

proved itself unable to enter this country without clumsily causing a rebellion. After the rebellion it granted the Métis all that they had demanded; had it met their demands in time there never would have been a rebellion. Under the land regulations of July, 1879, the Manitoba settler was required to go sixty miles from the railway to buy land at as low a figure as was charged in the United States alongside the railways. Those regulations sent our immigrants across the boundary so fast that they had to be repealed. Others were introduced in October of the same year. Under those of October, 1879, the prices charged the settlers continued to be 75 cents and \$2.25 per acre more than those charged for lands similarly situated in the United States. In a few months these also had to be repealed. In May, 1880, a new set of regulations was introduced containing ill-advised provisions, which continued to send settlers over the boundary, and again in January, 1882, the third set was replaced by a fourth. All these mistakes coming in quick succession swept back the wave of immigration which threatened to fill this country to overflowing. Monopoly will continue what the land regulations have begun. The figures of the last census are before the people of Ontario, and they tell their own story. The immigration returns show that 155,000 immigrants have swarmed into Manitoba and the Northwest during the years of 1881-85. The census, on the contrary, shows only 46,636 more here now than in 1881, and of this increase, 10,000 is said to be due to the extension of our boundaries in that year. So that the increase has really been but 36,686, and of this a great portion is natural increase and not due to immigration. What then has become of the 155,000? As far as we are concerned, they have disappeared off the face of the earth. It must be noted, too, that all this increase is covered by the growth in the population of the towns, Winnipeg itself having added 13,682 to her population since the census of 1881. What then has been done to settle our 116,021 square miles of area? Very little, and it must be evident that so long as monopoly rates continue, the present deplorable state of affairs cannot greatly improve.

Winnipeg.

F. C. W.

### FEAR KILLING.

MRS. (or Miss?) FRANCES POWER COBBE has contributed a clever article to the *Contemporary*, on "Faith Healing and Fear Killing," of which we abridge the latter portion, as it contains some exceedingly useful information on the subject of Pasteurism, and also calls attention to a novel result of nineteenth century sanitary developments:

How, then (says the writer) do we stand now as regards Fear Killing? It seems to me that alongside of the gains which have accrued to our generation from the progress of hygienic science, we have acquired habits of mind which go far to counterbalance them. Forty years ago, Kingsley took up his parable, and preached well and wisely of religious obedience to the natural laws of health. But had his noble life lasted until now, his voice, I think, would have been loudest in the denunciation of that *hygieolatry* which threatens to become our only religion. Kingsley adjured us to preserve health, that we might the better serve God with vigorous brains and hands. We coddle ourselves chiefly, it is to be feared, for our own comfort, and ardently cherish this life with no particular expectation of another. We have ceased to fear God, and learned to fear microbes.

No one can doubt that this scientific view must prove, in the long run, more conducive to caution than the notion of a Providential span, or of fate, or a planet, or kismet; and accordingly we practically find all around us evidences of redoubled care concerning the conditions of health. Of course, in many directions, this new caution is good and rational. More temperate diet, more airy bedrooms, better drained houses, and more effectual ablutions are real improvements on the habits of our ancestors. But the excess to which hygienic precautions are carried, the *proportion* which such cases now occupy amid the serious interests of life, is becoming absurd, and conducting us rapidly to a state of things wherein, if we are not killed by Fear, we are paralysed by it for all natural enjoyment. The old, healthful, buoyant spirit seems already fled from the majority of English homes.

Aged people seldom exhibit now that gentle gaiety which so often brightened with hues of sunset the long, calm evening of a well-spent life. The middle-aged are all hag-ridden by anxiety; and, as to the young, if we may trust the reports which reach us from the great schools, a very great change has come over them, seriously indicative of the sensitiveness of young souls to the chill breath of the Zeitgeist. The lads have grown colder and harder, and are interested in pecuniary profits rather than in nobler professional ambitions. Nay, we have been told (it is a large demand upon credulity) that English schoolboys have almost ceased to be reckless about heat and cold, about eating indigestible things, about climbing trees and precipices, about going on deep water in unseaworthy boats; in short, about all those pursuits which excited the perennial alarms of their fond mothers. Many boys are to be found, it is stated (I write under reservation), who may be described as Mollycoddles, so cautious are they about their health and their limbs. Urchins in round jackets speak of the danger of checking perspiration after cricket, and decline to partake of unripe apples and pastry on the never-before-heard-of ground of

dyspepsia. Invited in the holidays to the ecstatic lark of a long excursion on horseback, they have declined with reference to the playfulness of their pony's heels, and have been seen to shrink from a puppy's caressing tongue, murmuring the ominous word "Rabies."

In short, our girls, who are just acquiring physical courage as a new virtue, are sometimes braver than their brothers, who think it good form to profess disinclination to risk their valuable persons. It is not a small matter that this ebb should be noticeable anywhere in the tide of English manly courage. On the contrary, if it continue, the results must be deplorable. For our present purpose it is enough to point out that all this new-born caution about their health will, at the best, create a generation of hypochondriacs and valetudinarians, not of robust and stalwart Englishmen. Life, to be worth living, must be concerned with quite other things beside diseases, draughts, and drains; we want to *live* not merely to *postpone death* and die by inches through half a century. Let us take as one example of the Fear-Killing of our time the Hydrophobia Scare. The history of this scare and of Pasteurism, as connected therewith, will one day, no doubt, form a very amusing and instructive chapter in a future continuation of Mackay's "Popular Delusions." A rare disease, which by its nature is exceptionally closely connected with and controlled by mental impressions, was announced to be suddenly manifested all over the civilised world, from Moscow to Chicago. Mad dogs became as plentiful as blackberries—at least the reports of them in the newspapers were so; and it was difficult to open a daily journal without finding a paragraph adding to the general hue and cry. Speaking of the Hydrophobia Bugbear, which spread consternation through America, while our own scare was depriving us of our common sense and humanity, Dr. Edward Spitzka tells us in the *Forum* for April, 1887: "In order to determine how great the danger in the United States from rabies is, the writer has carefully followed up all the newspaper reports of alleged outbreaks of the disease. In not a single instance has satisfactory evidence of its existence been obtained. Before scientific tests all the newspaper alarms are shown to have been either fabrications, exaggerations, or mistakes." We are very far, indeed, from making light of the terrible disease of hydrophobia when it ever really afflicts man, woman, or child. But the whole history of this scare bears a false ring which provokes incredulity. As the *Referee* last August acutely observed: "One thing is certain. The present epidemic of rabies did not begin till M. Pasteur was ready for it. If he were to-morrow to abandon his experiments in this direction, we should hear of very few cases of mad dogs. The panic would have died out long ago, but it has been fomented by the press in the interests of Pasteurism; and when the mad dog has not been available for sensational treatises, the mad dog has been invented."

Had no hydrophobia scare been raised, and if it had been generally understood that many more men die every year from the kicks of horses than the bites of dogs (251 persons died in 1886 in consequence of accidents caused by horses and conveyances in the streets of London, and nine from hydrophobia), Pasteur would not have achieved such glory as he has obtained. Whether, beside exulting over every real or fictitious case of rabies, Pasteur's admirers are responsible for actually causing the disease in some of the infected animals is a question not to be lightly dismissed. Mr. G. H. Lewes told the Royal Commission on Vivisection: "When one man publishes an experiment, there are people all over Europe who will set about to repeat it, and repeat it, and repeat it again." Pasteur and his followers have been playing with a tremendous poison, of which the properties are utterly unascertained, and we may never know the evils they have let loose, both as regards the virus of rabies and of anthrax. What interest, it may be asked, can English scientific men have had in glorifying the French savant. The reason, I fear, is not far to seek. For twelve years past the English advocates of experiments upon living animals have seized on every straw to enable them to answer the challenges of their opponents to produce a case wherein human life had been saved by a discovery due to vivisection. M. Pasteur, if his recognition as a successful healer of a dreaded disease could be insured, would afford the best possible argument for doing away with restrictions on English vivisection. There are before the world several other remedies for hydrophobia, carrying quite sufficient testimonials of success to merit the patient investigation of medical enquirers. For example, there is the system of vapour baths, which was known to Celsus, and was brought into prominence by the late Dr. Buisson, who cured himself by such means, and afterwards nearly a hundred patients. But which of all the biologists and doctors who have glorified Pasteur has taken the trouble so much as to read the evidence in favour of these harmless methods of treatment, even when, as in the case of the Buisson baths, they have been largely advertised at the cost of non-medical, benevolent persons, and offered gratuitously to needy patients.

We find that in 1886 the deaths in France from hydrophobia were thirty-nine. Of these, twenty-two were of persons inoculated by Pasteur and seventeen of others not inoculated. Thus Pasteur had the opportunity of diminishing the mortality by more than half had his method been successful. Instead of this we find that the total of deaths exceeded the average by nine. On the other hand, how many lives has the Pasteurian delusion actually cost? For how many deaths are Pasteur and his supporters responsible? He has failed to *save* more patients than would have been saved, judging by averages, in the natural order of things. Of how many has he caused the death? It would seem clear that he has had two classes of victims.

When next there is a question of condoning cruelty on the plea of benefiting humanity, it is to be hoped that this instructive history will not be forgotten. Of the moral injury done to the community by sanctioning cruelty there can be no question at all; of the physical advantages to be purchased by it we have an example in Pasteurism. An infinite