

United States General, or even an ordinary citizen, they would have called for a rigid investigation. The untutored savages may well be pardoned should they suspect that the whole thing was premeditated, or that the police had its instructions beforehand as to what to do in case a rescue were attempted—though we earnestly hope for the sake of the national honour that such a suspicion would be a foul injustice. But, so far as appears, the arrest itself was, or would have been, in the case of a citizen, only "on suspicion," and for no overt act, and it would have been the duty of those having the prisoner in charge to take every precaution to guard him from injury while in their custody. Should the fact be, as there seems reason to believe, that he was shot down by his captors while unarmed and defenceless, Christian civilization would once more have cause to blush. The exact facts of the case will probably never be known. "Sitting Bull" was doubtless a restive and troublesome Chief, but he was Chief of a band belonging to a tribe which has been bitterly wronged and defrauded by the Congress of the United States—a tribe whose people, General Miles declares, "have been hungry for the last two years," and are now "devoured with hunger, wretched and perfectly desperate." And this state of starvation, be it remembered, is caused by the failure of the National Government to provide the full quota of supplies pledged by solemn treaty. It can hardly be doubted that the slain Chief was a patriot in his own unenlightened, savage fashion. He was also a product of the Governmental system which has now remorselessly taken his life. However unamiable, or even revolting, some of his traits and deeds may have been, it must be confessed that there was something heroic in the bearing and conduct of the old Chieftain at the last, when, held fast on horseback as a prisoner and face to face with instant death, he, in defiance of all threats, and, probably, with the muzzles of levelled rifles staring him full in the face, continued to shout directions to his faithful followers until silenced suddenly and forever by the deadly bullets. Had the picture drawn by the brief story of the police had its scene laid somewhere "in darkest Africa," and its central figure an American or British soldier, in the hands of savages, how the great heart of Anglo-Saxondom would have thrilled over it, and how the praises of the dauntless hero would have resounded all over Christendom! But "Sitting Bull" was only a half-starved Indian, the product of a century of American civilization. That makes all the difference.

IS THE FARMER PROSPEROUS?

THE answer to this question depends altogether upon the view one takes of it. It is generally admitted that the Eastern farmer—that is in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec—is not so prosperous as he used to be. When the soil produced twenty and thirty bushels of wheat to the acre and the price ranged all the way from a dollar to two dollars, it was an easier matter to get rich. The soil has lost some of its primitive vigour; the climate has changed; the old provinces have ceased to be so well adapted to wheat culture. Barley, which has in a measure taken its place, has not been so profitable. Mixed farming is only being developed, and, until our stock of horses and cattle is much improved, will not bring in the wealth that used to flow into the farmer's stocking. We must remember moreover that money made is not, by any means as it used to be, money saved. In the old days of lumber wagons and homespun, it cost comparatively little to live; the conditions of life were cheap and simple. The farmhouse was a busy hive. The boys worked in the fields and the daughters in the kitchen and the dairy. Those who could be spared went out to service. *Nous avons changé tout cela.* The farmer now must have a handsome stone or brick house, and mortgage his land to build it. It must be well furnished with brussels or tapestry carpets and art furniture; a piano, or at least an organ, must grace the drawing-room. The waggon is for work on the farm, but not for church or town; the well-upholstered democrat, or patent spring buggy, takes its place. Jane must have music lessons, and Robert studies Latin at the nearest collegiate institute with a view to making his mark in one of the learned professions. In one sense this is all as it ought to be. We should rejoice that life for the farmer and his family is not the drudgery that it used to be; that he has risen in the social scale; that he is able to keep his children about him instead of sending them among strangers; that he is able to educate his sons, often with the satisfaction of seeing them take a position among the most prominent men in the country. But the old adage nevertheless holds good: "That you can't eat your pudding and keep it too." If the farmer spends his money in living, he won't have it to buy land or to fill the traditional stocking; if he becomes extravagant the result is quite likely to be a mortgaged farm and bankruptcy. We should remember these things when we ask whether the farmer is prosperous. Another

thing we should remember is that there are farmers and farmers. There are Canadian farmers and American farmers, and in our own country Eastern farmers and Western farmers. Those who, with some sinister purpose or other, take every opportunity of depreciating Canada are very fond of drawing a comparison between the condition of the farmer here and in the neighbouring republic. They tell us that he is poverty stricken on this side of the boundary, but a prosperous and opulent citizen on the other. Now I undertake to say on the best authority this is not true. The Canadian farmer is as well if not better off than his American cousin. Take the American magazines and newspapers and see what evidence they give; not a month passes without this question being discussed in some of the periodicals. They all bear one testimony, viz., that the American farmer is not prosperous. They are not only united in opinion as to the fact, they agree also as to the cause. In the April number of the *Forum*, Mr. C. Wood Davies, in an article on "Why the Farmer is Not Prosperous?" says it is owing to the use of improved machinery and the cultivation of vast wheat and corn areas in the West; production has outgrown population. The supply is greater than the demand, and there is a consequent fall in the market. The Eastern farmer with his limited acres has to suffer from competition with the West. The secretary of Internal Affairs of Pennsylvania asked the same question of six hundred grangers of that State. The most important cause assigned for the agricultural depression was over-production. An American paper of recent date says: "We raised more of two or three leading staples than could be consumed at home, and as other countries were making increased exertions to supply their own needs the inevitable result was a fall in prices, and to that the depression is due. The situation is the same as if the rolling mills of the country were turning out more iron than could be used at home, and were forced to sell the surplus in competition with the product of cheaper foreign labour."

So much for Eastern agricultural depression. And what about the West? We have every reason for believing that the farmers in north-western Canada are infinitely more prosperous than those south of the international boundary. The *Topeka Capital*, the most reliable journal in the State, gives us a most appalling picture of the result of the failure of the Kansas corn crop for two successive years. A recent issue contains letters from clerks of the district courts in 43 of the 106 counties into which the State is divided, in reply to questions asking how many real estate foreclosures have taken place in the first six months of the year 1890. In the 43 counties heard from there were 1,103 foreclosures—an average of 25 in each county. If the 63 counties unheard from have the same record, it would give 2,650 foreclosures in the State in the brief space of six months. This tells its own story. But Kansas does not stand alone in this misfortune; Missouri and Nebraska share its fate. Iowa and Dakota are fellow-sufferers.

It is cheering to turn from this gloomy picture to our own North-West. Year after year the farmers in Manitoba have been growing rich; even last year, a season of exceptional drouth, they had a good crop and did well. This year they have had an extraordinary yield, and, notwithstanding the loss from a wet harvest, will realize a handsome reward for their labour. The *Brandon Sun* tells us there are scores of farmers in that district who will be made comparatively rich by this year's crop alone; that many will realize from \$1,500 to \$10,000, while a few large farmers will realize even more. Mr. Sandison, for instance, is said to have a crop worth \$10,000.

A late issue of the same paper, Nov. 18, heads a column of news with these startling and hopeful words: "\$56,000 a week! Brandon farmers growing wealthy. They carry home pockets full of money and deposit receipts. Nearly 25,000 bushels of wheat marketed yesterday. Streets crowded with loads of wheat and the elevator capacity taxed." Below it gives us a detailed account of the wheat market and of the extraordinary scenes witnessed during the week, and concludes by predicting that 2,000,000 bushels of wheat will be marketed at Brandon this year. This will bring about a million and a-half of money into the pockets of the farmers in that district.

There is no reason to be despondent over the condition of the Canadian farmer. The effect even of the McKinley Bill will, I believe, be only temporary. We have a fine country, a good form of government, and glorious tradition. All we want is a little more faith in our future.

K. L. JONES.

PARIS LETTER.

THE French Academy every November awards the Montyon prizes to proficient in the Cardinal virtues, and to successful essayists in science, literature and world progress works in general. Montyon bequeathed all his wealth to the Academy, about seven millions of francs, out of which they pay donations to certain city charities, and publicly distribute every year several thousands of francs in prizes, to succour lowly virtue, to encourage struggling literary and scientific talent, mechanical skill, and inventive genius.

It is distressing to reflect on the number of persons hopelessly afflicted, especially with lung disease, trooping into Paris to be cured—as they believe—by the Koch remedy. Public opinion cannot be too carefully put on its guard, against running away with the

impression that everything is a success connected with the Koch lymph and its utilization. The Medical Faculty is still in the "feeling-the-way-stage"; it recognizes in Koch's discovery a mysterious and wonderful agent, having a direct influence on the various forms of tuberculoze. But no authenticated cure has yet been established—the trial periods being still insufficient; nor is it clear that relapses are not to be anticipated.

Several of the most eminent physicians in Paris have received some tubes of the lymph from the German Government to be experimented with. That Government has been presented with the discovery, and it is under its auspices that the lymph is prepared, not only to ensure its purity, but to prevent its falling into improper professional hands, till the experimental stage has been completely passed through. Senator Dr. Cornil has commenced a series of Sunday afternoon lectures in Paris on the experiments in course of being made under his direction. He is the highest authority on the bacillus or microbe question in France. Pasteur is not a doctor but a physiologist, hence, not a medical authority. Dr. Cornil is fifty-three years of age, and a native of Cusset, near Vichy. He received his first lessons in medicine from his father, a medical inspector, and obtained his degree in 1864. He has published several important and original works on anatomy and pathology. In 1870 he joined Gambetta's political fortunes, was made a prefect, was elected deputy, and, in 1885, a Senator for the department of Allier. Since 1882, he has been a professor in the University of Medicine. He has the largest collection of microbes extant, all classified and labelled like any other specimens of the animal kingdom. It was Dr. Cornil who made the post mortem examination of Gambetta, and handed over his extracted brain for conservation to the Anthropological Society, as directed by the defunct patriot and orator.

In 1884, the tuberculoze microbe was discovered and named after its discoverer, the "Koch bacillus." Some may not know that "tuberculoze" is the name given to the small aggregations or masses of roots resembling "little tubers" of diseased matter, which is associated with phthisis and scrofula. It is a hard yellowish semi-transparent substance, which on softening irritates and produces suppuration; the latter seeks naturally an outlet; in the case of consumption, by expectoration. But it is not so well known that these bacilli can not only swarm in the lungs—producing phthisis, but also in different other organs, as the skin, the lymph-glands, the bones, the joints, etc. The bacillus is also the active agent of brain fever, diseases of the larynx, etc. Hence the reason why all such maladies are now called tuberculoze, and why the Koch lymph is being tested on them as a remedy. If successful, what a victory for suffering humanity.

Dr. Cornil is the advocate of small doses of the lymph, at first a milligramme in solution. The lymph is injected between the shoulders, near the spine, and close to the nerve centres. The lymph attacks, in the course of four to six hours, the tuberculous tissue. That truly specific action has been unknown till now. Under the influence of the remedy, an intense fever of several hours' duration sets in, reddening the diseased parts when the tissues containing the bacilli become modified in their vitality. After repeated injections, the tubercles are killed; but an important point to note is that the bacilli are not; they retain all their virulent properties. Dr. Cornil draws attention to the fact, that the fever and the rushing of the blood to the affected part only take place when tuberculoze exists; hence the limitations of the lymph as a diagnosis.

How get rid of the dead tissue and its still virulent bacilli which are capable of propagating and infecting other parts of the economy? That's the difficulty. When the tubercles are upon or near the surface—as in facial lupus, etc., that tissue can drop away spontaneously; if deeper seated, surgical aid must be resorted to. In the case of the lungs where the tubercles are extensive and deep-seated, no surgical operation of course is possible. Dr. Cornil explained that inoculation under such circumstances would induce a flux of blood to the lungs, when the patient would undoubtedly expire from suffocation. But if phthisis was only in the commencing stage, the morbid tissue would be eliminated by expectoration. The skin and the joints can support without danger the violent congestion of blood, but such an organ as an inflamed brain could not. In the case of consumption in the larynx, a rush of blood caused by the Koch remedy would be followed by a swelling, which by closing the orifice would cause suffocation—as in the case of advanced phthisis.

Dr. Cornil's experiments are this week being continued on cases of advanced and incipient consumption. One man aged thirty-four was treated for facial lupus. Dr. Cornil tried the strongest dose, 5 milligrammes; the temperature rose—and fell back again—from 98 to nearly 105 degrees within 24 hours; accompanied with head-ache, and the sensation of nausea, but no shivering. Pains were felt in one of the finger and elbow joints, thus revealing the presence of the disease, though wholly unknown to the patient. And no pain was felt in an ankle joint which had been affected, and cured twelve years previously.

Cardinal Lavigerie seems to be politically "cornered" by Comte de Vanssay. A few weeks ago the Cardinal boldly declared in favour of the present constitution as the only viable one for France. He recommended his