

To my mind a *conclusive* objection to the embryonic argument, is found in the fact that the egg of a mammal undergoes an entirely different process of development from that of a reptile. This is shown in the modes of segmentation of the yolks, and is not only observable in the very first change which takes place in the eggs, but is characteristic of the eggs, *i. e.*, by means of the difference in the modes of segmentation, the egg of the mammal can always be distinguished from the egg of the reptile.

The *theory* is, that the mammal has passed through the reptilian stage ; *if so* the development of both must correspond up to that stage. The *fact* is, that from the very commencement of growth, in the very first changes which the eggs undergo, there are distinct modes of development peculiar to each, and consequently the mammal has not passed through the reptilian stage, and, therefore, the explanation of the facts must be sought elsewhere than in parental descent. The most reasonable explanation, in my judgment, is that before referred to, of typical, instead of parental resemblance.

In connection with the subject, Herbert Spencer argues as follows :

"Each organism exhibits, within a short space of time, a series of changes, which, when supposed to occupy a period indefinitely great and to go on in various ways instead of one, may give us a tolerably clear conception of organic evolution in general. If a single cell under appropriate conditions becomes a man in the space of a few years, there can surely be no difficulty in understanding how, under appropriate conditions, a cell may, in the course of untold millions of years, give origin to the human race."

Now, my friends, this *seems* to be very *fair reasoning*, but after all it is only a play upon words.

I can imagine the time required for the growth of any animal to be prolonged ; as a matter of fact we know that very different degrees of time are required for different animals ; the egg of the trout takes about ninety days ; that of the ordinary salmon about one hundred and twenty days, and some of the Pacific salmon forty days, while the shad requires only four or five days ; one animal requires a very short, another a very long period. I can therefore imagine that some animal might have been formed whose ovum might require an indefinite period, before the individual development became complete. It is true that such a supposition would require a marvellous exercise of the imagination ; but supposing this period to extend over "untold millions of years," it is manifest that such phenomenon would in no wise justify the belief that any ovum could ever produce any other animal than one like its parent. *We know as a fact* that a human cell will grow into nothing but a human being, and the cell of a fish into nothing but a fish, and so for every species, no matter how long or how short the time may be which is consumed ; but to argue that because *a cell* grows into an insect in a few hours, and *a cell* grows into a man in nine months, that therefore man might reasonably be supposed to be evolved from an insect's egg is absurdly illogical.

Dawson shows the fallacy of Spencer's reasoning in these words. "The reproduction of the animal as observed is a *closed* series, beginning at the embryo, and returning thither again. The evolution attempted to be established is a *progressive* series, going on from one stage to another."

#### MATERIAL FOR OUR CHURCH HISTORY.—BROME.

In 1811 the Rev. John Jackson, a graduate of Dartmouth College, and for many years pastor of the Congregational Church at Gill, Mass., came to Canada, and with his large family settled in the Eastern Townships of what is now the Province of Quebec. At that time this part of the country was wild, sparsely settled and almost destitute of gospel privileges, and Mr. Jackson was one of the earliest pioneer preachers. He first settled in Stukeley, but four years later removed to Brome where he spent the remaining years of his life. For ten years he exer-