

## AMERICAN FEELING TOWARDS CANADA.

As every observant Canadian knows, there is a deal of bitterness felt towards Canada by a very large section of the American people. It has puzzled many persons to account for this, and various reasons for it are offered. The well-known economist, Mr. James Bryce, speaking before the British Association, on the "Jingoes" of the States and Britain, and the harm they do, declares that "beyond all these noisy, querulous, and quarrelsome voices there stands in Great Britain—there stands, I am no less sure, in the United States also—the great, solid, sensible mass of the nation, which desires to attend to its business, and desires not to have it disturbed or shaken by rumors of wars; the great mass which deires to fear God and honor the sovereign, whether the sovereign be called a Queen or President. And I trust that in all three countries this great, solid and weighty mass of responsible national opinion will prevent these noisy voices from ever provoking real danger between these kindred people."

But the *Manitoba Free Press*, which has been considering the subject, thinks Mr. Bryce mistaken in speaking of the great mass of the American people as desiring peace and tranquility, and adds: "If it were possible to count noses, we believe it would be found that the majority, and a considerable majority, would have to be ranked as jingoes. Not that they may not desire peace and tranquility, for the jingo is not always and necessarily a war-like person; but by their speech and conduct they would have to be ranked among the noisy, querulous, and quarrelsome fellows, the makers of mischief, who thing it necessary to their own patriotism to speak abusively of other countries, and especially of Great Britain. But there is a mass behind, not so large as Mr. Bryce would lead us to believe, but substantial nevertheless, solid and sensible, who have no sympathy with the brawlers. If they do not count as many at the ballot box, they count for more in the last resort in directing and controlling public policy. They are not less American than the jingoes, but their Americanism is of an infinitely better sort. With them, as with all true patriots, there are worse things than war, but a resort to war would only appeal to them as the last extremity of a very bad case. They do not think such an extremity can ever arise with Great Britain, and they do not fear that the jingoes can ever imperil the two nations; but should there be danger of it, there would be such a roar of indignation from Maine to Mexico as would startle the most reckless politicians of the United States into good behavior. That so many newspapers are jingo is owing to the fact that they find more readers among that class, and they think it good business to cater to them."

Now to see what a Detroit manufacturer, who has lived for thirty years on the borders of Canada, and knows something of the Canadian people, their character, and their trade, thinks: H. N. Pingree, Governor of Michigan, has this to confess:

"The English people are a little sore on us now, but they are good people—people of the same race and blood. Why, they had all sorts of meetings advocating arbitration a few months back. They know what war costs, and we have had enough experience in this country to know the price of it, too. But every time a little fellow wants something to talk about he starts a war cry. I guess not many of the people in this country are hunting for war. The English are getting excited, it seems. They don't know as much about our Congressmen as we do. We don't want war with Canada. We want reciprocity. I learn that we get several times as much money from Canada each year as Canada gets from us. Detroit ought to be a big jobbing centre. But we are hemmed in. On one side we have Canada, with its market shut out from us by a tariff. On the other side we have

to come into cut-throat competition with Chicago. Detroit would be a much better business town if we could trade openly with Canada. It would help all towns along the border to have reciprocity."

## OUR QUARANTINE SYSTEM.

At the meeting of the British Medical Association in Montreal last week, Dr. Montizambert, of the Canadian Quarantine Station in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, made an address on the subject of infectious diseases, and precautions against them. We condense his paper, as under:

The general consideration of infectious disease in connection with the subject of this discussion divides itself naturally under two heads: The prevention of disease from without getting into the country, and the dealing with it once it has entered in. A system of arresting disease at the coast and frontier entrances, and a system of preparedness in the interior communities. Neither of these is sufficient without the other. Coast quarantines and inland health organizations form the double line of sanitary defence; or to borrow an illustration from the game of cricket, the coast quarantine may be compared to the wicket-keeper, and the inland health board to the long-stop. The interior communities throughout the length and breadth of the land have an interest, and a very close and vital interest, indeed, in the fittings and working of the quarantine service at the various ports of entry. But confidence in a quarantine system, however perfected, must never be allowed to lull us into a false sense of security to the neglect of striving ever more and more towards the sanitary improvement of the cities, villages and districts in which we dwell.

From the long period of incubation of some of the infectious diseases, and the relative shortness of the voyage from many ports outside the country, occasional cases of infectious diseases in the stage of incubation, and the micro-organisms of disease lurking in unsuspected clothing or merchandise, may pass from time to time, in an invisible and unrecognizable stage and condition, the most efficient quarantine that is practicably possible. This cannot be entirely avoided without such routine detention of vessels and passengers at the ports of arrival, such routine disinfection of all clothing and merchandise from abroad, and such consequent interference with travel and traffic as would be altogether unjustifiable and impracticable. Quarantines must not be expected to do the impossible; nor must they be leant upon as an excuse for lessened effort inland. The quarantine regulations of Canada are framed upon the same modern general principles as are those of the United Kingdom, as far as they can be made to meet the peculiar conditions of this country. The principles upon which our regulations are founded are immediate inspection, and, when required, prompt disinfection and isolation, with notification inland to precede the passengers.

In them there is no survival of that old routine time detention of healthy vessels from which the modern service has inherited nothing but its most unfortunate and misleading name.

## DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CANADIAN AND BRITISH PRACTICE.

In the application of these principles our differences from the practice in the United Kingdom, as laid down in the reports of the British delegates to the International Sanitary Conferences of Dresden, 1893, and Venice, 1897, and in the regulations of the Local Government Board of 9th November, 1896, are mainly in three respects, and these are due to the different conditions of this new and extensive country.

In the first place healthy persons arriving at our ports in infected vessels may be held under "observation" at our quarantines during the accepted period of the incubation of the disease in question from the ascertained date of last possible exposure.

The doctor then describes the British methods of dealing with persons, mail matter, etc., coming into the United Kingdom, and shows why, by reason of the differences in the size and character of the countries, the English ways cannot be applied in Canada. He resumes:

For such reasons as these Canada cannot depend to the same extent as Great Britain upon inland "surveillance." And "observation" of suspects at quarantine must form part of our system of protection. Accordingly in becoming a party to the Dresden Sanitary convention this country accepted its conclusions fully, and without the reservation made by Great Britain in her own case, that healthy persons landing from infected ships should not be detained.

## DISINFECTION OF MAIL MATTER.

In the second place, under the regulations in the United Kingdom, no mail matter, except that by parcel post, is liable to detention or disinfection; in Canada disinfection of the mails is not forbidden, and is sometimes considered necessary. Notably is this the case, for instance, for the local mail arriving at Victoria from China. But little is known of the sanitary conditions in the interior of China, and that little is anything but reassuring; cholera, the bubonic plague and smallpox being usually present there. The disinfection of the mails from that country is, therefore, considered advisable, especially in epidemic seasons, before their distribution throughout the "Chinatowns" of Victoria, Vancouver and other cities.

In the third place the regulations of the Local Government Board for ports in the United Kingdom limit the term "infected" to infected with cholera, yellow fever or plague.

Under the Canadian regulations actual cases of any of the infectious diseases are removable at quarantine so as to prevent the importation of new cases even of the minor diseases, to become fresh centres for the spread of infection throughout our country. And the arrival of all classes of infectious disease is notified inland from our coast quarantines.

Under this head perhaps the most noteworthy difference between the two countries is with regard to smallpox. In the Canadian regulations smallpox is included amongst the graver forms of infectious disease, and there are indeed special regulations concerning it. According to the English regulations, and the English usage, as reported to me, a vessel arriving at a port of the United Kingdom with smallpox on board, is not considered an infected vessel at all. \* \* \* \* \*

These are the chief, if not indeed the only, points in which the Canadian quarantine regulations and usage differ from those of the United Kingdom. And they are necessitated, as I trust I have established, by the different conditions of this country.

For the rest, our regulations are based on inspection, prompt disinfection, isolation, and notification inland. They are designed to secure the maximum protection of the public health with the minimum interference with travel and traffic.

With regard to our minor ports and our land frontiers we have regulations which can be fully amplified should an emergency so require. But with respect to the importation of disease from Europe, Asia, Central and South America, etc., via the United States and across the frontier, we put our main dependence upon their protection of themselves by the well-worked quarantines of our southern neighbor, such as those of Boston, New York, Portland and New Orleans, and their admirable national quarantine service under the able administration of Surgeon-General Wyman, who is to join with me in the opening of this discussion.

In conclusion, I beg leave to submit and to maintain that the Canadian quarantine system, as at present conducted, is certainly of most unquestionable utility to this country. (Applause.)