

calmly viewed his work, as he has now had time to do, he really believes that the above statements approximate the truth as to the state of affairs? Are they not, putting it mildly enough, much more like a conglomeration of hyperbolic exaggeration—erroneous and misleading to say the least? The quarantine organization at Grosse Isle has probably never been in a more efficient position for ready action than now or at that time. On the first reports of the outbreak of cholera in France, the precaution was taken by the Minister of Agriculture, I understand, to at once issue stringent instructions in relation to the quarantines, in order that every necessary precaution might be exercised in preventing the infection of cholera or other malignant disease taking root in Canada. And these preliminary instructions were followed up by supplementary orders, by proclamation, usually acted upon only in times of extreme danger; which orders, "The Writer of the Article" states, are a "sufficient refutation of the *Sanitary Journal*;" but which, in reality, I say, are a confirmation of what was stated in the *Journal*. The references of "The Writer of the Article" to the circumstances connected with the *Peruvian* a few years ago can, if necessary, be shown to be at least greatly exaggerated; and those insulting ones, relative to the steamship companies, the Grand Trunk Railway, and the "newspaper press of the Dominion," may be left for the latter to ponder over or deal with.

Permit me here to draw attention to a fact in connection with the quarantines of the Dominion, which is of no little importance to Canada, and bears strongly on the present discussion. At a general assembly of the International Congress of Medical Men of Colonies, held at Amsterdam, Holland, not long ago, in a report made by Dr. VanLeent, Canada was highly complimented on her quarantine organization, which the reporter characterized as "*tres complets et tres efficaces*."

But I must not omit to point out another very important "erroneous and misleading" statement in the article referred to in *THE WEEK*, and which is "of a piece" with the others. "The Writer of the Article" writes:—

I find that it has been stated, on good authority, that a steamship recently arrived in the port of Quebec with sickness on board, and that, too, of such a serious nature that the Port Physician ordered the vessel back to quarantine, but the owners telegraphed to Ottawa and secured authority to proceed to Montreal. This is a sample of what occurs in every case where the interests of the public come in conflict with the higher interests of the monopolists.

This was in *THE WEEK* of the 31st of July. Now, it is true that something of this kind was reported in the *Quebec Morning Chronicle*, on the morning of the 23rd of July, in connection with the City Council proceedings. On the same day, however, Dr. Rowand, the Inspecting Physician at Quebec, wrote to that paper the following letter:—

To the Editor of the *Morning Chronicle*:

DEAR SIR,—A statement appeared in your paper of this morning that, in my capacity of Inspecting Physician, I have had occasion to send a steamer to Grosse Isle for quarantine, but that Government had promptly ordered it back again. This is a pure fabrication, and I have no knowledge of any such case. I have much pleasure in being able to say that, since I have held the office of Inspecting Physician at this port, I have never known immigration so healthy and free from infectious or contagious diseases as in the present season.—I am, dear Sir, yours truly, A. ROWAND, M.D., Inspecting Physician. *Quebec, 23rd of July, 1884.*

On the 24th of July the *Chronicle* inserted the above letter in prominent type, and referred to its editorial columns to the importance of Dr. Rowand's contradiction.

To one more important point before concluding. "The Writer of the Article" adds, "the quarantine regulations recently issued are a sufficient refutation of the *Sanitary Journal*, but I can promise the editor to make the answer far more complete." This seems somewhat mixed. It is not clear, and it is not easy for one to understand what he means. As intimated above, the "refutation" might more properly read confirmation. As to the "promise," if he has any more of which he is anxious to unburden himself, by all means let us have it. We, an anxious public, patiently await it. Let us have the whole truth. As dark clouds in the distance are often more threatening than when over our heads, so such insinuations cause often vastly more uneasiness than the plain known truth. Finally (almost), he writes, "zealous friends (that doubtless 'means me') are occasionally far more dangerous than enemies"—enemies doubtless refers to himself, and when taken with his article in *THE WEEK*, rings as if he were "anxious to break a lance" antagonistic to the Minister of Agriculture. *Vincit omnia veritas*. Yours truly,

EDITOR THE SANITARY JOURNAL.

Ottawa, August 25, 1884.

[The above communication was received too late for insertion last week.—ED.]

MR. MOWAT'S CONQUEST.

To the Editor of *The Week*:

SIR,—I have just passed through the territory annexed to Ontario, after so much turmoil and expenditure, by the Boundary Award, and the acquisition of which is to form the occasion of the destined ovation to Mr. Mowat. I think it may safely be said that through the whole length of it, from Rat Portage to Port Arthur, so far as can be seen from the railway, there is neither a single acre of cultivable land nor a single stick of good timber. All is rock and scrub, lake or swamp. We are told that there are minerals beneath the surface, but this is sometimes a polite way of saying that there is nothing above it. Stone for a monument to our Conquering Hero there may be. Otherwise we seem to have acquired nothing but an irreclaimable and melancholy wilderness.

VIATOR.

KNIGHTHOOD IN CANADA.

To the Editor of *The Week*:

SIR,—For the benefit of "Canadian," whose "sense of honour" is so dull that he fails to perceive anything ludicrous in the conferring of Knighthood upon Canadians, I would call his attention to the fact that there is no analogy whatever between the conferring of Knighthood upon men who have never distinguished themselves in "chivalry," or in anything else worthy of such a title, and the conferring of M.A., D.C.L., LL.B., etc., upon learned and scholarly men as a reward for their excellence. The title of Knighthood represents neither honour nor power in our day, but simply "vanity decorated." Englishmen of mark will not accept it; it has become so degraded, so common, that it is much easier to obtain it than it is to obtain the degree of M.A.

at a University. Almost any vain colonial politician whose ambition leads him to seek, may find a Knighthood, but whether worthily won or properly conferred is sometimes questionable. "Canadian" evidently does not know anything of the origin of Knighthood, or he would not value it so lightly as to think it properly conferred when some old and crafty politician with no little difficulty bends the knee in the presence of royalty, who with sword on suppliant neck exclaims: "In the name of God and St. George I dub thee Knight." The brand-new "Knight" with still greater difficulty then arises to his feet, in his own estimation a greater man, but in the estimation of those who know him well a smaller one. Is there not something ludicrous in all this? Is it not vanity to which no man having respect for his country would sell himself? INDEPENDENT.

A CORRECTION.

To the Editor of *The Week*:

DEAR SIR,—I regret that, in enumerating those who have laid our native letters under obligation, I omitted the name of Mr. Henry J. Morgan. His biographical contributions are incomparably the most valuable we have; and his "*Annual Register*" is at once meritorious and indispensable. I am sorry, too, in mentioning Dr. Withrow, that I failed to name some of the work done by him besides the history. His "*Catacombs of Rome*" is a delightful volume, and so pleased Mr. Gladstone that he at once sent a complimentary copy of one of his own books to the author. Dr. Withrow has also produced several other works, which have been well received in England. His history, though inevitably exhibiting ability, I could not admire, because it was of a piece with all the other books in its line. Permit me likewise to disclaim the words, "our friend," which appeared through an error of the types, in my late allusion to Colonel Denison. I do not wish to be on record as an exponent of a vulgar and impertinent familiarity in referring to public persons, leaving that mode to the gentleman who writes literary criticisms for the *Globe*. Yours truly,

J. E. COLLINS.

HISTORICALLY INCORRECT.

To the Editor of *The Week*:

SIR,—J. Davenport Kerrison says many wise and opportune things in his articles on Church Music. He seems to know a good deal about his subject, and puts in a plea for good, genuine church music, for which, in all Protestant places of worship, and even in some Anglican churches, "tunes of the Moody and Sankey type," which "have not the first element of sacredness in them," are now almost exclusively used. But he touches on a point of history, and there he shows that he is out of his element, and has got beyond his depth. He opens his paper on "Modern Church Music" thus: "The era of the Reformation gave rise to a variety of sects. The first great divisions were the Episcopal Church of England," etc. Does he mean to inform us, in this enlightened age, that the "Episcopal Church of England" (and when was the Church of England not Episcopal?) is a creature of the Reformation? Does he expect intelligent readers of *THE WEEK* to believe that the Service Books of the Church of Rome were used in England before the Reformation? It will not take much research into the history of England's Church to discover that, in the sixteenth century, she was reformed, not created; that she translated her Prayer Book from her own pre-reformation service books; and that she had a perfect right to do so by the first clause of Magna Charta.

SUBSCRIBER.

EMIGRATION OF YOUNG MEN TO THE UNITED STATES.

To the Editor of *The Week*:

SIR,—Of the many evils which follow in the train of party politics there is one that appears so far to have escaped the notice of those who oppose party methods, and that is the neglect of questions which, although not party issues, are in the true sense of the term political, and, therefore, of great importance to the country. Such, I fear, has been the fate of the one which the heading of this letter suggests. As a young man who recently emigrated from Canada to this country, I beg to add my opinion to the somewhat speculative letters on this subject that appeared in your columns about two months ago.

The cause of the movement as presented by your correspondent "J. H. S."—viz., because we can do better in the United States—is as truthfully put as it can be. I can affirm from personal experience, as well as from what I know of other cases, that a young man can save two dollars here for one that he could save in Canada. It must be admitted, of course, that Canada has not so wide a field of professions and trades; but in order that this field may be extended, the business men of Canada must do something more towards retaining the young men. American employers not only show their business tact but their patriotism in making it their aim to secure and retain efficient service. The employé from the outset approaches nearer the character of a partner in the business than does his Canadian brother, and his age is never an argument against his being placed in a position of trust if competent to fill it. The result of such a policy is that, while both employer and employed are benefited, emigration is encouraged and every business becomes a source of strength to the nation. The Canadian employer's aim is first to obtain cheap service, even if it be at the sacrifice of efficiency. So soon as a young Canadian becomes fairly proficient in a trade or in the mercantile line, he is impelled to emigrate to the United States, where his ability is appreciated. The Canadian positions as soon as vacated are filled by novices, a system which must certainly keep business at zero and cause the country to suffer accordingly.

It will thus be seen that Canada's business men, if for no other purpose than to serve their own interests, must in a greater degree emulate the progressive spirit of their brethren across the line. If they cannot afford to do this, then the sooner we are under one government the better.

Your correspondent, "A. H. Gross," thinks that Canada should feel proud that her young men are able to fill better positions in a neighbouring country. This is surely a very unsatisfactory kind of patriotism. On the contrary, such a statement is rather calculated to give an impetus to an exodus which must be a thorn in the side of every truly loyal Canadian. It must be clear to everyone capable of judging that this is a question beside which the Boundary Award, Streams' Bill, etc., are of little importance, although Canadian politicians look upon it with indifference. If the Dominion Government, by instituting the present tariff, have assisted trade in