

cope is required to assure us of its tangible presence. We cannot contemplate life as an abstract idea; we cannot dissociate it from *matter* under forms and certain modes of composition,—and to bodies exhibiting these forms and these modes we assign the term *organic*. The phenomena manifested by organic bodies, the result of an innate power in the body itself, collectively make up our ideas of *life*. We sometimes talk of a *vital principle*, but the expression is calculated only to cover our ignorance respecting the ultimate cause of the phenomena uniformly exhibited by all living beings. This principle is a mystery. An animal, a fowl or a plant develops itself from its embryo condition to maturity; its development supposes the reception and assimilation of external matters, the throwing away of useless or effete matters, a constant change of particles; growth up to a certain point, and then, as if the living machinery wore itself out in the working, decline, and death. But why so? We cannot tell. But this we know, that after death the elements which compose the body, and which were composed in one harmonious whole, contrary to the laws of chemistry, are now freed from their mystic governance—they separate, they return to the earth and atmosphere; and the once living body is dissolved. All organic bodies propagate their species respectively. The idea of spontaneous generation, as it is termed, is absurd. No combination of material particles can produce an organic being; but light, heat, and other influencing causes can and do excite the development of dormant germs. But those germs had paternity—they sprung, not from a fortuitous concurrence of atoms, but were the results of a law impressed upon all organic beings.

As being more nearly allied to the subject in hand, let us turn to that part of the animal kingdom represented by birds and fowls of the air. The number of classes and families as classified by naturalists are legion, and probably there are many yet undiscovered in foreign, unknown and inaccessible lands. We can but believe that all these numerous families or distinct species of fowls and birds are the same as existed at the creation. Each species is now, as then, a distinct species; distinct in every particular characteristic as to size, form, shape, color, habits, etc. We do not find sparrows mating and breeding with swallows or crows, or hawks; the bluebird with the robin, and so on. No; each family, guided by some great universal law, keeps pure and untainted within itself. We cannot bring ourselves to believe that any new and distinct species of birds or wild fowl have come into existence since the creation; still there are those who believe that creation may have been going on, and that the great power which called all creatures into existence, can and may

call up from time to time other races, according to a vast scheme beyond the comprehension of our minds. But even granting this, the theory of spontaneous generation is not the less absurd.

The naturalist, whose pleasing duty it is to properly classify the different objects of the animal kingdom which come into his hands, is struck with admiration at *the perfect resemblance in every point and every detail* of the different families of birds and fowls; every feather is of same shape size, color and markings. Take any species you like it is all the same, there is no difference; they are one of a great family, and their law knows no change.

(To be continued.)

### Scoring.

Editor Review.

Permit me to express my sympathy with most of the sentiments expressed in your quotation in last issue from an English contemporary; especially do I concur in your comments upon it. But, when you consider the spirit of the times—how sternly and emphatically the British are now wont to demand all needed reforms—you will admit, I think, that it is no wonder that our mother should regard her pliable and unprogressive offspring with feelings akin to pity and commiseration. But seriously, Sir, we are a cautious people. There is no doubt but our judges have done their duty in the past, but does not the increase of the poultry industry in Canada necessitate the same changes which the same causes have produced in other countries? The greater the number of competitors, and consequently the closer the competition, the more perfect the system of judging requisite to give satisfaction. I admit that our Ontario show does not bear out the truth of this assumption; but on the other hand, note the subordinate associations springing up in all directions, and their success, and may we not count on many of the exhibitors at these smaller shows becoming exhibitors at the Ontario show in time? Especially will this be the case if scoring is adopted.

The practice of having the owners names on the coops when the fowls are being judged, needs no comment from me after what has been said. I shall just observe that I have ever failed to understand what good purpose it could serve. Nor can I think that any judge in Canada would choose to have it so if he had to perform the work of judging.

I see that "Pure Blood" has supplied what was, to me, a "missing link;" that is, the method of procedure followed by American judges under the scoring system. Now, in the first place, it is plainly evident that "Pure Blood," knows whereof he speaks, and it is just as plain that all the speci-