

POETRY.

THE WIFE.

I could have stemmed misfortune's tide
And borne the rich one's sneer;
Have braved the haughty glance of pride,
Nor shed a single tear;
I could have smiled on every blow
From Life's dull quiver thrown,
While I might gaze on thee, and know
I would not be alone.

I could—I think I could—have brooked
E'en for a time, that thou
Upon my fading face had looked
With less of love than now:
For then I should at least have felt
The sweet hope still my own,
To win thee back, and whilst thou dwelt
On Earth, not been alone.

But thus to see from day to day,
Thy brightening eye and cheek,
And watch thy life sands waste away
Unnumbered, slowly, meek,—
To meet thy smile of tenderness,
And catch the feeble tone
Of kindness ever breathed to bless,
And feel, I'll be alone—

To mark thy strength each hour decay,
And yet thy hopes grow stronger,
As filled with heavenward trust, they say,
'Earth may not claim thee longer;
Nay, dearest! 'tis too much—this heart
Must break when thou art gone;
It must not be, we may not part,
I could not live alone.'

MISCELLANY.

The following affecting story is from the *Toronto Constitution* of the 9th instant.—

A FAMILY POISONED.—Those who can feel for the miseries of others will drop a tear when they peruse the following statement.

A family of the name of Smith, resided in Coulton's Field, Toronto, consisting of the father, mother, and four children. The eldest girl eleven years of age, another younger, and the boy, went out in the woods to gather mushrooms, a few days ago, and by mistake gathered toad stools, which are poisonous. They brought them home, the eldest girl cleaned them, the mother cooked them on the gridiron with salt. The children ate them and took sick, first one and then the others—the physician could do nothing for them—they all died—and last Saturday we hear that the 4th or youngest infant died also, but not of poison like the others. The two children of a Mr Jameson, also of this city, were out with Smith's infants, and one of them went to Smith's, ate of the toad stools with the others and is since dead and buried. It is truly remarkable how many ways there are in which death approaches the human family with his dread summons.

By an Act of the 1st Victoria, cap. 34, which came into operation on the first of August, those anomalies respecting the conveyance of Newspapers, so much and justly complained of have been entirely removed. The following is an extract from the table which forms the 28th section, regulating the rates of postage for printed British Newspapers within the United Kingdom:—

By the General Post, from one post town to another within the United Kingdom—*Free*.

By the General Post, and delivered by any penny or twopenny post—*Free*.

By any penny or twopenny post, and after-

wards passing by the General Post, from one post town to another—*Free*.

By any penny or twopenny post, and not passing or intended to pass the General Post—*Id. each*.

By the General Post of a post town, addressed to a person within the limits of that place or its suburbs—*Id. each*.

Between places within the United Kingdom: by private ships—*Id. each*.

Between the United Kingdom and Her Majesty's Colonies and Possessions beyond the seas—*Free*.

By private ships—*Id. each*.

SLEEP.—'I cannot think that man amiable, or even innocent, who, after the placidity, and refreshment of a night's rest, can awake only to his resentments. He must forget the being who sheds his balmy blessing over our shattered, perhaps perverted senses, and who enjoins the forgiveness of injuries before the sun goes down upon our wrath.'

DESTRUCTION OF SALT AT TURKS' ISLAND.—A letter from a respectable person at Turks' Island, dated, August 7, says, "On the 3d we were visited by a tremendous hurricane, which destroyed one-half the salt on Grand Key, and four-fifths of it on Salt Key." Another letter estimates the quantity lost, at 350,000 bushels. Most of the small houses were lost.

COLUMN FOR YOUNG PEOPLE.

RICH AND POOR.—PART II.

CAN it be supposed that the poor would be better off if all the property of the rich were taken away and divided among the poor, and no one allowed to become rich for the future? The poor would then be much worse off than they are now. They would still have to work for their living, as they do now; for food and clothes cannot be had without somebody's labour. But they would not work near so profitably as they do now; because no one would be able to keep up a large manufactory or farm, well stocked, and to advance wages to workmen (as is done now), for work which does not bring in any return for perhaps a year or two. Every one would live, as the saying is, "from hand to mouth," just tilling his own little patch of ground, enough to keep him alive, and not daring to lay by any thing; because if he were supposed to be rich, he would be in danger of having his property taken away and divided.

And if a bad crop, or a sickly family, brought any one into distress, which would be the case with many, what could he do after he had spent his little property? He would be willing to work for hire; but no one could afford to employ him, except in something that would bring in a very speedy return. For even those few who might have saved a little money would be afraid to have it known, for fear of being forced to part with it. They would hide it somewhere in a hole in the ground which used formerly to be a common practice in this Country; and still is, in some others, where property is very insecure. Under such a state of things, the whole country would become poorer and poorer every year. For, each man would labor no more than just enough for his immediate supply; and would also employ his labor less profitably than now, for want of a proper division of labor; and no one would attempt to lay by any thing, because he would not be sure of being allowed to keep it. In consequence of all this, the whole produce of the land and labor of the Country would become much less than it is now; and we should soon be reduced to the same general wretchedness and distress which prevails in many half-savage Nations. The rich, in-

stead of improving, would be much worse off than before. All would soon be as miserably poor as the most destitute beggars are now. Indeed, so far worse, that there would be nobody to beg of.

It is best for all parties, the rich, the poor, and the middling, that property be secure, and that every one should be allowed to possess what is his own, and to gain whatever he can by honest means, and to keep it or spend it, as he thinks fit,—provided he does no one any injury.

Some rich men, indeed, make a much better use of their fortunes than others; but one who is ever so selfish in his disposition can hardly help spending it on his neighbours. If a man has an income of five thousand pounds a year, some people might think at first sight, that if his estate were divided among one hundred poor families, which would give each of them fifty pounds a year, there would thus be, by such a division one hundred poor families the more enabled to subsist in the Country. But this is quite a mistake. Such would indeed be the case if the rich man had been used to eat as much food as one hundred poor families, and to wear out as much clothing as all of them. But we know this is not the case. He pays away his income to servants, laborers, and tradesmen, and manufacturers of different articles; who lay out the money in food and clothing for their families. So that in reality, the same sort of a division of it is made as if it had been taken away from him. He may, perhaps, if he be a selfish man, care nothing for the maintaining of all these families: but still he does maintain them. For, if he should choose to spend one thousand pounds a year in fine pictures, the painters who are employed in these pictures are as well maintained as if he had made them a present of the money, and left them to sit idle. The only difference is, that they feel they are honestly earning their living, instead of subsisting on charity; but the total quantity of food and clothing in the Country is neither the greater nor the less in the one case than in the other.

But if a rich man, instead of spending all his income, saves a great part of it, this saving will almost always be the means of maintaining a still greater number of industrious people. For a man who saves, hardly ever, in these days at least, hoards up gold and silver in a box; but lends it out on good security, that he may receive interest on it. Suppose, instead of spending one thousand pounds a year on painting, he saves that sum every year. Then, this money is generally borrowed by farmers, or manufacturers, or merchants, who can make a profit by it in the way of their business, over and above the interest they pay for the use of it. And in order to do this, they lay it out in employing laborers to till the ground, or to manufacture cloth and other articles, or to import foreign goods: by which means the corn, and cloth, and other commodities of the Country are increased.

The rich man, therefore, though he appears to have so much larger a share allotted to him, does not really consume it; but is only the channel through which it flows to others. And it is by this means much better distributed than it could have been otherwise.

AGENTS

FOR THE BEE.

Charlottetown, P. E. I.—Mr. DENNIS REDDIE
Aliramicli—Rev. JOHN McCURDY.
St. John, N. B.—Mr. A. R. TRURO.
Halifax—Messrs. A. & W. MCKINLAY.
Truro—Mr. CHARLES BLANCHARD.
Antigonish—Mr. ROBERT PURVIS.
Guysboro'—ROBERT HARTSHORNE, Esq.
Tatmagouche—Mr. WILLIAM MCCONNELL.
Wallace—DANIEL MCFARLANE, Esq.