

Columbia



Democrat.

AND BLOOMSBURG GENERAL ADVERTISER.

LEVI L. TATE, Editor.

"TO HOLD AND TRIM THE TORCH OF TRUTH AND WAVE IT O'ER THE DARKENED EARTH!"

\$2 00 PER ANNUM.

VOL. 14.--NO. 6.

BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA., SATURDAY, APRIL 14, 1860.

VOL. 24.

THE Columbia Democrat

IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING, BY LEVI L. TATE, AT BLOOMSBURG, COLUMBIA COUNTY, PA. OFFICE

At the new Brick Building, opposite the Exchange, by side of the Court House. "Democratic Head Quarters."

ORIGINAL POETRY.

Written for the Columbia Democrat. THE TIME WHEN I WOULD DIE. BY EDNA L. TATE.

O! let me die in the summer time,
When the sun shines bright in a sunny sky,
And gentle zephyrs fan my cheek,
Will waft my soul to God on high.

When the gloomy hours of night have fled,
And the dawn of day has just begun,
And musical birds are singing high,
O! then is the time when I would die.

O! let me die in the morning fair,
When the fragrant flowers waft through the air,
And the hum of the busy bee is heard,
O! then is the time when I would die.

As Mother's hand will soothe a weeping head,
When I am sick, my mother's hand,
And mourning friends are standing by,
O! then is the time that I would die.

And there the joy that I would meet,
When I am dead, my mother's hand,
And there with all the angels raise,
Our voices in a hymn of praise.

IF WE KNEW. BY EDNA L. TATE.

If we knew the cause and reason
Crowding round our neighbor's way,
If we knew the little things,
How they annoy our daily day,
Would we then so often chide him
For his lack of thrift and gain—
Leaving on his hearth a stain
Leaving on our lives a stain?

If we knew the clouds above us,
How they gently bless us here,
Would we then away all trembling,
In our search for weak despair?
Would we shrink from little shadows,
Lying on the dewy grass,
Waiting only for the dawn,
Just in mercy flying past?

If we knew the silent story,
Quivering through the heart of pain,
Would our womanhood dare down them
Back to haunts of guilt again?
Life has many a tangled crossing,
Joy hath many a break of view,
And the check, the wail, the woe,
This the blessed angels know.

Let us reach in our bosoms
For the key to other lives,
And with love loving in our nature,
Can reach good that still survives;
So that when our work is done,
We may say, dear Father, judge us
As we judged our fellow men.

HOW PARENTS PROVOKE THEIR CHILDREN TO WRATH.

"And ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath."—Eph. vi. 4.

Immediately preceding the text, children are commanded to honor their parents; and then, as if to warn parents against governing them in such a way as to forfeit that honor, it is added, "And ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath." The counsel is given to fathers because they are the heads of families.—Mothers, of course are to regard it as equally addressed to themselves, though the government of children more generally devolves upon fathers where signal authority is to be exercised, and obedience secured. They more frequently administer those painful corrections and chastisements which are the last resort. For this reason the counsel in the text may be addressed to them. Fathers, too, are naturally sterner and more severe than mothers, so that there is more need of warning them than the text. Many a child has sought shelter from a father's severity in a mother's gentleness and love.

But, in general, the command here is to parents to guard against provoking their children to wrath. They must not give them occasion to disobey. Doubtless there is much disobedience and recklessness among children that is provoked by parental imprudence or impatience. It exists solely because it is provoked into being.

The Trustees of the Girls' Reform School at Lancaster, say, in their first report, "One important fact has already been discovered, and which the Trustees would impress upon the minds of all, viz: That in nearly every case, the parents, or those who previously had them in charge, were more in fault than the girl, and that with nearly one half the number, their unfortunate condition was attributed to the neglect or abuse of a step father or step-mother." It is thus among adults in the community. There are many wrong things in neighborhoods that live because there was provocation. Thoughtless words, censorious words, unkind words, biting words, call forth others of a similar character; and then follows a jealous spirit, a retaliating spirit, a contentious spirit, and almost anything but a good spirit. If we could subvert all provoked evils from the sum total of evils in a given community, there would be a great reduction of unpleasant occurrences. So, it is believed, there would be

a very material reduction of disobedient acts among children, if all that are provoked were taken away.

It is, then, a matter of much importance to reduce the sentiment of the text to practice. How shall a parent avoid these provocations to wrath? It is a question that demands an answer. It is an inquiry that relates to vital points in the family. Its peace, harmony, happiness, the good or evil course of sons and daughters, character in this life, and glory or shame in the life to come are points involved.

I shall speak of some of the ways in which parents provoke their children to wrath.

1. By want of sympathy with them.—Some fathers always keep their children at arm's-length. Perhaps they are pressed with cares and duties belonging to their business, so that they have no time to spend in conversing with the little ones about their sports, studies, companions and other things. They eat with them, are occasionally in and out, and spend a short time at the close of the evening in reading a newspaper at the fire-side; but they have no time to devote especially to the entertainment of the children. They never stop to observe their plays and toys, and express their views about this, that and the other, and thereby show their interest in what secures juvenile attention. Perhaps they think that it is of no consequence whether children are amused or not—it is well enough if they surround themselves with things to entertain them without troubling their father, who never provides them with that which shall interest. Here is no sympathy with childhood, and it is soon perceived by young observers. Such a father may be feared; but he is not ardently loved. A young man in his employ, who loves to sport with children, will draw the sons of that father to himself, as the father does not, and cannot draw them.

Some mothers have not true sympathy with their offspring. They can see no need of so much running and noise. They wonder if other children are so active and boisterous. A check is put upon their portiveness many times a day by the mother's voice, hushing, complaining, or scolding. They learn, in a short time, that their mother has no interest in their pastimes, and that the best way for them is to have all their enjoyments by themselves.—A barrier is thus erected between them and a mother's love, that may diminish their attachment to home hereafter, and finally send them reckless wanderers over the earth.

Rev. Mr. Hempstead, late chaplain of our State Prison, said at a public meeting in Boston, that he had found, by actual observation, that want of sympathy with childhood has been a prolific cause of crime. Parents, in not appreciating the motives and dispositions of their offspring, had corrected them unwisely, and thus sent them adrift in the world, sick of home, and determined to have their own way; or else, maintaining a cold reserve, and never stopping to participate in their early pleasures, or console with them in their daily sorrows, strong affection either for parents or home, so that they were easily drawn away by the fascinations and temptations of the world.

Now, no parent is qualified to govern the young, unless he can sympathize with them, and join with them, at suitable times, in their plans, works, and plays. We should all remember that once we were children, a fact which the class of parents referred to seem to have forgotten. The more correctly and vividly we can recall the feelings and aims of childhood, the more ready can we enter into the projects and joys of our own children. We should recollect, also, that it would be unwise and perilous to make little men and women out of them. A child must be a child. He must think and act like a child. The parent who would make him otherwise inflicts an injury upon his undeveloped nature, and will probably provoke him to wrath. Dr. Scott, the commentator, had remarkable success in family discipline. A friend once asked him what was the secret of his success; and he replied, "I never corrected them for being children, but for being naughty children."

Then the trials of children are real.—We are too apt to think that, when a child loses or breaks a toy, or experiences some other trouble to make him weep bitterly, that it is of no consequence. It is only a childish enjoyment that is lost.—But these trials of the young are real to them. What loss of riches and office, the trials of disappointment and sickness, together with the ordinary perplexities and vexations of domestic and social life, and to adults, such are the juvenile trials in question to our offspring. Unless we remember this, it is impossible to express such sympathy for them as we ought.

Now, the direct tendency of a want of sympathy with children, is to diminish their sympathy for us. If I sympathize with you in trial, you will sympathize with me. Love draws out love. You hate another and he will hate you in return. Speak kindly to a neighbor, and he cannot speak unkindly to you. Here is a philosophy that is substantiated wherever human nature is found. It holds good with regard to childhood as really as it does with regard to mature years. The consequences, that want of paternal sympathy for the child keeps him at a distance, so that filial affection does not expand and grow, and diverts home of its highest charms, thereby leaving him more exposed to the temptations of life. At the same time, the disposition becomes sour, and an irritable temper of mind is begotten. It is probable that many parents, perhaps un-

consciously withholding this necessary sympathy, have been surprised at the apparent disregard of their wishes and feelings, which children early exhibit. They can scarcely understand why it is that they are so unaccommodating, morose, reckless and unkind. We suggest the foregoing as one of the possible reasons.

2. Parents provoke their children to wrath sometimes by favoritism. That pride of a child's brightness or beauty which some mothers and fathers possess will certainly run into favoritism unless there is a studied watchfulness. That genuine reason may exist for thinking more of one child than another, in some respects, we would not deny, but care should be taken that it may not appear in the conduct, and one be treated with partiality; which is what we mean by favoritism. Nothing will arouse the indignant feelings of a son or daughter quicker than this evident partiality. It stirs up the worst class of passions in the human bosom. Nothing creates more surely the *Idon't care spirit* in the young than this; and such a reckless spirit generally leads to ruin.

Parental favoritism is one of the evils which is universally deprecated, and, on that account, parents are quite unwilling to admit that they have favorites among their children. But this is a stealthy evil, and takes possession of the heart without sounding alarm. Simply living without stopping to reflect upon this danger may lead to it. It is one of the perils that must be pondered often, to guard effectually against it.—Wisdom will not always do it, nor even goodness. As good a man as Isaac had his favorite Esau, and as good a woman as Rebecca had her favorite Jacob. Evidently neither of them intended to wrong their sons. Perhaps they never stopped to consider whether they were partial. The consequences, however, are a perpetual warning against this evil. A long train of sorrows were entailed thereby upon both parents and sons. A great rupture was made in the family, and Esau became a rougher, harder, and more wilful man than he otherwise would have been. The worst part of his nature was developed by that partiality, and his fierce passions raged for more than twenty years. Then, when Jacob became the father of a large family notwithstanding the experience he had had in this regard, he made Joseph his favorite. It was manifest in his conduct. The brothers saw it clearly, and you recall how it provoked them to wrath. What a terrible tragedy was enacted, in consequence, in that family. There is scarcely any thing upon the annals of crime, in all past history, to compare with it. We have murders now, and lower shoots lower in the plerency of disappointment, and barbarous cruelties are perpetrated upon men; but where does brother rise up against brother, and conceive of such malignant wickedness, that which sold Joseph into hopeless bondage? That was a deed done in the family circle. It was conceived and acted by those who had sat around the same table, and knelt at the same altar. Children of a common parent, bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh, developed a spirit that was fiendish and cruel as the grave, extinguishing the last, flickering spark of fraternal love, and terminating in a family quarrel that crushed the hearts of the parents, and destroyed the peace and happiness of the children. Parental partiality was the mother of a deep-rooted and spiteful enmity; and this gnawed away, as a canker-worm, at the heart of domestic peace.

3. Parents provoke their children to wrath by excessive indulgence. In indulged children are usually peevish, headstrong, and wilful. Being left to their own way so much flattered, caressed and pampered they finally demand the gratification of their wishes, and become turbulent and passionate if denied. The direct tendency of indulging a child in his own way is to make him rash and reckless. If allowed to go uncorrected to day because it is difficult to secure obedience, he will take more advantage to-morrow. Give a child an inch, in this respect, and he will take an ell. One indulgence causes him to demand another, until he reaches a point where he resists all restraints, and passion usurps the throne of reason. Hence, in any community, the most unruly and irresponsible children are found among the indulged. They are much oftener found with this class, than they are with those who have been treated so severely. The Scriptures warn parents against indulgence much more frequently than they do against severity, intimating thereby that it is a greater evil. We have such instructions as the following repeated: "He that spareth the rod hateth his son; but he that chasteneth him, chasteneth him betimes." "Chasten thy son, while there is hope, and let not thy soul spare for his crying." "Withhold not correction from the child, for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die." "Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and deliver his soul from hell." Then the example of Eli and others is held up as a beacon light over this dangerous shoal.—Judging from the frequent reference of the Bible to this subject, we should infer that it was a prolific source of evil—that it is a very common way of spoiling children.

There are two frequent causes of this indulgence. The first is *wire animal affection*. Some parents idolize their children so that they can scarcely endure to see them punished. Any thing that causes them pain, or makes them weep, is deprecated. Their love is blind and unreasoning quite enough to spoil any thing human. The second cause is a desire for *personal ease*. Perhaps a mother is fee-

ble, or weighed down with cares, and she consents to almost any thing that will bring relief. If the erring child will be quiet and cease troubling her, by the proffering of indulgence, it is readily granted. Perhaps she wants time for fancy needle-work or some other employment that pertains to pleasure or display, and therefore children are allowed to do what otherwise would be forbidden. It takes time to correct the faults of the young. Work must frequently be laid aside and domestic matters interrupted, in order to do it. This is often too great a sacrifice for a parent who wants every moment for something else.

But it matters not what is the cause of this indulgence, the direful fruits are the same in all cases. It provokes children to wrath.

4. Parents provoke children to wrath by undue severity. While it is true that over-indulgence leads to ruin, it is also true that over-severity does. This is particularly the case with severity that is the result of passion. Some parents seldom administer punishment except when angry.—So long as their patience is not tried, and their affection is not crossed, they allow their children to do many wrong things with impunity. But when your patience is exhausted, and anger rages, they fly to the rod, and use it un-paringly. The child readily perceives that passion is on fire.—He knows very well that he is punished because his parent is enraged. Then he concludes that, if it is right for his father to whip him in anger, it is right for him, through a child, to receive it with a like spirit. So he becomes surly, angry, and vindictive. The father of Madame Roland was a passionate uneven man, and often subjected her to almost brutal treatment. The last act of this kind, on which her life seemed to turn, occurred when she was seven years old; and it was done to compel her to swallow a medicine. Years after she referred to it in the following language: "I experienced the same inflexible firmness that I have since felt on great and trying occasions; nor would it, at this moment, cost me more to ascend unto the scaffold, than it then did to resign myself to brutal treatment, which might have killed, but could not conquer me." In this case, undue severity, the result of anger, provoked a spirit of angry determination, which a thousand rods could not subdue. The case of Byron was similar.—His mother never punished him unless she was angry, and then her punishment was barbarous. His young spirit was aroused against her at an early age, and he grew up without a particle of love for her, and the end you know. Punishment inflicted in wrath can do no good, but evil. It may secure a temporary and formal obedience, but the heart is injured thereby. It is driven to unkind thoughts and plotting. Said a boy, about twelve years old, to a lady who was admiring which some counsel to him in view of his having stolen some of her money, still he, after having listened attentively and seriously, "My parents never talked to me like that. If they had I shouldn't have been so bad a boy." On the next day he called to see this lady again, apparently grateful for her timely words. His were Christian parents, who supposed, probably, that severity only could cure him of his stealing propensity. He is thought, however, to have perpetrated two thefts for every whipping. It is one of those cases which show us that dispositions must be studied, if we would properly control the young. Another case might have been cited by just such severity. Treatment that will save one child will spoil another.

There is a golden mean between indulgence and severity to be sought out if possible. He who can discover and observe it, has one of the secrets of successful family government. He will find necessarily involved therein the control of his own temper. Self-government is the beginning and foundation of all good government, be it in the family or state. "He that is slow to anger is better than the mighty; and he that reth his spirit than he that taketh a city." Napoleon may achieve glorious victories at Magenta and Solferino, when he is not fitted to govern a child.

5. Parents provoke children to wrath by punishing them for wrong doing without regard to their motives. Children do not wrong things ignorantly and accidentally. When the boy, George Washington, cut the apple-tree with his new hatchet, he was ignorant of the consequences. He did not know that such cutting would kill the tree. Some fathers would have punished him at once, without stopping to see whether the boy understood what he was doing. A little child is allowed to mark an old book with a pencil for amusement. It fills some of his childish hours with joy. By and by he takes the best book from the parlor table, and defaces it in the same way, for which he is punished, or severely reproof. But possibly he has received no instruction that he should not do so. He can defend one book and not another. He did not mean to do wrong. There was no evil intention in his heart. Why, then, should he be punished or reproof? Instead of either, explanation and counsel is what the case demands.

But faults of accident are more common than those of ignorance; and they are frequently punished, when the child may be actuated by the best of motives. A child is allowed to play with a ball in the house until a window is broken thereby, when a termination is put to the sport by immediate punishment. Yet the breaking of the window is only incidental to playing ball in the house. If correction be demanded at all, it is for playing thus in the house, and not for accidentally destroying a pane of

glass. Suppose a parent directs a daughter to render some assistance about the house, and in yielding obedience she breaks some valuable article. How many there are who would scold, and perhaps punish, although it was purely an accident! How many would not stop to reflect upon her good intentions to afford needed aid, but think only of the loss sustained. She might be careless; but then she should be reproof for carelessness, and not for the injury done. The extent of the injury might be noticed to show the sad results of carelessness, but with no other view. Children are sometimes chastised for soiling and tearing their clothes, losing articles of value, and injuring companions, and similar acts, when nothing wrong was intended. A man of rank and affluence said that, in his youth, he was severely punished for losing a ten dollar bill with which he was sent to a neighbor's and he confessed that he always carried the recollection of it as an act of injustice on the part of his father. He desired to perform the errand promptly. He yielded cheerful obedience; and yet it all weighed nothing beside the accident of losing the money.

The tendency of such disregard of motive in the punishment of children is to begot the feeling of having been wronged—to arouse a spirit of hostility against what seems to be, and what actually is, injustice. Children know when they intend to do wrong, and when they do not intend to. They know that there is a great difference between the moral state of the heart in the two cases; and while conscience condemns them for the intended wrong, it does not for the accidental. Parents know this, too. They always judge of men by motives. The killing of a man is not murder unless it is done with malice aforethought. The motive is always regarded in judging of men. Shall not children be treated with as much consideration as adults? Especially ought not this to be the case when making no difference between a fault of intention and accident obliterates the distinction between right and wrong in the mind of the child. How can a child know what is right and what is wrong, if his motives are not regarded? There can be no line to distinguish between them, when this is removed. To a child, it must be confusion and mystery.

6. Parents provoke their children to wrath by habitual fault-finding. Some people have a tact for fault-finding. In the neighborhood and family, they are more likely to discover blemishes than graces. They pass by exhibitions of human excellences with a kind of reserve and determined silence, and speak and comment only when defects are seen. When this class become parents, they watch their children closely for faults, and are seldom disappointed in discovering them. As children are not usually more nearly perfect than their parents, the opportunities of reminding them of their faults are numerous. The consequence is that almost continual fault-finding salutes their ears. Parents differ at this point, like the commanders of vessels described by Basil Hall.—Speaking of two captains, he says, "When ever one of these commanding officers came on board the ship, after an absence of a day or two, and likewise when he made his periodical round of the decks after breakfast, his constant habit was to cast his eye about him, in order to discover what was wrong; to detect the smallest thing that was out of its place; in a word, to find as many grounds for censure as possible. This constituted, in his opinion, the best preventive to neglect, on the part of those under his command; and he acted in this crusty way on principle. The attention of the other officer, on the contrary, appeared to be directed chiefly to those points which he could approve of.—For instance, he would stop as he went along from time to time, and say to the first lieutenant, 'Now, these ropes are very nicely arranged; this mode of bestowing the men's bags and mess lids is just as I wish to see it;' while the first officer described would not only pass by these well arranged things, which had cost hours of labor to put in order, quite unnoticed, but would not be easy till his eye had caught hold of some casual omission which afforded an opening for disapprobation."

Under the one, accordingly, we all worked with cheerfulness, from the conviction that nothing we did in a proper way would miss approbation. But our duty under the other, being performed in fear, seldom went on with much spirit. We had no personal satisfaction of doing things correctly, from the certainty of getting no commendation. The case being quite hopeless, the chastisement seldom concluded either to the amendment of an offender, or to the prevention of offences."

It is so in the family. Habitual fault-finding breaks the spring of generous and noble effort. It hardens the heart against its influence, so that recklessness is the legitimate result. Children who are accustomed to hear fault-finding so generally heed it about as much as they do the idle wind. It provokes them to yet grosser faults.

for the lesser evils they perpetrate; but he proceeds to remove the greater ones out of which inferior defects grow.

7. Parents provoke their children to wrath by administering punishment without regard to their mental moods. It is as important to study moods as motives.—Children are not always alike in their mental states. Nor is it peculiar to them. It is so with their parents. The latter have days when their patience is more easily exhausted, when they are more irritable, sad, or testy than they are at other times. The exceptions to this are few and far between. It does not require very long or deep study for any of us to discover this in ourselves; and there are causes for it. Multiplicity of cares, mental anxiety, bodily illness, and similar causes, beget these varying and unhappy states of mind. But if adults are so subject to them, may not children be? Is there no more excuse for them in the latter, who have not arrived to years of discretion, and over whom motives of self-control have, consequently, less influence? This must be granted. But whether conceded or not, every parent knows that his children are not always in an equally favorable frame of mind to receive correction. When they are peevish in consequence of illness, correction often arouses a retaliating, sullen or revengeful spirit.—The same kind of correction will awaken harder thoughts, and angrier thoughts, than at other times. So, when a child is angry, it is nearly as dangerous to inflict punishment, as to do it when the parent is angry. The child is not then in a frame of mind to perceive the justice of his chastisement, nor to care much about it. His feelings are too bitter for that. Also, the nervous system is frequently affected by the weather and physical indisposition, so that the child is more easily provoked to wrath by the parents. When these differing frames of mind are not observed, and chastisement is administered without any regard to them, injury is usually done.—The heart of the child becomes more sadly warped than ever. A bad thing is made worse. The child will misconstrue, or misapprehend paternal motives then, and be likely to take the very worst view of his experience, and hence feel the most unkindly towards his parents.

8. It is easier to preach on family government than it is to practice. Enough has been said to show that the government of children is a very difficult matter—that it requires wisdom, foresight, penetration, and a good knowledge of human nature, to be able to discipline the young heart aright. No doubt it is the desire and aim of nearly all parents to govern their children so that they shall become useful and worthy members of society. But we err in judgment, or knowledge of the mental and moral laws under which children act. The science of family government we are not so familiar with as we are with other sciences. If it be true, as the poet says,

"That shuts within its breast a bloom for heaven,
May take a bluish from the bloom of love,
And bear the bright forever."

it is not strange that many of the young make shipwreck of their hopes. We say that a teacher must have a knowledge of human nature if he would be a successful disciplinarian, and we say the truth. But how much more true must this be of the parent, whose government over his children never ceases during their years of minority! Yet this is a difficult knowledge to acquire. If all the points considered demand our attention, and others beside, every one must see that parents have no inferior work to perform. How often they are perplexed, and scarcely know what to do! How many of the wisest have asked anxiously, "Who is sufficient for these things?" and how many others have responded, "Who?" Men who have made good governors and legal counsellors have failed utterly in managing their sons. It is so much more difficult to govern a family than a state! A ruler is not obliged to study the dispositions of his subjects, but a parent must. Facts prove that an amiable disposition may be soured by mismanagement, and a naturally unamiable one may be improved by judicious culture. But how shall we acquire this necessary knowledge of different dispositions. This is the difficulty. Such considerations show that we can theorize upon this subject much more easily than we can reduce theories to practice.

2. We learn, hence, the necessity of parents making family government more of a study, and the subject of more serious thought than they generally do. Men have their treatises on the cultivation of bees, colts, and other animals; but how few of them, who are fathers, have any treatise upon the management of children! They have weekly papers upon politics, agriculture, the mechanic arts, and upon almost every thing else that pertains to the trades and callings of life. But how few have any means of instruction upon the subject of Home Education! True, very little has ever been written or published upon the subject—a fact which shows how little attention has been devoted to it. While enough has been produced upon the culture of plants and the training of colts, and even Canary birds, almost nothing has been done for the instruction of parents concerning the most important of all their duties—the government of their children—on which, not only the happiness of both parties is suspended; but, in a great measure, the welfare of church and state. But thought, reflection, study, can, and ought to be given to this subject. Instead of devoting no particular thought to it, nor

ful and virtuous, parents should feel that no more important subject can claim their attention. And the more thought they can bestow upon it, the more they will see the need of information relating thereto.

Finally, we learn the need of love as the pervading element of family government. Whatever may be our views about corporal punishment, or the use of the rod, either for or against, all must agree that LOVE should be the pivot on which all things in the family turn. If we inflict corporal punishment, it should be done in love. That tender, affectionate spirit, which alone is consistent with the parental relation, should be manifest even in the severity employed. This is true of the Divine government. God is just, but his justice is tempered with mercy. Severity sometimes characterizes his government, but it is prompted by love. "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth." It is true in nature, and it is true in providence. Were the power of God more prominent, his love in creation, instead of prevailing sunshine and calm, we should have wind and storm, thunder and tempest, and other manifestations of Divine power, more than the opposite. Dark and frowning skies, wild tornadoes, and mighty earthquakes, would convert this beautiful world into a scene of indescribable terror. So if justice, in the providence of God, prevailed over love, we should be arrested in our earthly career, and the merited retributions of eternity would fall upon us at once. We should be overwhelmed with the consequences of our guilt, and perdition would open its yawning gulf to receive our banished spirits. But now that Divine love underlies and pervades the entire universe, we rejoice every moment in a life that is crowned with blessings. So manifest and wonderful is that love, that we can respond to the lines of another,

"Could we with ink the ocean fill,
And were the skies of parchment made,
Were every leaf on earth a scroll,
And every man a scribe by trade;
To write the love of God above,
Would drain the ocean dry,
Nor could the scroll contain the whole,
Though stretched from sky to sky."

So must love in the family underlie and pervade its entire discipline. Then children will not be provoked to wrath so frequently, and peace, harmony, and consequent happiness, will be more generally secured.

EXECUTION OF QUEEN MARY.

Arrived on the scaffold, Mary seated herself in the chair provided for her, with her face towards the spectators. The dean of Peterborough, in ecclesiastical costume, sat on the right of the Queen, with a black footstool before him. The Earls of Kent and Shrewsbury were seated like him on the right, but upon larger chairs. On the other side of the Queen stood Sheriff Andrews, with a white wand. In front of Mary was seated the executioner and his assistant, distinguished by their vestments of black erape with red erape around the left arm. Behind the Queen's chair, ranged by the wall, went her attendants and maids. In the body of the hall the nobles and citizens from the neighboring counties were guarded by the musketeers of Sir Ayns Paul and Sir Drew Drewery.—Beyond the balustrade was the bar of the tribunal. The sentence was read: the Queen protested against it in the name of royalty and of innocence, but accepted death for the sake of faith.—She then knelt down before the block, and the executioner proceeded to remove the veil. She repelled him by a gesture, and turning towards the Earl's with a blush on her forehead, "I am not accustomed," she said, to be undressed before so numerous a company, and by the hands of such grooms of the chamber."

She then called Jane Kennedy and Elizabeth Curle, who took off her mantle, her veil chains, cross, sash, &c. On their touching her robe the Queen told them to unloose the corage, and fold down the ermine collar, so as to leave her neck bare for the axe. Her maidens weeping yielded these services. Melville and the three other attendants wept and lamented. And Mary placed her finger on her lips to signify that they should be silent. She then arranged her handkerchief, embroidered with thistles of gold with which her eyes had been covered by Jane Kennedy. Thie she kissed crucifix each time repeating "Lord, unto thy hands I commend my spirit." She knelt anew, and bent her head on the block, already scored with deep marks; and in this solemn attitude she again recited some verses from the Psalms. The executioner interrupted her at the third verse by a blow of the axe, but its trembling stroke only grazed her neck; she groaned slightly and the second blow severed the head from the body.—*Lamar-tine.*

A LESSON FOR THE LADIES.—A gentleman, who had often been annoyed by waiting a long time for the making of the toilets of those ladies he had escorted to balls, was invited by one of the ladies to attend a Leap Year Ball, recently at—The lady called for him at the appointed hour, but he was "not quite ready." Our lady friend was ushered into the parlor, and had the pleasure of waiting until nearly 10 o'clock, for the gentleman to "dress." The joke was kindly taken, but was so well done that the fame thereof had extended to almost every person in the ball room, in the course of the next hour. Not a few were the jokes and repartees exchanged, and all said that our gentlemanly friend