

opened, and a quiet voice said "Mamma, you aint always gentle."

In self-justification I replied, "But, you know, dearling, mamma *has* to scold you when you're naughty."

"Yes' m."

The argument dropped; so did the little head upon my bosom. I did not finish the song. nor have I sung it since. Tenderly tucking in the little truth-teller, I reproached myself for deserving his remark, and greatly questioned the truth of my answer. Do mothers ever *have* to scold? Has scolding any legitimate place in the family government? How is the word defined? "Railing with clamor; uttering rebuke in rude and boisterous language." Is this a helpful adjunct to parental authority? Why do Christian parents sometimes scold? For two reasons, as it seems to us. First, for lack of self-control; second from habit. Children are often terribly trying, and loud and angry tones seem a safety-valve for our stirred tempers. Besides, we feel that gentleness alone can never safely steer the family bark over life's troublous sea. Force, firmness, decision, sternness, even severity, are often necessary. A suitable degree of these is not incompatible with gentleness. It is not a synonyme for weakness. The gentleness that makes one great comes from subdued strength. This lovely fruit of the Spirit proves an element of power. The "soft answer" often costs the answerer dearly. Sweetness of spirit is the outgrowth of self-control. Serenity of soul, whatever be the constitutional characteristics, comes most frequently from long self discipline and prayerful struggle.

THE SEED AND THE TREE.

It is a favourite theory with many that the egg was before the animal, and the seed before the plant; but

this is not a true scientific view of the matter. We plant an acorn, and it is true there grows up from this seed the branching oak with its mighty limbs and rich foliage. But whence came those limbs and that foliage? From the seed? Certainly not. The oak was never in the acorn. There was a vital principle in the acorn, by whose action, under certain requisite conditions, the material from surrounding nature were drawn to it, united and assimilated so as to make the oak. The oak, we know, was never in the acorn. Could the great bulk have been in the little seed? When the acorn was planted, the future oak was lying all around in the other vegetable matter of the earth. Now then, if the analogy of growth, as we see it, requires not only the seed, but a surrounding field of material for that seed to use, how could an original seed have affected anything when there was no surrounding vegetation! The oak must have been before the seed, the animal before the egg. If we are going back to originals, it is in this way we must solve the problem. And now what does the first chapter of Genesis say? "And the earth brought forth the herb yielding seed (not the seed yielding herb) and the tree whose seed is in itself (not the seed whose tree is in itself)." What mere human mind would ever have thought of putting it in this way? And yet this is the only way in which a true science can settle the question between the seed and the tree.—*Rev. Howard Crosby, D.D.*

RUM AND CHEESE.

A gentleman was dining at the table of a lady who refused to tolerate a drop of wine or spirits on her table, and who, when asked to entertain one of the British nobility, replied, "I can; but it must be understood that