

travelling in their company in the cars two years ago, I took for a most estimable lady. She makes herself conspicuous in courting the fulsome adulation of admirers—prides herself on being "Seesh" and has a brother who is an officer in the Rebel Army.

The changing throng of comers and goers paced the suite of rooms and the large hall, (all elegantly furnished to Mrs. Lincoln's taste) "keeping step to the music of the Union," by a large band in one of the anterooms. The greetings among the savans, and the officers of the army and navy present, seemed very cordial, and no one could discover an anxious word or look to indicate that a powerful rebel army were now hovering within a few miles of that spot, in the hope of seizing or shelling it. Lord Lyons was not there with the other foreign ambassadors; he was probably engaged in the consideration of late important despatches respecting Mason and Slidell. The pleasure of an introduction to General McClellan did not discover to me many signs of the daring intrepid soldier, "seeking the bubble reputation, even in the canon's mouth." He seems a quiet gentleman with a pleasant Dutch face and a red mustache. He is said to be a good man, but I do not think him adapted to the high position assigned him. The result of success or defeat will in the eyes of this people either deify or degrade him.

An exchange of prisoners is going on between the contending parties, whereby many are being returned from both sides. The other day 240 of the 3 months' men, prisoners since the battle of Bull Run, were joyfully received from Richmond; and the list brought by Mr. Ely, M. C., (exchanged for Mr. Faulkner), shows a balance of 2000 to 3000 more! in the rebel prisons.

I have written perhaps too much on this subject, but it is the all absorbing one of the times, on which hang the hopes and temporal destiny, the life or death of many of our poor fellow being! would it were a happier theme, under a united and prospering republic—disseminating to all alike the blessed privileges of an approving Providence. I shall be glad to send you the first good tidings of better success. Till then, adieu—my sheet is full—and I take the coming train for the West.

S. H. H.

Harrisburg, Jan. 7th, 1862.

For the Christian Messenger.

Animal vs. Vegetable Food.

In the *Christian Messenger* of the 8th inst., there appeared a communication on the above subject, and containing some statements which though very confidently made are quite erroneous. Without any disrespect to the writer it may be possible to show that he has mistaken opinions for facts, and the desired conclusions for sound reasoning.

The assertion respecting the inhabitants of Scotland, "who chiefly live on oatmeal," and "are robust, strong and active," goes for nothing. To meet the requirements of the argument it should be stated that those persons live entirely on vegetable food. But such a statement would not be true of them nor of any other known race of people on the face of the earth. What your correspondent R. has asserted is true. Many of the poor of Scotland do live chiefly on oatmeal, but milk, butter, eggs, and fish, are items of their common food, and meat, especially mutton, is more or less eaten by them, except in extreme destitution. The assertion that among those who endure this privation of animal diet in Scotland, "disease is less known than in other parts, where they have flesh in abundance," is new to me. If your correspondent R. knows this to be correct, will he have the kindness to name his authority for it? So important a fact will of course be found in the Reports of the Scottish Poor Law Commissioners, or in those of the Registrar General.

Our vegetarian friend tells us that, "The poor Irish who cannot afford animal food, and notwithstanding the want of comfortable houses and general cleanliness, are generally robust and healthy, one indication of health is their unusual good teeth." The composition of this sentence is quite as good as its assertions and reasoning. Neither, however, will bear very close examination. "The poor Irish" are the last witnesses a vegetarian should bring into court. Whoever will read attentively Chadwick's justly celebrated "Irish Poor Law Reports," will discover many invaluable facts. He will there learn, probably to his astonishment, as it certainly was to mine, that the poor peasantry of Connaught who could procure nothing but potatoes to eat, consumed daily the enormous quantity of 12½ lbs. each. He will find also abundant proof that their vegetarianism resulted in a physical, mental and moral degradation of one of the finest races of mankind, unparalleled in the world's history. A happier day has come to Ireland. Her peasantry can now generally obtain animal as well as vegetable food, and, as is well known, a corresponding improvement in their state has accompanied the change. All this the inhabitants of these provinces have had demonstrated before their eyes. In 1845, '46 and '47, the wretched emigrants from Sligo, Connamara and Cork: None who witnessed that sad spectacle will ever forget it, or the rapid improvement

made in the appearance of these "Irish vegetarians," by a few months wholesome mixed diet.

Respecting the Quakers, it is enough to say that as they are in all parts of the world proverbially healthy, and yet many of them eat animal food, vegetarianism cannot be the cause of their excellent health and longevity. I quite agree with the editor of the *Christian Messenger* that the real cause is their "moderation in all things," in which we would do well to imitate them.

The argument from sea-life is against vegetarianism. It is true that if the diet be confined to salt meat, with little vegetable food; for a long period, it will cause disease, in any latitude, on land or sea. But fresh meat, especially with fresh vegetables, restores health. Those who have read Dr. Kane's Arctic Expedition will remember his vivid description of the relief afforded his crew, almost dying from scurvy, by their obtaining a few meals of fresh Walrus. It was almost like life restored by miracle. Indeed the whole of the experience of Arctic voyagers goes to prove that in the higher latitudes it would be impossible to support life long without fresh animal food. At the best, then, vegetarianism would have to be local. We have yet to learn the effects on a ship's crew, of a long sea voyage, upon vegetarian principles, in more favourable latitudes. It might result in something even worse than the scurvy, caused by salt meat.

I am sorry that vegetarianism, among other evils, inculcates that "All our fine, noble and useful animals are graminivorous." I must stand up for my friend, the dog, though he does love a bone—the more meat on it the better. Is there nothing fine, noble or useful in the St. Bernard that exhume the traveller from his thick winding sheet of snow. Nothing in the world-wide reputation of the Newfoundland dog, to win for him one, if not all these adjectives which vegetarians seem to think appropriate for that noble animal, the ox; that fine creature, the ass and that very useful bird, —to a vegetarian—the pigeon? If Mr. R.'s assertions about the lower orders of creation were correct, which they certainly are not, they could not be used seriously as arguments to influence the decision of the question, What shall we eat? For if so, why not also to determine what shall we wear? If the habits of the brute are to govern man in one particular, why not in another? And who is to decide which animal is to be the model? Our vegetarian friend will find many who think the lion more noble than the horse, the tiger more beautiful than the ox, the eagle incomparably superior to the partridge, and the bear quite as pleasant as the gorilla.

I was exceedingly sorry to read the last sentence but one in the article to which I am replying. Where the writer of it says "It is probable it would be a blessing if man were deprived of all except the 'staff of life.'" He reminds me of Alonzo of Portugal saying— "Had the Creator consulted me, I think I could have suggested some improvements in his plans."

Vegetarianism is contradicted by human Anatomy and Physiology. The teeth, the digestive organs, the gastric juice,—all prove that mankind were intended to eat a mixed diet of animal and vegetable food. This argument alone, to scientific men, is conclusive. No student of Cuvier or Owen would need anything more to settle the question with him. If Comparative Anatomy is science, then man was designed by the Creator to eat animal food. That knowledge which enables the philosopher to pick up a single bone, and from it to delineate the structure, and decide with unerring accuracy the habits of an animal he never saw or heard of before, enables him, too, from the study of man, to decide that God never designed human beings to live by bread alone, as our Saviour has taught us, resting, as he often did, a spiritual truth upon a physical fact. The teachings of the Bible are nowhere in favor of vegetarianism. If the Apostle Paul had believed in it, he would have had a much speedier way of settling the question about meat offered to idols; nor would he have spoken of eating no meat while the world standeth, as a great sacrifice he was willing to make rather than offend a weak brother.

History condemns vegetarianism. No race of people have ever willingly practiced it. Those who have done so to the greatest extent and for the longest period,—the Chinese and Hindoos,—though not actual vegetarians are physically and mentally inferior to the races that eat largely of flesh. The Sepoys who perpetrated the enormities of the late mutiny in India; are almost vegetarians. The Chinese, the most treacherous, cruel and vile people in the world, eat scarcely anything but rice. But it was a handful of flesh-eating men who made these millions,—comprising nearly half the human family—cower down at their feet, and who were as magnanimous in the hour of victory as they were dauntless in the day of battle. Observation and experiment condemn vegetarianism. It has been tried carefully, repeatedly and extensively, under men of the highest standing, in poor houses, penitentiaries and prisons in England, on the Continent of Europe and America. Everywhere, as far as I know, it has been a failure. Not one scientific man has given his support to the theory. And I venture to say none worthy of the name ever will. It is only advocated by a few writers who are as unknown to science as science is evidently unknown to them. It has found most supporters among the Quakers, who adopt it on the principle that it is wrong for us to kill the lower animals. I only wonder they don't go further and prove that it is right for the lower animals to kill us.

Vegetarianism would make our food dearer,—not cheaper. More grain and vegetables can be raised on a farm with flocks and herds than without them; and it would not pay the farmer to keep much stock unless a considerable portion of it were annually sent to market. With-

out, then, some great chemical discovery, not yet found out, which would be cheaper and as fertilising as manure, vegetarianism—while it would largely increase the demand for vegetable food—would as largely diminish the supply. If it were universally adopted, half the human family would probably be without any food, and famine would soon reduce the population of the world to a mere fraction of its present amount. And this remnant would have to limit itself to a few highly favored localities, such as parts of Greece, Italy, Spain, and the Western States. Here they might live,—no, not live, but vegetate. For they would be so physically and mentally deteriorated in the scale of humanity, that any enterprise that could dignify life would be impossible to them. Instead of its being a blessing, as our vegetarian friend supposes, we can scarcely conceive of any curse greater, than mankind being deprived of all animal food.

M.

Christian Messenger.

HALIFAX, JANUARY 22, 1862.

SUBSCRIBERS who are in arrears, but are uncertain as to the amount of their indebtedness, and have no other opportunity of sending to our office, will greatly oblige by forwarding to us any convenient sum by letter, through the post office. We shall be happy, in acknowledging the receipt of the same, to inform them to what date the sum sent will pay.

The Religious Census of Nova Scotia.

Although the official results of the Census have not yet been made public, yet there has been so much publicity given to them and such free access given to the Returns that their general contents are pretty well known.

The returns have been printed we understand and are now in the hands of the binder, and after being presented to the Legislature will, we presume, be for sale under the direction of the Government.

There appears to be some complaints, not without cause, from that portion of the Presbyterians designated "The Church of Scotland in Nova Scotia."

The *Monthly Record* of the Church of Scotland says in regard to this matter,

"The whole population of the province is represented as 330,857; that of 1851 having been 276,117, thus showing an increase of some 20 per cent. all over. It would seem also that all the large denominations except the Church of Scotland have increased in a large ratio, viz. Episcopalians, 30 per cent., Catholics, 24 do., Presbyterians of Lower Provinces, 28 do., Baptists, 47 do., Methodists, 44 do., and Church of Scotland 1 per cent., that is taking into account the tabular provincial increase we have lost one fifth of our adherents. It is somewhat difficult to understand this. In the first place, the number of our clergy in 1851 was five, in 1861 it was fifteen. There has been no defection from our ranks during the last ten years—but on the contrary in several of our congregations considerable accessions. It can scarcely be believed that the population of the "Kirk" portion of the province has been standing still—but we must either accept this hypothesis or reject in toto the accuracy of the census return so far as we are concerned. Perhaps it may be partially accounted for by the column tabulated "Presbyterian" intended we suppose for a particular sect of that body, but which in some districts may have been misunderstood. But whatever may have been the cause we repudiate its accuracy, as well as all claim to be considered of any authority whatever.

The Rev. Mr. Pollok of New Glasgow, has drawn public attention to the subject in a letter to the *Pictou Colonial Standard*, an extract from which, which at this late period of the month is all we have room for, shows very forcibly the absurdity as well as entire worthlessness of this portion of the census return.

"The credit of the late census is vitiated by the certain fact that it has treated one class of Presbyterians in a way in which persons who ought to act, not as Presbyterian clerks or ecclesiastical clerks, but only as clerks, have no right to do in a public office. I certainly do not represent the interest of the Free Church people, nor do I wish to meddle with their affairs. I wish to bring their case forward as an illustration of my position. I hear accounts all round me of persons who returned themselves as belonging to the "Free Church." From the notorious dissatisfaction of a large number of Free Church people with the late union (in which I neither justify nor condemn them), and which attends upon even of the most successful character, this is only what might reasonably be expected. I am certain that there are hundreds of such entries, and I would not be surprised if there were thousands; and I would now ask—What has become of them? While the 3 Deists of Nova Scotia form a conspicuous trio who have received due acknowledgement in the records of their country, what becomes of these people who exercised their right in inscribing upon the records of the Province their sympathy with the principles of a body which has occupied a large place in the religious history of modern times. I read a public letter from a Free Churchman to-day complaining of this, and I mention it because it follows as a legitimate consequence that if this has been done with one class of religionists it may have been done with others, just as sectarian

bias may direct, and it is quite sufficient of itself to destroy the authority of the late Census.

"Recurring to the flagrant case of the Church of Scotland, the Census gives an increase of 196 in 10 years. Does any man in his senses believe this? I can easily understand how other bodies can increase 20, 30, or 40 per cent., because, though there are adverse periods inherent in all christian denominations, yet, and especially in a new country, the natural increase continues, and there must always be a considerable increase of this kind at least. This supposes, of course, that there has been no secession or disruption in the religious denomination. But what are the facts in our case? Before the beginning of the last ten years, we had experienced the greatest calamities which, in peaceful times, could well befall any Church, and were reduced to the lowest state. There were only four ministers in the country, and three of them rather old men.—Accessions to our clergy began in 1852, and now we have 13 ministers in this Province. From the lowest condition at the time of the last Census, there has been a wonderful advancement up to this time. There is improvement in the number and youthful vigour of the clergy; there has been improvement in the attendance at Church; there has been improvement in contributions; there has been an improvement in our literature; there has been an improvement in public opinion concerning our character and principles as a body;—but there is one place in which there is no improvement, and that is in the Census. There the increase is, in the face of all this, set down at 196."

"One is entitled to suppose, however, not only that there was a natural increase, but that in a Church that has added 10 to the number of its clergy in 9 years, there was an enlargement of a more general nature, consequent upon the improvement of its means of grace. We have a right to suppose that additions have been made to the list of its membership. If such increase were equal to the total increase of this one congregation, the result would be a general increase of about 5,000. I do not for a moment suppose that this is the case, for the fact that only one-half of these congregations have been supplied in that time, furnishes a correction. Hence, probably 3,000 is the correct result—a very extravagant one when compared with the 196 of the Census.

The *Witness* very unceremoniously puts aside these complaints by intimating that it is not of much consequence seeing "it is all in the family!"

Temperance.

The Grand Division of the Sons of Temperance held its Quarterly Session last week at Hantsport, commencing on Wednesday.—About forty representatives from different parts of the country, were present. The G. W. P., J. D. B. Fraser Esq., of Pictou, was present and presided.

In addition to the routine business of the Order, a Resolution was passed to memorialize the Legislature for a donation of \$400 towards the employment of a lecturer to go through the Province and awaken greater interest on this important social question, and to purchase tracts for general distribution.

On the question of omitting cider from the pledge, being discussed it was decided unanimously, not to amend the pledge.

The consent of the Subordinate Divisions, is to be sought to an increase of the *per capita* tax, so as to afford the Grand Division more means for the employment of lecturers &c.

A Public Meeting was held on Thursday evening. Able and animating Addresses were given by J. D. B. Fraser Esq., the President, Ezra Churchill Esq., Rev. S. T. Rand, D. Mosher Esq., and others.

Those who had not previously visited Hantsport expressed themselves much pleased with the village, its people, and institutions. Mr. Randall's Seminary is one of much importance to the present and future welfare of Hantsport and its neighbourhood.

PROGRESS OF TEMPERANCE PRINCIPLES.—The *Abstainer* says,

"As an indication of progress we would mention, that the Volunteer Artillery Company of this City, under Capt. Tremain, entertained their Drill Instructor, Sergt. Alex. Ross, of the Royal Artillery, at a banquet on Wednesday evening last—that over one hundred persons were present—and not one drop of intoxicating liquors of any kind was used. This speaks well for the Company. It is creditable to them—especially as Sergt. Ross is a Son of Temperance. In respecting his principles they respected themselves. A number of the company, we believe, are Sons of Temperance. We would place much confidence in that body in case of an emergency."

REMOVALS OF MINISTERS.—The *N. B. Baptist and Visitor* gives the following in reference to this subject:

"The instability of the pastoral relationship all over the continent of America is a matter of deep regret to all enlightened christians. It is found to act most injuriously upon ministers and people, and so long as this state of things exists it is in vain to hope for permanent prosperity. In New Brunswick with a very large portion of our Churches the tendency to change is truly appalling, and the call for a remedy for this evil is loud and urgent."