion, renders an insight into the grounds of prohibitory laws a very suitable and indeed an urgent inquiry. If prohibitory laws involve the mischievous elements which we have here intimated, we have many on our statute books which should be erassd. Instead of pursuing longer a false theory of government, we should at once retrace the mistaken steps which we have already taken.

The relations of human society render civil government indispensable. Civil government is indeed an ordinance of God. Of the form of the government we now say nothing, except that the republican seems to us the perfection of government. Of such a government then, what is the design? Our republicanism, theoretically at least, will not be doubted when we answer,—its design is to secure to each individual, (and to all individuals alike,) the opportunity of developing as he will, and to the widest extent his own happines provided only that he shall not invade the same rights in his neighbors. In other words, the civil government is the union of the citizens for securing to each individual, (and to all individuals alike, his natural rights, which rights are those just named. Under this theory, which is the theory of the government under which we live, every citizen is thus addressed:—Your opportunities are as wide as the universe—employ your mind, your hands your time, your skill and your property as you may judge best for your interests and happiness, restricted only by the equal privileges of others. If you restrain not yourself within these limits, you shall be restrained. If others violate your rights, you shall be protected. This is the compact, to which there are no exceptions, and from which there can be no release.

Now if these things be so, it follows that the rightfulness of prohibitory laws, as indeed of all others, is to be determined by their relation to these fundamental principles. The "moral theory" of Dr. Arnold has nothing to do with the case, and all fear of Church and State may be summarily dismissed. The civil government not only may, but must pass prohibitory laws, when any citizen, or any number of citizens, commit acts which violate the rights of their neighbors. This is the ground of such laws, and both justifies and demands them. Thus, if my neighbors appropriate my property without my consent, the law properly step in and forbids the theft. If my neighbors invade my personal liberty and bind me in chains or shut me within prison walls, the law secures to me my release, and avenges the injury. It declares that no man shall invade the rights with which God has endowed me, and adapts its prohibtory provisions to this end. It does not assume to be a censor of morals, but the guardian of equal rights. It does not seek to control men's convictions, but to restrain their invasion of their neighbor's privileges, possessions or happiness.

When therefore an individual finds himself pressed by prohibtory laws, and is disposed to complain that his rights are thereby invaded, he will do well to pause and inquire whether the liberty which he demands for himself is not a license to invade the the rights of others. That is a thing which the government, if true to its design, cannot allow. The humblest and the weakest of its citizens is entitled to protection. Suppose the complainant in this case to be a trafficker in intoxicating liquors. He protests that the government is seeking to enforce upon him certain notions about morality, whereas on such subjects he has his own rights of conscience,—and to injure his property by interfering with business. But to this the reply is, that others have rights which *he* is invading. Wives and children are entitled to conjugal and parental care, which he deprives them of by furnishing to the drunken husband and father the demon of the cup. Men of sober lives and industrious habits are entitled to the fruits of their earnings, which his traffic is filching away in the shape of taxes for poor houses, police and prisons. He is violating the rights of his neighbors—he is demanding the privilege of invading the social peace and welfare, and it is no violation of his proper freedom to restrain him. He mistook the nature of liberty when he imagined that it involved the privilege of injury to others, and society lays its hands upon him and says, Equal rights, sir you can have, but no more.

Such in our view is the philosophy of prohibitory laws,—a matter exceedingly clear and readily apprehended, but strangely involved in mystery and misrepresentation. A little reflection; under the guidance of first principles, will at any time solve questions of legislation about which men contend as if they saw some portent threatening our republican institutions. First principles are safe guides, and never more safe than in the making of laws.—*New-York Recorder,*

NECESSITY FOR COLONIZATION.

It is a bitter sight to witness the ripening discontent or the sullen magnanimity of those who brought up as gentlemen, crave the wages and the work of office-sweepers and errand porters. Yet of such is London full. What is common in the metropolis is not rare in the provinces. Other cities exhibit in their different proportions the same annomalies of society and the same aspirations of fortune. There is in the British empire an enormous aggregate of unemployed capabilities and unprofitable skill. This, by itself, demands consideration. Great talents are given to a nation as they are given to an individual—to be turned to account, not to die idle. Despite the pedantry of the economists and the eternal preaching of *Laissez-faire*, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that so great an evil should be left to cure itself, while there are national means at command by which it might be diminished if it could not be destroyed. We have a colonial empire of greater extent than the world has ever yet seen—greater promise than any other kingdom has ever hoped for. Our Australian and American settlements together, exceed the whole arena of Europe. In either of these, hundreds of miles, millions of acres, are still yearning for the axe, the plough, and the wheel. In either of them is there the material for thousands of homesteads and millions of inhabitants—in either of them the source of future wealth and the supply of present food. In both of them there are opportunities of doing that which men are ashamed to do in their own country, and among their own people, viz: of exchanging the sterile dignity of inactivity for the profitable toil of active life. In both of these there is work enough for the thews and muscles of that pitable crowd who consume the energies of their minds in calculating the disadvantages of a liberal education in the cheap eating-houses and dingy divans of London. But though the State may feel itself discharged from the duty of turning poor scholars, famished artists, and desponding surgeons into colonists, and may leave them to settle their own account of future and miserable with political economy, there is another class which must be heard, and will not be put off with a "leave alone." There is a multitudinous, more exacting, more wretched. The end of each succeeding year sees the addition of nearly a quarter of a million of human beings to the inhabitants of this country. The crowded seats of manufactures and commerce—Liverpool and Manchester, Nottingham and Stockport teem with the annual increment of creatures who exclaim, "Give us work and bread." How shall we meet this cry? Shall we tell them that work is an affair of demand; that work depends upon competition; that competition is an effect of population; that population outruns subsistence; that they are too many; in a word, that they have no right to exist? They would be bold men—that would be a bold government, which should hold such language as this. With Chartism in front, and discontent in the rear, it would be perilous to begin such lecturing. But is not the principle acted on though not avowed, when—with a vast territorial domain in which labor might grow into power, and poverty into wealth—with mines of ore and fields of fertility—with capital calling for labor, and adventure crying for help—the State refuses to acknowledge the duty of settling its redundant multitude in its own distant lands, or discharges it in a niggardly and grudging mood? The danger of such neglect or such parsimony is great. Time glides on, adding alike to the numbers and the discontent of the masses. Misery has strange axioms.—The misery of multitudes invites a mild policy. They whose normal condition is endurance, will avenge themselves on the empire by a normal agitation. They whom the national wealth does not assist in bettering their fortune will wage an obstinate war against wealth, property and order. We have put down Chartism: but we have not conciliated discontent. Let us beware lest the discontented become the majority. —Much depends upon ourselves, much on the use to which we turn our existing establishments; and no establishments have we more valuable than our colonies. A colonial empire founded on the sparings of our superfluous wealth and the craving of our unemployed industry would be a grander commemoration of victorious order and triumphant law than a century of hospitals or a myriad of wash-houses. Those who were elated and those who were dejected on the 10th of April, might alike view with pleasure the glorious fabric of a new empire springing from the ruins of a broken faction and the energies of a noble purpose, emblematic of the "bow of hope that spans the earth"—emblamatic of the only faith that ever yet inculcalted liberty, fraternity, and equally aright.—*London Times.*

THE LIGHT OF NATURE.

There lived many years ago, in Philadelphia, a celebrated Indian chief by the name of Tedyuscung. He was sitting one evening by the fireside of a friend, both of them looking silently at the fire, indulging their own reflections

At lenght the silence was interrupted by the friend, who said, "I will tell you what I have been thinking of; I was thinking of a rule delivered by the Author of the Christian religion, which from its excellence, we call the *Golden Rule.*"

"Stop," said Tedyuscung, "dont praise it to me, but rather tell me what it is, and let me think for myself. I do not wish you to tell me of its *excellence*—tell me what it *is*."

"*It is for one man to act toward another as he would the other should do to him!*"

"That's impossible! it cannot be done," Tedyuscung immediately replied; and taking his pipe, lighted it, and commenced walking about the room. In about a quarter of an hour he came up to his friend with a smiling countenance, and (taking the pipe from his mouth) said, "Brother, I have been thoughtful on what you told me. If the Great Spirit that made man would give him a *new heart*, he could do as you say, but not else.,'

Ezekiel xxxvi, 26—A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh.

Wealth of the Union.—The report of the Patent office, recently made, presents some interesting statistics relative to the wealth of the Union. The population of the United States is set down at 20,750,000, and the aggregate of personal and real property is estimated at $[illegible]295,560,000. New York is the richest State, her property being $1,112,000,000; Pennsylvania next, $550,000,000; then Ohio, $740,000,000; then Virginia, $508,000,000. The remainder of the States rank as follows:

Indiana, $384,000,000; Tennessee, $380,000,000; Kentucky, $3[illegible],000,000, Massachusetts, $340,000,000; Georgia, $320,000,000; North Carolina, $[illegible]; Illinois, $294,000,000; Alabama, $276,000,000; Mississippi, $256,000,000; South Carolina, $242,000,000; Missouri, $[illegible] Maine, 240,000,000; Maryland, $[illegible],000,000; Louisiana, $1[illegible],000,000; New Jersey, $166,000,000; Michigan, $1[illegible]; Connecticut, $132,000,000; Vermont, $[illegible]; New Hampshire, $1[illegible]; Arkansas, $80,000,000; Texas, $[illegible]; Iowa, $52,000,000; [illegible] $[illegible]; Wisconsin, $36,000,000; Delaware, $32,000,000, Florida, $30,000,000; District of Columbia, $18,000,000 Oregon, $[illegible],000.

Wealth of Great Britain.—The whole property of Great Britain, says the Nonconformist, was estimated, nearly thirty ago, years at £3,600,000,000. Since that period it value has increased to *between six and seven billions* of pounds sterling; so that the national debt of £[illegible],000,000, frightful as it is, is only about one-eighth part of our national wealth. In other words, our assets show a sevenfold surplus over our liabillities. —*New York Recorder.*

Spare Moments.—Spare moments are the dust of time; and Young was writing a true as well as a striking line, when he taught that "moments make the mountain, and moments make the year." Of all the portions of our life, the spare moments are the most fruitful in good or evil. They are the gaps, through which temptations find the easiest access to the garden of the soul.

Tight Lacing—A learned doctor, referring to tight lacing, avers that it is a public benefit, inasmuch as it kills all the foolish girls, and leave the wise ones to grow to be women.

FRANKLIN THEATRE.

We take shame to ourselves for not having seen the *Golden Farmer* before its withdrawal, as we are told that Sefton's performance of one of the characters was quite a hit. We have seen his portrait in the part, and learn that some of his *mots* therein are becoming proverbial among those who look to the forcible expression, rather than the elegance or refinement of a phrase. By all accounts, things are going on prosperously at this little band-box of a theatre.

Maryland Historical Society

The Maryland State Colonization Society Papers

XII. Newspapers
B. Liberia Herald

February 1842(XI,4)--February 18,1857(n.s. VII,4)

1849

NEW SERIES NO 1