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Correspondence relating to the Conference held at Venice in January 1892 respecting the Sanitary Regulations of Egypt.

No. 1.


LE Gouvernement de Sa Majesté la Reine du Royaume-Uni de la Grande-Bretagne et d’Irlande, Impératrice des Indes, et le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté l’Empereur d’Autriche, Roi de Bohème, et Roi Apostolique de Hongrie, désirant s’entendre sur certaines questions concernant les Règlements du Conseil Sanitaire Maritime et Quarantenaire d’Égypte ;

Les Soussignés, dûment autorisés à cet effet, sont convenus de ce qui suit :

Considérant que les réformes projetées dans l’administration du Conseil Quarantenaire et Maritime d’Alexandrie exigéront une augmentation des ressources financières malgré les réductions des dépenses projetées d’environ £ E. 2,000 par an, il est reconnu nécessaire d’adopter une taxe de £ E. 5 pour chaque bâtiment passant le Canal en quarantaine et de £ E. 1 pour chaque paquebot.

Dans le cas d’insuffisance de ces nouvelles ressources financières du Conseil indiquées ci-dessus, on se propose d’augmenter proportionnellement ces taxes. Il est entendu que les bateaux postaux payeront les mêmes droits que les autres.

Les bâtiments Anglais à destination d’un port du Royaume-Uni infectés ou non seront libres de passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine, sous les trois conditions suivantes, et sans aucune détention quarantenaire :

1. L’arraisonnement et l’interrogatoire se feront à Suez de même qu’ils se pratiquent actuellement même vis-à-vis des bâtiments de guerre de Sa Majesté la Reine sous foi de serment délivré par le Commandant.

Cette mesure aurait le but de constater l’état sanitaire du bâtiment.

2. Tout bâtiment infecté ou suspect sera accompagné durant son passage par le Canal par deux Gardiens Sanitaires dignes de confiance, dont la mission principale consisterait à empêcher tout contact entre le bâtiment et les personnes ou objets se trouvant sur les bords du Canal. Un bâtiment infecté ou suspect admis en passage dans les conditions qui précèdent ne pourra ni embarquer ni débarquer des personnes ou des marchandises pendant le trajet. Cette disposition n’implique aucun changement dans la pratique adoptée en cette matière dans les ports de Suez et de Port-Saïd tant qu’elle continuera à fournir les garanties nécessaires de sûreté. Il est cependant reconnu désirable que ces usages soient codifiés lors de la révision des Règlements sanitaires nécessitée par la réorganisation projetée du Conseil même.

3. Pour exercer le contrôle voulu afin que tout bâtiment infecté ou suspect prenne effectivement le cours indiqué, c’est-à-dire, au port national et ne puisse avant d’arriver au port de destination Anglais toucher en route des ports appartenant à d’autres Puissances, la sortie et le port de destination de ce bâtiment seront signalés de Suez par voie télégraphique à un des ports de chaque pays de la Méditerranée.

Le télégramme sera expédié par le Conseil Sanitaire Maritime d’Alexandrie à l’autorité désignée par chaque Puissance ; l’expédition du télégramme sera aux frais
du bâtiment, et se fera de la manière la moins coûteuse. Dans le cas des bateaux postaux dont le cours est bien connu, cette précaution ne sera pas exigée, à moins que l'état d'infection actuelle n'ait été constaté.

Il en sera de même pour les bâtiments Anglais à destination étrangère, pourvu que la Puissance étrangère admette en principe, ou par décision spéciale dans chaque cas, les navires transitant le Canal en quarantaine.

Chaque Puissance édictera, dans sa discrétion, des dispositions pénales contre les bâtiments qui, abandonnant le cours indiqué par le capitaine, aborderaient indûment un des ports du territoire de cette Puissance. Seront exceptés les cas de force majeure et de relâche forcée.

Un port sera réputé infecté pendant que le choléra y existe et pendant les dix jours après la manifestation du dernier cas de choléra.

Un port dans le voisinage duquel le choléra existe sera réputé port suspect.

Les provenances des ports Britanniques ne seront réputées ni infectées ni suspectes après un trajet indéterminé de dix jours et au delà. Il est toutefois entendu que si un bâtiment arrive à Suez avant que les dix jours d'un trajet indéterminé ne soient écoulés, il sera tenu d'opérer le passage en quarantaine, mais il lui sera donné libre pratique au premier port auquel il touche après l'expiration de ce délai dans le Canal, soit à Ismaïlia, soit à Port-Saïd.

Les bâtiments autres que ceux sous pavillon Britannique seront libres ou d'opérer le passage en quarantaine dans les conditions indiquées ci-dessus, ou de se soumettre à la quarantaine réglementaire,

Fait à Londres, le 20 Juillet, 1891.

(L.S.) SALISBURY.
(L.S.) DEYM.

(Translation.)

Protocol recording an Arrangement between Great Britain and Austria-Hungary respecting the Regulations of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt.—Signed in London, July 29, 1891.

THE Government of Her Majesty the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, Empress of India, and the Government of His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, and Apostolic King of Hungary, desiring to come to an agreement on certain questions respecting the Regulations of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt;

The Undersigned, being duly authorized thereto, have agreed to the following:—

Considering that the proposed reform of the administration of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Alexandria will necessitate an augmentation of revenue, notwithstanding the proposed reductions in expenditure, of about £ E. 2,000 a-year, it is acknowledged that it will be necessary to adopt a due of £ E. 5 for every ship passing the Canal in quarantine, and a due of £ E. 1 for every mail-boat.

Should these new sources of the Board's revenue be insufficient, it is proposed to increase these dues proportionately. It is understood that postal boats will pay the same dues as others.

English ships, infected or not, bound for a port of the United Kingdom, will be free to pass the Suez Canal in quarantine under the three following conditions:—

1. The examination ("arraisonnement") and the interrogatory shall be carried out at Suez, as now done in the case of ships of war of Her Majesty the Queen, under the oath of the Commander.

This measure would be for ascertaining the sanitary state of the ship.

2. Every infected or suspected ship shall be accompanied during its passage through the Canal by two Sanitary Guards, in whom reliance can be placed, and whose principal duty would be to prevent all contact between the ship and persons or things on the banks of the Canal. An infected or suspected ship allowed to pass under the above conditions may neither ship nor land persons or goods during the passage. This provision implies no change in the practice now adopted in the matter in the ports of Suez and Port Said as long as that practice continues to furnish the necessary guarantees for security. It is, however, recognized as desirable that the practice in force should be codified on the revision of the Sanitary Regulations rendered necessary by the proposed reorganization of the Board itself.

3. In order to exercise the necessary control so that every infected or suspected
ship shall indeed keep to its course, that is, to one of the ports of the nation to which it belongs, and shall not, before reaching its English port of destination, touch, on the voyage, at ports belonging to any other Powers, the fact that the ship has left, and its port of destination, shall be reported by telegraph from Suez to one of the ports of each of the Mediterranean countries.

The telegram shall be dispatched by the Maritime Sanitary Board of Alexandria to the officer appointed for the purpose by each Power; the telegram will be sent at the expense of the ship, and will be sent in the least costly manner. In the case of postal steamers, the course of which is well known, this precaution will not be exacted, unless it be shown that the ship be then infected.

The same course will be followed in the case of English ships bound to a foreign port of destination, provided the foreign Power receives generally, or by a special decision in each case, ships having passed the Canal in quarantine.

Each Power will, at its discretion, provide penalty against ships which may abandon the course declared by the captain, and improperly put into ports in the territory of that Power. Cases of vis major and of forced putting into any port are excepted.

A port will be held to be infected as long as cholera exists there, and for ten days after the appearance of the last case of cholera.

A port in the neighbourhood of which cholera exists will be held to be a suspected port.

Ships arriving from British ports shall not be held to be either infected or suspected after a healthy voyage ("voyage indemne") of ten days or more. It is, however, understood that if a ship arrives at Suez before the ten days have expired, it shall pass in quarantine, but will receive free pratique in the first port at which it touches after the expiration of that period in the Canal, either Ismailia or Port Said.

Ships other than those under the British flag will be free to pass through in quarantine under the above-mentioned conditions, or to submit to the quarantine as laid down in the Regulations.

Done in London, the 29th July, 1891.

(L.S.) SALISBURY.
(L.S.) DEYM.

No. 2.

Count Wydenbrück to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received November 28.)

(Translation.)

My Lord,

Belgrave Square, London, November 27, 1891.

I HAVE just received the instructions of my Government to address, in their name, to Her Majesty's Government, the official invitation to be represented by their Delegates at the International Sanitary Conference which is to meet on the 5th January, 1892, at Venice.

I now have the honour to acquaint myself of the charge thus laid on me, and beg to inclose two copies of the programme prepared for the Conference by the Imperial and Royal Government.

As your Excellency will have learnt from my earlier communications, the Imperial and Royal Government has addressed invitations to attend the Conference to the seven Great Powers, and also to Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Sweden and Norway, Portugal, Greece, and Egypt; and my Government will communicate to your Excellency the answers to the invitations which may be received from those Powers.

Karl, Count Kuefstein, Imperial and Royal Minister Plenipotentiary and Privy Councillor, has been appointed First Representative of Austria-Hungary. He will be furnished with the full power necessary for signing any Agreements that may be concluded.

Karl Gsiller, Knight, Imperial and Royal Consul-General at Galatz, will act as Second Austro-Hungarian Delegate. On maritime and sanitary questions these gentlemen will be assisted, as adviser, by Dr. Hagel, Imperial and Royal Sanitary Delegate at the Constantinople Council.

The Imperial and Royal Government has made the necessary arrangements
with the Government of His Italian Majesty for the latter to take all requisite measures for the formalities attending the opening of the Conference at Venice.

I beg to repeat, in the name of, and under instructions from my Government, that, according to their promise, they will endeavour to exclude from discussion at the Conference everything that might seem unacceptable to English interests.

On the other hand, the Imperial and Royal Government hope that a thorough discussion and settlement of the questions before the Conference will be obtained by reason of the assurances made to that Government by Her Majesty’s Government, and of the friendly feeling shown by the latter, such as was manifested recently by your Excellency on the subject of extending the invitation to the smaller among the Interested States.

I have, &c.

(Signed) WYDENBRÜCK.

Inclosure 1 in No. 2.

Programme des Travaux d’une Conférence Sanitaire Internationale convoquée à Venise, le 5 Janvier, 1892.


2. Modifications à introduire dans la constitution du Conseil Sanitaire Maritime et Quarantenaire d’Égypte, notamment—

(a.) En ce qui concerne la question de n’admettre dorénavant comme membres du Conseil que des médecins diplômés et régulièrement salariés, ou d’Agents Consulaires de carrière d’un rang non inférieur à celui de Vice-Consul.

(b.) Révision des Règlements Sanitaires actuellement en vigueur en Égypte, tels que le Règlement Général de Police Sanitaire, celui contre le choléra, ceux concernant les pèlerins, la désinfection, &c.

(c.) Institution d’un corps de Gardes Sanitaires, offrant les garanties nécessaires pour le service de transit en quarantaine.

(d.) Création de ressources financières suffisantes pour couvrir les frais occasionnés par les modifications du Service Sanitaire ci-dessus indiquées; entretien des établissements quarantennaires, fourniture des appareils de désinfection, &c.

(Translation.)

Programme for the International Sanitary Conference to meet at Venice, January 5, 1892.

1. DISCUSSION of, and resolutions on, the Arrangement signed in London on the 29th July, 1891, between Austria-Hungary and Great Britain, respecting the passage in quarantine of the Suez Canal.

2. Alterations to be made in the constitution of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt, namely—

(a.) As regards the question of admitting henceforth as members of the Board none but doctors with diplomas and in the receipt of regular salaries, or Consular Agents in the Consular Service ("de carrière") of a rank not below that of Vice-Consul.

(b.) Revision of the Sanitary Regulations now in force in Egypt, such as the General Regulations of Sanitary Police, those against cholera, those respecting pilgrims, disinfection, &c.

(c.) Establishment of a corps of Sanitary Guards, affording the necessary guarantees for the service of passing ships in quarantine through the Canal.

(d.) Provision of financial resources sufficient to cover the expenses produced by the above alterations in the Sanitary Service, maintenance of the quarantine establishments, supply of disinfecting apparatus, &c.
No. 3.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Count Wydenbrück.

M. le Chargé d’Affaires,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your note of the 27th instant, conveying to Her Majesty's Government an invitation to be represented at the International Sanitary Conference which is to meet at Venice on the 5th January next. In reply, I would beg you to inform the Imperial and Royal Government that Her Majesty's Government have pleasure in accepting this invitation, and that they share the hopes expressed in your note in anticipating the best results from the discussions of the Conference.

I would also ask you to inform the Austro-Hungarian Government that Her Majesty's Delegates to the Conference will be Mr. J. W. Lowther, M.P., Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs; and Dr. Mackie, British Consular and Medical member of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt.

The date fixed for the meeting of the Conference is quite convenient to Her Majesty's Government, but as Parliament will meet on the 9th February, and as Mr. Lowther's presence will then be required in London, it is most desirable that the date fixed should be adhered to, and that all the Delegates should be prepared to enter without any delay on the consideration of the matters referred to the Conference.

I would add that Her Majesty's Government attach importance to the maintenance of the order in which the subjects are set down for discussion; they concur in the proposal of His Majesty's Government that the principles recorded in the Agreement of the 29th July last shall be first considered, and decisions taken upon them before passing on to the remainder of the programme.

I have, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 4.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. Lowther, M.P., and Dr. Mackie.

Gentlemen,

I HAVE the pleasure of informing you that the Queen has been graciously pleased to approve of your nomination to be the British Delegates at the Conference which is to meet at Venice on the 5th of next month to consider proposed changes in the Regulations of the Egyptian Sanitary, Maritime, and Quarantine Board.

This Board, which sits at Alexandria, and regulates sanitary matters connected with navigation, including the passage of vessels through the Suez Canal, was established by a Decree of the Khedive, dated the 3rd January, 1881. It consists of twenty-three members, namely, nine Egyptian members named in the above-mentioned Decree, and fourteen foreign Delegates, representing respectively the following countries: Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden and Norway, and Turkey.

The Khedive's Decree appoints the following persons members of the Board:—

A President nominated by the Government;
The Inspector-General of the Maritime and Quarantine Sanitary Service, who is to be a European medical man;
The Sanitary Inspector of Alexandria;
The Principal Physician of the General Hospital at Alexandria;
Another medical officer of that hospital selected by the Government;
The Veterinary Inspector of Lower Egypt;
The Director-General of Customs;
The Controller-General of Ports and Lighthouses;
The Controller of the Port of Alexandria.

Of the fourteen foreign Delegates, the Representatives of Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Russia, and Sweden and Norway are Consular officers; the French Delegate is assisted by a medical colleague, who, however, has no vote when the Consular Delegate is present. The other eight Powers are represented by mediators.

The original object of the presence of foreign Delegates on the Egyptian Board of Health was no doubt to protect, under the privileges conceded by the Capitulation the subjects and ships of the countries they represented from arbitrary proceeding on the part of the local authorities. In the first instance, these Delegates had only consultative voice. A Decree of the Pasha of Egypt, issued in November 1854, authorized the Consuls-General of Austria, France, Great Britain, Greece, Prussia, Russia, and Sardinia to send to the Sanitary Board a Delegate to act on the behalf in a consultative capacity. By a subsequent Decree, dated the 14th August 1855, a vote in the deliberations of the Board was conferred on these Delegates in discussions on quarantine questions.

At different dates after 1855 the Viceroy or the Khedive authorized the admission to the Board of Delegates on the part of Spain, the Netherlands, Belgium and Sweden and Norway.

It is thus apparent that the Alexandria Board is an Egyptian institution, the creation of the Government of Egypt, and that foreign Delegates have been added to it at different times by the act of the Ruler of Egypt. The Board has not bee established by an international agreement, and has no international character or status.

In dealing with sanitary questions bearing on the passage of vessels through the Suez Canal, difficulties have arisen on several occasions. Some of the foreign Delegates at the Sanitary Board at Alexandria have accentuated the views held in their respective countries in support of a policy of strict quarantine, and difference of opinion have arisen as to the course to be adopted with regard to the transit of particular vessels through the Canal.

You are fully aware of the details of these discussions, and it is unnecessary for me to advert to them at length. It is sufficient to state that the Government of Austria-Hungary opened negotiations with Her Majesty's Government, and an Agreement, intended to form the basis of new Regulations, was signed by the Austrian-Hungarian Ambassador at this Court and myself on the 29th July last. A copy of this document is herewith annexed, together with a copy of the programme proposed by that Government for the discussions at the approaching Conference at Venice, to which programme Her Majesty's Government have, in principle, expressed their assent.

Under the above-mentioned arrangements the following subjects will be the main questions to be discussed at the Conference, namely:

1. The Transit of the Canal.
2. Charges on Shipping.

1. Transit of the Canal.

This heading in regard to British interests comprises two sub-divisions (1) the passage of ships bound to the United Kingdom; and (2) security that British vessels proceeding to foreign ports shall receive there treatment equally favourable to that which is accorded to the national ships of the country to which such port of destination belongs.

The first of these sub-divisions appears to be settled satisfactorily by the Agreement of the 29th July last; the second should be watched, in order to prevent any local Regulations being applied under which British shipping might, at some foreign ports, be subjected in effect to differential treatment.

2. Charges on Shipping.

Mail-packets, which in regard to all matters connected with their transit enjoy priority, are not charged with any sanitary fee, and vessels passing the Canal
in quarantine do not pay fees sufficient in amount to defray the expenses incident to the facilities afforded to them. The receipts of the Sanitary Board appear to be inadequate to defray its expenditure. In these circumstances, Her Majesty's Government have come to the conclusion that each mail-packet may properly be charged a fee of 1l., and that each vessel passing the Canal in quarantine may properly be charged a fee of 5l., as payment for services rendered in connection with their transit.

Her Majesty's Government have further agreed that in certain cases notice of the departure of particular vessels from Port Said, and of their declared destination, shall be telegraphed at the cost of each vessel thus passing through the Canal to some one port of countries bordering on the Mediterranean. This measure is adopted to afford satisfaction to the strongly expressed desire on the part of the Government of some of these countries to avoid dangers arising from the arrival of vessels in conditions held by them, and by general opinion in their country, to be prejudicial to public health, and to prevent the recurrence of instances where a vessel has proceeded to a port other than her avowed destination on leaving the Canal. Her Majesty's Government feel assured that British ship-owners will not, in view of the facilities secured to them, raise any objection to those payments. It is possible that a form of abbreviated telegrams might be adopted which will lessen the cost of these Mediterranean notices.

The additional funds thus obtained would appear to be, from the information now possessed by Her Majesty's Government, sufficient to defray the expenses which may properly be charged to shipping in connection with the transit through the Canal. Measures intended primarily for the protection of health in Egypt, or for the accommodation of Mahommedan pilgrims, do not concern general navigation interests. Any measures of this nature which are well considered and practical may very properly be supported by you, but expenditure in regard to them should be provided from sources other than charges on general navigation.


Her Majesty's Government hold that the Board exists for the protection of the public health of Egypt, and that its composition must be such as to carry out this object to the greatest extent realizable. They will accordingly treat any questions of reorganization which may be raised from this point of view, and are quite unpledged as to the details of any fresh arrangements under this head to which they may agree. If, however, the Powers represented at the Conference desire that it should be laid down that the foreign Delegates at the Board shall be either Consuls provided with Commissions from their Government, or medical men professing defined qualifications, you are aware that these conditions have been fulfilled in the case of the British members of the Board, and you may agree to a general provision in this sense. As regards the Egyptian members, you will bear in mind the views above expressed respecting the object for which, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, the Board is constituted.

If the Conference thinks fit to adopt a decision altering the conditions under which ports are to be considered as being infected or suspected with regard to cholera, you may agree to any such change within the terms of the Agreement of the 29th July last, and you will endeavour to render it as little onerous as possible to shipping interests.

The foregoing general instructions seem to be sufficient, in the first instance at least, for your guidance at the forthcoming Conference at Venice; and if further directions are necessary on any matters in discussion you will report to me on them, and state the points with respect to which more detailed or fresh instructions are needed.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 5.

The British Delegates to the Venice Sanitary Conference to the Marquis of Salisbury.—

(Received January 11.)

My Lord,

Venice, January 6, 1892.

WE have the honour to report that the International Sanitary Conference met on the 5th instant in Venice, at the Palazzo Farsetti, now in the occupation of the munici-
authorities of the city. Count d'Arco, the Senior Italian Plenipotentiary, welcomed the foreign Delegates in the name of the King and of the Italian Government. Count Kuefstein, the Austro-Hungarian Plenipotentiary, replied in the name of his colleague and proposed Count d'Arco as President; this proposal was accepted. Count d'Arco then pronounced the Conference open.

Some purely formal business was then transacted, and the Conference adjourned to the 7th instant, nominally because some of the Delegates had not yet arrived; but the intervening day will no doubt be used to effect an informal exchange of ideas among the members of the Conference.

We have, &c.
(Signed) JAMES W. LOWTHER.
J. MACKIE.

No. 6.

The British Delegates to the Venice Sanitary Conference to the Marquis of Salisbury.—
(Received January 11.)

My Lord,

Venice, January 6, 1892.

We have the honour to report that we have had informal conversations with several of our colleagues the foreign Delegates to the Sanitary Conference.

It appears that the French Delegates will raise serious objection to the transit through the Canal in quarantine of ships on which a recent case of cholera has occurred. They will maintain that such ships must be disinfected before entering the Canal; that such ships are not now allowed to pass in quarantine, although ships in which there has been cholera at a comparatively remote date are allowed transit in quarantine as a favour; and that in practice the number of ships which would be deprived of immediate transit would be very small indeed.

This proposal would appear, so far as we are at present able to ascertain, to receive a considerable amount of support from several of the other Delegates; and there is little doubt that it will be strenuously pressed by the French Delegates. It is not improbable, therefore, that at an early date we may have to ask for your Lordship's instructions upon the point. In the event of our finding ourselves in a position to accept the French proposal in this regard, it seems not improbable that the French would be prepared to agree to reduce the "voyage indemne" from a period of ten days to a shorter term.

We have not as yet learnt what the term "disinfection" is intended to imply; but, independently of the French proposal now under consideration, we shall put forward the view that "disinfection" in the case of a ship should, as in the case of a hospital, extend only to that part of the ship actually occupied by the patient, the disinfection of crew, passengers, cargo, and hull being clearly impracticable.

We have pointed out that the great number of British ships passing through the Canal are cargo-vessels which do not carry a doctor, and cannot perform the operation of disinfection during the voyage; in this respect their position differs widely from that of the French and Austrian ships, which are, almost without exception, large passenger-steamers.

So far as the reorganization of the Board is concerned, the French Delegates appear to desire to diminish to a considerable extent the present Egyptian representation upon it, and in this matter they will probably support the views of the Austro-Hungarian Delegates.

We have, &c.
(Signed) JAMES W. LOWTHER.
J. MACKIE.

No. 7.

The British Delegates to the Venice Sanitary Conference to the Marquis of Salisbury.—
(Received January 8.)

My Lord,

Venice, January 8, 1892.

With reference to our despatch of the 6th instant, we have the honour to report that at the meeting of the Sanitary Conference held yesterday it was resolved to form a
Committee of the whole Conference, in order that the questions to be treated might be discussed with greater freedom than in formal Conference.

M. Proust, one of the French Delegates, then put forward, in the name of all the French Delegates, certain observations which constitute in reality a scheme alternative to that recorded in the Anglo-Austrian Agreement. M. Proust's "observations" have now been printed, and we have the honour to forward a copy for your Lordship's information.

We have, &c.

(Signed) JAMES W. LOWTHER.
J. MACKIE.

Inclosure in No. 7.

Observations présentées par M. le Docteur Proust au nom de la Délégation Française sur les Modifications à introduire dans l'Arrangement Austro-Ange au sujet du Passage du Canal de Suez en Quarantaine.

La question qui fait le sujet de cette Conférence est une des plus importantes de l'hygiène internationale. Aussi, bien que la nature de l'arrangement Austro-Ange ne nous convienne pas sur tous les points, nous avons conseillé au Gouvernement Français, qui nous a fait l'honneur de nous consulter, d'accepter l'invitation qui lui était adressée, de discuter cet arrangement.

Je ferai toutefois une remarque relativement à la Conférence actuelle, qui nous paraît différente, au moins pour la forme, des Conférences antérieures. A Paris en 1851 et 1852, à Constantinople en 1856, à Vienne en 1874 (déjà à cette époque je représentais la France à cette Conférence et j'en suis aujourd'hui ici le seul survivant), à Rome en 1885, où je me trouvais avec mes deux collègues Brouardel et Rayschi, dans toutes ces réunions, le programme général était uniquement celui-ci: la protection de l'Europe contre l'importation du choléra. A la Conférence de Vienne, au contraire, on paraît surtout se préoccuper du libre passage des navires, qu'ils soient infectés ou non du choléra, puisque l'article du Protocole est ainsi conçu: "Les bâtiments Anglais à destination d'un port du Royaume-Uni, infectés au non, seront libres de passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine." De sorte qu'il semble bien qu'il ne s'agit que des intérêts du commerce.

Le programme demande donc le passage en quarantaine pour tous les navires venant de l'Inde et de l'Extrême-Orient, qu'ils soient infectés ou non. Or, le passage en quarantaine, formulé ainsi, nous semble présenter de graves inconvénients.

Le Canal de Suez, en effet, est fort étroit dans quelques-unes de ses parties. Les communications sont difficiles à empêcher sur beaucoup de points et dans les endroits de garde. En outre, un certain nombre de chauffeurs sont pris à Port-Saïd et à Ismaïlia pour les navires se rendant dans l'Extrême-Orient, dont ils complètent l'équipage. Au retour ces chauffeurs débarquent de nouveau, soit à Ismaïlia, soit à Port-Saïd. Or, il est bien difficile de les empêcher de débarquer. C'est, du reste, ainsi que le choléra a été transmis en Égypte, en 1863, par des chauffeurs qui débarquaient du "Timour." C'est l'opinion exprimée par la Délégation Allemande, dirigée par M. Koch, d'accord avec M. Mahé, notre Médecin Sanitaire à Constantinople, qui avait été envoyé en Égypte pour étudier l'origine et la marche de cette épidémie cholérique.

Le passage en quarantaine ne peut être, non plus, concédé aux navires d'une seule Puissance; les Compagnies de Navigation des autres États seraient fondées à réclamer contre une faveur qui les placerait, au point de vue de la durée du trajet, dans un état d'inégalité marquée. Il doit donc y avoir, à ce point de vue comme aux autres, entre les pavillons des différents États, égalité absolue.

On sera donc contraint, comme le propose d'ailleurs le Protocole, d'accorder cette faculté à toutes les Puissances de la Méditerranée. Or, comme la distance est très courte entre Port-Saïd et la plupart de ces ports, le danger se trouvera sensiblement accru.

En outre, une fraude est toujours possible, malgré les précautions indiquées par le Protocole. En 1701, un navire Anglais, le "Fuford," est venu débarquer à Pauilac bien que le Captaine, pour obtenir le passage en quarantaine, se fût engagé à aller directement en Angleterre. Or, il suffit d'une fraude pour qu'un navire sur 1,000, par exemple, apporte le choléra en Europe et y provoque une épidémie pendant plusieurs années, causant une mortalité considérable et vénèrante, pour la Méditerranée, l'Europe et l'Amérique, les quarantaines excessives et incroyables, les troubles et les gênes pour le commerce et la navigation dont nous n'avons plus à souffrir en ce moment.

Le passage en quarantaine, s'il peut être accordé en principe, ne doit donc l'être que...
pour des cas spéciaux et pour des navires ne pouvant compromettre la santé de l’Égypte, de la Méditerranée, et de l’Europe.

Je demande à la Conférence de lui exposer comment nous comprenons que le programme Austro-Anglais puisse être modifié.

La défense de l’Égypte et du Canal de Suez est d’autant plus importante que, lorsque le choléra a franchi ces barrières, l’Europe entière est menacée, les diverses nations sont successivement envoûtées, et, après son importation en Europe, le choléra, comme cela a été prouvé plusieurs fois, gagne l’Amérique.


Cette surveillance est d’autant plus nécessaire que nous ne pouvons adopter la doctrine Anglo-Indienne, doctrine qui donne patente nette aux navires partant d’un port de l’Inde, tant que ce port n’est pas le siège d’une grande épidémie et bien que le choléra s’y montre à l’état endémique.

J’ajouterai que, si nous voulons diminuer et même supprimer les quarantaines dans la Méditerranée et en Europe, il est absolument indispensable d’exercer la surveillance la plus attentive sur le Canal de Suez. Trois médecins et un chef de service médical possédant des connaissances épidémiologiques et bactériologiques doivent être installés à Suez. Un médecin de service, à tour de rôle, de jour et de nuit, ferait la visite médicale de tous les navires, quelle que soit la nature de leur patente.

Une inspection serait organisée pour vérifier la façon dont se fait la visite médicale. Une police serait instituée, le long du Canal, de façon à empêcher les communications compromettantes.

Un établissement de désinfection, un hôpital, devraient être créés aux Sources de Moïse, pour les passagers des navires ordinaires, Gebel Tor continuant recevoir les pèlerins, et les pèlerins seuls.

Il s’agit maintenant de préciser le traitement pouvant être accordé à chaque catégorie de navires.

Ces navires se divisent en trois classes :

**Navires Indemnes.**

**Navires Suspects.**

**Navires Infectés.**

**Navires Indemnes.** — Les navires reconnus indemnes, après visite médicale, auront libre pratique immédiate, sans aucun retard, quelle que soit la nature de leur patente. Ils ne seront pas soumis à l’observation de vingt-quatre heures, qui est prescrite actuellement contre les navires avec patente brute.

**Navires Suspects.** C’est-à-dire navires ayant eu des cas de choléra au moment du départ et même pendant la traversée, mais aucun cas nouveau depuis huit jours. Ces navires seront traités d’une façon différente, suivant qu’ils ont ou n’ont pas à bord un médecin et une équipe.

(a.) Les navires ayant un médecin et une équipe remplissant les conditions voulues, seront admis à passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine dans des conditions de précaution à déterminer. Si, en effet, un cas de choléra se déclarait dans le Canal ou plus loin, le cas serait facilement combattu puisque le navire possède l’outilage nécessaire : le médecin et l’équipe.

(b.) Les autres navires suspects n’ayant ni le médecin ni l’équipe, seront retenus aux Sources de Moïse le temps nécessaire pour opérer la désinfection du linge sale, du linge de corps et autres objets susceptibles, et s’assurer de l’état sanitaire du navire.

**Navires Infectés.** C’est-à-dire ayant du choléra à bord, ou ayant présenté des cas nouveaux de choléra depuis huit jours. Ils se divisent eux-mêmes en navires avec médecin et équipe et navires sans médecin ou sans équipe.

(a.) Les navires sans médecin ou sans équipe seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse, les malades débarqués et isolés dans un hôpital ou une infirmerie spéciale. La désinfection sera pratiquée d’une façon rigoureuse.

Les autres passagers, débarqués et isolés par groupes aussi peu nombreux que possible, de façon à ce que l’ensemble ne soit pas solidaire d’un groupe particulier, si le choléra venait à s’y développer. Le linge sale, les objets à usage, les vêtements de l’équipage et des passagers seront désinfectés ainsi que le navire. Il est bien entendu qu’il ne s’agit pas du déchargement complet des marchandises qui ne transmettent pas le choléra, mais seulement de la partie du navire qui a été infectée.

Les passagers resteront cinq jours à l’établissement des Sources de Moïse. Lorsque les cas de choléra remonteront à plusieurs jours, la durée de l’isolement pourra être diminuée. Cette durée variera avec l’époque de l’apparition du dernier cas.
(b) The passage en quarantaine pourra même être accordé avant l’expiration des cinq jours par l’autorité Sanitaire après la désinfection opérée, si le navire possède un médecin et une étuve présentant les conditions indiquées.

En un mot, facilités aussi grandes que possible quand le navire est reconnu sain, mesures sérieuses, mais non vexatoires, contre tout navire infecté ou suspect de l’être.

Or, il s’agit maintenant de préciser combien de navires entrent en chacune de ces classes.

En 1886, il est passé par le Canal de Suez 3,100 navires ; en 1887, 3,137 ; en 1888, 3,440 ; en 1889, 3,425 ; et en 1890, 3,389.

Voyons maintenant combien il est passé de navires infectés et de navires suspects.


L’un avait eu six cas, l’autre cinq cas.

Quant au nombre des navires suspects ayant passé le Canal, il est le suivant :—

En 1885, il a été de 18 ; en 1886, de 6 ; en 1887, de 4 ; en 1888, de 8 ; en 1889, de 9 ; en 1890, d’un seul, précisément le “Fulford,” et en 1891, de 7.

Par conséquent, voilà cinquante navires seulement qui, en sept ans, auraient été arrêtés pendant le temps nécessaire pour la désinfection aux Sources de Moïse, et encore, sur ces cinquante navires, il en est trente qui ont passé le Canal en quarantaine, de sorte que vingt seulement se seraient trouvés dans la situation de navires suspects, retenus à Suez pour y subir la désinfection.

Ainsi donc, en total, vingt navires suspects retenus à Suez et deux navires infectés, pendant l’espace de sept ans.

Or, je le demande : Y a-t-il parité entre cette gêne insignifiante pour vingt-jeux navires en sept ans, sur plus de 20,000 navires, et le danger d’importer de nouveau le choléra en Europe en supprimant toute mesure protectrice et en laissant passer librement le Canal aux navires infectés ?

J’ajouterais que, si l’on prenait plus de précautions dans les mesures au point de départ et pendant la traversée, on aurait encore à réduire ce chiffre déjà si minime. La tendance de la science sanitaire actuelle est, en effet, de substituer aux mesures que l’on prend à l’arrivée, les mesures à prescrire au point de départ et pendant la traversée.

Si, en effet, dans les régions contaminées, on prenait la précaution de ne laisser embarquer aucun linge sale ou infecté sans le désinfecter, et si on prévenait les mesures de désinfection pendant la traversée, le chiffre si minime dont nous avons parlé se trouverait encore diminué et presque annihilé. Mais pour arriver à la suppression absolue des mesures restrictives, il ne faut rien précipiter. Il faut, pour éviter les réactions, une grande prudence. J’ajouterais que, si après la suppression de toute précaution, de toute garantie, comme de laisser passer en quarantaine les navires infectés par le Canal du Suez, un accident survenait, on reviendrait bien vite aux sévices d’autrefois et les populations accidentées redemanderait les quarantaines excessives que nous voulons supprimer un peu à peu avec toute la prudence nécessaire. Nous avons toujours eu en vue de diminuer les entraves imposées au commerce et à la navigation, autant qu’elles pouvaient être restrictives, en sauvegardant d’une manière absolue les intérêts supérieurs de la santé publique. Nous voulons substituer à d’infinibles quarantaines devant forcément disparaître en face des progrès et de la rapidité de la navigation, des mesures plus rationnelles, plus scientifiques et offrant des garanties tout aussi efficaces. Nous espérons que la Conférence voudra bien nous suivre dans cette direction et modifier dans le sens que je viens d’indiquer les propositions qui lui sont soumises. Nous avons conscience d’avoir fait toutes les concessions possibles, dans l’état actuel de la science, pour la protection de la santé publique. Vouloir : “ce plus rien ne serait compris par l’opinion et ne serait pas justifié par la science.”

[For Translation, see Inclosure 1 in No. 7.]

No. 8.

*Foreign Office to Local Government Board.*

Sir,

I AM directed by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to transmit to you, to be laid before the Local Government Board, a copy of a despatch from the British Delegates to the Sanitary Conference now sitting at Venice.*

*No. 7.*
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Lord Salisbury would be glad to be favoured with the views of the Local Government Board on the French proposals contained therein at the earliest convenient opportunity.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. V. LISTER.

No. 9.
Foreign Office to Local Government Board.

SIR VILLLERS LISTER presents his compliments to the Board of Trade, and is directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to transmit herewith a telegram received from Venice, embodying certain modifications in the French proposals, inclosed in the letter from this Office of the 14th instant.

Foreign Office, January 15, 1892.

No. 10.
Foreign Office to Admiralty.

THE Under-Secretary of State presents his compliments to the Secretary to the Admiralty, and is desired by the Marquis of Salisbury to transmit herewith the following papers, which relate to matters now under discussion at the Sanitary Conference sitting at Venice in connection with the transit of various categories of ships through the Suez Canal:

1. A summary of the existing Regulations in force in Egypt with regard to the passage of the Suez Canal. The strict application or otherwise of these Regulations depends upon the vote of the Egyptian Quarantine Board, who administer them.

2. Protocol signed between Her Majesty's Government and that of Austria in July last, and which the British Delegates to the Conference have been instructed to support.

3. Telegram from British Delegates of the 10th January, giving substance of a counter-proposal put forward by the Representative of France.

4. Despatch from British Delegates, dated the 8th January, inclosing details of the French proposals of which the above telegram is a summary.

5. Telegram from British Delegates of the 15th January, embodying certain modifications in French proposals.

Lord Salisbury would be glad to be favoured with the views of the Lords of the Admiralty on the French scheme, so far as it affects troop-ships, at their Lordships' earliest convenience.

Foreign Office, January 16, 1892.

No. 11.
The British Delegates to the Venice Conference to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received January 18.)

My Lord,

Venezuela, January 14, 1892.

We have the honour to report that we have, after many unofficial conversations with our French colleagues, arrived at a modification of the proposals they originally made to the Conference.

We have the honour to inclose a translation of the resulting text.

We consider that these proposals rest on a sound basis in that all precautions are directed against actual disease, as is the case in the Local Government Board Regulations of 1890 against cholera. The vexatious quarantines which have hitherto pressed so heavily on navigation were founded on a "constructive" contamination according to the health of the port of departure, and not on the health of thence on board the vessels.

Giving substance of No. 11.
As compared with the terms mentioned in our telegram of the 10th instant, we have obtained lighter treatment for passenger-steamers which have had no case of cholera on board for seven days before arrival at Suez and have thoroughly cleansed and disinfected the ship before or during the voyage; they will now be admitted at once to transit in quarantine; and, if the last case occurred fourteen days before arrival, these ships will be admitted after disinfection to pratique in Egypt. It is true that the term of fourteen days is too long to meet the case of vessels from Bombay; but cases of cholera are much rarer on such vessels than on those from Calcutta and the Far East; the latter would therefore profit by this arrangement.

It will also be observed that passengers for Egypt in such suspected ships as are not entitled to pratique will be free to proceed to their destination after twenty-four hours' observation at Moses' Wells and disinfection of their linen, &c.

As the main point of our French colleagues was that no actual case of cholera and no cholera-fouled linen shall enter the Canal, we were unable to make any terms under which even first-class passenger-ships and troop-ships with cholera on board, or having had cases within seven days, should transit at once in quarantine; the utmost concession that we could obtain was, in the case of passenger-ships, that the measures taken shall be strictly limited to the persons and to the parts of the ship actually affected; and that, if the circumstances of the ship permit, the landing of persons other than the sick may be waived.

Troop-ships, from the point of view of the transmission of cholera, do, no doubt, constitute a dangerous class, owing to the numbers of men on board whose health is debilitated, and who are therefore peculiarly open to any disease that may break out on board.

We were not able to arrange that troop-ships with cholera on board, or having had a case within seven days of arrival at Suez, should transit in quarantine unless the actually sick are left at Moses' Wells, and unless the men in the compartments of the ship affected be disembarked during the disinfection of those compartments.

It is clearly understood that disinfection of a ship extends only to such parts as may have been actually soiled by the cholera patients, and consists in cleaning and probably washing with some disinfecting fluid.

The disinfection of linen, &c., is to be effected by superheated steam.

It is proposed that ships passing through the Canal in quarantine shall pass without stopping in any of the "gares" along the Canal, and that troop-ships shall transit by day only, anchoring, if necessary, in Lake Timsah.

Three guards are to be employed on ships passing in quarantine.

We have the honour to inclose herewith a Table prepared by Mr. Miéville, from a perusal of which it will appear that during the last seven years forty-four ships, of which thirty-six were British, have, on arrival at Suez, been classed as "infectés."

If the French proposals, as now modified in consultation, had been in force during that period, only two cases, viz., the "Euphrates" in 1886 and the "Gulf of Mexico" in the same year, would have been classed as "infectés." The remaining forty-two would have been classed as "suspects." Of these forty-two classed as "suspects," thirty-nine, if they had been mail or passenger ships, would have come under the category of ships in which the case of cholera had occurred more than fourteen days before arrival, and if the sanitary condition of the ship had appeared to be satisfactory, they would have received free pratique at Suez.

As a matter of fact, of these forty-two ships, thirteen ships performed quarantine at Tor for periods varying from seven to three days.

We are not able to give your Lordship a complete list of vessels which were subjected, by reason of their having come from a foul port, to twenty-four hours of observation at Suez during the whole period of the seven years from 1885 to 1891 inclusive; but taking the period from 1887 to 1891 inclusive, viz., five years, it appears that 516 ships were so detained. These ships would, if the French proposals, as now modified, had been in force during that period, have passed in free pratique without any detention whatever. In addition to this, eighty-one ships which, during the said period of five years, passed the Canal in quarantine for one cause or another, would have received free pratique at Suez.

Having reached this stage in the negotiations, we now have to ask your Lordship for instructions as to our further course of procedure.

We have, &c.

(Signed) JAMES W. LOWTHER.

J. MACKIE.
SHIPS found to be healthy after medical inspection will obtain immediate pratique, whatever be the nature of their bill of health. They will not be subject to the twenty-four hours' observation now in force against ships with foul bills of health.

2. Suspected Ships.

That is to say, ships having had cases of cholera on board on departure or during the voyage, but having had no fresh case within seven days of arrival at Suez. These ships shall be treated differently, according as they do or do not carry a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus ("étuve").

(a.) Ships carrying a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus of proper construction shall be allowed to pass the Suez Canal in quarantine under the Regulations hereinafter laid down.

(b.) Other suspected ships carrying neither doctor nor disinfecting apparatus will, before being allowed to transit in quarantine, be detained at Moses' Wells during the time required for disinfecting their dirty linen, body clothing, and other susceptible things, and for ascertaining the sanitary condition of the ship.

The Regulations shall lay down under what circumstances the dirty linen and susceptible things need not all be disinfected.

Should cholera occur only amongst the crew, disinfection will extend to the dirty linen of the crew only, but it shall extend to all the dirty linen of the crew and the spaces occupied by the crew.

In the case of a mail-steamer, or of a packet specially engaged in the passenger traffic, having no disinfecting apparatus, but carrying a doctor, if the local sanitary authority is assured by the evidence of official papers that the requisite measures of sanitation and disinfection have been properly carried out, either at the port of departure or during the voyage, transit in quarantine shall be immediately granted.

In the case of the same class of ships, if the last case of cholera happened fourteen days or more before arrival at Suez, and if the sanitary state of the ship is satisfactory, free pratique may be granted as soon as the disinfection is finished.

In the case of ships having had a passage of less than fourteen days, passengers for Egypt will disembark at Moses' Wells and be isolated for twenty-four hours, and their dirty linen and used clothing be disinfected. They will then receive full pratique.

3. Infected Ships.

That is to say, ships having a case of cholera on board, or having had a fresh case of cholera within seven days of arrival at Suez, are divided into ships with a doctor and disinfecting apparatus ("étuve"), and ships without a doctor and disinfecting apparatus.

(a.) Ships without a doctor and disinfecting apparatus will be sent to Moses' Wells, the sick will be disembarked and isolated in the hospital, and thorough disinfection will be applied.

The remainder of the passengers will be disembarked and isolated in as small groups as possible in order that the whole number of passengers may not be contaminated by a case of cholera occurring in any one particular group. The dirty linen, the things in use, the clothes of the crew and of the passengers, will be disinfected. The ship will also be disinfected.

It is understood that no disembarkation of cargo is to take place, and that only the infected part of the ship is to be disinfected.

The passengers will remain five days at the establishment of Moses' Wells. When the cases of cholera have occurred several days before arrival, the period of isolation may be shortened. The length of such period of isolation will vary according to the date of the appearance of the last case of cholera.

(b.) Transit in quarantine may even be granted by the sanitary authority before the expiration of the said five days if disinfection has been applied, and if the ship carries a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus of a proper kind.

In the case of mail ships and packets specially engaged in passenger traffic, which have a doctor on board but no disinfecting apparatus, where the cholera has only shown itself in a particular part of the ship, it shall be for the sanitary authority to determine the necessity, if any, for disembarkation, and the number of persons to be disembarked, according to the position which they occupied on board in relation to the place where
the cholera showed itself. The sanitary authority will also determine what parts of the ship will require to be disinfected.

Exceptional treatment will be accorded to large transport ships, subject to military discipline and carrying a doctor and disinfecting apparatus. In this case the sanitary authority need only compel the disembarkation of persons living in that compartment of the ship in which the case of cholera broke out. While the men are disembarked, this compartment and the section of the ship's hospital to which the sick individual or individuals may have been taken, together with things used by any persons in contact with the sick, shall be completely disinfected.

The ship's sanitary authority shall, under oath, declare what compartments are infected or suspected.

The dirty linen of the rest of the troops shall be disinfected on board.

Furthermore, a disinfecting apparatus may be brought alongside on a lighter in order the more quickly to carry out the disinfection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom du Navire</th>
<th>Pavillon</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Date de l'arrivée à Suez</th>
<th>Nombre de Cas</th>
<th>Nombre de Jours écoulés entre la date du dernier cas de Choléra et celle de l'arrivée du Navire à Suez</th>
<th>Mesures appliquées</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bengal...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Soerabaia</td>
<td>26 Octobre, 1881</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Transité Canal en quarantaine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Britian</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>15 Novembre, 1881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>27 Février, 1882</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ecopept sept jours à Tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongvin...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Saigon</td>
<td>7 Octobre, 1883</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gueghin...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>18 Juillet, 1883</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suez...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>10 Octobre, 1884</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispania...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>19 Avril, 1885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brême...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>30 Mai, 1884</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surin...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>1er Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Saigon</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Disinfecté.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Léon...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Saigon</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ecopept sept jours à Tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallada...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Mombasa</td>
<td>27 Mai, 1885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemuria...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Tucterina</td>
<td>9 Juin, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeneas...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Kurrahee</td>
<td>18 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembrance...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Tornip...</td>
<td>27 Octobre, 1885</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ecopept dix jours à Tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Château Yquem</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>27 Novembre, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ecopept sept jours à Tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natal...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>1er Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Transité Canal en quarantaine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Nice...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Décobion...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comorin...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Côte...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionie...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquitain...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Philip...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orage...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tongvin...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverton...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphrones...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golfe de Mexic.</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghai</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Iden.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inclosure 2 in No. 11.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom de Navire</th>
<th>Pavillon</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Date de l'arrivée à Suez</th>
<th>Nombre de Cas</th>
<th>Nombre de Jours écoutés entre la date du dernier cas de choléra et celle de l'arrivée du Navire à Suez</th>
<th>Mesures appliquées</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Lebanon</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>5 Décembre, 1886</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Escompté sept jours à Tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Octobre, 1887</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Transité Canal en quarantaine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vestris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Novembre, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohila</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathleven</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yokohama</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Télemanus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shanghaï</td>
<td>5 Décembre, 1888</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochil</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>25 Février, 1888</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haiphong</td>
<td>20 Mars</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Transité Canal en quarantaine après avoir escompté trois jours à Tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cantor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haiphong</td>
<td>19 Mai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Cassassein</td>
<td>26 Mars, 1889</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Escompté sept jours à Tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benlering</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benarein</td>
<td>24 Avril</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Transité Canal en quarantaine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galéouzion</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haiphong</td>
<td>18 Juin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>11 Août</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albertia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haiphong</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samarang</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>17 Septembre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagholde</td>
<td></td>
<td>Basorrah</td>
<td>13 Octobre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dryshado</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tégal (Java)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulford</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chittagong</td>
<td>18 Mars, 1890</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Haiphong</td>
<td>22 Février, 1890</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axana</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>17 Mars</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Escompté sept jours à Tor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trecvylor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moulmein</td>
<td>4 Mai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathlyon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pudchinga</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Genoa</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>21 Octobre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellerophon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shanghaï</td>
<td>30 Novembre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Le Président du Conseil Sanitaire,
Maritime, et Quarantenaire d'Égypte,
(Signé) W. F. MIEVILLE.

Alexandrie, le 15 Décembre, 1891.
Sir,

I am directed by the Local Government Board to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 14th and 15th instant, and their inclosure, relating to the proposals which have been submitted by the French Delegates to the Sanitary Conference now sitting at Venice. In forwarding to you, for the information of the Marquis of Salisbury, the accompanying copy of Minutes on the subject of Dr. Buchanan, the Board's Medical Officer, and Dr. Thorne Thorne, their Assistant Medical Officer, I am to state that the Board concur in the observations contained in those Minutes.

I am, &c.

(Signed) C. N. DALTON, Assistant Secretary.

Inclosure No. 12.

Minutes.

WHilst the French proposal submitted by Dr. Proust embodies greater concessions than the French have heretofore been willing to assent to, yet they contain several objectionable features of importance.

1. Vessels will be held to be "indemnes," "suspects," or "infectés," according as a "Médecin de Service" shall decide after a visit to the vessels, and this irrespective of their "patente." This is a great responsibility for such a nation as England to hand over to an unknown man, whose decision can hardly fail to be governed according to the country of his nationality, and the place where he received his medical education and training.*

2. The detention in quarantine for "navires infectés," nominally for five days, is that against which England has hitherto always protested. The five days will be repeated every time the person in authority chooses to hold that a fresh case or suspected case has occurred. The circumstances of detention on the shore of the Red Sea are, both as regards climate and inadequacy of accommodation, precisely such as are calculated to lead to a spread of cholera, and the arrangements suggested for isolating passengers, &c., in groups are hardly likely to be carried out—and could not be carried out and properly maintained except at great cost—in any such manner as to do away with the dangers attendant on such detention. Hitherto those in authority in the lazarets about the Red Sea have been content with arrangements that have given a cruel and inhuman character to the detentions proposed.

3. No attempt is now made to show that the passage of the Canal by an English vessel, whether infected or suspect, has caused any danger to Europe, unless, indeed, the case of the "Timour" is claimed in that connection. The evidence in favour of the French view as to the "Timour" being casually related to the Egyptian epidemic was always of the flimsiest; whereas there are strong grounds for believing that the epidemic was due to uncontrolled pilgrim traffic and movements.

4. There is thus no medical evidence to support the views of the French Delegation in so far as home-bound vessels belonging to this country are concerned; and the principal argument raised by the French Delegation as to this seems to be that since other Powers will claim the same privilege, and since a number of Mediterranean Powers are not fitted—by reason of their sanitary administration or otherwise—to claim it, therefore England ought to forego her claims in regard of the passage of the Canal in quarantine.

I do not see that any medical considerations are here involved; the point seems one to be decided by reasons of policy.

January 15, 1892.

R. T. T.

I concur.—G. B. January 15, 1892.

* The figures quoted by Dr. Proust (p. 7) may come to be materially altered by reason of the decision of such an officer; dysentery and diarrhoea not being uncommon on board vessels bringing home passengers from India.
Minutes referred to.

As regards the copy telegram,* specifying amendments in the French proposals, I would observe:—

1. That the reduction "from eight to seven" days is practically no concession at all.
2. And this the more because vessels having had cholera on board within fourteen days before arrival at Suez are alone to have pratique when disinfected; whereas in Dr. Froust's former proposal "eight days" were contemplated with regard to vessels that had had cholera on board "mêmes pendant la traversée" (see page headed 6, § "Navires Suspects").
3. The question of detention for disinfecting and quarantine purposes remains to be entirely decided by some local official and this notwithstanding the views and contentions of British medical officers on board troop and other ships.
4. I do not understand partial disinfection of infected vessels.

R. T. T.

January 16, 1892.

So far as the telegram is intelligible, it certainly points to rather an increase than a "concession" in the stringency of the regulations to be applied to suspected and to infected ships.

G. B.

January 16, 1892.

No. 13.

Admiralty to Foreign Office.—(Received January 21.)

Sir, (Admiralty, January 21, 1892.)

IN reply to your semi-official letter of the 16th instant, and its inclosures, respecting matter now under discussion at the Sanitary Conference sitting at Venice, in connection with the passage of various ships through the Suez Canal, I am commanded by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to acquaint you, for the information of the Marquis of Salisbury, that, in their opinion, Her Majesty's Government should press for troop-ships with full precautions being allowed to pass freely through the Canal unless the disembarkation at Moses' Wells is necessary in their own interests.

I am, &c.

(Signed) EVAN MACGREGOR.

No. 14.

The Marquis of Salisbury to British Delegates to the Venice Sanitary Conference.

(Extract.) Foreign Office, January 22, 1892.

YOUR letter of the 14th received here on the 18th instant, and containing text of a Provisional Agreement which you have arrived at with the French Delegates, has been carefully considered by Her Majesty's Government. It was originally intended that the Anglo-Austrian Protocol of July 1891 should, in the first instance, form the basis of the discussions of the Conference. You have, however, informed me that it is not likely to receive any effective support, and I have no doubt that you are right in recommending the substitution of the modified French proposals for this purpose.

Before examining these proposals in detail, it may be advantageous to recall the position which this question occupies in an international point of view. Great Britain has never admitted the right of any Power to hinder British ships from passing through the Suez Canal, on payment of the necessary tolls, so long as proper precautions were taken to prevent that passage from being injurious to the country through which the Canal is pierced. Egypt has the right, inherent in every State, of taking the measures which seem to her necessary within her jurisdiction to prevent the importation of disease. The Egyptian Sanitary Board, acting under the authority of the Khedive, exists for the purpose,

* Substance included in No. 11.
among other things, of carrying these precautions into effect, and derives from him the powers necessary to that end. Whether it would be competent for the Khedive to surround the passage through the Canal, on sanitary grounds, with conditions so onerous as practically to arrest the traffic, is a question which it might be difficult to answer; but it exists at present only in a theoretic form, as the administration of the Sanitary Regulations by the Egyptian Board of Health has, on the whole, been lenient and judicious. Nothing has, however, yet been done in any way inconsistent with the position that the Sanitary Board exercises its powers by virtue of the authority of the lord of the soil, and does so with the object of protecting Egypt, and Egypt alone, from the importation of disease.

It was intended that an Anglo-Austrian Protocol should form the basis of the discussions to which the Conference was invited, nor until the beginning of the present year was it known that any rival scheme would be produced. The French Government have presumably been aware for some five or six months of the terms of the Anglo-Austrian proposal, or at all events with the general nature of the proposals which would be placed before the Conference. It is to be regretted that the counter-project was not communicated to Her Majesty's Government before the Conference met. Any such controversy must, it was evident, turn largely upon technical questions, upon commercial conditions, upon estimates of expense. It could not be satisfactorily conducted without a reference of the main proposals made to the great Companies who would be largely affected by them, and to the Admiralty, whose troop service would be similarly implicated. It has been impossible up to this time to obtain the whole of these opinions, or to collect the facts necessary for the full examination of the new proposals. In the telegram, therefore, that I addressed to you yesterday, I was only able to authorize you to accept the French proposals as a basis for discussion, leaving a definitive decision upon the questions raised to a later stage. As a test question, I have authorized you by the same telegram to submit to the Conference the proposition that infected ships bound to British ports, if mainly employed in the carriage of troops or passengers, should be allowed to pass the Canal in quarantine, expressing at the same time our willingness to consider any practicable proposals for preventing all risk of contact between the ship passing in quarantine and the Egyptian shores. Whether such ships should be allowed to call at Malta and Gibraltar is a secondary matter with which the foreign Delegates could have nothing to do, but on which it would be inconvenient to propose any regulation until the Companies and the Colonial Governments could be consulted.

There are some points in Dr. Proust's preliminary statement, and in the proposals to which you and he have provisionally agreed, on which I will make some remarks. In the observations presented by Dr. Proust in the name of the French Delegation, the reasons advanced against the transit of passenger and troop-ships in quarantine appear to be these. In the first place, it is said that there is a difficulty in preventing communication with the shore. No instance is given of any failure to prevent this communication when it was desired except the case of the "Timur," which, in 1893, is said to have communicated cholera to Egypt by stokers who disembarked from it. Dr. Proust must be well aware that the evidence as to this statement is of the flimsiest description. The "Timur," the ship in question, was twenty days coming from Bombay to Port Said, where the stoker landed. There was no sickness on board during the whole time of her passage. The stoker himself never had the complaint, and even if it were true, which it obviously is not, that he was the cause of importing cholera into Egypt, the circumstance would be no illustration of the difficulty of guarding the banks of the Suez Canal; for he left the ship not in the Canal, but at Port Said. Secondly, Dr. Proust contends that even if the ship professes only to be bound to England, it may break its engagement, and land its infected crew at some Continental port.

The only basis for this suggestion is the case of the ship "Fulford," which, according to Dr. Proust, went straight from Port Said to the Gironde, though she professed to be bound for England, and had passed the Canal in quarantine. As a matter of fact, the "Fulford" had previously gone as far as the English coast, and had only turned back off a British port on receiving telegraphic orders from her owners. As she had passed the Canal in quarantine, the proceeding was undoubtedly improper; but unless the germ of infection is far more tenacious of life than Dr. Proust's other proposals admit it to be, the banks of the Gironde could not have been exposed to any danger from a ship which had left Port Said for so long a time. These two objections to the passing of ships in quarantine depend upon two solitary cases of alleged abuse, which are not authenticated.

The third argument advanced by the French Delegate is of a more general character. He says, quite justly, that it would be impossible to give to English ships the liberty of
passing in quarantine without giving it to those of all other nations. But the Mediterranean ports would think it unsafe to receive ships that had passed in quarantine; and, consequently, ships bound for them could not pass in that manner. Dr. Proust contends that because other countries under the influence of certain doctrines will not allow ships coming to them to pass in quarantine, therefore ships bound for British ports where these views do not prevail ought not to be allowed to enjoy a privilege from which their commercial rivals are excluded. The scientific men in whom Continental Governments place confidence entertain opinions which, in our judgment, are erroneous. In obedience to those views, they impose an unnecessary disability upon their own ships, and then they propose to us that we should accept for our ships the burden of these precautions, in which we do not believe, in order that our commerce may not enjoy an unfair advantage over theirs. Her Majesty’s Government are wholly unable to accept the validity of this argument.

The proposals which Dr. Proust has submitted to the Conference are undoubtedly in many respects well worthy of consideration. It seems to be a distinct step in advance to treat a ship according to her ascertained health at the moment of her arrival, and not according to the health of the places at which a week or a fortnight before she may have touched. But it involves novel conditions of great gravity, which require to be very seriously examined before they can be admitted to control interests so important as the British trade through the Canal. The summary you have sent me of the modifications which the French Delegates have consented to adopt, in the despatch under reply, is vague in several respects, and further detail is necessary before a full judgment can be formed upon it. But the new system, as it applies to passenger ships and troop ships, is in strong contrast to the existing system in certain important respects. For the first time, the Regulations of the Board will have the sanction of an international authority, and it may be therefore assumed will be administered with greater exactitude and rigour. Secondly, for the first time, if the views of the majority of the Powers of the Conference are adopted, they will be applied by a Council in which Great Britain will not have the prevailing influence. Thirdly, for the first time, the treatment of ships will depend almost entirely upon the judgment which a medical man at Suez may form of the health of all those on board them.

In the opinion received from the Local Government Board, Dr. Buchanan and Dr. Thorne point out that the extent to which cholera is supposed to prevail upon ships coming from the East will depend very much upon the school in which the medical man shall have been trained, and the nationality to which he belongs. They observe that diarrhoea and dysentery are not uncommon on board vessels bringing passengers home from India, and it obviously results that in the case of almost every ship coming from India, the question whether it shall be declared infected by cholera or not will depend upon the prepossessions, and the judgment, and possibly the bias of the medical officer in whose hands the decision will be placed.

I have called your attention to these difficulties by telegraph. I do not myself at present see any satisfactory solution of them except by allowing, under whatever precautions may be desired, all passenger ships to pass the Canal in quarantine. But in any case, if any kind of detention to healthy persons under any circumstances whatever is allowed, it will be vital to secure that the decision of their fate shall be in the hands of men to whom no suspicion of undue preference in the exercise of their duties can be attached.

No. 15.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. Lowther.

(Telegraphic.)

The Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. Lowther.

Foreign Office, January 23, 1892.

AN impression is conveyed to the Austrian Ambassador from his Court that the French are willing to restrict disembarkation to the actual patient and his effects, and that a declaration of the presence of cholera should be conditional on the assent of the ship’s doctor. He has, on the other hand, an impression that you are objecting to the requirement of the disinfecting apparatus (stove) and ship’s doctor. I did not think that this was the case, I said.
Mr. Lowther to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received January 24.)

(Telegraphic.)

VENICE, January 24, 1892.

BOARD'S reorganization.

French proposal, at to-day's meeting of Conference, was carried to reduce Egyptian votes to three and the President, with a casting vote. My proposal for four and the President was supported by the German Delegate alone. The Conference accepted other unimportant details with regard to remainder of reorganization scheme.

No. 17.

The British Delegates to the Venice Sanitary Conference to the Marquis of Salisbury.—

(Received January 26.)

My Lord,

We have the honour to inform your Lordship that a meeting of the Conference was held to-day.

In accordance with your Lordship's instructions, contained in a telegram of the 21st instant,* we submitted the amendment therein indicated. We beg to inclose a copy of the text thereof. The proposal, however, elicited no active support.

It was contended by the French, the Russian, the Dutch, the Belgian, and the Spanish Delegates that no exceptional treatment should in this matter be accorded to Great Britain; that if other Powers were to claim and receive a similar privilege, a considerable number of infected ships would be continually transiting the Canal; that it was impossible to take any precautions which would absolutely insure that no contact of the ship passing in quarantine or of those on board should take place with the Egyptian soil; and that, if such a ship should run aground in the Canal, contact with the ship's crew and passengers would be inevitable.

It was also pointed out that under the modified French proposals only a very small number of troops would have to be disembarked, and that such disembarkation in the case of a well-found troop-ship with a doctor and disinfecting apparatus on board would only extend over the period of time necessary for the disinfection of the infected parts of the vessel and of the dirty linen. As to passenger-ships, it was pointed out that the question of the extent of disembarkation necessary would, under the modified French proposals, be left to the Sanitary authority at Suez to be decided according to the locality of the outbreak of cholera, and that it was possible that under favourable circumstances no disembarkation at all would be necessary.

On the opinions of the Delegates being severally asked, the French, the Greek, the Dutch, the Belgian, the Spanish, the Russian, the Danish, and Turkish Delegates pronounced against the amendment.

On the other hand, the Austrian, the German, and the Italian Delegates stated that as they had been instructed to support the Anglo-Austrian Protocol, and as they considered that the British amendment was a portion of the Protocol, they supported it.

The Austrian and the Italian Delegates expressed themselves favourably towards the French proposals, as modified after consultation with ourselves, and the general opinion of the Delegates was in accord with theirs.

The German Delegate stated that he would have to obtain the views of his Government before he could pronounce a definite opinion.

In the course of the discussion we stated that we desired to have the opinion of the Conference upon the amendment proposed by us, and that we should take the decision of the Conference ad referendum.

We have, &c.

(Signed) JAMES W. LOWTHER.
J. MACKIE.

* Giving substance of No. 14.
Inclusion in No. 17.

Amendment.

JL sera permis aux navires transports et aux navires affectés au service des passagers, lorsqu'ils se trouveront dans la catégorie des navires infectés, de transiter le Canal en quarantaine, pourvu qu'ils se dirigent directement à un port du Royaume-Uni.

(Translation.)

PERMISSION will be given to vessels detailed for the service of passengers, when they find themselves in the class of infected ships, to transit the Canal in quarantine, provided that they proceed direct to a port in the United Kingdom.

No. 18.

Summary of the Egyptian Quarantine Regulations.

THE present quarantine and sanitary system of Egypt is extremely intricate and involved, being comprised in several different sets of Regulations which have never been codified. Those whose provisions principally affect shipping are the General Regulations, the Cholera Regulations, and the Regulations for the transit of the Suez Canal. All these three must be read together to appreciate the details of the system, which embraces three distinct factors, viz., (a) the health of the ship; (b) the health of the place she comes from; and (c) the condition of her bill of health. But, as a matter of fact, in practice the Cholera Regulations have only been strictly applied when, owing to a rise in the death-rate at those places, such a Proclamation has been issued in Egypt.

(Signed) W. MAYCOCK.

Foreign Office,

January 26, 1892.

Analysis of Regulations.

(N.B.—The numbers refer to those at the commencement of each paragraph.)

Airing clothes in Canal forbidden, 35.

"Arraisonnement," 4, 5.

Arrival of ship. Formalities to be observed, 1.

Bills of health, 2, 6, 18, 28, 32 (2), (3), (4); endorsement of, 7, 31, 34; definition of clean and foul, 9; treatment when bill is foul, 11, 16, 21; when clean, 15; in relation to transit of Canal, 34; to state time of transit of Canal, 40.

Canal Transit Regulations, 31-40; ships in quarantine not to stop, 35; time taken in transit to be noted on bill of health, 40.

Captain of ship's responsibility for not tampering with seals, 37.

Cholera, 10 (F), (G), (II), (J), 23-30, 32, 34, 40.

Corpses not to be thrown into Canal, or buried in banks, 39.

Disembarkation from ship's transit Canal in quarantine, 38.

Disinfection, 19, 26, 37.

Doctor with European diploma, 23.

Flag (yellow), when to be flown, 1, 35, 39.

Health Guards for Canal, 35, 40.

Infected ship. (See Ship.)

Interrogatory (form, &c), 2.

Lights, when yellow required for Canal, 35.

Medical inspection, 4.

Merchandise, definition of susceptible, 19.

Pilots for Canal. Rules to be observed, 36, 37, 40.

Postal boats, scale of quarantine for, 25.

Pratique, when accorded in relation to bills of health, 8, 10; in relation to disinfection, 26.

Quarantine, when applied, 11; various categories defined, 14; of observation, 15; simple, 16-20; rigorous, 21; simple, when made rigorous, 20; rigorous, where performed, 21; scale for places where there is cholera, 24, 25; length of rigorous quarantine, 27; when necessary before entering Canal, 32, 37.

"Reconnaisance," meaning of, 3, 5.

Sanitary authority: His discretion with regard to bills of health, 9.

Seals for hatchways in Canal, 36 (1), (6), 37.

Ship, condition of, 10 and subheads: "suspected," definition of, 12; "infected," definition of, 13, 27; time of staying at and leaving infected ports, 28-30.

Suspected ship. (See Ship.)

Time for executing formalities, 3

Troop ships, scale of quarantine for, 25.

Voyage, duration of, not an element for consideration with infected ship, 22.
Summary of General Regulations.—(Abbreviation, G. R.)

I. Formalities on arrival.

1. Every ship arriving in an Egyptian port must fly a yellow flag on her mizen, to show she has not had pratique, and to prevent any communication (Article 24, G. R.).

2. The captain is required by this official to fill up an interrogatory. (Form in "Règlement" Annexe 1), and produce the bill of health (ditto, Annexe 2).

3. This formality, which may be done at any hour (Article 28, G. R.), is called the "reconnaissance." (Article 7, G. R.)

4. If the "reconnaissance" is not satisfactory, and further investigation seems necessary, the next step is an "arraisonnement" and medical inspection, which can only take place in the daytime (Article 28, G. R.).

5. The result of the "reconnaissance" or "arraisonnement," as the case may be, is recorded in writing and registered in the office of the Sanitary authority (Article 8, G. R.).

II. Bills of Health.

(See also under same head in Cholera Regulations.)

6. The production of a bill of health is at all times obligatory for every vessel arriving in an Egyptian port. (Article 10, G. R.)

7. The bill of health issued at port of departure must be indorsed at each place at which the ship touches, and retained till it reaches its final destination. The indorsement must state the vessel's condition, and the length of its stay. No fresh bill of health can be taken till a vessel sets out afresh after reaching her ultimate destination. (Article 18, G. R.)

8. Ships with no bills of health, or irregular ones, are not allowed pratique, but are subjected to investigation, and if it be satisfactory, they will be provided with fresh ones (Article 13, G. R.).

9. A bill of health is considered clean when it shows the absence of any infectious ("pestilentielles") disease in the country or countries from which the ship has come. It is considered foul when it indicates the presence of a disease of this character. The Sanitary authority decides whether it is clean or foul (Article 16, G. R.).

10. Ships provided with a clean bill of health are immediately admitted to free pratique after the "reconnaissance" or "arraisonnement," except in the following cases (Article 29, G. R.):—

* (A.) When the ship is in an unhealthy condition on arrival.

* (B.) When there are doubts as to the sanitary condition of the ship during her voyage.

* (C.) When there are doubts as to the genuineness of the bill of health.

† (D.) When, bill of health notwithstanding, there are doubts about the health of the place of departure. (See also paragraph 23.)

† (E.) When the ship has had communication at sea with another whose sanitary condition is doubtful.

† (F.) When the ship comes from a place in free communication with a vicinity where plague, yellow fever, or cholera exists.

† (G.) When the ship has come from a port where one of the above diseases have broken out after she left within a certain number of days (for which see special Regulations for Cholera, paragraph 28).

† (H.) When the ship has come from a place where disease has existed for a certain period before she left, too short for the place to be considered clean (for period see special Regulations for Cholera, paragraph 29).

(1.) When a vessel has stayed, without communicating, in a suspicious ("compromis") or infected port beyond the period fixed by special Regulations against Cholera. (See paragraph 30.)

‡ (J.) When a ship provided with a clean bill of health has had on board during her passage actual or suspected cases of plague, yellow fever, cholera, or a serious malady of an infectious nature. (See paragraph 13.)

* With respect to these three headings, vide Article 33.
† With respect to these five headings, vide Article 34.
‡ With respect to this heading, see Article 35.
Quarantine Measures.

11. Every ship arriving with a foul bill, or even with a clean one under the exceptions above mentioned, is liable to quarantine according to the case. It may be different for passengers, crew, merchandize, and the ship itself, and according as to whether it arrives from the Mediterranean or Red Sea (Article 30, G. R.).

12. A suspected ship is one which comes under the category defined in preceding paragraph, but with a declaration made by the captain that she has had no case of sickness on board since her departure, and this statement is borne out by the medical inspection (Article 31, G. R.).

13. An infected ship is one on which certain or probable cases of infectious disease have occurred on board, either at the port of departure, during the voyage, no matter how far back, or on arrival (Article 31, G. R.). For treatment of such ships, see paragraphs 21 and 27.

14. Quarantine consists of three categories (Article 32, G. R.):
   (1.) Quarantine of Observation.
   (2.) Simple Quarantine.
   (3.) Rigorous Quarantine.

15. Quarantine of observation is applicable to ships with a clean bill of health, and which, though not having had suspicious cases on board during the voyage, find themselves in one of the circumstances enumerated in exceptions A, B, and C of Article 29. Under these circumstances the ship has to undergo observation of from one to three days with medical visit; except in extreme cases this observation does not entail disembarkation of either goods or passengers (Article 33, G. R.).

16. Simple quarantine is applicable to vessels with a foul bill, or which are considered to be in a foul condition, though they have had no suspicious case on board. A ship provided with a clean bill is considered foul under the circumstances specified in exceptions marked D, E, F, G, and H of Article 29.

17. With regard to ships under category D the Board may, according to circumstances, shorten the period of quarantine, or even substitute mere observation.

18. Simple quarantine consists in isolating, for a period fixed by special Regulations, the ship, crew, passengers, and merchandize. It also includes medical inspection. If the foul bill be in respect of cholera only passengers may do their quarantine on board, except in cases of overcrowding. Under similar bill of health the days occupied by voyage will be taken into consideration on a scale provided. (See Cholera Regulations, paragraphs 24 and 25.)

19. Simple quarantine necessitates the disembarkation of very susceptible articles, first category (viz., rags, paper rags, clothes, bedding, and all kinds of wearing apparel) at a lazaret or on lighters, and disinfection of less susceptible articles, second category (viz., skins and untanned hides, feathers, bristles, debris of animals generally, silk, wool, cotton, flax, hemp, and other raw textiles) is compulsory or optional according to circumstances (Article 34, G. R.).

20. Simple quarantine may be replaced by rigorous quarantine if a case of infectious disease shows itself while it is being undergone (Article 3, G. R.).

21. Rigorous quarantine is applicable to every ship with a foul bill, or with a clean bill under the conditions specified in exception J of Article 29 (paragraph 10), which has had on board either at port of origin, during the passage, or since its arrival either certain or suspicious cases of cholera, plague, or yellow fever.

22. Rigorous quarantine can only be carried out in a port or lazaret of the first order. It entails the discharge of passengers and cargo, and thorough disinfection of susceptible merchandize and of the ship under supervision of Health Guards; no account is taken of the duration of the voyage (Article 35, G. R.).

Special Cholera Regulations.—(Abbreviation, C. R.)

ARTICLE 1.

Non-infected Ships.

23. Every ship arriving from a contaminated place,* which has not had on board during the passage certain or suspicious cases of cholera, must undergo simple quarantine (for definition see ante) of seven full days to date from the medical inspection.

* The Quarantine Board decide what is a contaminated place by declaring quarantine against that place.
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24. If, however, the Sanitary authority is satisfied that no certain or suspicious case has occurred on board during the voyage, and if, moreover, the vessel is in a satisfactory sanitary condition, the above-mentioned period of quarantine may be reduced according to the following scale:

After 8 days' voyage, 6 days' quarantine.
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
for a voyage over 13 days, 24 hours' quarantine.

25. In the cases of ships of war, or postal vessels with a doctor with a European diploma on board, the above scale is reduced as follows:

After 8 days' voyage, 3 days' quarantine.
- 9
- 10 and over, 24 hours.

26. The ship must undergo disinfection before getting free pratique, but pratique will not be allowed to persons who have remained on board until after the ship has been disinfected, and their wearing apparel also. Quarantine may be performed on board if no case of cholera appears in the meanwhile (Article 2, C. R.).

**Article 2.**

**Infected Ships.**

27. Every infected ship (for definition see paragraph 13) must undergo seven days' rigorous quarantine, which may be extended to ten if the Board so decide (Article 2, C. R.).

**Bills of Health.**

(See also under same head in General Regulations.)

28. Ships provided with a clean bill of health having had no cases on board, if they have come from a place where cholera has appeared under seven days from the time they left, will be subjected to the quarantine prescribed in Article 1 of these Regulations.

29. Ships which have left a cholera-infected place under a period of fifteen days after the last case, as shown by their bill of health, are subjected to same Regulations.

30. Ships which have remained more than thirty-one days in an infected port, or more than five days in a suspected port, that is to say, one in free communication with an infected place (see exceptions G, H, I, to Article 29 of General Regulations, paragraph 10) are subjected to same Regulations (Article 3, C. R.).

**Regulations for transit of Vessels through the Suez Canal.**

31. Article 1. No ship is allowed to enter the Canal without the visa of the Sanitary authority to her bill of health, or a new bill of health if necessary (vide paragraph 8).

32. Art. 2. The following categories of ships are not allowed to enter the Canal until they have purged their quarantine.

1. Those which have had certain or suspected cases of cholera, plague, or yellow fever.

2. Those with a foul bill of health, which, even though they have had no suspicious cases on board, are in an unhealthy state.

3. Those with a foul bill of health destined for some place in the Canal.

4. Those with a foul bill of health which have pilgrims or similar crowds on board.

33. Sanitary Agents at Suez or Port Said are formally forbidden to affix their visa to the ship's bill of health, or to issue a new one (one or the other being necessary to enable a ship to enter the Canal) to ships coming under any of the above four categories, before they have been admitted to pratique.

34. Art. 3. Ships with a foul bill, or adjudged foul (see General Regulations, Articles 29 and 34), but which are not comprised in the four conditions cited in paragraph 32, may, if there be no reason to the contrary, go through the Canal in quarantine.
In such a case an explanatory indorsement is affixed to the bill of health at port of entry and port of exit.

35. Art. 4. Ships authorized to go through the Canal in quarantine must take two Health Guards on board, must fly a yellow flag on their mizen mast, and yellow lights during the night. They are not allowed to air body clothing and wearing apparel except at crossing-stages, where Health Guards should keep an especial sharp watch; they must not stop anywhere unless compelled by force majeure duly established. In such exceptional cases the nearest Sanitary authority must be at once advised, and he will take the necessary steps required by the circumstances.

36. Art. 5. In each case where the Rules permit transit in quarantine, the Canal Company's pilots have authority to go on board under the following conditions:

(1) On the arrival of the ship, seals are affixed to the hatchways of the hold, and kept there till the ship enters the sea on leaving the Canal.

(2) Two Health Guards will go on board to prevent any communication between the ship and land.

(3) The affixing of the seals at the entrance, and their verification at port of exit, are to be formally recorded.

(4) Pilots and Health Guards accompanying the vessel must perform quarantine when they leave it for the same period that the ship would have had to undergo had it waited for pratique, and their wearing apparel disinfected.

37. Art. 6. In the case of simple cholera quarantine ships arriving from the Red Sea, after having performed the scale of quarantine laid down in Article 1 of the Cholera Regulations, and after disinfection of passengers' personal effects and the affected part of the ship, may dispense with the disinfection of cargo, and, nevertheless, transit the Canal in free pratique, on the condition that seals are affixed to the hatches of the hold and retained there till the ship leaves the Canal. In these conditions the Canal Company's pilot will be admitted in pratique on board the ship. The captain is responsible for non-interference with the seals.

38. Ships transiting the Canal in quarantine, having passengers or goods on board destined for Egypt, will be authorized by the Sanitary Board to disembark them at Moses' Wells. This disembarkation will be carried out with every necessary sanitary precaution. Passengers and goods so disembarking will undergo regulation quarantine.

39. Art. 8. If it happens that while a ship is transiting the Canal in pratique a suspicious case breaks out, the quarantine flag must be immediately hoisted, she must abstain from communication with the shore, and at once proceed to report the circumstances to the nearest Sanitary officer. In case of a death on board it is strictly forbidden to throw the corpse into the waters of the Canal, or to bury it in the banks. The captain and the doctor, if there be one, are held responsible for any breach of these Regulations.

40. Art. 9. If any of the infectious diseases: cholera, plague, or yellow-fever should exist at any of the places along the Canal, ships desirous of transhipping, without exposing themselves to consequences should abstain from all communication with the shore, or with suspected ships. Pilots and Health Guards charged with the superintending of a ship will be placed on board the conducting boat, and will not communicate with the ship till it leaves the Canal. The time occupied by its transit will be noted on the bill of health.

No. 19.

Foreign Office to Local Government Board.

Sir, Foreign Office, January 26, 1892.

With reference to your letter of the 18th instant, copy of which was communicated to the British Delegates to the Sanitary Conference now sitting at Venice, I am directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to transmit herewith, for the information of the Local Government Board, a copy of a despatch which has been received from the British Delegates since the letter from this Office of the 15th instant, and which will serve to make those proposals clearer than the telegraphic summary which was inclosed in the letter above mentioned.

Lord Salisbury would be glad to be favoured with any further observations the Local Government Board may feel disposed to offer, and I am at the same time to add that the French proposals were accepted in principle by the Conference on the 23rd, the only Powers which supported an amendment which the British Delegates had been instructed to

* No. 11.
propose being Austria, Germany, and Italy, and they expressed a preference for the modified French proposals pure and simple.

The British amendment proposed was to the effect that infected ships should be allowed to pass the Canal in quarantine if they were mainly employed in carrying troops or passengers, and bound only for British ports.

I am, &c.

(Signed) T. V. LISTER.

No. 20.

The British Delegates to the Venice Sanitary Conference to the Marquis of Salisbury.——
(Received January 27.)

My Lord,

Venice, January 24, 1892.

WE have the honour to forward herewith a copy of the statement made to the Conference on the 9th instant by Mr. J. W. Lowther on behalf of the English Delegates. In this statement we trust that the whole position of Her Majesty's Government is fully stated so far as the Anglo-Austrian Agreement of the 29th July 1891, is concerned.

We have, &c.

(Signed) JAMES W. LOWTHER.

J. MACKIE.

Inclosure in No. 20.

Observations présentées à la Conférence (constituée en Comité) par Mr. J. Lowther, Premier Délégué Britannique, en réponse aux Observations exposées par M. le Dr. Proust, au nom de la Délégation Française.

[See Inclosure 2 in No. 27.]

No. 21.

The British Delegates to the Venice Sanitary Conference to the Marquis of Salisbury.——
(Received January 27.)

My Lord,

Venice, January 24, 1892.

WE beg to inclose, for your Lordship's information, two copies of the modified French proposals in their final shape as they have been accepted by the Conference. Under your Lordship's directions we have only accepted them ad referendum; the amendment, which we proposed under the instructions contained in your Lordship's telegram of the 21st instant, not having proved acceptable to the Conference.

Although all the proposals are not such as a British Sanitary authority, starting upon a tabula rasa, would probably propose; yet in the main they follow the lines laid down by the Local Government Board, especially in the matter of the disinfection of cholera-soiled linen, and cholera-infected parts of ships.

We venture also to submit to your Lordship the following points in which the proposals appear to us to be a great advance upon the existing Regulations:—

1. The detention of ships at Suez is reduced to a minimum.
2. The period laid down under the existing Regulations of seven or ten days' detention at Tor for infected ships is reduced to a five days' detention of individuals in the immediate neighbourhood of Suez.
3. The said detention is limited to the case of a ship which has had cholera on board within seven days of arrival at Suez. (Under the existing Regulations no such limit of time is taken into account.)
4. The vicious system of considering a ship, regardless of its sanitary condition, as suspected or infected because it arrives from a cholera-infected port, is abolished.
5. Special facilities are given to passenger ships carrying a doctor.
6. The disinfection of linen, &c., is limited to the linen, &c., of the crew, in the event of a case of cholera having occurred amongst the crew only, and this is the portion of the ship's passengers which experience has shown to be the most liable to the disease.
7. The disembarkation of merchandise is entirely abolished.
8. The "arraisonnement" and disinfection, if it should be required, shall take place by night as well as by day, which will avoid unnecessary detention.
9. The period of twenty-four hours' observation for ships coming from a foul port is completely abolished.

We have, &c.
(Signed) JAMES W. LOWTHER.
J. MACKIE.

Inclosure in No. 21.

Modified French Proposals.

LE principe du passage en quarantaine des navires par le Canal de Suez, formulé dans le Protocole Austro-Anglais, est accepté, sous la réserve des mesures suivantes, propres à sauvegarder la santé publique de l'Égypte et de l'Europe.

Sous ce rapport, les navires sont répartis en trois classes:

1. Navires indemnes;
2. Navires Suspects;

1. Navires indemnes.—Les navires reconnus indemnes après visite médicale auront libre pratique immédiate, quelle que soit la nature de leur patente. Ils ne seront pas soumis à l'observation de vingt-quatre heures, qui est prescrite actuellement contre les navires avec patente brute.

2. Navires suspects, c'est-à-dire ayant eu des cas de choléra au moment du départ ou pendant la traversée, mais aucun cas nouveau depuis sept jours. Ces navires seront traités d'une façon différente suivant qu'ils ont, ou n'ont pas à bord un médecin et un appareil à désinfection (étuve).

(a) Les navires ayant un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuve) remplissant les conditions voulues, seront admis à passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine dans les conditions qui seront indiquées plus loin.

(b) Les autres navires suspects n'ayant ni le médecin ni l'appareil de désinfection (étuve) seront, avant d'être admis à transiter en quarantaine, retenus aux Sources de Moïse, pendant le temps nécessaire pour opérer la désinfection du linge sale, du linge de corps et autres objets susceptibles, et s'assurer de l'état sanitaire du navire.

S'il s'agit d'un navire postal, ou d'un paquebot spécialement affecté au transport des voyageurs, sans appareil de désinfection (étuve), mais ayant un médecin à bord, si l'autorité locale a l'assurance, par une constatation officielle, que les mesures d'assainissement et de désinfection ont été convenablement pratiquées, soit au point de départ, soit pendant la traversée, le passage en quarantaine sera accordé.

S'il s'agit de navires postaux ou de paquebots spécialement affectés au transport des voyageurs, sans appareil de désinfection (étuve) mais ayant un médecin à bord, si le dernier cas de choléra remonte à plus de quatorze jours et si l'état sanitaire du navire est satisfaisant, la libre pratique pourra être donnée à Suez, lorsque les opérations de désinfection seront terminées.

Pour les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours, les passagers à destination de l'Égypte seront débarqués aux Sources de Moïse et isolés pendant vingt-quatre heures, et leur linge sale et leurs effets à usage désinfectés. Ils recevront alors la libre pratique.

Le Règlement déterminera dans quelles conditions la totalité du linge sale pourra ne pas être désinfectée.*

3. Navires infectés, c'est-à-dire ayant du choléra à bord ou ayant présenté des cas nouveaux de choléra depuis sept jours. Ils se divisent en navires avec médecin et appareil de désinfection (étuve) et navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuve).

(a) Les navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuve) seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse, les malades débarqués et isolés dans un hôpital. La désinfection

* Lorsque le choléra se montrera exclusivement dans l'équipage, la désinfection ne portera que sur le linge sale de l'équipage, mais tout le linge sale de l'équipage, et dans les postes d'habitation de l'équipage.
sera pratiquée d'une façon complète. Les autres passagers débarqués et isolés par groupes aussi peu nombreux que possible, de façon à ce que l'ensemble ne soit pas solidaire d'un groupe particulier si le choléra venait à se développer. Le linge sale, les objets à usage, les vêtements de l'équipage et les passagers seront désinfectés ainsi que le navire.

Il est bien entendu qu'il ne s'agit pas du déchargement des marchandises, mais seulement de la désinfection de la partie du navire qui a été infectée.

Les passagers resteront cinq jours à l'établissement des Sources de Moïse.

Lorsque les cas de choléra remonteront à plusieurs jours, la durée de l'isolement pourra être diminuée. Cette durée variera selon l'époque de l'apparition du dernier cas.

(b.) Le passage en quarantaine pourra même être accordé avant l'expiration des cinq jours, par l'autorité Sanitaire, après la désinfection opérée, si le navire possède un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuve) présentant les conditions indiquées.

Pour les navires postaux dans le cas où la maladie n'aurait eu qu'une partie limitée du navire, l'autorité locale sera juge de l'opportunité du débarquement, du nombre des personnes à désinfecter suivant les postes qu'elles occupent à bord. Elle aura également à déterminer les points du navire à désinfecter.

Par exception, s'il s'agit de grands transports de troupes soumises à la discipline militaire, si le navire possède un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuve), l'autorité Sanitaire pourra prescrire seulement le débarquement des personnes logées dans le compartiment du navire où la maladie s'est déclarée. Pendant le débarquement ce compartiment et la section de l'hôpital dans laquelle le ou les malades auront été transportés, ainsi que les objets à usage de toutes les personnes qui ont été en rapport avec eux, seront complètement désinfectés.

L'autorité Sanitaire du bord déclarera, sous serment, quels sont le ou les compartiments infectés ou suspects.

Le linge sale du reste des troupes subira la désinfection à bord. En outre, une étuve placée sur un ponton pourra venir accoster le navire pour rendre plus rapides les opérations de désinfection.

Dispositions concernant le Passage en Quarantaine.

1. L'autorité Sanitaire de Suez accorde le passage en quarantaine ; le Conseil est immédiatement informé.

Dans les cas douteux la décision est prise par le Conseil.

2. Un télégramme est aussitôt expédié à l'autorité désignée par chaque Puissance.

L'expédition du télégramme sera aux frais du bâtiment.

Chaque Puissance édictera les dispositions pénales contre les bâtiments qui, abandonnant le parcours indiqué par le capitaine, aborderaient indûment un des ports du territoire de cette Puissance.

Seront exceptionnés les cas de force majeure et de relâche forcée.

3. Lors de l'arraisonnement, le capitaine sera tenu de déclarer s'il a à son bord des équipes de chauffeurs indigènes, ou des serviteurs à gages, quelconques, non inscrits sur le registre du bord ("log book").

4. Un officier et deux Gardes Sanitaires montent à bord.

Ils doivent accompagner le navire jusqu'à Port-Saïd ; ils ont pour mission d'empêcher les communications et de veiller à l'exécution des mesures prescrites pendant la traversée du Canal.

5. Tout embarquement et tout transbordement de passagers et de marchandises sont interdits pendant le parcours du Canal, de Suez à Port-Saïd inclusivement.

6. Les navires transitant en quarantaine devront effectuer le parcours de Suez à Port-Saïd sans garages.

En cas d'échouage ou de garage indispensable, les opérations nécessaires seront exécutées par le personnel du bord, en évitant toute communication avec le personnel de la Compagnie du Canal de Suez.

7. Le stationnement des navires transitant en quarantaine est interdit dans le port de Port-Saïd.

Les opérations de ravitaillement devront être pratiquées avec les moyens du bord.

Les chargers ou toute autre personne qui seront montés à bord, seront isolés sur le ponton quarantenaire.

Leurs vêtements y subiront la désinfection réglementaire.

8. Lorsqu'il sera indispensable, pour des navires transitant en quarantaine, de prendre du charbon à Port-Saïd, ils devront exécuter cette opération hors du port, entre les jetées.

9. Les pilotes, les électriciens, les agents de la Compagnie, les Gardes Sanitaires seront
débarqués à Port-Said, hors du port entre les jetées, et de là conduits directement au ponton de quarantaine, où leurs vêtements subiront une désinfection complète.

[For Translation, see Inclosure 3 in No. 27.]

No. 22.

Local Government Board to Foreign Office.—(Received January 28.)

Sir,

Local Government Board, Whitehall, January 28, 1892.

I AM directed by the Local Government Board to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 26th instant, and their inclosures, with reference to the proposals before the Sanitary Conference now sitting at Venice. In forwarding to you, for the information of the Marquis of Salisbury, the accompanying copy of a Minute on the subject by the Board's Assistant Medical Officer, I am to state that the Board concur in the observations contained therein.

I am, &c.,

(Signed) ALFRED D. ADRIAN.

Assistant Secretary.

Inclosure in No. 22.

Minute.

The President,

I HAVE read the despatch of the British Delegates dated the 14th January, 1892, together with the inclosure, embodying Regulations as to (1) healthy ships, (2) suspected ships, and (3) infected ships, based on the French proposals. These proposals were, it is stated in the covering letter, “accepted in principle by the Conference on the 23rd,” and I therefore assume that they have superseded the proposals embodied in the Austro-English Protocol of the 29th July, 1891.

The despatch states, as regards the precautions embodied in the inclosure, that they “are directed against actual disease, as is the case in the Local Government Board Regulations of 1890 against cholera.” I would, with all deference, point out that the comparison involves a misconception of the Board’s Order and Regulations. That Order is based on the principle now maintained by England for at least eighteen years, that the detention of those on board ship should be limited to (1) persons actually “suffering from cholera,” and (2) persons suffering from “any illness which the Medical Officer of Health suspects may prove to be cholera.” The Order further lays it down that any person not certified under one or other of these two classes “shall be permitted to land,” and, subject to his supplying certain information, shall be allowed to proceed to his destination.

As I read the Regulations based on the French proposals the matter is altogether different. Ships that are admittedly without actual disease, i.e., cholera, on board, but which happen to have had a case of that disease “within seven days of arrival at Suez,” are to be sent to Moses’ Wells, and after any “sick” have been disembarked and isolated, “the remainder of the passengers,” i.e., those believed to be actually healthy at the time, are also to be “disembarked and isolated” in groups. Even where there is a doctor on board the same system of disembarkation of the healthy can be insisted on. There thus remains a fundamental difference between the French proposals and the Regulations embodied in the Board’s Cholera Order of 1890, and it is this difference which raises grave apprehension as to the result of the application of the new proposals to those on board British ships.

As regards the period of detention for those who are presumptively healthy, a period of five days is suggested as the usual one. But it is clearly intended, by reference to the system of grouping, that this period shall be renewed for the entire group, healthy as well as sick, so long as any fresh cases occur. This is misconceived isolation; it is essentially the “quarantaine de rigueur” of the Constantinople Conference of 1866.

* The detention of this latter class is limited to a “period not exceeding two days,” it is for diagnostic purposes “in order that it may be ascertained whether the illness is or is not cholera.”

† As distinguished from “quarantaine d’observation.”
It is true that, in regard of vessels carrying a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus, or a doctor only, the five days "may" not be insisted on in respect of healthy persons, and that as regards these and other special vessels the "Sanitary authority" may, if they see fit, otherwise abate the stringency of certain Regulations. But I assume that the "Sanitary authority" must, of necessity, be guided in these and a number of other matters referred to in the proposals by the "médecin de service" to whom I made reference in my previous Minute of the 15th January, 1892.

Troop-ships are especially referred to in the despatch. It may therefore be well to state that under the exceptional advantages of medical control, discipline, &c., on board British troop-ships, experience has shown that the best method of staying cholera is the most rapid passage possible into a higher latitude than the Red Sea.

In so far, therefore, as medical considerations are concerned, I cannot but regard many of the Regulations attached to the despatch as being both unnecessary and calculated to involve danger to those who may be subjected to them.

(For the Medical Officer),
(Initialled) R. T. T.

January 27, 1892.

P.S.—The telegram of the 26th January, 4:30 p.m., since received, modifies the Agreement in respect of disembarking "cholera patients and contaminated [? linen]" only. This appears to be an important concession. Its value will depend upon the scope of its application, i.e., to one or other class of vessel, and on the method of its application by the individual with whom the system of control immediately rests.

R. T. T.

No. 23

The Marquis of Salisbury to the British Delegates to the Venice Sanitary Conference.

Gentlemen,

I APPROVE your proceedings, as reported in your despatch of the 23rd instant, with the view to obtain the assent of the Conference to a Regulation under which transports and passenger-ships, considered to be infected with cholera, should be allowed to pass through the Suez Canal in quarantine, when bound direct to a port in the United Kingdom.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 24.

The British Delegates to the Venice Sanitary Conference to the Marquis of Salisbury.—

(Received January 20.)

My Lord,

WE beg to inclose, for your Lordship's information, an amended copy of the modified French proposals as finally agreed to at the meeting of the Conference held to-day, subject to the reservation made by ourselves in accordance with your Lordship's directions contained in your Lordship's telegram of the 21st instant.

We have, &c.

(Signed) JAMES W. LOWTHIER.
J. MACKIE.

Inclosure in No. 24.

Modified French Proposals as finally agreed to.

LE principe du passage en quarantaine des navires par le Canal de Suez, formulé dans le Protocole Austro-Anglais, est accepté, sous la réserve des mesures suivantes, propres à sauvegarder la santé publique de l'Egypte et de l'Europe.

* Giving substance of No. 24.
† Giving substance of No. 14.
Sous ce rapport, les navires sont répartis en trois classes :

1. Navires Indemnes ;
2. Navires Suspects ;

1. Navires Indemnes.—Les navires reconnus indemnes après visite médicale, auront libre pratique immédiate, quelle que soit la nature de leur patente.
Ils ne seront pas soumis à l'observation de vingt-quatre heures qui est prescritte actuellement contre les navires avec patente brute.

2. Navires Suspects, c'est-à-dire ayant eu des cas de choléra au moment du départ ou pendant la traversée, mais aucun cas nouveau depuis sept jours. Ces navires seront traités d'une façon différente suivant qu'ils ont, ou n'ont pas à bord un médecin et un appareil à désinfection (étuves).
(a.) Les navires ayant un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuves) remplissant les conditions voulues, seront admis à passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine dans les conditions qui seront indiquées plus loin.
(b.) Les autres navires suspects n'ayant ni le médecin ni l'appareil de désinfection (étuves) seront, avant d'être admis à transiter en quarantaine, retenus aux Sources de Moïse pendant le temps nécessaire pour opérer la désinfection du linge sale, du linge de corps, et autres objets susceptibles, et s'assurer de l'état sanitaire du navire.
S'il s'agit d'un navire postal, ou d'un paquebot spécialement affecté au transport des voyageurs, sans appareil de désinfection (étuves), mais ayant un médecin à bord—si l'autorité locale a l'assurance, par une constatation officielle, que les mesures d'assainissement et de désinfection ont été convenablement pratiquées, soit au point de départ, soit pendant la traversée, le passage en quarantaine sera accordé.
S'il s'agit de navires postaux ou de paquebots spécialement affectés au transport des voyageurs, sans appareil de désinfection (étuves) mais ayant un médecin à bord ; si le dernier cas de choléra remonte à plus de quatorze jours, et si l'état sanitaire du navire est satisfaisant, la libre pratique pourra être donnée à Suez, lorsque les opérations de désinfection seront terminées.
Pour les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours, les passagers à destination de l'Égypte seront débarqués aux Sources de Moïse et isolés pendant vingt-quatre heures, et leur linge sale et leurs effets à usage désinfectés. Ils recevront alors la libre pratique.
Les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours et demandant à obtenir la libre pratique en Égypte seront également détenus pendant vingt-quatre heures aux Sources de Moïse.
Le Règlement déterminera dans quelles conditions la totalité du linge sale pourra ne pas être désinfectée.*

3. Navires Infectés, c'est-à-dire ayant du choléra à bord ou ayant présenté des cas nouveaux de choléra depuis sept jours. Ils se diviseront en navires avec médecin et appareil de désinfection (étuves) et navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuves).
(a.) Les navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuves) seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse, les malades débarqués et isolés dans un hôpital. La désinfection sera pratiquée d'une façon complète. Les autres passagers débarqués et isolés par groupes aussi peu nombreux que possible, de façon à ce que l'ensemble ne soit pas solidaire d'un groupe particulier si le choléra venait à se développer. Le linge sale, les objets à usage, les vêtements de l'équipage et des passagers seront désinfectés, ainsi que le navire.
Il est bien entendu qu'il ne s'agit pas du déchargement des marchandises, mais seulement de la désinfection de la partie du navire qui a été infectée.
Les passagers resteront cinq jours à l'établissement des Sources de Moïse.
Lorsque les cas de choléra remonteront à plusieurs jours, la durée de l'isolement pourra être diminuée. Cette durée variera selon l'époque de l'apparition du dernier cas.
(b.) Le passage en quarantaine pourra même être accordé avant l'expiration des cinq jours, par l'autorité Sanitaire, après la désinfection opérée, si le navire possède un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuves) présentant les conditions indiquées.
Pour les navires postaux dans le cas où la maladie n'aurait envahi qu'une partie limitée du navire, l'autorité locale sera juge de l'opportunité du débarquement, du nombre des personnes à débarquer suivant les postes qu'elles occupent à bord. Elle aura également à déterminer les points du navire à désinfecter.

* Lorsque le choléra se montrera exclusivement dans l'équipage, la désinfection ne portera que sur le linge sale de l'équipage, mais tout le linge sale de l'équipage, et dans les postes d'habitation de l'équipage.
Lorsque toutes ces opérations auront été accomplies si le navire abandonne ses malades et ses suspects, il pourra transiter le Canal en quarantaine sans retard.

Par exception, s'il s'agit de grands transports de troupes soumises à la discipline militaire, si le navire possède un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (éveu), l'autorité Sanitaire pourra prescrire seulement le débarquement des personnes logées dans le compartiment du navire où la maladie s'est déclarée. Pendant le débarquement ce compartiment et la section de l'hôpital dans laquelle le ou les malades auront été transportés, ainsi que les objets à usage de toutes les personnes qui ont été en rapport avec eux, seront complètement désinfectés.

L'autorité Sanitaire du bord déclarera sous serment quels sont le ou les compartiments infectés ou suspects.

Le ligne sale du reste des troupes subira la désinfection à bord. En outre une étuve placée sur un ponton pourra venir accoster le navire pour rendre plus rapides les opérations de désinfection.

L'autorité Sanitaire du bord déclarera sous serment quels sont le ou les compartiments infectés ou suspects.

Dispositions concernant le Passage en Quarantaine.

1. L'autorité Sanitaire de Suez accorde le passage en quarantaine; le Conseil est immédiatement informé.
   Dans les cas douteux la décision est prise par le Conseil.

2. Un télégramme est aussitôt expédié à l'autorité désignée par chaque Puissance.
   L'expédition du télégramme sera aux frais du bâtiment.

Chaque Puissance édictera les dispositions pénales contre les bâtiments qui, abandonnant le parcours indiqué par le capitaine, aborderaient indûment un des ports du territoire de cette Puissance.

Seront exceptés les cas de force majeure et de relâche forcée.

3. Lors de l'arraisonnement, le capitaine sera tenu de déclarer s'il a à son bord des équipes de charbonniers indigènes, ou des serviteurs à gages, quelconques, non inscrits sur le registre du bord ("log-book").

4. Un officier et deux Garde Sanitaires montent à bord.
   Ils doivent accompagner le navire jusqu'à Port-Saïd; ils ont pour mission d'empêcher les communications et de veiller à l'exécution des mesures prescrites pendant la traversée du Canal.

5. Tout embarquement et tout transbordement de passagers et de marchandises sont interdits pendant le parcours du Canal, de Suez à Port-Saïd inclusivement.

6. Les navires transitant en quarantaine devront effectuer le parcours de Suez à Port-Saïd sans garages.

En cas d'échouage ou de garage indispensable, les opérations nécessaires seront exécutées par le personnel du bord, en évitant toute communication avec le personnel de la Compagnie du Canal de Suez.

Les transports de troupes transitant en quarantaine seront tenus de transiter seulement de jour. S'ils doivent sejourner de nuit dans le Canal ils prendront leur mouillage au Lac Timsah.

7. Le stationnement des navires transitant en quarantaine est interdit dans le port de Port-Saïd.

Les opérations de ravitaillement devront être pratiquées avec les moyens du bord.

Ceux des chargeurs ou toute autre personne qui seront montés à bord, seront isolés sur le ponton quarantenaire.

Leurs vêtements y subiront la désinfection réglementaire.

8. Lorsqu'il sera indispensable, pour des navires transitant en quarantaine, de prendre du charbon à Port-Saïd, ils devront exécuter cette opération hors du port, entre les jetées.

9. Les pilotes, les électriciens, les agents de la Compagnie, les Garde Sanitaires seront débarqués à Port-Saïd, hors du port entre les jetées, et de là conduits directement au ponton de quarantaine où leurs vêtements subiront une désinfection complète.

(Translation.)

THE principle of passing ships in quarantine through the Suez Canal, stated in the Austro-English Protocol, is accepted upon condition of the adoption of the following measures, which are calculated to safeguard public health in Egypt and in Europe.
With this object, ships are divided into three classes:

1. Healthy ships;
2. Suspected ships;
3. Infected ships.

1. Healthy Ships.—Ships found to be healthy after medical inspection will obtain immediate pratique, whatever be the nature of their bill of health. They will not be subject to the twenty-four hours' observation now in force against ships with foul bills of health.

2. Suspected Ships, that is to say, ships having had cases of cholera on board on departure or during the voyage, but having had no fresh case within seven days of arrival at Suez. Those ships will be treated differently, according as they do or do not carry a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus (“étuve”).

(a.) Ships carrying a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus of proper construction shall be allowed to pass the Suez Canal in quarantine under the Regulations hereinafter laid down.

(b.) Other suspected ships, carrying neither doctor nor disinfecting apparatus, will, before being allowed to transit in quarantine, be detained at Moses' Wells during the time required for disinfecting their dirty linen, body clothing, and other susceptible things, and for ascertaining the sanitary condition of the ship.

In the case of a mail-ship, or of a packet specially engaged in the passenger traffic, having no disinfecting apparatus, but carrying a doctor, if the local Sanitary authority is assured by official evidence that the requisite measures of sanitation and disinfection have been properly carried out, either at the port of departure or during the voyage, transit in quarantine shall be granted.

In the case of mail-ships, or of packets specially engaged in the passenger traffic, having no disinfecting apparatus, but carrying a doctor, if the last case of cholera occurred more than fourteen days before, and if the sanitary state of the ship is satisfactory, free pratique may be given at Suez, when the operation of disinfection is over.

In the case of ships having had a passage of less than fourteen days, passengers for Egypt will disembark at Moses' Wells and be isolated for twenty-four hours, and their dirty linen and used clothing be disinfected. They will then receive full pratique.

Ships having had a passage of less than fourteen days, and wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt, will also be detained twenty-four hours at Moses' Wells.

The Regulations shall lay down under what circumstances the dirty linen and susceptible things need not all be disinfected.*

3. Infected Ships, that is to say, ships having a case of cholera on board, or having had a fresh case of cholera within seven days of arrival at Suez, are divided into ships with a doctor and disinfecting apparatus (“étuve”), and ships without a doctor and disinfecting apparatus.

(a.) Ships without a doctor and disinfecting apparatus will be sent to Moses' Wells, the sick will be disembarked and isolated in a hospital. Thorough disinfection will be applied. The remainder of the passengers will be disembarked and isolated in as small groups as possible, in order that the whole number of passengers may not be affected by a case of cholera occurring in any one particular group. Dirty linen, things in use, the clothes of the crew and of the passengers, will be disinfected as well as the ship.

It is understood that no disembarkation of cargo is to take place, and that only the infected part of the ship is to be disinfected.

The passengers will remain five days at the establishment of Moses' Wells.

When the cases of cholera occurred several days before, the period of isolation may be shortened. The length of such period of isolation will vary according to the date of the appearance of the last case of cholera.

(b.) Transit in quarantine may even be granted by the Sanitary authority before the expiration of the said five days if disinfection has been applied, and if the ship carries a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus of the required kind.

In the case of mail-ships, where the cholera has only shown itself in a limited part of the ship, it shall be for the Sanitary authority to determine the necessity, if any, for disembarkation, and the number of persons to be disembarked, according to the position

* Should cholera occur only amongst the crew, disinfection will extend to the dirty linen of the crew only, but it shall extend to all the dirty linen of the crew and the spaces occupied by the crew.
which they occupied on board. The Sanitary authority will also determine what parts of the ship will require to be disinfected.

When all these operations have been completed, if the ship abandons her sick and her suspects, she may at once pass the Canal in quarantine.

Exceptional treatment will be accorded to large transport-ships, subject to military discipline, and carrying a doctor and disinfecting apparatus. In this case the Sanitary authority need only compel the disembarkation of persons living in that compartment of the ship in which the case of cholera broke out. While the men are disembarked, this compartment and the section of the ship's hospital to which the sick individual or individuals may have been taken, together with things used by any persons in contact with the sick, shall be completely disinfected.

The ship's Sanitary authority shall, under oath, declare what compartments are infected or suspected.

The dirty linen of the rest of the troops shall be disinfected on board. Furthermore, a disinfecting apparatus may be brought alongside on a lighter in order the more quickly to carry out the disinfection.

Ships wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt will be detained at Moses' Wells five days from the last case that occurred on board.

Provisions respecting the Passage of the Canal in Quarantine.

1. The Sanitary authority at Suez grants the permission to pass the Canal in quarantine; the Board is at once informed that such permission has been granted. In doubtful cases the Board decides.

2. A telegram is at once sent to the authority appointed for the purpose by each Power. The telegram is sent at the expense of the ship. Each Power will provide penal measures against ships which abandon the course indicated by the captain, and improperly touch at any of the ports in the territory of such Power.

Cases of vis major and stress of weather are excepted.

3. At the examination of the ship, the captain will be bound to declare if he has had on board native stokers or any paid servants whatsoever not entered on the log-book.

4. An officer and two Sanitary Guards go on board the ship. They travel with the ship as far as Port Sa'id; it is their duty to prevent communication, and to see that the required measures are carried out during the passage of the Canal.

5. All shipping and transhipping of passengers and goods are prohibited during the passage of the Canal from Suez to Port Said inclusive.

6. Ships passing in quarantine must not enter a passing station between Suez and Port Said. Should a ship run aground, or should she be obliged to enter a passing station, the necessary operations shall be carried out by the ship's staff, and all communication with the Suez Canal Company's staff shall be avoided.

Transporte passing in quarantine may pass by day only. If forced to pass the night in the Canal, they must anchor in Lake Timsah.

7. Ships passing in quarantine are prohibited from remaining in Port Said. The operation of revictualling shall be carried out by the ship's staff. Any porters or others who may have gone on board shall be isolated on the quarantine pontoon.

Their clothes shall be disinfected according to the Regulations.

8. In case ships passing in quarantine are obliged to coal at Port Said they must do so outside the port, between the pier-heads. Pilots, electricians, Company's agents, and Sanitary Guards shall be landed at Port Said, outside the port, between the pier-heads, and shall thence be taken directly to the quarantine pontoon, where their clothes shall be thoroughly disinfected.

No. 25.

The Marquis of Salisbury to the British Delegates to the Venice Sanitary Conference.

(Extract.) Foreign Office, January 29, 1892.

I HAVE received and carefully considered your despatch of the 24th instant, inclosing a copy of the proposals of the French Delegate in the form in which they were
accepted by the majority of the Conference. I agree with you in the opinion that if the proposals are executed in an impartial manner, with a due regard to the commercial interests of all the nations making use of the Canal, the system of quarantine established by these proposals is a considerable improvement on that which nominally prevails at present. I should select as specially worthy of approbation the proposal to judge of the healthiness of ships by their actual condition rather than by the condition of the places which they may have previously visited.

But it is evident that the innocuous character of this new system of quarantine depends upon the spirit in which it is to be administered by those who will have authority to do so. Much obstruction which might be very oppressive to commerce could be inflicted under the rules which at the present moment are in force. If they were applied harshly, and still more if they were applied unequally, they might do serious injury to the trade of a particular nation. The advantage of the existing system is that though much fault may be found with the rigour of its provisions, it has been administered in so fair and so judicious a spirit that the cases of real hardship have been comparatively few.

The operation of the new proposals, if they were adopted, would in the same manner largely depend upon the disposition of the Sanitary Council, or of the local authorities who apparently are to be appointed by them. I will pass by the provisions which affect suspected ships, and also, for the present, those that deal with infected ships, except so far as they apply to troop-ships and passenger-ships. I do not mean to say that there is nothing to criticize in those which I omit to notice; but the observations I desire to make will be sufficiently illustrated by the more important and pressing case of the troop-ships and passenger-ships. In respect to these, there is to be an unlimited discretion of ordering the disembarkation not only of the patients themselves, but of healthy persons also whom it may be supposed for sanitary reasons to be necessary to put into quarantine. A certain limit is admitted in respect to troop-ships, but it is not stated with sufficient definiteness to enable me to appreciate its operation. If the disembarkation of contaminated persons applies only to those who have been actually touched by the infected matter, its operation may possibly not be the subject of complaint; but the power of selecting the passengers who are to disembark is entirely discretionary. If administered injudiciously it may cause needless inconvenience, or suffering, or even danger to those on whom it operates. It is the well-known conviction of those who are opposed to the system of quarantine, that by massing healthy persons in localities which are almost certain to be infected, under circumstances of every kind prejudicial to their health, it does far more to spread the disease against which it is directed. Whether the new rules will have an oppressive effect, whether they will inflict unnecessary hardship or danger upon the troops or the passengers brought under their action, will depend entirely upon the spirit of the administrators at Suez and at Alexandria.

I need not add that these rules will bear still more hardly upon the crews and passengers of ordinary cargo-ships, who will apparently be detained at Moses' Wells, usually for five days, whether they are brought under the definition of "contaminated" or not. But there is this difference between the case of passenger-ships belonging to the postal lines and ordinary cargo-ships. With cargo-ships the injury is limited to the actual inconvenience or hardship of the detention to which the ship and those on board her are subjected. But in the case of a passenger-ship, the injury may go much further. It may operate upon the whole undertaking of the Company to which they belong. The object of all passengers arranging for the homeward voyage will be to select the ship which is least liable to interruption of this kind; and if there is any prevalent impression that the ships of some particular Company, or of some particular nation, are more liable than others to a harsh and rigorous application of the rules, it is evident that that line of ships will speedily be ruined.

Reference is made in the Report of the Local Government Board to the uncertainty which, owing to the narrow line which separates Asiatic cholera from other maladies, attends the facts in the present case; and the consequently wide limit which is almost necessarily given to the discretion of any person administering such Regulations as those that are proposed by the French Delegates. With reference to this consideration, it is well here to quote the views entertained upon the French proposal by Dr. Buchanan and Dr. Thorne Thorne, the medical officers for the Local Government Board in this country:—

"Whilst the French proposal submitted by Dr. Proust embodies greater concessions than the French have heretofore been willing to assent to, yet they contain several objectionable features of importance:

1. Vessels will be held to be 'indemnes,' 'suspects,' or 'infectés' according as a 'médecin de service' shall decide after a visit to the vessels, and this irrespective of their 'patente.' This is a great responsibility for such a nation as England to hand over to an
unknown man, whose decision can hardly fail to be governed according to the country of his nationality, and the place where he received his medical education and training.

"2. The detention in quarantine for 'navires infectæs,' nominally for five days, is that against which England has hitherto always protested. The five days will be repeated every time the person in authority chooses to hold that a fresh case or suspected case has occurred. The circumstances of detention on the shore of the Red Sea are, both as regards climate and inadequacy of accommodation, precisely such as are calculated to lead to a spread of cholera, and the arrangements suggested for isolating passengers, &c., in groups are hardly likely to be carried out—and could not be carried out and properly maintained except at great cost—in any such manner as to do away with the dangers attendant on such detention."

It is manifest from these considerations that the merits or demerits of any system of quarantine, especially of any in which a large discretion is allowed, must depend upon the constitution of the body by whom it is administered. Unless we are satisfied in this respect, the undoubted advantages that belong to some parts of the French proposal can hardly reconcile us to a change of the existing system.

At present quarantine is administered by the Alexandrian Board of Health, in which nine Egyptian officers have seats. The number of foreign Delegates who also have seats is slightly larger, but in practice the Council as it works has almost always a majority of Egyptian Delegates present. The working of the quarantine system is therefore that of the Egyptian Government. Setting aside the peculiar circumstances, which at the present moment give a great weight to the opinion of Great Britain in the eyes of the Egyptian Government, this authority is probably as impartial as any that could be selected. It is not accessible to the bias by which particular schools of medicine are affected; nor has it any reason for preferring the commerce of one nation before another. In practice after an experience, which has now extended over a considerable number of years, we have had no serious ground for complaining of the manner in which its duties are performed.

But under the proposed system, these nine Egyptian Delegates will be cut down to three. Egypt will no longer control the deliberations of the Council. Whatever guarantee we derive from the impartiality of the Egyptian Government, or from its inclination to receive our representations with consideration, will entirely disappear. The responsibility which now presses upon the single mind of the Egyptian Ruler, of selecting fit depositaries for this power, will be dissipated among a number of Governments, some of them very moderately interested in the matter.

For the year 1800, 77 per cent. of the net tonnage that passed through the Canal belonged to Great Britain. Sweden and Norway, Russia, Portugal, and Greece, contributed a net tonnage each of less than 1 per cent.; Belgium and Denmark sent no ships at all; yet these Powers together, contributing less than 1 ½ per cent. of the traffic of the Canal, on a division will have six times as much weight as Great Britain, and twice as much weight as the Egyptian Ruler of the soil.

The matter has been very carefully considered by Her Majesty’s Government, with every desire to provide legitimate satisfaction for those Powers which rely upon the system of quarantine. Her Majesty’s Government are very sensible of the improvements which in many respects the French proposals would introduce into the Regulations which are now in force; but it does not seem to them possible to confide large discretionary powers which may be used, if they are used badly, with fatal consequences to British trade, to a body in which British influence will bear no kind of proportion to the vast British interests which are involved in the free passage of the Canal.

I have therefore, by telegraph, informed you to-day that in view of the powers confided to the authorities, especially in the case of healthy persons in ships classed as infected, Her Majesty’s Government are not prepared to agree to the change in the constitution of the Egyptian Board which has been accepted by the majority.

No. 26.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir A. Paget.

Sir, Foreign Office, January 29, 1892.

COUNT DEYM spoke to me about the Venio Sanitary Conference, as to which there were material differences between the view taken by Great Britain and by many of the other Powers.

I said that the discussions had to a certain extent come on me by surprise. We had agreed to attend the Conference on the understanding that the Anglo-Austrian Protocol
was to be the subject of discussion in the first instance. When our Plenipotentiaries arrived there, it appeared that the French Government had put forward a totally different scheme as an amendment, and had gained so many Powers round to their view that it was useless to submit the Protocol to the Conference.

The consequence was that I was imperfectly informed as to the precise resolutions that had been provisionally adopted, as well as to the reasons by which they were supported.

Our general view was that we could not admit that the strength of the Egyptian Government in the Sanitary Council should be diminished unless the regulations were such as to make the British trade secure from vexatious interference. As at present advised it seemed to me we ought to insist on the general right to passage in quarantine if the Council was made a more purely international body than it was now.

I did not reject the possibility of some plan being arranged by which the views of Great Britain and the other Powers could be accommodated. But I pointed out to him that Great Britain owned 72 per cent. of the tonnage which passed through the Canal; and that in the reformed Council, from which the Egyptian vote was to be to a great extent eliminated, six Powers which sent scarcely any tonnage to the Canal would have six times as much voting power as Great Britain. I feared that it would take some time to arrange a Council which should be fair to Great Britain if the Regulation gave an unfettered power of sending healthy persons to the lazaretto.

It would hardly be possible for the Conference now to adjust this difficulty. I ventured to suggest that, in order to give time for a separate negotiation, the Conference should adjourn. His Excellency promised to lay the suggestion before his Government.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

---

The British Delegates to the Venice Sanitarian Conference to the Marquis of Salisbury.—
(Received February 4.)

My Lord, Venice, January 31, 1892.

WE have the honour to submit to your Lordship a Report of the proceedings of the Sanitary Conference at Venice which has recently concluded its labours, and to which we had the honour of being appointed as the British Delegates.

The Conference met on the 5th January, and at the first sitting proceeded to appoint Count d’Arco, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs in the Italian Government, as its Chairman.

The following is a list of the Powers represented and of the names of the Delegates who attended the Conference:—

Germany.

Delegates—
Count Leyden, Councillor of Legation, German Consul-General at Cairo.
Dr. Kulp, German Delegate to the Alexandria Sanitary Board.

Austria-Hungary.

Delegates—
Count Kuefstein, Privy Councillor and Chamberlain to His Imperial, Royal, and Apostolic Majesty, his Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.
Chevalier Ch. de Gsiller, Consul-General for Austria-Hungary.

Assistant Delegates—
Dr. Hagel, Austro-Hungarian Delegate to the Superior Council of Health at Constantinople.
Dr. Karlnski, Military Doctor.

Belgium.

Delegate—
M. E. Beco, Secretary-General to the Ministry of Agriculture, Industry, and Public Works of Belgium.
DENMARK.
Delegate—
Count Knuth, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.

EGYPT.
Delegates—
Boutros Pasha, Under-Secretary of State for Justice.
Dr. Mahmoud Salhy Pashn, Under-Director of the Administration of Sanitary Services and Public Health.
Mr. Mieville, President of the Sanitary Board of Alexandria.

SPAIN.
Delegates—
Don Silverio Baguer de Corsi y Ribas, Count de Baguer, Minister Resident.
Dr. Cortezo, Councillor of Health of Spain, Member of the Academy of Medicine, Deputy.

FRANCE.
Delegates—
M. Barrère, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary for France at Munich.
Dr. Proust, Professor at the Faculty of Medicine, Inspector-General of Sanitary Services.
Dr. Frouardel, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, President of the Health Committee of France.
Dr. Catelan, Delegate to the Alexandria Board of Health.

GREAT BRITAIN.
Delegates—
Mr. James W. Lowther, M.P., Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Dr. Mackie, British Delegate to the Alexandria Board of Health.
Secretary to the British Delegates—
Mr. H. Farnall.

GREECE.
Delegates—
Dr. Zancarol, Greek Delegate to the Alexandria Board of Health.
M. Georges Argyropoulos, Greek Diplomatic Agent in Egypt.

ITALY.
Delegates—
Count d’Arco, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Dr. Pagliani, Director-General of Public Health in the Ministry for the Interior.
Marquis Carenno, Consul-General.

NETHERLANDS.
Assistant Delegates—
Commendatore Mayor, Head of Department in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.
Dr. Torella, Delegate to the Alexandria Board of Health.

PORTUGAL.
Delegate—
Count de Macedo, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.

RUSSIA.
Delegate—
M. Jonine, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.
Assistant Delegate—
Baron Wrangel, First Secretary of Legation.
Sweden and Norway.

Delegate—
M. Bildt, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.

Turkey.

Delegates—
Arif Bey, Vice-President of the Constantinople Board of Health.
Ahmid Bey, Councillor of State.
Colonel Boukowskii Bey, Chemist to His Imperial Majesty the Sultan.
Dr. Hafreddin Bey, Professor at the Faculty of Medicine at Constantinople.

The Egyptian Delegates, although appearing in this list, had a consultative voice only, and were instructed to consider themselves as a part of the Turkish Delegation.

The programme of the Conference was as follows:—

"1. Délibérations et décisions à prendre à l'égard de l'arrangement signé à Londres le 29 Juillet, 1891, entre l'Autriche-Hongrie et la Grande-Bretagne relativement au transit en quarantaine par le Canal de Suez.

"2. Modifications à introduire dans la constitution du Conseil Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d'Egypte, notamment—

(a.) En ce qui concerne la question de n'admettre dorénavant comme membres du Conseil que des médecins diplômés et régulièrement salaris ou des Agents Consulaires de carrière d'un rang non inférieur à celui de Vice-Consul.

(b.) Revision des Règlements sanitaires actuellement en vigueur en Égypte, tels que le Règlement Général de Police Sanitaire, celui contre le choléra, ceux concernant les pêlerins, la désinfection, &c.

(c.) Institution d'un corps de Garde Sanitaire offrant les garanties nécessaires pour le service de transit en quarantaine.

(d.) Création de ressources financières suffisantes pour couvrir les frais occasionnés par les modifications du service Sanitaire ci-dessus indiquées; entretien des établissements quarantinaires, fourniture des appareils de désinfection, &c."**

This programme was at once entered upon and discussed seriatim.

As the Conference resolved itself into a General Committee at an early stage of its proceedings no formal record in the shape of a procès-verbal was kept, but the proceedings were summarized in a Report which has been drawn up by the Chairman, and will be eventually forwarded to your Lordship by the Italian Government.

The first point of the programme was the discussion and settlement to be arrived at upon the Anglo-Austrian Agreement of the 29th July, 1891, respecting the transit in quarantine of vessels through the Suez Canal.

The Agreement was submitted for the acceptance of the Conference by the Austro-Hungarian Delegate in a brief speech. Very little criticism was expended upon it until one of the French Technical Delegates, Dr. Proust, brought forward the French proposals, a copy of which we have the honour to inclose (Inclosure No. 1).

Referring to previous Sanitary Conferences held in Paris in 1851 and 1852, at Constantinople in 1866, at Vienna in 1874, and at Rome in 1885, Dr. Proust pointed out that the object of all those Conferences had been to endeavour to discover a means of preserving Europe against cholera, whilst the object of the Venice Conference seemed to be to

*(Translation.*)—"1. Deliberations and decisions to be taken with regard to the arrangement signed in London on the 29th July, 1891, between Austria-Hungary and Great Britain, relative to transit in quarantine through the Suez Canal.

2. Modifications to be introduced into the constitution of the Egyptian Sanitary, Maritime, and Quarantine Council, particularly:—

(a.) As regards the question of admitting as members of the Council only physicians with diplomas and regular salaries, or Consular officers in the regular service of a rank not inferior to that of Vice-Consul.

(b.) The revision of the Sanitary Regulations at present in force in Egypt, such as the General Regulation of Sanitary Police, that against cholera, and those concerning pilgrims and disinfection, &c.

(c.) Institution of a Sanitary Guard offering the necessary guarantees for the service of transit in quarantine.

(d.) The creation of sufficient financial resources to cover the expenses caused by the modifications in the Sanitary service indicated above, and the maintenance of quarantine establishments, and providing of disinfecting apparatus, &c."
provide for facilitating the admission of ships, even though infected, into the Mediterranean basin. Dr. Proust then dwelt on the impossibility of obtaining complete security against the contact of cholera-infected ships or of their occupants with the shore during their passage through the Suez Canal. He cited Dr. Koch as an authority for the statement that cholera had been communicated to Egypt in 1883 by the escape of a stoker, Mahommed Khalifa, from the ship "Timour."

He then proceeded to argue that if the right of passage in quarantine, under all circumstances, were to be allowed to British ships, it could not be refused to the ships of other nations, and that, if granted to all alike, it would be a source of great danger to those nations whose ports were comparatively near to the Suez Canal.

Adverting to the precautions taken in the Anglo-Austrian Agreement for securing that a ship which has passed in quarantine shall take the prescribed course, viz., to a port of the United Kingdom, he commented on the impossibility of provision for their effectual enforcement, and cited the case of the "Fulford." The captain of this ship, he averred, had obtained permission to transit the Canal in quarantine upon the statement that he was bound for a British port, but had, in fact, arrived at Paulliac.

Dr. Proust also pointed out the danger which arises for Europe if cholera breaks out in Egypt, and the difficulty of continuing the present state of things which does not reckon an Indian port as a foul port unless a widespread cholera epidemic is raging there. He then proceeded to expound the French proposals, which were as follows: The appointment by the Quarantine Board of a staff of four doctors at Suez, one of whom would be always ready to visit a ship on her arrival, whether by day or night; the division of ships into three classes, regardless of their bills of health, namely, Healthy, Suspected, and Infected.

The details of the French proposals will appear from a perusal of Dr. Proust's observations. The principles upon which they are founded are, that cholera is communicable by the dejections and vomit of the sick; that the period of incubation in the human subject is comparatively short, say, five days, but that the infective germ may retain its vitality for a long time, even for a year, in fouled linen, &c.; that the germ can be destroyed by disinfection, preferably by the application of damp heat under pressure; that the sick must therefore be landed at once, and that all persons with whom they may have been brought into contact, and to whom the germs of cholera may have been communicated, are sources of danger; that all linen, clothes, &c., which have been, or could have been, in contact with the sick are equally sources of danger, and must be disinfected by exposure to a high degree of heat in order to destroy the cholera germ. Upon this principle, therefore, ships carrying a proper disinfecting apparatus and doctor would be subjected to a less rigorous treatment than the others, and, generally speaking, the antiquated system of long quarantines would be replaced by thorough disinfection, and in extreme cases by short periods of isolation.

Dr. Proust quoted figures to show that if his system had been in force, only two ships out of 16,491 during the last five years would have come under the class of infected ships; and only fifty five during the last seven years under the class of suspected. These figures made a considerable impression upon the Conference. In the future, he urged, even this number would be reduced as further sanitary precautions came to be taken at the ports of departure and during the voyage.

We found ourselves in a considerable difficulty in dealing with the French proposals by reason of the fact, that we were wholly without notice of their character or scope before the sitting of the Conference in which they were actually propounded. There is no doubt that if they had been communicated to us before our arrival at Venice we should have had an opportunity of fully considering them, and seeking for advice from those best able to give it upon some of the numerous details which they involved, and upon the effect likely to be produced on British shipping.

At the next meeting of the Conference, however, we replied at full length in a speech delivered by Mr. Lowther, a copy of the Report of which we have the honour to inclose (Inclosure No. 2). We laid stress upon the possibility of discovering means of precluding all possibility of contact between a ship passing in quarantine and the shore. We pointed out that the Anglo-Austrian Agreement left to every nation full liberty of action as to the prophylactic measures which it might deem advisable to adopt. We dwelt upon the unreasonableness of stereotyping any particular system in view of the rapid march of science, and we combated the value of the particular cases cited by Dr. Proust.

The Anglo-Austrian Agreement, however, received scarcely any other active support. The Russian, Spanish, Portuguese, Turkish, and Belgian Delegates supported the French proposals, urging different points in their favour, whilst the Egyptian Delegates expressed themselves as favourable to the proposals for the passage in quarantine.
As it soon became evident to us that the Conference would not be prepared to accept the Anglo-Austrian Agreement in its entirety, we proceeded to examine very carefully the French proposals, with a view to obtaining modifications in them in the direction of the principles contained in the Anglo-Austrian Agreement.

It appeared to us that whilst they were not of such a nature as Great Britain herself would have adopted for her own use in her own ports, yet that they were at all events a great advance upon anything which the European Powers had hitherto found themselves able to accept.

We are aware that the proposed arrangements differ in certain points from the Local Government Board's order of 1890, notably in that they provide for the detention and isolation as “suspected persons” not only of those having an ailment suspected of being likely to prove to be cholera, but treat as suspected persons all, even the healthy, who have been in contact with the choleraic; and that they further provide for the detention of “suspected” persons for five days instead of two, as required under the Local Government Board Regulations. But we are convinced that public opinion in Egypt would not concur in the enactment of the Local Government Board Regulations, pure and simple, in that country, and we think that even if they could be enacted in Egypt, the Local Government Board Regulations might be regarded by the Mediterranean Powers as affording an insufficient protection to Egypt. Ships leaving Egyptian ports might, in such circumstances, be treated as “suspected” in Mediterranean ports, to the great inconvenience of all interested in Egyptian trade and navigation.

Indeed, several points in the French proposals seemed to be of a character advantageous to British shipping, e.g., the proposal that ships should be treated according to their actual sanitary condition, and not according to the sanitary condition of the port of departure; that disinfection should, ... the case of suspected ships, supersede quarantine, and that in the case of infected ships, they should be sent for five days to Moses' Wells (which is close to Suez), instead of as now for seven or ten days to Tor, which is about 125 miles south of Suez.

Eventually after some negotiation, the French proposals were modified in accordance with certain suggestions urged by ourselves.

The modified French proposals, a copy of which we beg to inclose (Inclusion No. 3), differ from the original French proposals in several important particulars, namely:—

1. The period during which a case of cholera must have occurred to bring ships into the infected class was reduced from eight days to seven.

2. In the event of a case of cholera occurring amongst the crew, the disinfection was limited to the duty lien of the crew instead of to that of the whole ship.

3. Mail and passenger steamers coming under the suspected class were permitted to pass in quarantine at once if they carried a doctor, and could show that disinfection had been properly carried out on board.

4. The same class of ships were given pratique if the case of cholera had occurred fourteen days before arrival, and if the ship was in a sanitary condition.

5. If the outbreak of cholera was confined to a particular part of the ship (being a mail or passenger ship), the sanitary authority at Suez was to exercise its discretion in deciding how far, if at all, disembarkation was necessary.

6. In the case of troop-ships with a doctor, and a disinfecting apparatus on board, such doctor was to point out the infected or suspected compartments, and only the persons occupying them were to be disembarked.

Another amendment which we subsequently proposed was accepted. Under its terms, mail and passenger ships finding themselves in the suspected class would be permitted to go forward in quarantine at once after disembarking the sick and suspected cases, and after disinfection.
As no other amendment was proposed, the discussion upon the French modified proposals was then closed.

Before proceeding to report to your Lordship the action of the Conference upon the other parts of the programme, we desire to offer a few remarks upon the character of the French modified proposals as accepted by the Conference.

The chief point in them is the admission, for which some of our Navigation Companies have long contended, that the sanitary condition of a ship must be judged by the state of the ship itself, and not by the state of the port of departure.

Under the existing Regulations of the Board, a ship arriving at Suez from a foul port is subjected to a period of quarantine varying from six days to twenty-four hours, according to the length of its journey, and is further subjected to disinfection, and to disembarkation of susceptible cargo before being permitted to enter the Canal.

During the five years from 1887 to 1891, inclusive, it appears that no less than 516 ships were so detained at Suez. If the French modified proposals had been in force during that period, all these ships would have passed in free pratique without any detention. In addition to this, 81 ships which passed the Canal in quarantine during the said period of five years, for one cause or another, would have also received free pratique at Suez.

Again, under the existing Regulations of the Board, a ship is held to be infected if she has had a case of cholera on board at any time however remote during her voyage, and is subject to seven days' quarantine at Tor, accompanied by disinfection of the ship and susceptible objects.

It is true that, owing to circumstances upon which it is unnecessary for us to dwell, ships, which would in the ordinary course have been sent to Tor for seven days' quarantine, &c., have, by special decisions of the Maritime Sanitary and Quarantine Board of Egypt, been permitted to transit the Canal in quarantine.

It is impossible to predict how far, if at all, British navigation can rely upon an intermittent exemption being accorded by the Board to such cases; but it would certainly seem desirable to abrogate a rule which is continually though not in all cases suspended, and as to which the constant demands for exemption only serve to create friction amongst the members of the Board itself, which an equitable and clearly established procedure would allay.

The following is a table showing the number of cases during the last seven years in which ships under the category of infected either performed quarantine at Tor, or passed the Canal in quarantine by reason of a special vote of the Board:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Ships which did Quarantine at Tor</th>
<th>Ships which passed in Quarantine owing to decision of Board</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average per annum, 64 ships. |

A further Table, copy of which we inclose (Inclosure No. 4), gives particulars respecting each of the ships which arrived at Suez under the category of "infected" during the last eleven years.

It will be observed that had the modified French proposals been in force during the last seven years, only two cases would have been under them classed as infected ships, and the remainder (forty-two) would have been classed as suspected ships, and, furthermore, that of those forty-two ships no less than thirty-nine would have come under the provision for ships on which the cholera had broken out more than fourteen days before arrival at Suez.

An objection to the adoption of the French proposals which presents itself lies in the proposed medical inspection of British ships by a doctor possibly of a nationality different
to our own, and trained perhaps in a different school of thought upon hygienic questions, especially those relating to cholera. On this point we have only to observe—

1. That a thorough medical inspection is now required by the existing Regulations, and takes place in every case.

2. The present sanitary authority therefore now decides upon the condition and category of the ship.

3. It is only in doubtful cases that the Board at Alexandria is called upon to arrive at a decision as to the treatment to be applied.

That the opinion of the doctor must in the future, as it is now, be founded on, and be justified by, the ship's papers, especially by the log, by the doctor's journal, and by the register of drugs issued. It may be added that at present, where a ship is held by the sanitary authority at Suez to have had cholera on board, this finding is usually based, not on any declaration by the master, but on the evidence of the ship's papers.

The second part of the programme prepared for the Conference related to the reorganization of the Board.

The Board consists of a President, appointed by the Egyptian Government; the Inspector-General, who acts as Vice-President, also appointed by the Egyptian Government; the Comptroller of the Egyptian Lighthouse Service; the Chief Medical Officer of the Government Hospital at Alexandria; the Director-General of Customs; the Comptroller of the port of Alexandria; the Sanitary Inspector of Alexandria; the Veterinary Inspector of Lower Egypt; and a Doctor of the Government Hospital at Alexandria, together with a single Representative appointed by the Governments of each of the following countries, namely, Germany, Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, France, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, Sweden and Norway, and Turkey; making a total of twenty-three members.

The presence of the foreign members is doubtless due to the fact that, under the Capitulations, many acts cannot be carried out with regard to foreigners and foreign ships without the concurrence of a Representative of the Consulate interested.

The Austro-Hungarian Delegate, in a statement—copy of which is inclosed (Inlosure No. 5)—which he made in explanation of the Agreement of the 29th July, 1891, did not state very clearly the reasons which led his Government to desire a reorganization of the Board; but it was evident that the Austro-Hungarian Government wished to reduce the number of Egyptian Delegates because it was held that their votes, although far from constituting a majority, prevented those Powers who were anxious to see greater precautions taken against the introduction of disease into Europe from realizing their desire. In the statement of the Austro-Hungarian Delegate, above referred to, it is said that two currents of opinion have long been apparent at the Board; the one, supported by Great Britain, favoured the free passage of all ships through the Canal, whether infected or not; the other opinion demanded that the existing Regulations with regard to such ships should be strictly enforced; but those who held the latter opinion had never been able to obtain a majority to prevent exceptional treatment being granted to particular ships by special decisions of the Board.

The Austro-Hungarian Delegate went on to state that a Khedivial Decree had at first been requisite for the passage of every infected vessel, but that it had gradually become the rule for infected ships to be allowed to pass in quarantine, in circumstances which, to many Powers, did not appear to offer any sufficient guarantee for the protection of Europe from infection; that in 1886, Austria-Hungary had proposed to suspend the passage in quarantine of infected ships until additional precautions could be agreed upon; that this proposal failed to obtain a majority at the Board, and that the transit of infected ships had continued as before. These were the only grounds which were alleged even indirectly in support of the proposal to reduce the number of Egyptian votes; but it was evident that most of the Delegates were of opinion that the number of Egyptian members on the Board was too large, and tended to diminish the confidence which the Board should inspire.

The desires put forward semi-officially by the Austro-Hungarian Delegate were not, however, limited to the number of the Egyptian Delegates at the Board; they extended to its character, and to the internal working of the Board's Executive Department. The officers of the Board are under the immediate control of the President. The Austro-Hungarian Delegate informed us that there was a desire that this arrangement should cease; that the Presidency should be given to the Egyptian Minister for Foreign Affairs; and that the Vice-Presidency should be held in rotation by the various foreign members; and that the quarantine officials and the staff of the Board should be placed under the direction of a number of Committees elected by the Board from among its own members.

We urged that direction by a number of Committees, the members of which would
be continually changing, was by no means calculated to secure the proper execution of the Board’s Regulations and orders; that, moreover, the Board was charged with what was in fact a branch of the Egyptian Administration; that in these circumstances the Executive must not be deprived of its Egyptian character, and that its general direction must be confided to an Egyptian official, as at present. We should add that it was also proposed to change the Board’s present title of “Maritime Sanitary and Quarantine Board of Egypt” to “International Sanitary Board of Egypt.”

In our opposition to both these proposals we had the support of the French Delegates, who maintained that the Board was a part of the Egyptian Administration, and must remain so, although it would continue to have a certain international character: (1) because of the presence of the Representatives of the European Powers; and (2) because its duties are not confined to the protection of Egypt alone, but also include the protection of Europe from infection through Egypt.

We would take this opportunity of observing that we do not think that it will be possible in the future for any Power to maintain, as has been done more or less openly in times past, that the Board at Alexandria is in the true sense of the word “international,” or that it is anything other than a part of the administration of Egypt, existing primarily for the protection of Egypt; but we found all the members of the Conference to be decidedly of opinion that cholera was endemic in India and in certain countries beyond India, and that those regions were never wholly free from cholera; while, as a rule, Europe was happily free from that disease, and that this fact placed Egypt and the Suez Canal in an exceptional position, and imposed the moral obligation on all Powers to co-operate in order to prevent cases of cholera, and articles capable, in their opinion, of conveying the infection of cholera, from being brought either to Egypt itself, or through Egypt into the Mediterranean basin.

It was readily acknowledged that Egypt and the Suez Canal were not the sole channels through which cholera might come to Europe, and that, on the contrary, some of the European epidemics had come from the East by land; on the other hand, communications by land between East and West were very slow, while sea communication via Egypt was very rapid and very frequent, and was every day increasing both in rapidity and frequency. In these circumstances, it was argued all reasonable precaution should be taken to prevent infection by that route, although absolute immunity could not thereby be secured. In the same manner, it was maintained that disinfection could not be guaranteed to be in every case effectual, still it would in most cases be effectual, and should not therefore be omitted.

The French Delegates agreed with us, that the system of directing Committees would not work satisfactorily, and, further, that in this matter no change was necessary, inasmuch as the Executive of the Board had, notwithstanding many adverse circumstances, been brought to a very high state of efficiency.

The result of our communications with the French and the Austro-Hungarian Delegates was that in the end it became apparent that the reorganization of the Board would not extend beyond a reduction in the number of the Egyptian Delegates.

In the scheme for the reorganization of the Board, laid before us semi-officially by the Austro-Hungarian Delegate, it was proposed that the Egyptian members should be reduced to one.

The French Delegates would not agree that the Egyptian Government should command more than three votes and the President’s casting vote. On this matter being brought before the Conference, eleven States, namely, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, France, Greece, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Russia, Sweden and Norway, and Turkey supported the French view, and two only, namely, Great Britain and Germany, were in favour of retaining as many as four Egyptian votes, besides the casting vote of the President. The Austro-Hungarian Delegate, while stating that he was prepared to agree to the retention of one Egyptian member more than the French Delegates would consent to retain, expressed a decided preference for the French proposal. The Ottoman Delegates were also in favour of reducing the Egyptian vote to the figure proposed by France.

It has already been stated that the existing Regulations are not in all cases strictly enforced; they are very usually relaxed in favour of ships which have had cholera on board, but no fresh case for a considerable number of days, provided the ship and all contaminated effects have been disinfected. Such cases do not usually come to the knowledge of the Board’s officers until the ship arrives at Suez, and, in order to save time, the question whether the ship shall be sent to Tor to perform the quarantine required by the Regulations, or whether she shall transit the Canal at once in quarantine, is submitted to each member by a Circular from the President: great objection has been made to this
system, and proposals for its abolition found much support. We pointed out that even with Regulations acquiesced in by all parties, and which could therefore be enforced without making exceptions in favour of particular ships, matters would still occasionally arise which would require immediate settlement. To meet this difficulty, it was proposed and agreed that a Permanent Committee should be created, consisting of the President, the Vice-President, and two foreign Delegates (changing from time to time), and that, if not already a member, the Delegate of the nationality interested in the question to be settled should be added to the Committee.

The Austro-Hungarian proposal, mentioned in the programme, regarding the rank of members of the Board, was doubtless intended to raise its general character. The provision that the foreign members shall in future be duly qualified medical practitioners, or be of a rank not inferior to that of Vice-Consul, was unanimously accepted, and will not be without its advantages.

The third subhead of the programme, which related to the establishment of a sanitary guard, was met by the agreement to create a body of ten men, to be, if possible, retired non-commissioned officers of European armies or of the Egyptian army.

The last question in the programme related to the Board's finances.

Although the Board is a part of the Egyptian Administration, and although its officials are pensioned from funds at the disposal of the Egyptian Government, it derives the greater part of its revenue from certain taxes and fees on ships, persons, and merchandise arriving in Egypt. The revenue and expenditure of the Board vary from year to year, and are on so small a basis that it often happens that an increased expenditure in any particular year may not be accompanied by any increase in revenue: for some years the revenue largely exceeded the expenditure, and a considerable reserve fund was accumulated; so large, indeed, that the Board decided to abolish, temporarily at least, the fees levied for the disinfection of merchandise. These fees were altogether out of proportion to the value and cost of the operation, which were nil; since then the Board's revenue has not sufficed to meet its expenditure; the balance has been found by drawing on the reserve fund. It is by no means improbable that, before the reserve fund is exhausted, a balance in favour of revenue may be produced by an increase in the yield of existing taxes.

The Conference had, however, to consider the existing deficit, as well as the extra expenditure that would be incurred by putting into operation the new sanitary system, in favour of which it had pronounced the decided opinion referred to in the earlier part of this despatch. It was impossible at Venice to form an accurate estimate either of the initial cost of the new system, or of the annual expenditure which it would entail. In these circumstances, it was decided that the Egyptian Government and the Board should frame an estimate of expenditure, and should agree upon the manner in which the required revenue should be raised; the Conference merely suggested certain sources whence it might perhaps be drawn.

The Board's General Regulations and its Special Cholera Regulations, and the Regulation for the transit of the Suez Canal, were revised in accordance with the system advocated by the Conference when considering the first part of the programme.

A Committee, consisting of the Technical Delegates to the Conference, drew up a Report in regard to the sanitary measures which it would be well, in order to avoid or arrest outbreaks of cholera on board ship, to take at the port of departure and during the voyage. This Report was accepted by the Conference as a general recommendation to navigation, but not as a part of the Board's Regulations.

The revision of the Special Regulations regarding the plague and yellow fever and for the prevention of diseases among animals was left to the Board.

The Pilgrim Traffic Regulations were amended in certain particulars; but, as the pilgrims affected by these Regulations are not British subjects, and as the number of Cypriot pilgrims is small, the matter appeared to us to be of minor importance to Great Britain.

The Conference also agreed to make certain recommendations to the Board, in view of improving the accommodation existing at Tor, the quarantine station for pilgrims returning to Egypt, or through Egypt, from the Holy Places in the Hedjaz.

After these points had been settled, a Convention recording them was prepared and signed. We annex a copy of this document (Inlosure No. 6). The Delegates of Belgium, France, Greece, Italy, and Russia signed without any reservation; the Delegates of Austria-Hungary, Germany, Portugal, and Spain signed ad referendum; the Danish and the Ottoman Delegates were unable to sign, as they were not provided with the necessary power to do so. The Netherlands Delegate signed the Convention, but declared that his Government was prepared to admit for mail-ships the amendment proposed by us, and that if the principle of the amendment were to come into force, the Netherlands Gover-
ment would claim its benefit for mail-ships running to Netherlands ports. The Delegate for Sweden and Norway was absent.

Acting under the instructions conveyed in your Lordship’s despatch of the 29th instant, we did not sign the Convention. It was too late when the above-mentioned instructions reached us to propose an adjournment of the Conference. Guided, therefore, by the general nature of those instructions, we inserted in the “Protocole de Signature” a statement, to the effect that Her Majesty’s Government required time to consider certain practical consequences of the system that would be established by the Convention, and that we had therefore abstained from signing that instrument.

We desire, in conclusion, to express our thanks to Sir Thomas Sutherland, M.P., Chairman of the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, who travelled to Venice at considerable inconvenience to himself in order to place at our disposal his intimate knowledge of the details of British shipping communications with India and with the Far East; and, at the same time, we wish to place on record our appreciation of the great services and ready assis-tance which Mr. H. Farnall, C.M.G., at all times rendered to the Delegation, of which he was appointed the Secretary.

We have, &c.
(Signed) JAMES W. LOWTHER.
J. MACKIE.

Enclosure 1 in No. 27.

Observations présentées par M. le Dr. Proust au nom de la Délégation Française sur les Modifications à introduire dans l’Arrangement Austro-Anglais ou sujet du Passage du Canal de Suez en Quarantaine.

La question qui fait le sujet de cette Conférence est une des plus importantes de l’hygiène internationale. Aussi bien que la nature de l’arrangement Austro-Anglais ne nous convienne pas sur tous les points, nous avons conseillé au Gouvernement Français, qui nous a fait l’honneur de nous consulter, d’accepter l’invitation qui lui était adressée, de discuter cet arrangement.

Je ferai toutefois une remarque relativement à la Conférence actuelle, qui nous paraît différer, au moins pour la forme, des Conférences antérieures. À Paris en 1851 et 1852, à Constantinople en 1866, à Vienne en 1874 (jusqu’à cette époque je représentais la France à cette Conférence et j’en suis aujourd’hui ici le seul survivant), à Rome en 1885, où je me trouvais avec mes deux collègues Brouardel et Ruysch, dans toutes ces réunions, le programme général était uniquement celui-ci : la protection de l’Europe contre l’importation du choléra. À la Conférence de Venise, au contraire, on paraît surtout se préoccuper du libre passage des navires, qu’ils soient infectés ou non du choléra, puisque l’Article du Protocole est ainsi conçu : “Les bâtiments Anglais à destination d’un port du Royaume-Uni, infectés ou non, seront libres de passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine.” De sorte qu’il semble bien qu’il n’agît que des intérêts du commerce.

Le programme demande donc le passage en quarantaine pour tous les navires venant de l’Inde et de l’Extrême-Orient, qu’ils soient infectés ou non. Or, le passage en quarantaine, formulé ainsi, nous semble présenter de graves inconvenients.

Le Canal de Suez, en effet, est fort étroit dans quelques-unes de ses parties. Les communications sont difficiles à empêcher sur beaucoup de points et dans les endroits de garage. En outre, un certain nombre de chauffeurs sont pris à Port-Saïd et à Ismailia pour les navires se rendant dans l’Extrême-Orient, dont ils complètent l’équipage. Au retour ces chauffeurs débarquent de nouveau, soit à Ismailia, soit à Port-Saïd. Or, il est bien difficile de les empêcher de débarquer. C’est, du reste, ainsi que le choléra a été transmis en Égypte, en 1853, par des chauffeurs qui débarquaient du “Timour.” C’est l’opinion exprimée par la Délégation Allemande, dirigée par M. Koch, d’accord avec M. Mahé, notre Médecin Sanitaire à Constantinople, qui avait été envoyé en Égypte pour étudier l’origine et la marche de cette épidémie cholérique.

Le passage en quarantaine ne peut être, non plus, concédé aux navires d’une seule Puissance, les Compagnies de Navigation des autres États seraient fondées à réclamer contre une faveur qui les placerait, au point de vue de la durée du trajet, dans un état d’infériorité marquée. Il doit donc y avoir, à ce point de vue comme aux autres, entre les pavillons des différents États, égalité absolue.

On sera donc contraint, comme le propose d’ailleurs le Protocole, d’accorder cette faculté à toutes les Puissances de la Méditerranée. Or, comme la distance est très
courte entre Port-Saïd et la plupart de ces ports, le danger se trouvera sensiblement accru.

En outre, une fraude est toujours possible, malgré les précautions indiquées par le Protocole. En 1890, un navire Anglais, le "Fulford," est venu débarquer à Paullace bien que le Capitaine, pour obtenir le passage en quarantaine, se fût engagé à aller directement en Angleterre. Or, il suffit d’une fraude pour qu’un navire sur 1,000, par exemple, apporte le choléra en Europe et y provoque une épidémie pendant plusieurs années, causant une mortalité considérable et ramenant, pour la Méditerranée, l’Europe, et l’Amérique, les quarantaines excessives et incohérentes, les troubles et les gênes pour le commerce et la navigation, dont nous n’avons plus à souffrir en ce moment.

Le passage en quarantaine, s’il peut être accordé en principe, ne doit donc l’être que pour des cas spéciaux et pour des navires ne pouvant compromettre la santé de l’Égypte, de la Méditerranée, et de l’Europe.

Je demande à la Conférence de lui exposer comment nous comprenons que le programme Austro-Anglais puisse être modifié.

La défense de l’Égypte et du Canal de Suez est d’autant plus importante que, lorsque le choléra a franchi ces barrières, l’Europe entière est menacée, les diverses nations sont successivement envahies, et, après son importation en Europe, le choléra, comme cela a été prouvé plusieurs fois, gagne l’Amérique.


Cette surveillance est d’autant plus nécessaire que nous ne pouvons adopter la doctrine Anglo-Indienne, doctrine qui donne l’auto nette aux navires partant d’un port de l’Inde, tant que ce port n’est pas le siège d’une grande épidémie et bien que le choléra s’y montre à l’état endémique.

J’ajouterai que, si nous voulons diminuer et même supprimer les quarantaines dans la Méditerranée et en Canol de Suez, il est absolument indispensable d’exercer la surveillance la plus attentive sur Suez. Trois médecins et un chef de service médical possédant des connaissances épidémiologiques et bactériologiques doivent être installés à Suez. Un médecin de service, à tour de rôle, de jour et de nuit, ferait la visite médicale de tous les navires, quelle que soit la nature de leur patente.

Une inspection serait organisée pour vérifier la façon dont se fait la visite médicale. Une police serait instituée, le long du Canal, de façon à empêcher les communications compromettantes.

Un établissement de désinfection, un hôpital, devraient être créés aux Sources de Moïse, pour les passagers des navires ordinaires, Gebel Tor continuant à recevoir les pèlerins, et les pèlerins seuls.

Il s’agit maintenant de préciser le traitement pouvant être accordé à chaque catégorie de navires.

Ces navires se divisent en trois classes :—

- Navires Indemnes.
- Navires Suspects.
- Navires Infectés.

**Navires Indemnes.**—Les navires reconnus indemnes, après visite médicale, auront libre pratique immédiate, sans aucun retard, quelle que soit la nature de la patente. Ils ne seront pas soumis à l’observation de vingt-quatre heures, qui est prescrite actuellement contre les navires avec patente brute.

**Navires Suspects,** c’est-à-dire navires ayant eu des cas de choléra au moment du départ et même pendant la traversée, mais aucun cas nouveau depuis huit jours. Ces navires seront traités d’une façon différente, suivant qu’ils ont ou n’ont pas à bord un médecin et une équipe.

(a.) Les navires ayant un médecin et une équipe remplissant les conditions voulues, seront admis à passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine dans des conditions de précaution à déterminer. Si, en effet, un cas de choléra se déclarait dans le Canal ou plus loin, le cas serait facilement combattu puisque le navire possède l’outillage nécessaire : le médecin et l’équipe.

(b.) Les autres navires suspects n’ayant ni le médecin ni l’équipe, seront retenus aux Sources de Moïse le temps nécessaire pour opérer la désinfection du linge sale du linge de corps et autres objets susceptibles, et s’assurer de l’état sanitaire du navire.

**Navires Infectés,** c’est-à-dire ayant du choléra à bord, ou ayant présenté des cas [518]
nouveaux de choléra depuis huit jours. Ils se divisent eux-mêmes en navires avec médecin et étuve et navires sans médecin ou sans étuve.

(a.) Les navires sans médecin ou sans étuve seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse, les malades débarqués et isolés dans un hôpital ou une infirmerie spéciale. La désinfection sera pratiquée d'une façon rigoureuse.

Les autres passagers, débarqués et isolés par groupes aussi peu nombreux que possible, de façon à ce que l'ensemble ne soit pas solidaire d'un groupe particulier, si le choléra venait à s'y développer. Le linge sale, les objets à usage, les vêtements de l'équipage et des passagers seront désinfectés ainsi que le navire. Il est bien entendu qu'il ne s'agit pas du déchargement complet des marchandises qui ne transmettent pas le choléra, mais seulement de la partie du navire qui a été infectée.

Les passagers resteront cinq jours à l'établissement des Sources de Moïse. Lorsque les cas de choléra ramonteront à plusieurs jours, la durée de l'isolement pourra être diminuée. Cette durée variera avec l'époque de l'apparition du dernier cas.

(b.) Le passage en quarantaine pourra même être accordé avant l'expiration des cinq jours par l'autorité Sanitaire après la désinfection opérée, si le navire possède un médecin et une étuve présentant les conditions indiquées.

En un mot, facilités aussi grandes que possible quand le navire est reconnu sain, mesures sérieuses, mais non vexatoires, contre tout navire infecté ou suspect de l'être.

Or, il s'agit maintenant de préciser combien de navires entrent en chacune de ces classes.

En 1886, il est passé par le Canal du Suez 3,100 navires ; en 1887, 3,137 ; en 1888, 3,440 ; en 1889, 3,425 ; et en 1890, 3,389.

Voyons maintenant combien il est passé de navires infectés et de navires suspects.

En 1885 à 1891 il n'est passé que deux navires infectés. Ces deux navires sont passés en 1886, étaient " l'Euphrate " et le " Golfe du Mexique," venant l'un de Bombay, l'autre de Calcutta. Ils avaient eu du choléra six jours, tous deux, avant l'arrivée à Suez. L'un avait eu six cas, l'autre cinq cas.

Quant au nombre des navires suspects ayant passé le Canal, il est le suivant :—

En 1885, il a été de 13 ; en 1886, de 6 ; en 1887, de 4 ; en 1888, de 8 ; en 1889, de 9 ; en 1890, d'un seul, précisément le " Fulford; " et en 1891, de 7.

Par conséquent, voilà cinquante navires seulement qui, en sept ans, auraient été arrêtés pendant le temps nécessaire pour la désinfection aux Sources de Moïse, et encore, sur ces cinquante navires, il en est trente qui ont passé le Canal en quarantaine, de sorte que vingt seulement se seraient trouvés dans la situation de navires suspects, retenus à Suez pour y subir la désinfection.

Ainsi donc, en total, vingt navires suspects retenus à Suez et deux navires infectés, pendant l'espace de sept ans.

Or, je le demande : Y a-t-il parité entre cette gêne insignifiante pour vingt-deux navires en sept ans, sur plus de 20,000 navires, et le danger d'importer de nouveau le choléra en Europe en supprimant toute mesure protectrice et en laissant passer librement le Canal aux navires infectés ?

J'ajouterai que, si l'on prenait plus de précautions dans les mesures au point de départ et pendant la traversée, on aurait encore à réduire ce chiffre déjà si minime.

La tendance de la science sanitaire actuelle est, en effet, de substituer aux mesures que l'on prend à l'arrivée, les mesures à prescrire au point de départ et pendant la traversée.

Si, en effet, dans les régions contaminées, on prenait la précaution de ne laisser embarquer aucun linge sale ou infecté sans le désinfecter, si on prescrivait les mesures de désinfection pendant la traversée, le chiffre si minime dont nous avons parlé se trouverait encore diminué et presque annihilé. Mais pour arriver à la suppression absolue des mesures restrictives, il ne faut rien précipiter. Il faut, pour éviter les réactions, une grande prudence. J'ajouterai que si, après la suppression de toute précaution, de toute garantie, comme de laissez passer en quarantaine les navires infectés par le Canal du Suez, un accident survenait, on reviendrait bien vite aux sévérités d'autrefois et les populations aflojées redemandaient les quarantaines excessives que nous voulons supprimer peu à peu avec toute la prudence nécessaire. Nous avons toujours eu en vue de diminuer les entraves imposées au commerce et à la navigation, autant qu'elles pourraient être restreintes, en se souvenant d'une manière absolue les intérêts supérieurs de la santé publique. Nous voulons substituer à d'interminables quarantaines devant forcément disparaître en face du progrès et de la rapidité de la navigation, des mesures plus rationnelles, plus scientifiques et offrant des garanties tout aussi efficaces. Nous espérons que la Conférence voudra bien nous suivre dans cette direction et modifier dans le sens que je veux d'indiquer les propositions qui lui sont soumises. Nous avons conscience d'avoir fait toutes les concessions possibles, dans l'état actuel de la science, pour la protection de la
santé publique. Vouloir aller plus loin ne serait pas compris par l'opinion et ne serait pas justifié par la science.

(Translation.)

Observations made by Dr. Proust, in the name of the French Delegates, on the Alterations that should be made in the Austro-English Arrangement on the Passage of the Suez Canal in Quarantine.

The question for which this Conference has been called together is one of the most important in international hygiene. Although the nature of the Austro-English arrangement does not suit us on all points, we have advised the French Government, which honoured us by asking our opinion, to accept the invitation to discuss the arrangement in question.

I wish to make one remark on the present Conference, which appears to us to differ, at least in form, from previous Conferences. At Paris in 1851 and 1852, at Constantinople in 1866, at Vienna in 1874 (I already represented France at that Conference, and I am now the sole survivor of it,) and at Rome in 1885, where I was with my two colleagues, Brouardel and Ruysch, at all those Conferences the main question was simply how to protect Europe against the importation of cholera. At this Conference, on the contrary, the main object appears to be the free passage of ships, whether or not infected with cholera, for the Article in the Protocol is worded thus: "English ships bound for a port in the United Kingdom, whether infected or not, shall be free to pass the Suez Canal in quarantine." It certainly seems, therefore, that the interests of commerce are alone in question.

The programme asks that all ships from India and the Far East, whether infected or not, may be allowed to pass in quarantine. Now, passage in quarantine, put in this way, appears to us to be open to grave objection.

The Suez Canal is very narrow in some parts. It is difficult to prevent communications at many points and in the passing stations. Moreover, a certain number of stokers are shipped at Port Said and Ismailia by vessels bound for the Far East; they are wanted to complete the crews. On the return journey, these stokers are again landed at Ismailia or at Port Said. Now it is very difficult to prevent them from landing. It was thus that cholera came to Europe in 1883 by stokers who landed from the "Timour." Such was the opinion expressed by the German Mission, under the direction of Dr. Koch; the same opinion was shared by M. Mahé, our Sanitary Doctor at Constantinople, who was sent to Egypt to inquire into the origin and progress of the outbreak of cholera referred to.

Passage in quarantine cannot be granted to the ships of one country only; the Shipping Companies of other countries would be justified in protesting against the grant of a favour which would place them in a position of marked inferiority as regards the duration of the voyage. In this as in other respects there must be absolute equality between the flags of different States.

It will, therefore, be necessary, as, indeed, the Protocol proposes, to grant the same permission to all the Mediterranean Powers. But as the distance between Port Said and the greater number of the Mediterranean ports is very small, the danger will be considerably increased.

Moreover, an evasion of the Regulations is always possible, notwithstanding the precautions provided under the Protocol. In 1890, an English ship, the "Fulford," discharged at Pauillac, although the captain, in order to obtain permission to pass in quarantine, had bound himself to go straight to England. Now, such an evasion of the Regulations by one ship out of 1,000 is sufficient to bring cholera to Europe, and to produce an epidemic lasting for several years, causing great mortality, and calling back into existence in the Mediterranean, in Europe, and in America, long senseless quarantines, and disturbances and hindrances to trade and navigation from which we are not now suffering.

Passage in quarantine, if it can be granted in principle, ought only to be granted for special cases, and for ships which cannot endanger the health of Egypt, the Mediterranean, and Europe.

I ask permission to explain to the Conference how we think the Austro-English programme might be amended.

It is all the more necessary to protect Egypt and the Suez Canal, as, when once cholera has crossed those barriers, the whole of Europe is threatened, all the various countries are invaded one after the other, and after cholera has been imported into Europe, as has been several times shown, it reaches America.

It is therefore greatly in the public interest to exercise some real control at the [618]
entrance of the Suez Canal, in order to prevent direct communication between the ports of India and the Extreme East, on the one hand, and Egypt and the Mediterranean on the other.

It is all the more necessary to exercise this control as we cannot accept the Anglo-Indian doctrine, which suffers clean bills of health to be given to ships leaving an Indian port, so long as the port is not the seat of a great epidemic, even though cholera exists there in an endemic form.

I would add that if we wish to diminish, or still more abolish, quarantine in the Mediterranean and in Europe, it is absolutely necessary to keep up the most attentive control at the Suez Canal. Three doctors and a Superintendent of the medical service, instructed in epidemiology and bacteriology, should be appointed to Suez. The doctor on duty, according to the rota, would by day and night inspect all ships medically, whatever their bills of health.

A supervision will be organized in order to ascertain the manner in which the medical visit is performed. A police force will be instituted all along the Canal for the purpose of avoiding all infecting communication.

An establishment for disinfection, and a hospital, should be built at Moses' Wells for the passengers of ordinary ships, Gebel Tor continuing to receive the pilgrims, and the pilgrims only.

The next point is to determine the treatment to be accorded to each category of ships. These ships are divided into three classes:

- Healthy ships.
- Suspected ships.
- Infected ships.

**Healthy Ships.**—The ships pronounced healthy shall have free pratique immediately after the medical visit, and without any delay, whatever be the nature of the bill of health. They shall not be submitted to the twenty-four hours' observation which is at present prescribed for ships with a foul bill of health.

**Suspected Ships,** that is to say, ships which have had cases of cholera on board at the moment of sailing, or even during the passage, but no new cases since eight days. These ships shall be treated in a different manner according as they have or have not on board a doctor and a disinfector ("étuve").

(a.) Ships having a doctor and a disinfector fulfilling the required conditions shall be allowed to pass the Suez Canal in quarantine with such safeguards as may hereafter be provided. If, indeed, a case of cholera should occur in the Canal or further on, it would be easy to combat it, seeing that the ship possesses the necessary means, the doctor and the disinfector.

(b.) Other suspected ships, having neither doctor nor disinfector, shall be detained at Moses' Wells for the time necessary to disinfect the dirty linen, the body linen, and other susceptible objects, and to make sure of the sanitary condition of the ship.

**Infected Ships,** that is to say, ships with cholera on board, or on which new cases of cholera have occurred in the last eight days. These are again divided into ships with a doctor and disinfector, and ships without doctor or disinfector.

(a.) Ships without doctor or disinfector shall be stopped at Moses' Wells, and the sick landed and isolated in a hospital or special infirmary. The disinfection shall be strictly carried out.

(b.) Other passengers shall be landed and isolated in groups as small as possible, so that the whole number may not be infected if a case of cholera should occur in one particular group. The dirty linen, the things in use, the clothing of the crew and of the passengers, shall be disinfected as well as he ship. Of course, there is no question of the disembarkation of the whole of the goods which cannot carry the cholera, but only of that part of the ship which has been infected.

The passengers shall remain five days at the establishment at Moses' Wells. When the cases of cholera shall have occurred some days back, the period of the isolation may be shortened. This period shall vary with the date at which the last case appeared.

(b.) The passage in quarantine may be allowed by the Sanitary authority even before the expiration of the five days after the process of disinfection has been gone through, if the ship possesses a doctor and a disinfector of the required kind.

In short, every possible facility shall be granted when the ship is pronounced healthy, but serious, not harassing, measures shall be taken against every ship which is infected, or suspected of being so.
It is now necessary to determine exactly how many ships entered into each of these classes.

In 1886 there passed through the Suez Canal 3,100 ships; in 1887, 3,137; in 1888, 3,440; in 1889, 3,425; and in 1890, 3,389.

We will now see how many infected and suspected ships passed through the Canal.

From 1885 to 1891 only two infected ships passed through. These two ships passed in 1886. They were the “Emirates” and the “Gulf of Mexico,” one from Bombay, and the other from Calcutta. Both ships had had cholera on board six days before the arrival at Suez; one six cases, the other five.

The numbers of suspected ships which have passed the Canal are as follows:

In 1885, 13; in 1886, 6; in 1887, 4; in 1888, 8; in 1889, 9; in 1890, 1 only; the “Fulford;” in 1891, 4.

So that we see that in seven years there are only fifty ships which would have been detained for the time necessary for the disinfection at Moses’ Wells; and further, out of these fifty ships, thirty passed the Canal in quarantine, so that only twenty would have found themselves in the position of suspected ships detained at Suez for the purpose of undergoing disinfection there.

Thus, the total, during seven years, is twenty suspected ships detained at Suez, and two infected ships.

Now I ask is there any comparison between this trifling inconvenience to twenty-two ships, in seven years, out of the whole 20,000 ships, and the danger of again importing cholera into Europe by abolishing all preventive measures and allowing infected ships to pass freely through the Suez Canal?

I would add that if better precautions were taken at the ports of departure and during the voyage, the above figure, which is already so small, could be still further reduced. The tendency of sanitary science is at present to substitute measures at the place of departure, and during the voyage, for those which can be taken on arrival.

If in contaminated regions the precaution were adopted of shipping no dirty or infected linen without disinfection, if disinfection were prescribed during the voyage, the very small figure which we have given would be still further diminished and reduced to nothing. But if the object is to abolish all restrictions, nothing must be done hurriedly. Great prudence is necessary in order to avoid reaction. I would add that if, after the abolition of all precautions, of all guarantees, as by allowing infected ships to pass through the Suez Canal in quarantine, any accident were to happen, people would quickly return to the old system of severity and a panic-stricken population would demand those excessive quarantines which we wish to abolish gradually and prudently. We are always purposeful to diminish obstacles imposed on commerce and navigation as much as possible, but we wish to safeguard in the most complete manner attainable the superior interests of public health. We wish to substitute for never-ending quarantines, which must disappear with the progress and growing rapidity of navigation, more rational and more scientific measures which shall furnish equally efficacious guarantees. We trust that the Conference will follow us in this course, and will alter in the direction I have indicated the proposal submitted to it. We feel that we have made all the concessions compatible, in the present condition of science, with the protection of public health. Were we to go further, we should not be understood by public opinion, nor should we be justified by science.

Inclosure 2 in No. 27.

Observations présentées à la Conférence (constituée en Comité) par Mr. Lowther, Premier Délégué Britannique, en réponse aux Observations exposées par M. le Dr. Proust, au nom de la Délégation Française.

Mr. Lowther.—Au commencement de son discours, qui nous a si vivement intéressés, M. le Dr. Proust a fait remarquer que le Protocole Anglo-Autrichien a un autre but que celui visé par toutes les Conférences Sanitaires qui ont précédé celle à laquelle nous avons l’honneur d’assister.

Jusqu’à présent, nous a-t-il dit, on a cherché à empêcher le choléra de s’approcher de nos côtes, on a tâché d’éviter autant que possible que les vaisseaux contaminés, porteurs des germes de la maladie, puissent arriver en Europe. Le Protocole, suivant mon très honorable collègue, tendrait dans une direction toute contraire. Il permet, dit-il, aux vaisseaux infectés de passer librement dans la Méditerranée.
Les Délégués Britanniques ne peuvent se placer à ce point de vue ; nous pensons que le Dr. Proust lui-même n’insistera pas sur l’opinion qu’il a émise sur ce point.

Bien loin de l’effet qu’on lui a attribué, le Protocole visé pour le Canal de Suez des mesures prophylactiques plus sévères, plus efficaces que celles qui sont actuellement en vigueur. En fait de précautions prises dans l’intérêt des régions de la Méditerranée, il contient une disposition entièrement nouvelle, notamment le télégramme prévu à l’Article 3 ; le nom et la destination de chaque navire transistant le Canal en quarantaine seront communiqués par voie télégraphique aux Puissances intéressées.

Si nous avons bien saisi la manière de voir de notre très honorable collègue, le Canal Maritime constitue pour lui une barrière naturelle contre l’introduction du choléra en Europe, puisqu’on peut y arrêter les vaisseaux qui pourraient porter les germes de la maladie ; dans l’intérêt de l’hygiène publique il faut y arrêter tous les navires infectés ou suspects, et leur faire subir, avant leur entrée dans le Canal, un traitement qui les empêche de nuire à la santé publique de l’Europe et surtout de l’Europe méridionale.

Pût-on établir à Suez une barrière toujours et incontestablement infranchissable au choléra, fût-il absolument sûr que cette barrière défendrait l’Europe contre toute invasion cholérique, alors nous avouerions que les propositions que nous avons écouté hier avec un si vif intérêt, seraient dignes d’un grand sacrifice.

Mais franchement en est-il ainsi ?

Peut-on de cette manière rendre l’Europe inattaquable ?

Notre très honorable collègue peut-il garantir à cette Conférence, peut-il garantir à l’Europe que le système recommandé par lui, une fois adopté, mettra même le bassin de la Méditerranée à l’abri du choléra ?

Évidemment non. Tout dernièrement nous avons vu éclater le choléra sur les côtes de la Méditerranée.

Cette année même le choléra s’est produit à Damas : le système que l’on nous demande d’adopter ne saurait certes empêcher un pareil incident de se répéter.

Passons à un autre point.

Nous sommes chargés de concilier les demandes, les justes demandes de la navigation avec les demandes de l’hygiène publique telle qu’on la comprend dans les divers pays ici représentés.

M. le Dr. Proust, j’en suis convaincu, nous tiendra compte entre les premiers de la valeur des mesures d’assainissement exécutées pendant ces dernières années dans les Colonies Britanniques. Les immenses sommes qu’on y a dépensées dans les travaux sanitaires lui sont connues ; il apprécie ces travaux à leur juste et grande valeur.

En ce qui concerne la conciliation dont j’ai parlé, nous sommes fermement persuadés qu’elle est réalisable.

Nous aborderons les questions posées dans le programme préparé par le Gouvernement Austro-Hongrois, pénétrés du désir de trouver les moyens propres à réaliser la conciliation que nous cherchons tous. Il nous sera peut-être permis de faire observer, par parenthèse, que la base de nos délibérations d’après le programme de la Conférence, c’est le Protocole du 29 Juillet dernier. Mais les observations de M. Proust le passent sous un silence à peu près complet. Il nous propose un système entièrement nouveau.

Pour le moment nous nous limiterons aux objections qu’a soulevées notre très honorable collègue contre les dispositions consignées dans le Protocole Anglo-Autrichien.

En premier lieu, M. le Dr. Proust soutient que le séjour des vaisseaux dans les différentes gares du Canal fait qu’il est excessivement difficile de prévenir les communications entre les bords du Canal et le bâtiment transitant en quarantaine. Examinons ce point un peu à fond. On nous dit qu’un cholérique ou plutôt un individu déjà atteint de la maladie dans son état d’incubation pourrait facilement s’échapper du vaisseau. Mais à quelle époque précisément ? Pendant que le bâtiment est en route entre deux gares ou bien pendant un arrêt en gare ? Devons-nous sérieusement contempler l’idée qu’un individu se jette dans le Canal et nage à terre pour se trouver trempé sur les bords du Canal, au milieu d’un désert ? La présence aux gares voisines des agents de la Compagnie l’empêcheront d’y prendre refuge. L’individu s’échappera-t-il plutôt lorsque le navire est amarré dans une des gares ? Mais est-il réellement impossible de surveiller efficacement un bâtiment à l’amarré dans le Canal ? La nature des choses le défend-elle ? Au contraire : toutes les circonstances et surtout l’isolement du navire au milieu des déserts, loin de tout village, de toute cachette contribue à faciliter la surveillance.

Le système de notre très honorable collègue exige le maintien sous observation de centaines de personnes, aux Sources de Moïse. Il exige la garantie qu’aucune de ces personnes ne s’échappe. Il est tout aussi facile de surveiller cette portion limitée d’un navire qui se trouve le long d’un quai de garage : n’oublions pas qu’un seul côté du bâtiment est en communication immédiate avec la terre. Nous insistons qu’on peut avec
facilité maintenir une surveillance absolument efficace sur la partie du navire qui est près de terre, soit que les Gardiens se placent sur le bâtiment lui-même, soit qu'ils se placent sur le quai ou bien sur les deux. Il ne parle pas de la surveillance d'un bâtiment en marche, elle ne présente aucune difficulté. Pour ce qui concerne la surveillance de nuit, elle sera largement facilitée par la lumière électrique qui fonctionne sur les navires transitant le Canal. Les arrêts à Ismaïlia ne sont pas une source de danger ; il ne se fait pas près de la ville, mais au contraire au milieu du Lac Timsah, sans que le vaisseau sorte du chenal.

M. Proust lui-même n'abolit pas entièrement le transit en quarantaine. Au contraire, la première catégorie des navires suspects et la seconde catégorie (B) des navires infectés passent en quarantaine. Il reconnaît donc que le transit en quarantaine peut s'effectuer sans danger, autrement le transit en quarantaine de ces deux catégories de bâtiments ne signifie rien.

M. Proust nous a expliqué que la présence à bord d'un médecin et d'une étuve met les navires de ces catégories à même de traiter les nouveaux cas de choléra s'il s'en présentait ; mais le médecin et l'étuve ne peuvent évidemment rien pour protéger l'Égypte si un individu atteint du choléra à l'état d'incubation venait à s'échapper.

Respectivement au chauffeur Mouhammed Kahlifa, qui se serait évadé en 1883 d'un navire quelconque et se serait rendu à Damiette, nous devons faire remarquer que ce cas est le seul qu'on ait cité, bien que des milliers de vaisseaux aient traversé le Canal. Et encore les preuves sont-elles extrêmement douteuses sur la question capitale, savoir s'il s'est réellement évadé d'un vaisseau transitant en quarantaine. Il ne faudrait donc pas trop insister sur cet incident.

En deuxième lieu, M. Proust objecte que le Protocole donne un privilège exclusif au pavillon Anglais ; que les autres Puissances, il est vrai, sont libres de se revendiquer le même privilège. Mais dans ce cas l'extension du privilège constitue un danger. C'est, a-t-il dit, un privilège exclusif pour la navigation Anglaise, ou un danger pour la Méditerranée. Le Protocole est loin d'avoir le caractère que lui attribue notre très honorable collègue. Il ne nous donne aucun privilège exclusif ; nous n'en cherchons pas. La Grande-Bretagne demande uniquement qu'il soit permis aux vaisseaux Britanniques, non faisant pas escale dans un port Égyptien et destiné à un port du Royaume-Uni, de suivre librement leur voie ; elle demande que les vaisseaux Britanniques ne soient soumis qu'aux Règlements Sanitaires des autorités Britanniques dans les ports du Royaume-Uni où termine le voyage. La demande de la Grande-Bretagne a déjà été appuyée par plusieurs Puissances dont le pavillon est largement représenté dans la navigation du Canal.

Chaque Gouvernement doit rester maître de la législation réglant les conditions dans lesquelles il permet aux navires d'entrer dans ses ports. Il est évident que cette législation différerait de pays à pays selon leur situation géographique, leurs habitudes, et les croyances de la population. De cette manière, et sous le système visé par le Protocole, chaque Puissance aurait pleine liberté, comme à présent, respectivement à la législation maritime sanitaire ; elle imposerait, si bon lui semble, la surveillance de ses propres médecins ou à bord de ses navires ou dans ses ports d'arrivée ; elle appliquerait ses propres méthodes de prophylaxie. Nous demandons une même liberté pour tous, nous ne demandons ni plus ni moins. Nous désirons laisser à chaque Puissance une égale et pleine liberté. Nous ne désirons pas imposer à l'Égypte l'obligation de servir comme lazaret pour nos malades. Nous ne voulons aucunement charger ce pays d'un risque que nous croyons infiniment plus grand que celui du transit en quarantaine.

L'honorable Délégué de la France a traité cette question comme si tous les navires infectés allaient de l'est à l'ouest. Il n'a pas parlé des cas, dont il y en a plusieurs, de navires infectés de choléra qui ont transité le Canal de l'ouest à l'est. Il y a notamment le cas d'un navire portant 1,200 hommes à bord qui a transité le Canal en quarantaine le 1er Décembre, 1854, bien qu'à cette date il y eût le choléra à bord. Comment M. Proust traiterait-il un tel cas ? Nous recommande-t-il la construction de lazarets et d'étuves à désinfection à Port-Saïd, l'établissement d'un service médical à ce dernier port aussi bien qu'à Suez ! Sinon, et s'il compte abolir le transit en quarantaine, comment un navire arrivant à Port-Saïd, infecté ou suspect, passerait-il le Canal ? Le transi en quarantaine étant aboli, le libre transit d'un navire ayant le choléra ou les germes du choléra à bord, ne présente-t-il aucun danger pour l'Égypte ? Le cas du navire Anglais, le "Fullford," que M. Proust a cité et sur lequel il a tant appuyé, nous fournit un exemple de l'avantage d'un système de transit en quarantaine. Établissons les faits. Il y a eu trois cas de choléra à bord à Chittagong, où le vaisseau a été décinfecté par l'autorité Sanitaire. Il n'est arrivé à Suez que quarante jours après son départ de Chittagong. L'expédition a déclaré que la destination était un port Anglais et il lui a été permis de passer/
Le Canal en quarantaine. Il alla directement à Falmouth en Angleterre, d'où il fit voile pour Bordeaux sans entrer en pratique à Falmouth et sans y prendre de nouveaux papiers.

À l'arrivée à Bordeaux on vit clairement, en examinant les papiers de bord, que le "Fullford" avait passé le Canal en quarantaine; conséquemment on lui imposa sept jours de quarantaine. Le seul fait que ce navire avait passé le Canal en quarantaine a donc suffi pour mettre l'autorité Sanitaire sur ses gardes.

Nous passons ensuite aux chiffres qu'a cités M. Proust: nous en reconnaissons pleinement l'exactitude et ils ne demandent que peu d'observations de notre part. Il paraît que depuis l'année 1885- deux cas seulement auraient pu être classés dans la deuxième catégorie des navires infectés, c'est-à-dire dans la catégorie des navires n'ayant ni médecin ni équipe de désinfection et sur lesquels des cas récents de choléra se seraient produits. Suivant le système de notre très honorable collège, il aurait fallu mettre les malades à terre aussi bien que les passagers; ces derniers auraient été repartis en groupes et le vaisseau désinfecté. Pour cette opération il aurait fallu un grand bâtiment capable de recevoir tous les passagers d'un grand navire. Nous nous demandons si un si petit nombre de cas dans un si grand nombre d'années nécessitait une dépense si considérable.

D'après le Protocole, les vaisseaux dont il s'agit auraient transité le Canal en quarantaine et sous une surveillance rigoureuse; ils auraient été reçus au port d'arrivée dans le Royaume-Uni, où toutes les facilités voulues existent déjà.

En quatrième lieu M. Proust nous dit qu'une seule fausse déclaration de la part d'un capitaine de vaisseau pourrait être la cause d'une invasion de choléra qui atteindrait toute l'Europe. Soit. Mais nous voudrions vous adresser cette demande. Comptez-vous vous passer entièrement des déclarations des capitaines de vaisseau? S'il en est ainsi, qu'est-ce que vous y substituerez? la visite médicale? En ce cas, sur quoi portera la visite? le journal de bord? le vaisseau lui-même? ou les deux? Comment garantir que la visite médicale vous révélera avec exactitude l'état sanitaire du vaisseau, son histoire sanitaire? C'est impossible. Pour vous rendre compte de l'historique sanitaire d'un navire, il faut bien interroger une des autorités de bord; dès lors il surgit encore la possibilité d'une fausse déclaration. Vous revoirez forcément à l'examen du capitaine; vous ne pouvez vous garantir d'une manière absolue contre les fausses déclarations.

Le Protocole Anglo-Autrichien nous offre une solution de toutes ces difficultés, qui est non seulement pratique mais en même temps logique. Si nous acceptons le Protocole Anglo-Autrichien, chaque pays sera entièrement libre de prendre toutes les mesures que ses autorités scientifiques croient nécessaires et qu'elles pourront faire accepter par l'opinion de la majorité. Chaque pays sera libre de modifier ces mesures, de les rendre plus sévères suivant que l'opinion scientifique fait des progrès ou s'étend.

Mais si, au contraire, nous conventionnions un Règlement quelconque, si nous nous imposons un Règlement qu'aucun de nous n'aura le droit de changer, ne devons-nous pas nous attendre à ce que les progrès rapides de la science feraient que ce Règlement paraîtra bientôt soit trop sévère, soit pas assez sévère? Mais comment pourrions-nous le changer? Selon les pays, ce Règlement deviendra, pour les uns non assez sévère, pour les autres trop sévère. Nous aurons tous des mèmes circonstances. Nous n'aurons pas le droit de modifier le Règlement; il faudra convoquer une Conférence des Puissances et courir le risque de ne pouvoir arriver à une entente.

Nous revendiquons un autre avantage pour le système que contient le Protocole. Nous soutenons que le passage en quarantaine présente de meilleures garanties de sûreté qu'aucun système de désinfection et voici pourquoi: à l'arrivée au port de destination, le navire qui a transité en quarantaine reste toujours sujet à l'observation des autorités de ce port, lesquelles feront toutes les recherches voulues respectivement à la santé du navire jusqu'au moment même de son arrivée. Tandis que si le navire est visité à Suez, les autorités du port de destination devront se fier à une désinfection dont elles ignorent peut-être le système, et fonctionnant dans un pays très éloigné sous la surveillance d'agents absolument indépendants des autorités du port de destination.

M. le Dr. Proust admet— et nous pensons que tous les hommes de science partagent son opinion— que plusieurs parties du Règlement actuellement en vigueur sont déjà surannées. L'histoire se répète, dit-on; et assurément ce qui est arrivé au Règlement actuel arrivera au nouveau Règlement, quel qu'il soit. Qui nous garantira que ce qui est aujourd'hui le dernier mot de la science ne deviendra pas suranné à une époque plus ou moins proche? Bien que nous considérions, à l'heure qu'il est, tel ou tel Règlement comme parfait, contiennent de temps en temps se passera-t-il avant qu'on ne commence à douter de l'efficacité de ce Règlement? Si nous conventionnions un Règlement, en lui donnant l'imprimatur d'une Conférence Européenne, nous ne pourrons le changer sans obtenir l'unanimité; l'historie des Conférences qui se sont récemment réunies nous montre jusqu'à quel point il est difficile d'obtenir l'unanimité.
Mr. Lowther.—Dr. Proust, at the beginning of the speech which we listened to with so much interest, observed that the Anglo-Austrian Protocol had an aim other than that of all the Sanitary Conferences which have preceded that at which we have the honour to be taking part.

He said that till now endeavours had been made to prevent cholera approaching our shores, and to prevent infected ships, carrying the seeds of the disease from reaching Europe. According to my honourable colleague, the Protocol aims at quite a different result. He tells us that it is for allowing infected vessels to pass freely into the Mediterranean.

The British Delegates do not see the matter from this point of view. We even think that Dr. Proust himself will not insist on the opinion he has expressed.

The Protocol, far from the effect attributed to it, provides for the Suez Canal stricter and more effective preventive measures than those now in force. As regards precautions for the Mediterranean countries, it contains an entirely new provision, namely, the telegram required under Article 3; the name and destination of every ship passing through the Canal in quarantine will be telegraphed to the Powers interested.

If we rightly understand our honourable colleague’s view, he looks upon the Suez Canal as a natural barrier against the introduction of cholera into Europe, as vessels which might possibly convey the seeds of the disease to Europe can be stopped there; and holds that in the interests of the public health all infected and suspected ships should there be stopped, and that before entering the Canal they should undergo such treatment as will prevent their doing any harm to the public health of Europe, and especially of Southern Europe.

Were it possible to set up at Suez a barrier which cholera would always be absolutely unable to cross, were it absolutely certain that such barrier would defend Europe from every invasion of cholera, we would admit that the proposals to which we yesterday listened with such interest would be worth a great sacrifice.

But is this really the case? Can Europe be thus made invulnerable? Can our very honourable colleague guarantee to this Conference, can he guarantee to Europe that the system he recommends, if once adopted, will render the basin of the Mediterranean safe from cholera?

Evidently not. Quite recently we have seen cholera break out on the shores of the Mediterranean.

This year cholera has appeared at Damascus; the system which we are asked to adopt would not prevent such a thing happening again.

Let us take another point.

We are asked to reconcile the just claims of navigation with the claims of public health as understood in the various countries represented at this Conference.

Dr. Proust will, I know, be among the first to allow us credit for the sanitary measures executed of late years in the British Colonies. He is aware of the immense sums of money spent in those Colonies in sanitary work; he knows the true and great value of that work.

As regards a conciliation of the claims of navigation and of public health, we fully believe that it is possible.

We approach the questions in the programme prepared by the Austro-Hungarian Government fully desirous of finding means for realizing the conciliation which we are all anxious to bring about. We may perhaps observe, in passing, that according to the programme, the Protocol of the 29th July last is to be the subject of our discussions. But M. Proust’s observations passed it over almost in silence. He proposes an entirely new system.

For the moment we will not go beyond the objections raised by our honourable colleague to the provisions of the Anglo-Austrian Protocol.
Dr. Proust alleges, in the first place, that owing to the sojourn of ships in the passing stations it is extremely difficult to prevent communication between the Canal banks and ships passing in quarantine. Let us examine this point carefully. We are told that a man with cholera, or rather a man with the disease in the stage of incubation, could easily escape from the ship. But when would he do so? While the ship is under way between two passing stations, or while she in a passing station? Are we seriously to contemplate the idea of a man throwing himself into the Canal and swimming ashore in order to find himself on the banks of the Canal, wet through, in the midst of a desert? The Company's servants at the next passing stations will prevent his taking refuge there. Perhaps he will rather escape while the ship is moored in a passing station. But is it really impossible efficiently to guard a ship moored in a passing station? Do the circumstances of the case make it impossible? Quite the contrary. The circumstances of the case, and above all the isolation of the ship in the midst of the desert, far from any village and any hiding-place, make it easy to guard her.

The system advocated by our honourable colleague involves the guarding of hundreds of persons at Moses' Wells. It involves a guarantee that not one person shall escape. It is quite as easy to guard the limited extent of the ship's side which lies along the quay of a passing station; for it must be remembered that one side only of the ship is in direct communication with the banks. We maintain that an absolutely effective watch can be kept over the part of the ship which is next the banks, whether the guards are on the ship or on the banks, or on both. He does not speak of watching a ship under way, it involves indeed no difficulty. Night watching will be much facilitated by the electric light used on ships passing through the Canal. The stoppage at Ismailia is not a source of danger, for ships do not stop near the town, but out in Lake Timsah; the ship does not leave the fairway.

Even Dr. Proust does not entirely do away with passage in quarantine. On the contrary, ships in the first class of suspected ships, and the second class (B) of infected ships, will pass in quarantine. He therefore admits that ships can pass in quarantine without danger, otherwise the provision that these two classes of ships shall so pass is meaningless.

M. Proust says that the fact that ships in these classes carry a doctor and a disinfecter enables any fresh cases of cholera to be met, but the doctor and the disinfecter are manifestly useless to protect Egypt against the case of a man escaping with cholera in the stage of incubation.

As regards the stoker Muhammed Khalifa, alleged to have escaped from some ship in 1883, and to have gone to Damietta, we would observe that this case is the only one cited, although thousands of ships have passed the Canal. Moreover, the evidence on the capital question of whether he really did escape from a ship passing in quarantine is extremely doubtful. The case cannot be relied on.

In the second place, M. Proust objects to the Protocol as giving an exclusive privilege to the English flag; that other Powers are free to claim the same privilege, but that the extension creates a danger. He said that it was either an exclusive privilege in favour of English navigation or a danger to the Mediterranean. But the Protocol has by no means the character attributed to it by our honourable colleague. It gives us no exclusive privilege, and we ask for none. Great Britain only claims that British vessels not touching at any Egyptian port and bound for a British port shall be allowed to follow their course; she claims that British ships shall not be subject to any regulations other than those in force under British authority in the British ports where their voyage ends. The claim made by Great Britain has already received the support of many Powers whose flag has a large share in the navigation of the Suez Canal.

Every Government must remain supreme as regards the laws regulating the conditions under which ships shall be permitted to enter its harbours. These laws will naturally differ according to the country, its geographical situation, and the habits and opinions of its people.

Under the system of the Protocol each Power will thus have full liberty of action, as at present, in regard to maritime sanitary matters; each Power may, if it think fit, insist on supervision by its own doctors either on board or at the port of arrival; it will apply its own measures of defence. We claim an equal liberty for all; we claim neither more nor less. We do not want to make Egypt a lazaretto for our sick. We in no wise want to thrust on that country a risk which we consider to be infinitely greater than that of passage in quarantine.

The honourable Delegate of France has treated this question as if all infected ships travelled from East to West. He did not speak of the many cases of cholera-infected ships which have hassed through the Canal from West to East. He did not mention
the case of a ship which went through the Canal on the 1st December, 1884, in quarantine, carrying 1,200 souls, although there was cholera on board. How would M. Proust meet such a case? Would he ask us to erect lazarettos and disinfectors, and to station medical men at Port Said as well as at Suez? If he does not contemplate doing so, and if he contemplates abolishing transit in quarantine, how is a suspected or infected ship to pass the Canal? If transit in quarantine is abolished, does the free transit of a ship with the germs of cholera on board involve no danger to Egypt? The case of the English ship "Fulford," cited by M. Proust, and much emphasized by him, furnishes an example of the advantages of a system of transit in quarantine. Let us look at the facts of the case. Three deaths had occurred on board from cholera at Chittagong, where the ship was disinfected by the Sanitary officials. She arrived at Suez forty days after leaving Chittagong. The captain declared that he was bound for an English port, and was allowed to pass the Canal in quarantine. He went direct to Falmouth, in England, whence he sailed for Bordeaux without taking pratique at Falmouth and without fresh papers.

It was clearly seen, by inspection of the ship's papers at Bordeaux, that the "Fulford" had passed the Canal in quarantine, and she was consequently subjected to seven days' quarantine. Thus, the mere fact that she had passed in quarantine was sufficient to put the Sanitary officials on their guard.

We now pass to the figures quoted by M. Proust. We at once admit that they are correct, and they call for but few observations from us. It appears that since 1885 two cases only would have been classed in the second division of infected ships, that is, in the class of ships carrying neither a doctor nor a disinfector, and having had recent cases of cholera on board. Under our honourable colleague's system, both the sick and the passengers would have been landed; the passengers would have been divided into groups, and the ship disinfected. To carry this out a large building would have been required, capable of holding all the passengers carried by a large ship. We can but ask ourselves whether so great an outlay was necessary for so small a number of cases during so many years. Under the Protocol, the vessels in question would have passed the Canal in quarantine under strict watch; they would have been received at a port in the United Kingdom, where every requirement for dealing with them is already in existence.

M. Proust, in the fourth place, tells us that a false declaration by a captain might produce an invasion of cholera, reaching over all Europe. Quite so. We would, however, ask this question: Do you intend to dispense altogether with captains' declarations? If so, what will you take instead? Medical inspection? What will be inspected? The log, the ship, or both? How can you be sure that the inspection will correctly reveal to you the sanitary state of the ship and her sanitary history? It cannot do so. In order to know the ship's sanitary history, you must question those on board, and then there comes in again the possibility of a false declaration. You cannot avoid questioning the captain, and you can procure no absolute guarantee against a false declaration.

The Anglo-Austrian Protocol gives you a way out of all these difficulties which is both practical and reasonable. If we take the Anglo-Austrian Protocol, each country will be entirely free to adopt every measure which its scientific authorities may think necessary, and for which they may be able to accept with the approval of public opinion. Each country will be at liberty to vary these measures, and to make them stricter according as scientific opinion may advance or extend.

But if, instead of doing this, we fix any given set of Regulations by a Treaty, if we establish a set of Regulations which no one of us will have power to change, must we not expect that the rapid progress of science will make these Regulations appear at one time too strict, at another not strict enough? But how shall we be able to change them? They will be too severe for one country, and not severe enough for another. We shall all be in the like circumstances. We shall be powerless to change them, a fresh Conference will have to be summoned, and there will be the danger that it will be impossible to obtain any agreement.

We claim yet another advantage for the system established by the Protocol. We maintain that transit in quarantine furnishes greater guarantees for safety than any system of disinfection, because a ship having passed through the Canal in quarantine remains liable in the port of arrival to the control of authorities of that port, who will make all necessary inquiries into the health of the ship up to the very moment of her arrival; whereas, if she is inspected at Suez, the authorities will have to trust to a disinfection, of the system of which they are perhaps ignorant, carried out in a distant country by officers entirely independent of the authorities of the port of arrival.

Dr. Proust admits—and we think that all scientific men are of his opinion—that several parts of the present Regulations are now obsolete. It is said that history repeats itself, and most assuredly what happened to those Regulations will happen to the new
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ones, whatever they be. Who can insure that what is to-day the most recent expression of scientific opinion will not be obsolete at a date more or less near to the present time? Although we may at this moment consider any given Regulations as perfect, how long will it be before they are called in question? If we attach any set of Regulations to a treaty under the sanction of a European Conference, we shall be unable to change them unless we obtain unanimity in favour of the change. The history of recent Conferences shows us how difficult it is to obtain unanimity.

Be sure that the only safe course, the only course, that can reasonably be followed, lies in the adoption of a system assuring to each nation complete administrative and legislative freedom; that is the system of the Protocol which the British Government and the Austro-Hungarian Government ask the Conference to adopt.

Inclosure 3 in No. 27.

**Modified French Proposals.**

LE principe du passage en quarantaine des navires par le Canal de Suez, formulé dans le Protocole Austro-Anglais, est accepté, sous la réserve des mesures suivantes, propres à sauvegarder la santé publique de l'Égypte et de l'Europe.

Sous ce rapport, les navires sont répartis en trois classes:—

1. **Navires Indemnes.**
2. **Navires Suspects.**
3. **Navires Infectés.**

**1. Navires Indemnes.**—Les navires reconnus indemnes après visite médicale, auront libre pratique immédiate, quelle que soit la nature de leur patente. Ils ne seront pas soumis à l'observation de vingt-quatre heures qui est prescrite actuellement contre les navires avec patente brute.

**2. Navires Suspects,** c'est-à-dire ayant eu des cas de choléra au moment du départ ou pendant la traversée, mais aucun cas nouveau depuis sept jours. Ces navires seront traités d'une façon différente suivant qu'ils ont ou n'ont pas à bord un médecin et un appareil à désinfection (éboue).

(a.) Les navires ayant un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (éboue) remplissant les conditions voulues, seront admis à passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine dans les conditions qui seront indiquées plus loin.

(b.) Les autres navires suspects n'ayant ni le médecin ni l'appareil de désinfection (éboue) seront, avant d'être admis à transiter en quarantaine, retenus aux Sources de Moïse, pendant le temps nécessaire pour opérer la désinfection du linge sale, du linge de corps, et autres objets susceptibles, et s'assurer de l'état sanitaire du navire.

S'il s'agit d'un navire postal, ou d'un paquebot spécialement affecté au transport des voyageurs, sans appareil de désinfection (éboue), mais ayant un médecin à bord—si l'autorité locale a l'assurance, par une constatation officielle, que les mesures d'assainissement et de désinfection ont été convenablement pratiquées, soit au point de départ, soit pendant la traversée, le passage en quarantaine sera accordé.

S'il s'agit de navires postaux ou de paquebots spécialement affectés au transport des voyageurs, sans appareil de désinfection (éboue), mais ayant un médecin à bord ; si le dernier cas de choléra remonte à plus de quatorze jours, et si l'état sanitaire du navire est satisfaisant, la libre pratique pourra être donnée à Suez, lorsque les opérations de désinfection seront terminées.

Pour les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours, les passagers à destination de l'Égypte seront débarqués aux Sources de Moïse et isolés pendant vingt-quatre heures, et leur linge sale et leurs effets à usage désinfectés. Ils recevront alors la libre pratique.

Le Règlement déterminera dans quelles conditions la totalité du linge sale pourra ne pas être désinfectée.*

**3. Navires Infectés,** c'est-à-dire ayant du choléra à bord ou ayant présenté des cas nouveaux de choléra depuis sept jours. Ils se divisent en navires avec médecin et appareil de désinfection (éboue) et navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (éboue).

(a.) Les navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (éboue) seront arrêtés

* Lorsque le choléra se montrera exclusivement dans l'équipage, la désinfection ne portera que sur le linge sale de l'équipage, mais tout le linge sale de l'équipage, et dans les postes d'habitation de l'équipage.
aux Sources de Moïse, les malades débarqués et isolés dans un hôpital. La désinfection sera pratiquée d'une façon complète. Les autres passagers débarqués et isolés par groupes aussi peu nombreux que possible, de façon à ce que l'ensemble ne soit pas solidaire d'un groupe particulier si le choléra venait à se développer. Le linge sale, les objets à usage, les vêtements de l'équipage et les passagers seront désinfectés, ainsi que le navire.

Il est bien entendu qu'il ne s'agit pas du déchargement des marchandises, mais seulement de la désinfection de la partie du navire qui a été infectée.

Les passagers resteront cinq jours à l'établissement des Sources de Moïse.

Lorsque les cas de choléra remonteront à plusieurs jours, la durée de l'isolement pourra être diminuée. Cette durée variera selon l'époque de l'apparition du dernier cas.

(b) Le passage en quarantaine pourra même être accordé avant l'expiration des cinq jours, par l'autorité Sanitaire, après la désinfection opérée, si le navire possède un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuved) présentant les conditions indiquées.

Pour les navires postaux dans le cas où la maladie n'aurait envahi qu'une partie limitée du navire, l'autorité locale sera juge de l'opportunité du débarquement, du nombre des personnes à débarquer suivant les postes qu'elles occupent à bord. Elle aura également à déterminer les points du navire à désinfecter.

Par exception, s'il s'agit de grands transports de troupes soumises à la discipline militaire, si le navire possède un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuved), l'autorité Sanitaire pourra prescrire seulement le débarquement des personnes logées dans le compartiment du navire où la maladie s'est déclarée. Pendant le débarquement de ce compartiment et la section de l'hôpital dans laquelle le ou les malades auront été transportés, ainsi que les objets à usage de toutes les personnes qui ont été en rapport avec eux, seront complètement désinfectés.

L'autorité Sanitaire du bord déclarera sous serment quels sont les ou les compartiments infectés ou suspects.

Le linge sale du reste des troupes subira la désinfection à bord. En outre une étuve placée sur un ponton pourra venir accoster le navire pour rendre plus rapides les opérations de désinfection.

---

Dispositions concernant le Passage en Quarantaine.

1. L'autorité Sanitaire de Suez accorde le passage en quarantaine ; le Conseil est immédiatement informé.

Dans les cas douteux la décision est prise par le Conseil.

2. Un télégramme est aussitôt expédié à l'autorité désignée par chaque Puissance.

L'expédition du télégramme sera aux frais du bâtiment.

Chaque Puissance édicterà les dispositions pénales contre les bâtiments qui, abandonnant le parcours indiqué par le capitaine, aborderaient indûment un des ports du territoire de cette Puissance.

Seront exceptés ces cas de force majeure et de relâche forçée.

3. Lors de l’arraisonnement, le capitaine sera tenu de déclarer s'il a à son bord des équipes de chauffeurs indigènes ou des serveurs à gages quelconques, non inscrits sur le registre du bord (“log book”).

4. Un officier et deux Garces Sanitaires montent à bord.

Ils doivent accompagner le navire jusqu'à Port-Saïd ; ils ont pour mission d'empêcher les communications et de veiller à l'exécution des mesures prescrites pendant la traversée du Canal.

5. Tout embarquement et tout transbordement de passagers et de marchandises sont interdits pendant le parcours du Canal, de Suez à Port-Saïd inclusivement.

6. Les navires transitant en quarantaine devront effectuer le parcours de Suez à Port-Saïd sans garages.

En cas d'échouage ou de garage indispensable, les opérations nécessaires seront exécutées par le personnel du bord, en évitant toute communication avec le personnel de la Compagnie du Canal de Suez.

7. Le stationnement des navires transitant en quarantaine est interdit dans le port de Port-Saïd.

Les opérations de ravitaillement devront être pratiquées avec les moyens du bord.

Ceux des chargeurs ou toute autre personne qui seront montés à bord, seront isolés sur le ponton quadranteur.

Leurs vêtements y subiront la désinfection réglementaire.

8. Lorsqu'il sera indispensable, pour des navires transitant en quarantaine, de prendre du charbon à Port-Saïd, ils devront exécuter cette opération hors du port, entre les jetées.
9. Les pilotes, les électriciens, les Agents de la Compagnie, les Gardes Sanitaires seront débarqués à Port-Saïd, hors du port entre les jetées, et de là conduits directement au ponton de quarantaine où leurs vêtements subiront une désinfection complète.

(Translation.)

The principle of passing ships in quarantine through the Suez Canal, laid down in the Austro-English Protocol, is accepted upon condition of the adoption of the following measures, which are calculated to safeguard public health in Egypt and in Europe.

With this object, ships are divided into three classes:

1. Healthy ships;
2. Suspected ships;
3. Infected ships.

1. Healthy Ships. — Ships found to be healthy after medical inspection will obtain immediate pratique, whatever be the nature of their bill of health. They will not be subject to the twenty-four hours' observation now in force against ships with foul bills of health.

2. Suspected Ships, that is to say, ships having had cases of cholera on board on departure or during the voyage, but having had no fresh case within seven days of arrival at Suez. These ships will be treated differently, according as they do or do not carry a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus ("étuvé").

(a.) Ships carrying a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus of proper construction shall be allowed to pass the Suez Canal in quarantine under the regulations hereinafter laid down.

(b.) Other suspected ships, carrying neither doctor nor disinfecting apparatus, will, before being allowed to transit in quarantine, be detained at Moses' Wells during the time required for disinfecting their dirty linen, body clothing, and other susceptible things, and for ascertaining the sanitary condition of the ship.

In the case of a mail-ship, or of a packet specially engaged in the passenger traffic, having no disinfecting apparatus, but carrying a doctor, if the local Sanitary authority is assured by official evidence that the requisite measures of sanitation and disinfection have been properly carried out, either at the port of departure or during the voyage, transit in quarantine shall be granted.

In the case of mail-ships, or of packets specially engaged in the passenger traffic, having no disinfecting apparatus, but carrying a doctor, if the last case of cholera occurred more than fourteen days before, and if the sanitary state of the ship is satisfactory, free pratique may be given at Suez, when the operation of disinfection is over.

In the case of ships having had a passage of less than fourteen days, passengers for Egypt will disembark at Moses' Wells and be isolated for twenty-four hours, and their dirty linen and used clothing be disinfected. They will then receive full pratique.

The Regulations shall lay down under what circumstances the dirty linen and susceptible things need not all be disinfected.*

3. Infected Ships, that is to say, ships having a case of cholera on board, or having had a fresh case of cholera within seven days of arrival at Suez, are divided into ships with a doctor and disinfecting apparatus ("étuvé"), and ships without a doctor and disinfecting apparatus.

(a.) Ships without a doctor and disinfecting apparatus will be sent to Moses' Wells, the sick will be disembarked and isolated in a hospital. Thorough disinfection will be applied. The remainder of the passengers will be disembarked and isolated in as small groups as possible, in order that the whole number of passengers may not be affected by a case of cholera occurring in any one particular group. Dirty linen, things in use, the clothes of the crew and of the passengers, will be disinfected as well as the ship.

It is understood that no disembarkation of cargo is to take place, and that only the infected part of the ship is to be disinfected.

The passengers will remain five days at the establishment of Moses' Wells.

When the cases of cholera occurred several days before, the period of isolation may be shortened. The length of such period of isolation will vary according to the date of the appearance of the last case of cholera.

* Should cholera occur only amongst the crew, disinfection will extend to the dirty linen of the crew only, but it shall extend to all the dirty linen of the crew and the spaces occupied by the crew.
(b.) Transit in quarantine may even be granted by the Sanitary authority before the expiration of the said five days if disinfection has been applied, and if the ship carries a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus of the required kind.

In the case of mail-ships, where the cholera has only shown itself in a limited part of the ship, it shall be for the Sanitary authority to determine the necessity, if any, for disembarkation, and the number of persons to be disembarked, according to the position which they occupied on board. The Sanitary authority will also determine what parts of the ship will require to be disinfected.

Exceptional treatment will be accorded to large transport-ships, subject to military discipline, and carrying a doctor and disinfecting apparatus. In this case the Sanitary authority need only compel the disembarkation of persons living in that compartment of the ship in which the case of cholera broke out. While the men are disembarked, this compartment and the section of the ship’s hospital to which the sick individual or individuals may have been taken, together with things used by any persons in contact with the sick, shall be completely disinfected.

The ship’s Sanitary authority shall, under oath, declare what compartments are infected or suspected.

The dirty linen of the rest of the troops shall be disinfected on board. Furthermore, a disinfecting apparatus may be brought alongside on a lighter in order the more quickly to carry out the disinfection.

---

Provisions respecting the Passage of the Canal in Quarantine.

1. The Sanitary authority at Suez grants the permission to pass the Canal in quarantine; the Board is at once informed that such permission has been granted. In doubtful cases the Board decides.

2. A telegram is at once sent to the authority appointed for the purpose by each Power. The telegram is sent at the expense of the ship.

Each Power will provide penal measures against ships which abandon the course indicated by the captain, and improperly touch at any of the ports in the territory of such Power.

Cases of vis major and stress of weather are excepted.

3. At the examination of the ship, the captain will be bound to declare if he has had on board native stokers or any paid servants whatsoever not entered on the log-book.

4. An officer and two Sanitary Guards go on board the ship.

They travel with the ship as far as Port Sa'id; it is their duty to prevent communication, and to see that the required measures are carried out during the passage of the Canal.

5. All shipping and transhipping of passengers and goods are prohibited during the passage of the Canal from Suez to Port Sa'id inclusive.

6. Ships passing in quarantine must not enter a passing station between Suez and Port Sa'id.

Should a ship run aground, or should she be obliged to enter a passing station, the necessary operations shall be carried out by the ship’s staff, and all communication with the Suez Canal Company’s staff shall be avoided.

7. Ships passing in quarantine are prohibited from remaining in Port Sa'id.

The operation of revictualling shall be carried out by the ship’s staff. Any porters or others who may have gone on board shall be isolated on the quarantine pontoon. Their clothes shall be disinfected according to the Regulations.

8. In case ships passing in quarantine are obliged to coal at Port Sa'id, they must do so outside the port, between the jetties.

9. Pilots, electricians, Company’s agents, and Sanitary Guards shall be landed at Port Sa'id, outside the port, between the pier-heads, and shall thence be taken directly to the quarantine pontoon, where their clothes shall be thoroughly disinfected.
### Tableau des Navires arrivés à Suez de l'Extrême-Orient ayant ou à bord soit au port de provenance, soit pendant la traversée, des cas certains ou suspects de Choléra.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bengal...</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Sainthome</td>
<td>26 Octobre, 1881</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Transité Canal en quarantaine.</td>
<td>* Qy. heures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Britain</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Samarang</td>
<td>15 Novembre, 1881</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>22 Février, 1882</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ecompté sept jours à Tor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonquin</td>
<td>Français</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>18 Juillet, 1883</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govino</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Bassin</td>
<td>15 Avril, 1884</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>10 Octobre, 1881</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>10 Octobre, 1881</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sailors</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bassin</td>
<td>15 Avril, 1884</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sortie</td>
<td>Français</td>
<td>Saigon</td>
<td>1er Mai, 1885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24* observation quarantenaire aux Sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mira</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>1er Mai, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ecompté sept jours à Tor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vienne</td>
<td>Français</td>
<td>Saigon</td>
<td>2 Juillet, 1885</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24* observation quarantenaire aux Sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullion</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Moulmein</td>
<td>27 Mai, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ecompté sept jours à Tor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lencana</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Tientsin</td>
<td>9 Juin, 1885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Désinfecté.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azuba</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Kurrachée</td>
<td>15 Octobre, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ecompté sept jours à Tor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remembrance</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>10 Octobre, 1881</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Château Yquem</td>
<td>Français</td>
<td>Tonquin</td>
<td>1er Novembre, 1885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natal</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Shanghaï</td>
<td>1er Mai, 1885</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ecompté dix jours à Tor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Nixe</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Shanghaï</td>
<td>1er Mai, 1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ecompté sept jours à Tor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dencollin</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghaï</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transité Canal en quarantaine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comorin</td>
<td>Français</td>
<td>Hiphong</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Plusieurs</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucettes</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Shanghaï</td>
<td>3 Décembre,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energie</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Yokohama</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Shanghaï</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Philip</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Yokohama</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grunes</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>19 Juin, 1886</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonquin</td>
<td>Français</td>
<td>Along</td>
<td>10 Octobre, 1886</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ecompté sept jours à Tor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haverton</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Nagasaki</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transité Canal en quarantaine.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euphrates</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Idem.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>2 Décembre,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ecompté sept jours à Tor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Qy. heures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nom du Navire</th>
<th>Pavillon</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Date de l'arrivée à Suez</th>
<th>Nombre de Jours écoulés entre la date du dernier cas de Choléra et celle de l'arrivée du Navire à Suez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mount Lebanon</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>9 Novembre, 1886</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Décembre, 1886</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yesta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Octobre, 1887</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Novembre, 1886</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathleven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 Novembre, 1886</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telemechas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Décembre, 1886</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohilla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Février, 1888</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astronomer</td>
<td></td>
<td>Halphong</td>
<td>10 Mai, 1886</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>François</td>
<td></td>
<td>26 Mars, 1889</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Anglia</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Bassorin</td>
<td>24 Avril, 1889</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benelberg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Juin, 1889</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calédonien</td>
<td>Français</td>
<td>Halphong</td>
<td>11 Août, 1889</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glendower</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Hello</td>
<td>29 Juillet, 1889</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Samaraq</td>
<td>30 Mars, 1889</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elvis</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>17 Septembre, 1889</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bassorin</td>
<td>12 Octobre, 1889</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baghdad</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tegal (Java)</td>
<td>16 Juin, 1889</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deysdale</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chittagong</td>
<td>18 Mars, 1890</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Février, 1891</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombo</td>
<td>Français</td>
<td>Halphong</td>
<td>17 Mars, 1891</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azania</td>
<td>Anglais</td>
<td>Calcutta</td>
<td>3 Septembre, 1891</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trevelor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Moulmein</td>
<td>21 Octobre, 1891</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deke of Devonshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Décembre, 1891</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strathilson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 Septembre, 1891</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf of Genoa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21 Novembre, 1891</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Le Président du Conseil Sanitaire,  
Maritime, et Quarantenaire d'Égypte,  
(Signé)  
W. F. MIÉVILLE.
Observations prononcées le 9 Janvier, 1892, par son Excellence M. le Comte de Kuefstein à la Conférence Sanitaire Internationale en réponse aux Observations présentées par M. le Dr. Proust au nom de la Délégation Française.

JE pense qu'il est indiqué par la nature de la chose qu'avant toute discussion ultérieure chacun des deux Gouvernements qui ont signé le Protocole du 29 Juillet dernier expose les points de vue qui ont guidé son action, afin qu'aucun malentendu ou équivoque ne puisse se produire à cet effet.

Je lirai à la Conférence un exposé spécial sur la question du transit :

Les négociations que nous avons poursuivies avec le Gouvernement Britannique depuis plusieurs années sur la question sanitaire d'Égypte, et qui ont abouti à l'accord soumis à l'approbation éclairée de la haute assemblée, concernaient deux points principaux : le passage en quarantaine par le Canal de Suez et la nouvelle constitution du Conseil Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d'Alexandrie. Dans ces deux questions, différents courants résultant de la divergence d'opinion sur la valeur des systèmes opposés de précaution contre les maladies contagieuses s'étaient fait jour, et, par conséquent, on voyait se heurter des intérêts divers qu'il paraissait difficile de concilier.

L'Angleterre et la plupart des États portés pour le système de l'inspection désiraient le libre passage de tous les navires indemnes, suspects ou infectés, tandis que les pays à quarantaines, surtout ceux de la Méditerranée, ne cessaient de réclamer l'exécution consciencieuse des Règlements existants, sans cependant pouvoir faire prévaloir leur opinion contre la majorité des voix dans le Conseil Sanitaire d'Alexandrie.

Il a paru nécessaire de mettre enfin un terme à cette situation indécise, en lui substituant une organisation clairement définie et conciliant les intérêts qui se trouvent en jeu. C'est dans ce but que nous sommes entrés en pourparlers avec le Gouvernement de la Reine, auquel depuis huit ans déjà nous avions proposé comme base de négociations une modification du Conseil dans le sens d'une répartition plus normale des voix et, de l'autre côté, le transit en quarantaine sous certaines conditions de sévérité.

Sans vouloir entrer dans les détails, il me sera peut-être permis de jeter un rapide coup d'œil sur le développement graduel de la question.

Vous savez mieux que moi, Messieurs, que le transit des navires avec patente brute n'était au début accordé que dans des cas spéciaux par Décret du Khédive comme faveur exceptionnelle. Dans ces cas, la quarantaine d'observation était remplacée par la visite médicale et la désinfection, demandant un arrêt de vingt-quatre heures au plus.

Plus tard le mouvement de la navigation dans le Canal devenant plus intense, les exceptions à la règle devinrent de plus en plus nombreuses, des abus se produisirent et enfin, depuis le déplacement de la majorité dans le Conseil, le transit en quarantaine se généralisa, la désinfection fut négligée et par suite de l'introduction du passage de nuit, l'arraisonnement et l'interrogatoire se firent souvent également la nuit.

Il devint évident que ces procédés devaient aller de pair avec une relâche dans l'exactitude du service et nourrir la tendance des capitaines de reculer le véritable état de santé sur leurs navires. En effet, des navires notoirement infectés ont pu obtenir le transit et transporter le choléra en Europe (Toulon, Naples, etc.).

Dès 1885, du reste, nous avions, d'accord avec l'Allemagne, formulé quatre points concernant la création des fonds nécessaires, le contrôle des bâtiments destinés au transport d'hommes en masse, la défense du transit en quarantaine et la réorganisation du Conseil d'Alexandrie. Ces propositions n'ayant plus pu être prises en considération par la Conférence de Londres, le Gouvernement Britannique bientôt après se déclara prêt à les examiner et à accepter une surtaxe spéciale pour le transit en quarantaine.

En même temps, le Gouvernement Italien, préoccupé à juste titre des progrès de l'épidémie, prit l'initiative de convoquer une Conférence à Rome, qui ne put cependant émettre que certains vœux, la question sanitaire d'Égypte ayant été écartée de son programme.

L'état des choses ne fut pas sensiblement altéré, en ce qui concerne le transit en quarantaine, par les résolutions prises à la Conférence de Paris ni par les décisions de celle de Constantinople, ni même par les délibérations du Conseil Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d'Égypte, auxquelles nous avions soumis les trois premières de nos propositions susmentionnées.

Le Conseil les rejeta, sauf la première, et le transit en quarantaine continua comme par le passé.

En 1887, après que l'Allemagne, la France, et l'Italie se furent, sous certaines conditions de sécurité, déclarées prêtes à accorder, mais à titre de révocabilité, le transit en
quarantaine des navires suspects, nous n'avons pas hésité à nous associer également à cette mesure.

Cependant cette concession, n'étant que provisoire, ne parut pas satisfaire aux désirs des intérêts en cause, bien que nous n'ayons pas tardé à nous ranger à un autre désir de la navigation, c'est-à-dire à l'abolition provisoire de la taxe des marchandises, dans le désir de réaliser notre projet longtemps nourri, d'arriver à une réforme du Conseil Santé.

De l'autre côté, il ne paraît pas absolument impossible de trouver des modalités pour poser les éléments d'une transaction acceptable par les deux parties.

En effet, l'Angleterre semblait surtout attacher de l'importance au transit en quarantaine, tout en admettant l'inspection médicale, et désirait en outre une interprétation par laquelle les navires venant des Indes ne seraient pas considérés dans tous les cas comme suspects.

Dès lors les conditions étaient données d'examiner si certaines garanties de sécurité ne pourraient pas suffire pour permettre de se rapprocher.

Le Gouvernement Impérial et Royal crut le moment opportun pour essayer d'arriver à une entente avec la Grande-Bretagne, sur les modifications à apporter au Conseil International d'Alexandrie, aux Règlements en vigueur, au Tarif, &c.

Les négociations poursuivies entre les deux Cabinets depuis près d'un an et demi, aboutirent enfin au Protocole du 29 Juillet, à l'accord pour la convocation d'une Conférence et à la fixation du programme qui lui est soumis.

L'accord intervenu entre l'Angleterre et nous constituerait, dans le cas où la Conférence voudra bien le sanctionner, une situation qui, à notre avis, serait préférable à l'état des choses incertain et contesté qui existe aujourd'hui. Car, ainsi que nous l'espérions, il sera possible, enfin, de procéder, dans les limites que la Conférence jugera convenable de tracer, aux réformes qui depuis longtemps déjà ont été reconnues indispensables, tandis que les concessions à faire au sujet du transit en quarantaine pourront être entourées de toutes les garanties de sécurité nécessaires pour les empêcher de devenir la source d'appréhensions pour l'Europe. Voici la situation telle qu'elle se dégage des stipulations du Protocole du 29 Juillet —

1. Les navires suspects ou même infectés à destination de ports nationaux ou bien dirigés, par suite d'une permission préalable, dans d'autres ports, pourront transiter le Canal en quarantaine.

Tout navire provenant d'un port infecté ou suspect et dont le trajet indépendant de moins de dix jours, est considéré comme suspect. Ce délai pourra être complété pendant le transit en quarantaine ; après les dix jours les navires obtiennent pratique libre à Ismailia ou à Port-Saïd.

Ces bâtiments pourront dans le but d'augmenter les ressources du Conseil, surtout en vue de l'augmentation du personnel Sanitaire nécessaire pour le nouveau arrangement, une taxe de £ E. 5 en dehors des autres frais (Gardiens Sanitat, arraisonnement de nuit, télégrammes, &c.).

Les paquebots joindront en plus de la franchise qui leur avait été accordée antérieurement.

2. Tout navire à destination d'un port d'une tierce Puissance, pour lequel il n'aura pas reçu l'admission préalable, sera soumis au Règlement et devra subir la quarantaine d'observation de vingt-quatre heures ou de plus, ainsi que la désinfection à Suez.

Mais ceux qui n'auront pas obtenu pratique libre pourront passer le Canal en quarantaine.

3. Quand un navire le désire, il pourra, au lieu de choisir le passage en quarantaine, se soumettre à la quarantaine réglementaire.

4. Enfin les navires arrivant à Suez après un passage indépendant de dix jours, seront libérés des mesures prophylactiques et ne pourront pas non plus la taxe de £ E. 5.

5. Dans le but d'entourer le nouveau arrangement de toutes les garanties de sécurité possibles, il a été convenu que les navires usant de la faculté du transit en quarantaine devront être accompagnés pendant sa durée par deux Gardiens Sanitaires, chargés d'empêcher tout contact du bâtiment avec le pays qu'il traverse ; les navires ne pourront ni embarquer ni débarquer des personnes ou des marchandises ; des télégrammes annonceront aux ports de la Méditerranée la destination de chaque navire, afin d'être certain qu'il maintienne le cours indiqué, et en outre des dispositions pénales doivent renforcer ce système préventif.

Les précautions nouvelles ajoutées à celles qui existent déjà dans les Règlements actuellement en vigueur, nous semblent constituer, à condition qu'elles soient rigoureusement exécutées, un ensemble de mesures de prévention, qui tout en offrant des garanties suffisantes contre l'invasion des maladies contagieuses, nous permettront peut-être d'offrir à la navigation certaines facilités réclamées depuis longtemps.
Je crois donc pouvoir recommander les dispositions du Protocole du 29 Juillet au bienfaisant accueil de la haute assemblée, d'autant plus que la connexité de cette question avec celles des réformes à introduire dans le Conseil d'Alexandrie, nous permettrai
d'aborder de la discussion de ces dernières avec l'espoir certain d'un heureux résultat.
S'il n'est maintenant permis d'ajouter quelques mots au développement que je
viens d'avoir l'honneur de présenter, ce n'est certes que dans un esprit de conciliation et
et dans le désir de faire ressortir autant qu'il est en mon pouvoir les efforts faits par
mon Gouvernement dans le but d'amener un état satisfaisant pour tout le monde.
Il ne faut pas prendre du Protocole une seule phrase, comme par exemple celle du
transit des navires infectés et suspects, qui, isolée, pourrait donner lieu à des malentendus.
Mais il est nécessaire de la considérer en connexité avec les alinéas suivants qui stipulent les
conditions auxquelles cette connexité est liée et qui spécifient les garanties dont elle
doit être entourées.
En les examinant attentivement on se convaincra facilement que ce n'est pas des
intérêts du commerce qu'il s'agit en première ligne, mais bien des mesures de sécurité dont
nous nous sommes préoccupés depuis des années.
Le Protocole dans son ensemble nous donne, en effet, des garanties que nous avons
considérées comme suffisantes et que notre Conseil d'Hygiène a approuvées. Il nous offre
en outre la modification de la constitution du Conseil d'Alexandrie, la revision de ses
Règlements, la création de nouvelles ressources financières pour l'établissement des lazarets
et pour l'augmentation du personnel Sanitaire et d'autres améliorations dans cet ordre
d'idées.
Quand on compare ces nouvelles acquisitions, si j'ose parler ainsi, à l'état de choses
actuel, on ne peut, je crois, en juger avec équité, méconnaître qu'elles constituent un
grand pas fait en avant au profit de l'humanité.
On ne peut prendre comme point de départ un état idéal dans lequel aussi, je suppose,
le choléra n'existerait plus, mais il faut s'en tenir à la réalité.
Nous sommes des hommes et ce que nous créons ce n'est que des créations humaines,
c'est-à-dire incomplètes. Or l'état actuel est loin de présenter les garanties nécessaires.
Les Règlements existants ne sont plus exécutés scrupuleusement sur bien des points,
asîn que j'ai eu l'honneur de le démontrer, et le passage en quarantaine est devenu la
règle, sans être entouré des garanties que nous voulons lui voir appliquer aujourd'hui par
suite du Protocole.
C'était précisément le Gouvernement Impérial et Royal qui, par son Délégué au
Conseil d'Alexandrie, avait dès 1886 demandé l'interdiction préférable du transit en
quarantaine. Il n'a pas pu obtenir la majorité des voix et le transit a continué comme
aparavant.
C'est donc, en général, un état existant que nous avons trouvé et ce n'est rien de
nouveau qui doit être consacré par le Protocole, mais avec la modification très essentielle
de l'entourer d'un réseau de garanties que nous considérons comme très sérieuses. Ainsi
les navires seront accompagnés de deux Gardiens chargés de veiller à ce qu'il n'y aura ni
embarquements ni débarquements pendant le trajet à travers le Canal; la destination du
navire sera annoncée par télegramme aux ports de la Méditerranée, et enfin des disposi-
tions pénales que chaque pays dictera selon ses lois, seront destinées à empêcher toute
déviation de la route prescrite par les papiers de bord.
Il nous semble donc qu'il serait peu équitable de supposer que le Protocole ne se soit
pas préoccupé des mesures de sécurité requises pour sauvegarder les populations.
Si la haute assemblée juge nécessaire de les completer, nous aurons à examiner les
veux qui se produiront. Je ne peux pas encore aujourd'hui me prononcer sur les
amendements proposés par MM. les Délégués Francais qui, d'un côté réclament des
mesures plus sévères pour les bateaux infectés en accordant, de l'autre côté, des conces-
sions plus grandes quant au trajet indemne qu'elles réduisent de dix à huit jours. Nous
les examinerons quand le moment sera venu, avec le même esprit d'équité et de concilia-
tion qui les a dictées.
Quant aux autres objections qui ont été soulevées à l'égard du Protocole, mon très
honorable collègue de la Grande-Bretagne y a déjà répondu, de sorte que je n'ai que peu
de choses à ajouter.
On dit que les garages dans le Canal sont trop étroits. Je ne connais pas les lieux;
je dois donc laisser à des personnes plus compétentes le soin d'en juger. Cependant je ne
puis m'empêcher de penser qu'il ne doit pas être trop difficile de trouver des moyens de
surveillance efficaces pour empêcher tout contact avec le littoral.
En ce qui concerne les chauffeurs qui ont transporté le choléra à Damiette en
s'avançant des bateaux pendant le trajet à travers le Canal, je me permets de faire remarquer
qu'à cette époque la surveillance était exercée par de simples soldats en retraite, qui,
Observations made on January 9, 1892, by Count de Kuefstein at the International Sanitary Conference is reply to the Observations made by Dr. Proud in the name of the French Delegates.

I THINK that before any further discussion takes place each of the two Governments which signed the Protocol of the 29th July last should explain the points of view which guided their action, in order to avoid any misunderstanding or ambiguity.

I will read to the Conference a statement on the question of transit:—

The negotiations which we have carried on for several years with the British Government on the Egyptian Sanitary question have led to the Agreement now submitted to the approval of this high assembly, and reference to two principal points: the passage of the Suez Canal in quarantine, and the new constitution of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Alexandria. On these two questions different currents, resulting from the divergence of opinion on the value of rival systems of precautions against contagious diseases, had manifested themselves, and various opinions were seen to clash which it seemed difficult to reconcile.

England and the greater number of those States which favour the system of medical inspection wished for the free passage of all ships, healthy, suspected, or infected, while the States favouring quarantine, especially one of the Mediterranean, continually asked for the conscientious execution of the existing Regulations, without, however, being able to carry out their desires against the majority of votes on the Alexandria Sanitary Board.

It appeared necessary to put an end to this unde ned state of things, and to substitute for it a clearly defined organization conciliating the interests at stake. This was our reason for entering into negotiations with the Queen’s Government, to which we had eight years ago proposed as a base for negotiations a modification of the Board in the direction of a more normal distribution of votes, and, on the other hand, transit in quarantine under certain strict conditions.

I may perhaps be permitted, without going into details, to give a rapid sketch of the gradual growth of the question.

You are aware, Gentlemen, that the transit of ships with foul bills of health was originally only permitted, in special cases, by Khedivial Deeree as an exceptional favour. In these cases quarantine of observation was replaced by medical inspection and disinfection, which required a delay of twenty-four hours at the outside.

Later, when the navigation of the Canal had assumed larger proportions, exceptions from the rule became more numerous, abuses grew up, and, after the possession of the majority of the votes at the Board had passed to other hands, transit in quarantine became general, disinfection was neglected, and, through the introduction of passage at sight, the examination of ships and the interrogatory also often took place at night.

It became evident that these proceedings would bring with them a relaxation in the strictness of the service, and would encourage the tendency of captains to conceal the truth as to the health of their ships. In the end, ships well known to be infected were able to obtain permission to go through, and thus to bring cholera into Europe (Toulon, Naples, &c.).
As early as 1885, however, we had laid down, in concert with Germany, four points respecting the creation of necessary sources of revenue, the control of ships carrying many people ("hommes en masse"), prohibition of transit in quarantine, and the reorganization of the Alexandria Board. As these proposals could not be considered by the Conference of London, the British Government soon after expressed itself ready to examine them, and to agree to special dues on transit in quarantine.

At the same time, the Italian Government, justly concerned at the progress of the epidemic, took the initiative in summoning a Conference at Rome, which, however, was not able to do more than pass certain Resolutions, as the Egyptian sanitary question had been excluded from the programme of its discussions.

Matters were not sensibly changed as regards transit in quarantine by the Resolutions passed by the Conference of Paris, nor by the decisions of the Conference of Constantinople, nor even by the discussions of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt, to which we had submitted the first three of our above-mentioned proposals.

The Board rejected them, with the exception of the first, and transit in quarantine continued as before.

In 1887, when Germany, France, and Italy had declared themselves ready, under certain conditions of security, to grant transit in quarantine (reserving, however, power to withdraw it) for suspected ships, we did not hesitate to give our concurrence to the measure.

But this concession, being provisional only, did not seem to satisfy the interests concerned, although we had not hesitated to concur in a desire expressed on behalf of ship-owners, namely, the provisional abolition of dues on merchandise, in order to realize the purpose we had so long had in view of reorganizing the Sanitary Board.

On the other hand, it does not appear to be absolutely impossible to arrive at a means for laying a foundation for a compromise which might be acceptable to both parties.

England, indeed, seemed to see particular importance in transit in quarantine, and at the same time seemed willing to admit medical inspection, and wished for some interpretation under which ships from India would not in all cases be considered as suspected.

Thus there was an opportunity for inquiring whether certain guarantees for safety would not allow of a rapprochement.

The Imperial and Royal Government thought the moment opportune for trying to arrive at an agreement with Great Britain on the alterations to be made in the International Board of Alexandria, in the existing Regulations, in the tariff of dues, &c.

The negotiations carried on between the two Governments for nearly a year and a half ended in the Protocol of the 29th July, and in an agreement concerning the summoning of the Conference and the terms of the programme now submitted to it.

The agreement come to between England and ourselves would, if accepted by the Conference, establish a system which, in our opinion, would be preferable to the uncertain and disputed state of things now in existence. For, as we hope will be the case, it now becomes possible to proceed, within the limits which the Conference may lay down, to the reforms which have so long been acknowledged to be necessary, while at the same time the concessions to be made in regard to transit in quarantine may be surrounded with all the guarantees of safety required to prevent those concessions becoming a source of alarm in Europe. The provisions of the Protocol show matters to be as follows:—

1. Suspected or even infected ships bound for ports of their own country, or proceeding with previously obtained permission to other ports, may pass the Canal in quarantine.

All ships from infected or suspected ports, with a healthy voyage of less than ten days' duration, are held to be suspected. The period of ten days may be completed during transit in quarantine; upon the expiration of the ten days, ships obtain pratique at Ismailla or Port Said.

Such ships will, in order to augment the financial resources of the Board, especially in view of the increase in the Sanitary staff required under the new arrangement, pay £ E. 5, besides other expenses (Sanitary Guards, examination at night, telegrams, &c.).

Mail-boats will in addition enjoy the freedom from dues previously granted to them.

2. A ship bound for a port belonging to a third Power, and for which she may not have had previous permission, will be subject to the Regulations, and will have to undergo quarantine of observation for twenty-four hours or more, as well as disinfection at Suez.

But ships not having obtained free pratique may pass the Canal in quarantine.

3. If a ship desires to do so, she may submit to the quarantine provided by the Regulations instead of passing in quarantine.

4. Finally, ships arriving at Suez after a healthy voyage of ten days, will be freed from precautionary measures, and will, in addition, not pay the £ E. 5 dues.
5. In view of surrounding the new arrangement with all possible guarantees of safety, it has been agreed that ships availing themselves of the power to pass in quarantine must be accompanied during transit by two Sanitary Guards, whose duty it will be to prevent any contact of the ship with the country they pass through; such vessels may neither ship nor land persons or goods; their destination will be announced by telegram in the Mediterranean ports in order that it may be certain that they keep to the course they have indicated, and penal measures are to be enacted to support this precautionary system.

The new precautions added to those already provided in the Regulations will, it seems to us, form, if rigorously carried out, a series of preventive measures which, while furnishing sufficient guarantees against contagious diseases, will perhaps allow us to grant to navigation certain facilities which have so long been claimed.

I think, therefore, that I can recommend the provisions of the Protocol of the 29th July to the favourable consideration of this high assembly, and all the more as the connection which exists between this question and that of the reorganization of the Alexandria Board will permit our approaching the latter question with a sure hope of arriving at a successful result.

If I may now add a few words to the statement which I have had the honour to make, I shall do so only from a desire for conciliation, and because I want to emphasize as much as I can the efforts made by my Government to reach a state of things satisfactory to all.

We must not pick out any single phrase from the Protocol, such, for instance, as that concerning the transit of infected or suspected ships, which, if taken alone, might give rise to misunderstanding. Such a provision must be considered along with the paragraphs which follow, and which state the conditions bound up with it, and the guarantees with which it is surrounded.

If we attentively examine it, we shall easily convince ourselves that it is not the interests of trade which have held the first place, but measures of safety which we have aimed at for years.

As a whole, the Protocol gives us guarantees which we hold to be sufficient, and which our Council of Health has approved. It offers us, in addition, the reorganization of the Alexandria Board, the revision of its Regulations, and the creation of new financial resources for the establishment of lazarettos, and for an increase of the Sanitary staff, and for other analogous improvements.

When we compare these new acquisitions, if I may so speak, with the state of things which exists at present, one cannot, in equity, refuse to acknowledge that they constitute a great advance by which humanity will profit.

We cannot start from an ideal state, in which, moreover, cholera itself, I imagine, would not exist; we must keep to realities.

We are but men, and can but call human, and therefore incomplete, creations into existence. Now, the existing state of things is far from furnishing the necessary guarantees.

As I have had the honour to show, the present Regulations are not scrupulously executed on many points, and transit in quarantine has become the rule without being surrounded by the guarantees by which we now wish it to be accompanied under the Protocol.

It was indeed the Imperial and Royal Government which, through its Delegate on the Alexandria Board, asked, as far back as 1856, that transit in quarantine should first be stopped. That Government could not, however, obtain a majority of the votes, and transit in quarantine continued as before.

Speaking generally, therefore, we have found an already existing state of things, and nothing new is to be established by the Protocol, but with the very essential alteration of surrounding it with a network of guarantees which we think very real. Thus, ships will be accompanied by two Guards, whose duty it will be to see that neither embarkation nor disembarkation shall take place during passage through the Canal; the ship’s destination will be telegraphed to the Mediterranean ports; and, lastly, such penal provisions as each country may ordain according to its laws will prevent any deviation from the course laid down for the ship in her papers.

It would not, therefore, be just to suppose that the Protocol neglected measures necessary for safeguarding men’s lives.

If this high assembly should think fit to complete these measures, we will examine any wishes that may be expressed. I am not yet able to pronounce an opinion on the proposals made by the French Delegates, who, while asking for severe measures against infected ships, are ready to make greater concessions in regard to the duration of the healthy voyage, which they reduce from ten to eight days. We will examine them at the proper time with the same spirit of equity and conciliation as that which prompted them.
To the other objections raised against the Protocol my honourable colleague of Great Britain has already replied, and I have but little to add.

It is said that the passing stations in the Canal are too narrow. I do not know the Canal personally; I must therefore leave more competent persons to judge of the matter. Yet I cannot help thinking that it would not be very difficult to find some means of control which would prevent any contact with the banks.

With regard to the stokers who brought cholera to Damietta by escaping from ships during their passage through the Canal, I would observe that the control was then exercised simply by discharged soldiers, who, as can be imagined, were not up to their work. On a proposal made by our Delegate at the Sanitary Board, these soldiers were in 1884 replaced by two European officials, who accompanied ships, as is now done, and this measure has proved very useful, for since then cholera has not been carried to Egypt by the Suez Canal, although possibilities of such a contingency have not been wanting.

For since 1884 nearly all infected or suspected ships from the Extreme East have passed in transit [? in quarantine], as shown by the Table I have had the honour to lay before the Conference (forty-eight ships since 1881, of which forty were English and eight French).

None of the ships bound for England carried cholera to that country. This fact explains why it might perhaps be possible, owing to the difference of geographical situation, to provide for ships running a long journey, as, for instance, to beyond the Straits of Gibraltar and to northern countries, regulations differing from those provided for the Mediterranean.

But as the Protocol makes no distinction, I need not insist on this point.

In conclusion, I can but call attention again to the advantages which the new arrangement will produce in the future as compared with the existing state of things, and I beg leave to ask the high assembly to express its concurrence in the Protocol of the 29th July last, which, I trust, will furnish the elements necessary for a general agreement.
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Protocole de Signature (Samedi, 30 Janvier, 1892).

Présidence de Son Excellence le Comte d'Arco.

L'AN 1892, le 30 Janvier, la Conférence Sanitaire Internationale a tenu séance à l'Hôtel de Ville (Palazzo Farsetti).

Étaient présents:

POUR L'ALLEMAGNE:

Délégué—
M. le Comte de Leyden, Conseiller de Légation, Consul-Général au Caire.

Délégué-Adjoint—
M. le Dr. Kulp, Délégué au Conseil Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d'Égypte.

POUR L'AUTRICHE-HONGRIE:

Délégués—
Son Excellence le Comte de Kuefstein, Conseil Intime et Chambellan de Sa Majesté Impériale Royale Apostolique, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire.
M. le Chevalier Charles de Gisler, Consul-Général d'Autriche-Hongrie.

Délégués-Adjoint—
M. le Dr. Hagel, Délégué au Conseil Supérieur Sanitaire de Constantinople.
M. le Dr. Karlinski, Médecin du Gouvernement de la Bosnie et de l'Herzégovine.

POUR LA BELGIQUE:

Délégué—
M. Beco, Secrétaire-Général du Ministère de l'Agriculture, de l'Industrie, et des Travaux Publics de Belgique.

POUR LE DANEMARK:

Délégué—
M. le Comte de Knuth, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire.

POUR L'ESPAGNE:

Délégués—
Don Silverio Baguer de Corsi y Ribas, Comte de Baguer, Ministre Résident.
M. le Dr. Cortezo, Conseiller de la Sanité d'Espagne, Membre de l'Académie de Médecine, Député.
POUR LA FRANCE:

Délégués—
M. Barrère, Ministre Plénipotentiaire de Première Classe, Chargé d'Affaires de la République Française en Bavière.
M. le Professeur Brouardel, Doyen de la Faculté de Médecine de Paris, Président du Comité d'Hygiène de France.
M. le Professeur Proust, Professeur à la Faculté de Médecine de Paris, Inspecteur Général des Services Sanitaires.
M. le Dr. Catelan, Délégué au Conseil Sanitaire d'Alexandrie.

POUR LA GRANDE-BRETAGNE:

Délégués—
Mr. James W. Lowther, Sous-Secrétaire d'État aux Affaires Étrangères.
M. le Dr. Mackie, Délégué au Conseil Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d'Égypte.

POUR LA GRÈCE:

Délégués—
M. Georges Argyropoulos, Agent Diplomatique en Égypte.
M. le Dr. Zancaroli, Délégué au Conseil Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d'Égypte.

POUR L'ITALIE:

Délégués—
Son Excellence M. le Comte d'Arco, Sous-Secrétaire d'État aux Affaires Étrangères, Député.
M. le Professeur Pagliani, Professeur d'Hygiène à la Faculté de Médecine, Directeur de la Santé Publique au Ministère de l'Intérieur.
M. le Marquis Carcano, Consul-Général à Nice.

Délégués-Adjoints—
M. le Commandeur Mayor, Chef de Section au Ministère des Affaires Étrangères.
M. le Dr. Torella, Délégué au Conseil Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d'Égypte.

POUR LES PAYS-BAS:

Délégué—
M. le Jonkheder P. J. F. M. van der Does de Willebois, Agent Diplomatique et Consul-Général.

Délégués-Adjoints—
M. le Dr. Ruysch, Conseiller au Ministère de l'Intérieur.

POUR LE PORTUGAL:

Délégué—
Son Excellence M. le Comte de Macedo, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire.

POUR LA RUSSIE:

Délégués-Adjoints—
Son Excellence M. Yonine, Conseiller Intime de Sa Majesté l'Empereur de Russie, Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire.
M. le Baron Wrangell, Premier Secrétaire de Légation.

POUR LA TURQUIE:

Délégués—
Son Excellence Ahmed Bey, Conseiller d'État.
Son Excellence le Dr. Arif Bey, Vice-Président du Conseil Sanitaire à Constantinople.
Le Colonel Bontkowski Bey, Chimiste de Sa Majesté Impériale le Sultan.
M. le Dr. Haïreddin Bey, Professeur à la Faculté de Médecine de Constantinople.
Son Excellence Boutros Pacha, Sous-Secrétaire d'État à la Justice (Égypte).
M. le Dr. Mahmoud Sidiky Pacha, Sous-Directeur de l'Administration des Services Sanitaires et d'Hygiène Publique (Égypte).

Le Président présente à la Conférence le texte authentique de la Convention où sont consignés les résultats des travaux de la Conférence. Il invite les Délégués qui sont munis des pouvoirs nécessaires, à la signer.
Les Délégués d'Allemagne, de Belgique, d'Espagne, de Grèce, et des Pays-Bas déclarent qu'ils signent la Convention au référendum.
Le Délégué d'Allemagne fait en outre la déclaration suivante:

"Attendu que, dans le cours des négociations de la Conférence, des privilèges ont été [518]..."
demandés pour certains navires ne touchant pas à un port de la Méditerranée, le Délégué d’Allemagne déclare que le Gouvernement Impérial réclamera pour la navigation Allemande tout avantages, au point de vue des mesures sanitaires, qui serait accordé à la navigation de quelque autre pays.

La Conférence donne acte de ces différentes déclarations. Les Délégués de la Grande-Bretagne déclarent que leur Gouvernement n’est pas encore suffisamment éclairé sur certaines conséquences pratiques de la Convention. Ils ne se trouvent donc pas en mesure de signer cet acte. Ils expriment le désir que leur Gouvernement ait le temps nécessaire pour un examen plus approfondi de ses conséquences. Les Délégués de la Grande-Bretagne demandent que la Conférence veuille bien prendre acte de la déclaration qu’ils viennent de faire. La Conférence prend acte de cette déclaration ainsi que du désir exprimé par les Délégués de la Grande-Bretagne.

Le Délégué de Danemark déclare qu’il n’a pas encore reçu les pouvoirs nécessaires pour signer.

La Conférence donne acte de cette déclaration. Les Délégués des Pays-Bas font la déclaration suivante :— “Attendu que, dans le cours des débats de la Conférence, des privilèges ont été demandés pour certains navires ne touchant pas à un port de la Méditerranée, les Délégués des Pays-Bas signent, sous la réserve, déjà antérieurement formulée, que la navigation des Pays-Bas bénéficiera de tout avantages, en matière de mesures sanitaires, qui serait accordé à la navigation de quelque autre pays.”

La Conférence donne acte de cette déclaration. Le Délégué du Portugal déclare qu’il signe la Convention ad referendum. Le Conférence donne acte de cette déclaration. Le Premier Délégué de Turquie déclare accepter ad referendum la Convention, sous réserve de l’acceptation ultérieure de son Gouvernement. La Conférence donne acte de cette déclaration. Elle décide que le Protocole d’adhésion à la Convention, pour les Puissances dont les Représentants ne peuvent y apposer leur Signature, restera ouvert pendant un espace de quatre mois. Sous le bénéfice de ces observations et réserves, la Convention est signée et annexée au Protocole.

Fait à Venise, le 30 Janvier, 1892.

(Signé) COMTE LEYDEN.
KUEFSTEIN.
E. BECO.
KNUTH.
COMTE DE BAGUER.
CAMILLE BARRÈRE.
P. BROUARDEL.
A. PROUST.
JAMES W. LOWTHER.
G. ARGYROPOULOS.
D. G. ZANCAROL.
A. D’ARCO.
VAN DER DOES DE WILLEBOIS.
RUYSCH.
COMTE DE MACEDO.
A. YONINE.
AHMED BEY.

Le Président: (Signé) A. D’ARCO.

Les Secrétaires :
(Signé) DR. HAGEL.
DR. CATELAN.
H. FARNALL.
ED. MAYOR.
MACCHI DI CELLERE.
DR. TORELLA.

Certifié conforme à l’original :
(Signé) A. D’ARCO.
Protocol of Signature (Saturday, January 30, 1892).

President, his Excellency COUNT D’ARCO.

ON the 30th January, 1892, the International Sanitary Conference met at the Town Hall (Palazzo Farsetti).

Present:

FOR GERMANY:
Delegate—
Count de Leyden, Councillor of Legation, Consul-General at Cairo.
Assistant Delegate—
Dr. Kulp, Delegate to the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt.

FOR AUSTRIA-HUNGARY:
Delegates—
His Excellency Count de Kuefstein, Privy Councillor and Chamberlain to his Imperial, Royal, and Apostolic Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.
M. le Chevalier Charles de Gsiller, Consul-General for Austria-Hungary.
Assistant Delegates—
Dr. Hagel, Delegate to the Superior Board of Health at Constantinople.
Dr. Karlinski, Government Doctor in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

FOR BELGIUM:
Delegate—
M. Beco, Secretary-General in the Ministry of Agriculture, Industry, and Public Works of Belgium.

FOR DENMARK:
Delegate—
Count de Knuth, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.

FOR SPAIN:
Delegates—
Don Silverio Baguer de Corsi y Ribas, Count of Baguer, Minister Resident.
Dr. Cortezo, Councillor of Public Health of Spain, Member of the Academy of Medicine, Deputy.

FOR FRANCE:
Delegates—
M. Barrère, Minister Plenipotentiary of the First Class, Chargé d’Affaires for the French Republic in Bavaria.
Professor Brouardel, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, Chairman of the Public Health Committee of France.
Professor Proust, Professor in the Faculty of Medicine of Paris, Inspector-General of Sanitary Services.
Dr. Catelan, Delegate to the Sanitary Board of Alexandria.

FOR GREAT BRITAIN:
Delegates—
Mr. James W. Lowther, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.
Dr. Mackie, Delegate to the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt.

FOR GREECE:
Delegates—
M. Georges Argyropoulos, Diplomatic Agent in Egypt.
Dr. Zancarol, Delegate to the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt.
Delegates—
His Excellency Count d’Arco, Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Deputy.
Professor Pagliani, Professor of Hygiene in the Faculty of Medicine, Director of the
Public Health Department in the Ministry of the Interior.
The Marquis Carcano, Consul-General at Nice.

Assistant Delegates—
Commander Mayor, Head of Department in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.
Dr. Torella, Delegate to the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt.

FOR THE NETHERLANDS:
Delegates—
The Jonkheer P. J. F. M. van der Does de Willebois, Diplomatic Agent and Consul-
General.
Dr. Ruysch, Councillor in the Ministry of the Interior.

FOR PORTUGAL:
Delegate—
His Excellency Count de Macedo, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.

FOR RUSSIA:
Delegates—
His Excellency M. Yonine, Privy Councillor of His Majesty the Emperor of Russia,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary.
Baron de Wrangell, First Secretary of Legation.

The President lays before the Conference the authentic text of the Convention,
showing the results of the labours of the Conference. He invites the Delegates having
full powers to sign it.
The Delegates of Germany, Belgium, Spain, Greece, and the Netherlands declare that
they sign the Convention ad referendum.
The German Delegate makes the following declaration as well:—
“Seeing that, during the negotiations of the Conference, privileges have been asked
for certain ships not touching at a Mediterranean port, the German Delegate declares that
the Imperial Government will claim for German navigation every advantage in regard to
sanitary measures which may be granted to the navigation of any other country.”
The Conference takes note of these several declarations.
The Delegates of Great Britain declare that their Government is not yet sufficiently
enlightened on certain practical consequences of the Convention.
They are not, therefore, in a position to sign that document.
They express the wish that their Government may have the necessary time for a more
thorough examination of its consequences.
The Delegates of Great Britain ask the Conference to take note of the declaration they
have thus made.
The Conference takes note of this declaration, as well as of the wish expressed by the
Delegates of Great Britain.
The Delegate of Denmark declares that he has not yet received the powers necessary
for signing.
The Conference takes note of this declaration.
The Delegates of the Netherlands make the following declaration:—
"Seeing that, during the discussions of the Conference, privileges have been asked for certain ships not touching at a Mediterranean port, the Delegates of the Netherlands sign under the reservation already made, that Netherlands navigation shall have the benefit of any advantage in regard to sanitary matters which may be granted to the navigation of any other country."

The Conference takes note of this declaration.

The Delegate of Portugal declares that he signs the Convention ad referendum.

The Conference takes note of this declaration.

The First Delegate of Turkey declares that he accepts the Convention ad referendum, reserving the ulterior acceptance of his Government.

The Conference decides that the Protocol of adhesion to the Convention shall remain open four months for those Powers whose Representatives could not sign it.

On condition of these observations and reservations, the Convention is signed and annexed to the Protocol.

Done at Venice, the 30th January, 1892.

(Signed) COMTE LEYDEN. KUEFSTEIN. E. BECO. KNUTH. COMTE DE BAGUER. CAMILLE BARRÈRE. P. BROUARD. A. PROUST. JAMES W. LOWTHER. G. ARGYROPoulos. D. G. ZANCAROL. A. D’ARCO. VAN DER DOES DE WILLEBOIS. RUYSCHE. COMTE DE MACEDO. A. YONINE. AHMED BEY.

The President: (Signed) A. D’ARCO.

The Secretaries: (Signed) DR. HAGEL. DR. CATHEL. H. FARNALL. ED. MAYOR. MACCHI DI CELLERE. DR. TORELLA.

True copy: (Signed) A. D’ARCO.
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Convention signed January 30, 1892.

SA Majesté l’Empereur d’Allemagne, Roi de Prusse; Sa Majesté l’Empereur d’Autriche, Roi de Bohême, &c., et Roi Apostolique de Hongrie; Sa Majesté le Roi des Belges; Sa Majesté le Roi d’Espagne, et en son nom la Reine-Régente du Royaume; son Excellence le Président de la République Française; Sa Majesté le Roi des Hellènes; Sa Majesté le Roi d’Italie; Sa Majesté la Reine des Pays-Bas, et en son nom la Reine-Régente du Royaume; Sa Majesté le Roi de Portugal et des Algarves; Sa Majesté l’Empereur de Toutes les Russies;

Désirant procéder à la réforme du système sanitaire, maritime, et quarantenaire actuellement appliqué en Égypte à la navigation, et aussi pour introduire les modifications reconnues nécessaires dans la composition, le fonctionnement, et le règlement du Conseil
Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d’Égypte, ont nommé pour leurs Plénipotentiaires, savoir:

Sa Majesté l’Empereur d’Allemagne, ROI de Prusse, M. le Comte de Leyden, son Conseiller de Légation, son Consul-Général en Égypte ;

Sa Majesté l’Empereur d’Autriche, ROI de Bohême, et ROI Apostolique de Hongrie, son Excellence M. le Comte de Kuefstein, son Conseiller Intime et Chambellan, son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre plénipotentiaire ;

Sa Majesté le ROI des Belges, M. E. Becq, Secrétaire-Général du Ministère de l’Agriculture, de l’Industrie, et des Travaux Publics de Belgique ;

Sa Majesté le ROI d’Espagne, et en son nom la Réine-Régente du Royaume, Don Silverio Baguer de Cordi y Ribas, Comte de Baguer, son Ministre Résident ;

Son Excellence le Président de la République Française, M. Camille Barrère, Ministre Plénipotentiaire de première classe, Chargé d’Affaires de la République Française en Bavière ; M. le Professeur Brouardel, Doyen de la Faculté de Médecine, Président du Comité d’Hygiène de France ; M. le Professeur Proust, Inspecteur-Général des Services Sanitaires de France, Professeur à la Faculté de Médecine ;

Sa Majesté le ROI des Héritiers, M. Georges Argyropoulos, son Agent Diplomate en Égypte ; le Dr. Zancarol, Délégué Hellénique au Conseil Sanitaire d’Égypte ;

Sa Majesté le ROI d’Italie, son Excellence M. le Comte d’Arco, son Sous-Secrétaire d’État aux Affaires Étrangères ;

Sa Majesté la Réine des Pays-Bas, et en son nom Sa Majesté la Réine-Régente du Royaume, M. le Jonkheer P. J. F. M. van der Does de Willebois, son Agent Politique et Consul-Général en Égypte ; M. le Dr. Ruyesch, son Conseiller au Ministère de l’Intérieur ;

Sa Majesté le ROI de Portugal et des Algarves, son Excellence M. le Comte de Macedo, son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire près Sa Majesté le ROI d’Italie ;

Sa Majesté l’Empereur de Toutes les Russies, son Excellence M. Tonine, son Conseiller Intime, son Envoyé Extraordinaire et Ministre Plénipotentiaire ;

Lesquels, ayant échangé leurs pouvoirs, trouvés en bonne et due forme, sont convenus des dispositions suivantes, dont les Hautes Puissances Contractantes s’engagent à recommander l’adoption au Gouvernement de Son Altesse le Khédive.

En ce qui concerne le Régime Sanitaire, et spécialement le Passage en Quarantaine des Navires par le Canal de Suez :

Seront appliquées désormais les mesures indiquées et précisées dans l’Annexe I de la présente Convention.

Les ressources financières que comporte l’application du dit régime sont indiquées à l’Annexe II.

En ce qui touche la Composition et le Fonctionnement du Conseil Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d’Égypte, et la Revision de ses Règlements :

La composition, les attributions, et le fonctionnement de ce Conseil seront indiqués dans l’Annexe III.

Les Règlements Sanitaires sont révisés et arrêtés conformément au texte consigné dans l’Annexe IV.

Il en est de même de la création du corps des Gardes Sanitaires.

Tous les Règlements et pièces ci-annexés ont la même valeur que s’ils étaient incorporés dans la dite Convention.

L’Annexe V n’est rédigée et insérée qu’à titre de conseils et recommandations au commerce et à la navigation.

Il est stipulé en outre que chacune des Hautes Puissances Contractantes aura le privilège de proposer, par les voies diplomatiques qui lui paraîtront convenables, les modifications qu’elle jugerait nécessaire d’apporter aux dispositions ci-dessus énoncées ainsi qu’aux Annexes qui les accompagnent.

En ce qui concerne la modification des Règlements contre la peste et la fièvre jaune ainsi que ceux applicables aux animaux, le Conseil Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d’Égypte, réformé, est chargé de les réviser et de les mettre en harmonie avec les décisions ci-dessus énoncées.

La présente Convention sera ratifiée ; les ratifications en seront échangées à Rome le plus tôt possible et au plus tard dans le délai de six mois à dater du 30 Janvier, 1892.
En foi de quoi les Plénipotentiaires respectifs l’ont signée et y ont apposé leur cachets.

Fait en dix exemplaires à Venise le 30 Janvier, 1892.

(L.S.) COMTE LEYDEN.
(L.S.) KUEFSTEIN.
(L.S.) E. BECO.
(L.S.) COMTE DE BAGUER.
(L.S.) CAMILLE BARRÈRE.
(L.S.) P. BROUARD.
(L.S.) A. PROUST.
(L.S.) G. ARGYROPOULOS.
(L.S.) D. G. ZANCAROL.
(L.S.) A. D’ARCOS.
(L.S.) VAN DER DOES DE WILLEBOIS.
(L.S.) RUYSC.
(L.S.) COMTE DE MACEDO.
(L.S.) A. YONINE.

(Translation.)

HIS Majesty the Emperor of Germany, King of Prussia; His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, &c., and Apostolic King of Hungary; His Majesty the King of the Belgians; His Majesty the King of Spain, and, in his name, the Queen-Regent of the Kingdom; his Excellency the President of the French Republic; His Majesty the King of the Hellenes; His Majesty the King of Italy; Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, and, in her name, the Queen-Regent of the Kingdom; His Majesty the King of Portugal and the Algarves; His Majesty the Emperor of All the Russias;

Wishing to proceed to the reform of the sanitary, maritime, and quarantine system now applied to navigation in Egypt, and also to introduce modifications into the composition, manner of working, and regulations of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt the changes acknowledged to be necessary, have named as their Plenipotentiaries:

His Majesty the Emperor of Germany, King of Prussia, the Count Leyden, his Counsellor of Legation, and his Consul-General in Egypt;

His Majesty the Emperor of Austria, King of Bohemia, Apostolic King of Hungary, his Excellency Count Ruefstein, his Privy Councillor and his Chamberlain, his Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;

His Majesty the King of the Belgians, M. E. Beco, Secretary-General in the Ministry of Agriculture, Industry, and Public Works of Belgium;

His Majesty the King of Spain, and, in his name, the Queen-Regent of the Kingdom, Don Silverio Baguer de Corsi y Ribas, Count of Baguer, his Minister Resident;

His Excellency the President of the French Republic, M. Camille Barrère, Minister Plenipotentiary of the First Class, Chargé d’Affaires for the French Republic in Bavaria; Professor Brouardel, Dean of the Faculty of Medicine, President of the Public Health Committee in France; Professor Proust, Inspector-General of Sanitary Services in France, Professor at the Faculty of Medicine;

His Majesty the King of the Hellenes, M. Georges Argyropoulos, his Diplomatic Agent in Egypt; Dr. Zancarol, Hellenic Delegate to the Sanitary Board of Egypt;

His Majesty the King of Italy, his Excellency Count d’Arco, his Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs;

Her Majesty the Queen of the Netherlands, and, in her name, Her Majesty the Queen-Regent of the Kingdom, the Jonkheer P. J. F. M. van der Does de Willebois, his Political Agent and Consul-General in Egypt; Dr. Ruysh, his Councillor in the Ministry of the Interior;

His Majesty the King of Portugal and the Algarves, his Excellency the Count of Macedo, his Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the King of Italy;

His Majesty the Emperor of All the Russias, his Excellency M. Yonine, his Privy Councillor, his Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary;

Who, having exchanged their powers, found in good and due form, have agreed on the following provisions, which the High Contracting Powers engage to recommend for adoption to the Government of His Highness the Khedive.

As regards the Sanitary Regulations, and especially the Passage of Ships in Quarantine through the Suez Canal:

The measures indicated and laid down in Annex I to the present Convention shall be applied.
The financial resources required to apply the said Regulations are indicated in Annex II.

As regards the Composition and Manner of Working of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt, and the Revision of its Regulations:

The composition, functions, and manner of working of this Board will be shown in Annex III.

The Sanitary Regulations are revised and set out in accordance with the text of Annex IV.

The establishment of a body of Sanitary Guards is shown in the same manner.

All the Regulations and documents hereto annexed have the same value as if they were incorporated in the said Convention.

Annex V is only drawn up and inserted as giving advice and recommendations to trade and navigation.

It is stipulated in addition that each of the High Contracting Powers will have the privilege of proposing, through such diplomatic channel as may seem best to it, such alterations as it may think necessary to be made in the above provisions, as well as in the Annexes which accompany them.

As regards the alteration of the Regulations against plague and yellow fever, as well as those respecting animals, the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt, as reorganized, is charged with revising them and bringing them into harmony with the decisions announced above.

The present Convention shall be ratified; the ratifications thereof shall be exchanged at Rome as soon as possible, and at latest within six months from the 30th January, 1892.

In witness whereof the respective Plenipotentiaries have signed the same and sealed it.

Done in ten originals, at Venice, the 30th January, 1892.

(L.S.) COMTE LEYDEN.
(L.S.) KUEFSTEIN.
(L.S.) E. BECO.
(L.S.) COMTE DE BAGUER.
(L.S.) CAMILLE BARRÈRE.
(L.S.) P. BROUARDEL.
(L.S.) A. PROUST.
(L.S.) G. ARGYROPOULOS.
(L.S.) D. G. ZANCAROL.
(L.S.) A. D'ARCOS.
(L.S.) VAN DER DOES DE WILLEBOIS.
(L.S.) RUYSH.
(L.S.) COMTE DE MACEDO.
(L.S.) A. YONINE.

No. 28.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. Lounher and Dr. Mackie.

Gentlemen,

I HAVE to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch of the 31st ultimo, containing a full Report on the discussions at the Sanitary Conference which met at Venice last month, and the conclusion arrived at by the Conference.

I have already informed you of the reasons which precluded Her Majesty's Government from authorizing you to sign the Convention at the date when it was signed on behalf of most of the other Powers. Your report of the 31st ultimo confirms the opinion that the existing difficulties are not insurmountable, and while the Delegates could not be asked to remain at Venice for the period necessary to enable diplomatic communications to pass for the settlement of the points as yet undetermined, there is ground for expecting that an Agreement may be arrived at after further consultation between the Powers.

Your Mission at Venice was of a difficult character, from the nature of the technical and the international questions to be discussed and decided; and its difficulty was much
increased by the presentation of the French proposals to the Conference without any reference of them to the Governments represented for previous consideration.

I have much pleasure in now conveying to you the approval of Her Majesty’s Government of your proceedings at the Conference. I wish more particularly to express my sense of the attention which you gave to questions affecting British shipping interests, and my satisfaction at the successful result of your endeavours to obtain the recognition of the fact, that the Quarantine Board at Alexandria is a part of the Egyptian Administration, and that it is not an international institution otherwise than in the sense that its members belong to different nationalities.

I have read with satisfaction the testimony which you bear to the value of Mr. Farnall’s services while acting as your Secretary.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 29.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir A. Paget.

(Extract.)

THE Convention which has been adopted at the Conference at Venice by a large number of Powers, but has not yet been accepted by England, has arrived from Venice, and also the other papers setting out the proceedings of the Conference. The last of them only reached me on the 29th February. The length of time which has elapsed during their preparation is probably due to the haste with which, at the last, the proceedings of the Conference were concluded. But now, that they have been brought fully under the consideration of Her Majesty’s Government, it is desirable that we should express to the Austro-Hungarian Government the opinion which after careful consideration we have formed concerning the decisions to which the majority of the Conference have come. The proposed changes arc of grave importance, especially to this country. If they are adopted they will entirely change the conditions under which passage of the Canal is now, in practice, obtainable, and will establish a sanitary machinery and jurisdiction for which, as far as I know, there is no precedent. A Sanitary Council in which the European Continental Powers will have a very large majority will be set up at the instance of an International Conference, and will administer a Quarantine Code against a commerce of which more than three-fourths is English, in waters where no other Power except Egypt has any legal jurisdiction at all.

This is a very large change on the existing system. At present the Sanitary Council has no international authority. It consists of nine Egyptian and one English Representative, against twelve or thirteen of the Continental Powers. The nine Egyptian Delegates under the proposed new rules are to be cut down to three; but the number of European members will be unaltered.

This change has been proposed avowedly for the purpose of making the application of the Quarantine Code more severe. Hitherto, though the Code itself was extreme, and unreasonable in many of its regulations, it has been administered with a leniency and a readiness to admit exceptions which has made it tolerable to English commerce. It does not in its terms favour the system of transit in quarantine; but the spirit in which it has been administered is sufficiently illustrated by the fact (stated at the Conference by the Austrian Delegate), that since 1884 nearly all the ships which were either suspected or infected, coming from the Extreme East, have passed in quarantine. I believe this combination of a somewhat rigorous Code with a practice so lenient as to dispense with all the rigour in ordinary times, preserving greater strictness for emergencies, presents a tolerable compromise between the two schools of medical theory. This, however, is not the view of the medical authorities who have influence with the Continental Powers. They have spared no effort to secure a more rigorous enforcement of the Code.

The attitude of Her Majesty’s Government has been not to insist either on maintaining the present constitution of the Council, or on introducing more moderate regulations into the Code. We have only said that, in one way or the other, we have a right to receive adequate protection for English passengers and English commerce. If the Council is led as it is, we do not press for any reform of the Code, though we think it in many respects open to criticism; but if a new Council is to be constituted by international authority in which English influence will be entirely submerged, which will be governed by the Continental views on the subject of quarantine, and whose rigour it will not be
possible to modify by diplomatic representations, then the prescriptions of the Code become a matter of grave importance to us. As long as we can appeal to the lord of the soil, the owner of the territorial waters, or to those who sit in the Council as his officers, the severity of the Quarantine Regulations need not necessarily involve interruption to our commerce or hardship to English passengers. It has not done so in the past, and would not do so in the future. But it is necessary to scrutinize these Regulations with a more jealous eye if they are to be applied with exactitude by a Council in which our influence will be insignificant, and in which the supremacy will be held by those whose views are diametrically opposed to our own.

The Anglo-Austrian Protocol was designed to give a practical effect to this view. It substituted "passage in quarantine" for "detention in the lazaret." Its main principle was that under any circumstances ships bound to British or other open ports might always pass through the Canal in quarantine. The Conference, however, rejected it, even in its most restricted form; and adhered in preference to the old system of lazarets. It was upon this difference that the Conference broke down. The system of detention is only bearable, if it is administered with great leniency, and with due regard to the interests both of commerce and of the passengers. A Council, reconstructed avowedly for the purpose of insuring its greater strictness, and placed entirely in the hands of the Continental Powers, could not be intrusted by Great Britain with the administration of such a system. But if the power of detention is taken out of its hands, by a general liberty to pass in quarantine, the proposed change in its constitution becomes less important.

The following is a brief summary of the new Code:

Ships arriving at Suez which have had no case of cholera on board during their voyage pass at once, without molestation, even though the disease is raging at the port from which they come. So far as the Bombay traffic is concerned, this is an improvement on the present rule.

All ships that have had cholera on board at any time of their voyage must be disinfected before they pass the Canal. But if they have a doctor and a suitable apparatus, disinfection, which has been done on board before arrival at Suez, will be accepted as sufficient. After disinfection, but not till then, they are allowed to pass the Canal in quarantine, if the last case of cholera appeared more than seven days before their arrival. Though this provision might be worked vexatiously, we should not have taken objection to it if it had stood alone.

The difficulty arises in the case of ships on which cholera has appeared within seven days before their arrival. The Protocol proposed that such ships should pass in quarantine, with a number of precautions. This provision was rejected by the Conference.

In place of it they required that such ships should be detained, and that all who are in the ship must disembark at Moses' Wells, and spend five days in the lazaret. In that establishment they are divided as far as possible into groups, which are kept apart. But if, during the term of five days, a fresh case of cholera appears in any group, the healthy members of it, after the sick man has been removed, must spend another five days at Moses' Wells; and so on, totes quoties. Among English medical men it is commonly believed that confinement in a lazaret is eminently calculated to develop the malady in persons not previously affected. The gloomy isolation, the associations with disease and death which inevitably belong to such a locality, and the general unhealthiness for which such establishments have an evil reputation, are all predisposing agencies, which favour the disease.

There are to be two relaxations possible in the rule which prescribes that the healthy crew and passengers of an infected ship shall be confined in the lazaret for five days; but they are granted wholly at the discretion of the port physician (the "authorité Sanitaire"), acting under the orders of the Sanitary Council. One of these relaxations is that the number of days of enforced residence at the lazaret may be diminished, if the last case of cholera on board has occurred several days before. The other relaxation is that in the case of mail-ships and troop-ships, if the cholera has only affected a portion (or, in the case of troop-ships, a "compartment") of the ship, the port physicians may send to Moses' Wells only those who have been in contact with that part of the ship, and may allow her to pass the Canal in quarantine with the remainder. The application of these relaxations is entirely at the discretion of the Sanitary authority.

This detention of the ships and confinement of the passengers and crew, or a portion of them, in the lazaret must necessarily be both a hardship and a risk to those who are subjected to it. It will be all the more difficult for English passengers to bear because the sufferer will know that he is not confined because he is trying to enter any country which is apprehensive of infection, but simply because he is trying to get to his own country, by the nearest way, through a waterway which is open to all the world. If these measures
are inflicted often, the complaints from the British shipping, which is 77 per cent. of all that passes through the Canal, will be general and earnest.

M. Proust's language, based upon past experience, would seem to indicate his belief that these cases would not be frequent. It would be dangerous, in view of the greater strictness of system which is contemplated, to count on their rare occurrence. The medical advisers of the Local Government Board have pointed out that among those who return from the East diarrhea and dysentery are not uncommon complaints; and that the character to be assigned to the symptoms of these ailments would greatly depend on the school of medical theory to which the port physician might happen to belong. It appears at all events certain that, in the opinion of many medical men, the difference between the symptoms of the milder and those of the graver diseases is not always strongly marked.

It has been urged that the discretion given to the Council and its officers of deciding on the number of days to be spent in the lazaret, and on the number of persons to be sent there from the mail-boats and troop-ships, would be exercised with leniency and consideration. Again, this would be a very unsafe deduction from past experience. Everything points to the probability of a very strict administration of the Regulations. The Council is to be reconstructed for that purpose, and for no other. Why have the Mediterranean Powers taken all this trouble, and made these persevering efforts to eliminate British influence from the Council? For no other end but to make it more strict.

The Council will no longer follow in any degree the wishes of England, but will act wholly under the inspiration of those Powers whose views as to quarantine are, in our judgment, ill-founded, who do not share our sentiments about personal freedom from restraint, and who, quite naturally, take little interest in our commerce. Under such circumstances the Regulations cannot fail to be rigorously administered.

A British Government has good ground, therefore, for looking upon this change with apprehension, and may naturally hesitate to give by its signature the force of an international agreement to the proposed measures.

You are authorized to read this despatch to Count Kálnoky, and to give him a copy of it.

---

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir A. Paget.

Sir,

COUNT DEYM informed me to-day that he had duly communicated to Count Kálnoky the substance of our conversation of the other day on the subject of the Venice Conference, in which I had expressed my willingness to take part in any negotiations upon the subject of our differences at Paris, and had said that if any discussion took place I thought England would best be represented on the occasion by some medical expert; but had at the same time called the attention of the Austrian Government to the fact that there was one broad difference of opinion which, if it was accommodated, would make agreement easy, but which would be a fatal obstacle if it was not; and that was our objection to the detention in the lazaretto of healthy persons on the alleged ground that they had been in contact with the sick. He said that he had at the same time informed Count Kálnoky that we were perfectly willing to make any passage in quarantine through the Canal conditional, in cases where there was sickness on board, upon the vessel possessing the apparatus for disinfection.

Count Kálnoky had conveyed this information to the French Government, and asked them to consider whether it was not possible to meet our views, stating at the same time that in his judgment there was nothing in what we required that was unreasonable or objectionable.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.
No. 31.

Count Deym to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received May 7.)

M. le Marquis,

18, Belgrave Square, le 6 Mai, 1892.

J'AI l'honneur de transmettre sous ce pli à votre Excellence une copie de la note verbale que M. Ribot a adressée à l'Ambassade Impériale et Royale à Paris au sujet de la Convention Sanitaire de Venise.

Le Gouvernement Impérial et Royal ne doute pas que la teneur de cette réponse, notamment le désir exprimé par le Gouvernement Français d'arriver à une entente avec le Gouvernement Britannique qui concilierait les intérêts des voyageurs et les exigences du service et de vouloir faciliter une solution, pourra satisfaire votre Excellence, et qu'elle sera en mesure de pouvoir bientôt envoyer un Délégué à Paris pour entreer en pourparlers sur la question par rapport à laquelle on n'a pas pu arriver à une entente jusqu'ici.

Veuillez, &c.

(Signed) DEYM.

(Translation.)

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to transmit to your Excellency a copy of the note verbale addressed by M. Ribot to the Imperial and Royal Embassy in Paris respecting the Sanitary Convention of Venice.

The Imperial and Royal Government does not doubt but that this reply, namely, the desire expressed by the French Government to arrive at such an understanding with the British Government as would reconcile the interests of travellers with the demands of science and to facilitate a solution, will satisfy your Excellency, and that you will be able soon to send a Delegate to Paris to enter into negotiations on the question with regard to which no agreement has as yet been arrived at.

I have, &c

(Signed) DEYM.

Inclosure in No. 31.

Note Verbale.

DANS une note verbale qu'il a bien voulu lui remettre le 27 de ce mois, so Excellence l'Ambassadeur d'Autriche-Hongrie à Paris a fait connaître à M. le Ministre des Affaires Étrangères de la République Française que le Gouvernement Britannique s'est déclaré prêt à s'entendre avec le Gouvernement Français sur les points, au règlements desquels est restée subordonnée son adhésion à la Convention Sanitaire de Venise, mais demande, au préalable, que l'Administration Sanitaire Française consente au non-débarquement des passagers indemnes arrivant à Suez, sur des navires, infectés de choléra, qui posséderaient à bord un médecin et une équipe à désinfection.

En remerciant son Excellence M. le Comte Hoyos de cette communication, M. Ribot a l'honneur de lui répondre que le Gouvernement de la République, désirieux de faciliter une solution, est disposé à examiner de nouveau, de concert avec le Gouvernement Britannique, la question dont il s'agit, avec l'espoir d'arriver à une entente qui concilierait les intérêts des voyageurs et les exigences du Service Sanitaire. Les Délégués des deux Gouvernements pourraient, à cet effet, se réunir à Paris dans un bref délai.

Paris, le 30 Avril, 1892.

(Translation.)

IN a note verbale handed to him on the 27th instant, his Excellency the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador at Paris announced to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic that the British Government had declared itself ready to come to an understanding with the French Government on those points, on a settlement of which its adhesion to the Venice Sanitary Convention was conditional, but asks, in the first place, that the French Sanitary Administration should consent to the non-debarkation of healthy passengers arriving at Suez on ships infected with cholera, but carrying a doctor and a disinfecting stove.

In thanking his Excellency Count Hoyos for this communication M. Ribot has the honour to reply that the Government of the Republic, anxious to facilitate a solution, is ready to examine the question in point afresh with the British Government, in the hope of
arriving at a solution which will reconcile the interests of travellers with the demands of sanitary science. The Delegates of the two Governments could meet shortly in Paris to proceed to such examination

Paris, April 30, 1892.

No. 52.

Note Verbale.—(Communicated by M. Waddington, May 11.)

D'APRÈS une note verbale de l'Ambassadeur d'Autriche-Hongrie à Paris, le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté la Reine serait prêt à s'entendre avec le Gouvernement de la République sur les divers points au règlement desquels reste subordonnée son adhésion à la Convention Sanitaire de Venise du 30 Janvier, 1892. Toutefois, le Cabinet de Londres désirerait recevoir, au préalable, l'assurance que l'Administration Sanitaire Francaise ne fait pas une condition sine quâ non du maintien de la stipulation de la Convention qui concerne le débarquement, dans certains cas, des passagers indemnes arrivant à Suez, sur des navires reconnus infectés du choléra et qui posséderaient un médecin et une étu de désinfection.

Sans entrer, à ce sujet, dans une discussion qui paraît devoir être réservée aux Délégués des deux Gouvernements, le Gouvernement de la République, désireux de faciliter une solution, est disposé à examiner de nouveau, de concert avec le Gouvernement Britannique, la question dont il s'agit, avec l'espoir d'arriver à une entente qui concilierait les intérêts des voyageurs et les exigences du Service Sanitaire. Les Délégués Français et Anglais pourraient, à cet effet, se réunir à Paris dans un bref délai. Il n'entre pas dans notre pensée de porter atteinte au système sanitaire organisé par la Convention de Venise, mais nous estimons qu'un nouvel échange de vues entre les Délégués Français et Anglais, sur la portée de la stipulation en question, peut amener une combinaison qui donnerait satisfaction au Gouvernement Anglais.

Ambassade de France à Londres, le 9 Mai, 1892.

(Translation.)

IT appears by a note verbale from the Austro-Hungarian Ambassador in Paris that Her Majesty's Government would be prepared to come to an understanding with the Government of the Republic on the various points, on the settlement of which its adhesion to the Venice Sanitary Convention of the 30th January, 1892, is conditional. The London Cabinet wishes, however, to know beforehand that the French Sanitary Administration does not make a sine quâ non of maintaining the provision respecting the disembarkation in certain cases of healthy passengers arriving at Suez on vessels acknowledged to be infected with cholera, and carrying a doctor and a disinfecter.

Without entering on a discussion which it would seem more proper to reserve for the Delegates of the two Governments, the Government of the Republic, wishing to facilitate a solution, is ready to examine anew with the British Government the question referred to, in the hope of reaching an agreement which might reconcile the interests of travellers with the requirements of science. The French and English Delegates might, with this object in view, meet shortly at Paris. We do not contemplate disturbing the sanitary system established by the Venice Convention, but we think that an exchange of views between the French and the English Delegates on the bearing of the provision in question may lead to a result satisfactory to the English Government.

French Embassy, London, May 9, 1892.

No. 33.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Sir A. Paget.

Sir,

I HAVE had more than one conversation with Count Deyn upon the subject of the recent Conference at Venice, and the course to be pursued with respect to the Protocols to which the majority of that assembly assented, but in which Her Majesty's Government were not able to concur.

He perfectly understands that the main question upon which Her Majesty's Government felt themselves unable to agree with the rest of the Plenipotentiaries was the proposal that
persons in health who are on board a ship proposing to pass through the Canal should be sent to a lazaretto if they have been in a part of the ship in which a case of cholera had occurred. We have always contended that such a provision involved the infliction of great suffering and unnecessary danger upon the passengers and crews of ships passing through the Canal, and that the precautions attendant upon the passage through in quarantine were an amply sufficient guarantee against any probability that persons who at the time who had remained in good health would be the means of communicating the cholera poison to Europe. I gather from his Excellency that in this respect the Austrian Government do not differ from the view of Her Majesty's Government. They would, no doubt, themselves acquiesce in the consignment of the healthy passengers and crew to the lazaretto, but they appreciate the force of our objections, and would be quite content with passage in quarantine as a sufficient guarantee against the possibility of infection. The difficulty appears to lie entirely with the French Government, and as M. Ribot, when he has been spoken to on the subject, invariably refers to M. Proust, it may be said that the difficulty entirely lies with that medical authority.

The Austrian Government have ascertained that the French Government is willing to discuss this question further by the instrumentality of expert Delegates deputed by the three Powers to assemble at Paris.

He asked me whether we were really anxious that an Austrian should be present, as well as a French and English Delegate.

I replied that the Austrian would exercise a mediating influence, and that, probably, if he was present, there might be some hope of an agreement between the English and French medical authorities which otherwise was scarcely to be expected. I said that if a French and an Austrian medical man were ready to meet at Paris on this question, we were prepared to send the Medical Officer of the Local Government Board, who was familiar with this question, and who would fully represent the views of Her Majesty's Government on the matter.

His Excellency promised to convey this intimation. At the same time he informed me that it was the intention of Count Kálmán to propose a further prolongation, for the period of four months, of the period during which the signatures of those Powers who had not acceded to the Final Protocol might be affixed. To this I offered no objection.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 34.

Count Deym to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received May 12.)

(Translation.)

M. le Marquis,


ACCORDING to the provisions of the Final Protocol of the International Sanitary Convention signed at Venice, it is open to those States which are not parties to the Convention to signify their adhesion to it within a period of four months, that is, up to the 31st of the present month.

As the end of this period is approaching, and the negotiations with Her Majesty's Government are not concluded, it appears desirable, in order that difficulties and delays which might arise in consequence of this limitation of time may be avoided, to extend the period for a further four months, that is, up to the 30th September, 1892.

I have accordingly been instructed to apply to Her Majesty's Government for their formal consent to this proposal, and I have the honour to request your Excellency to favour me with a reply in the matter.

I have, &c.

(Signed) DEYM.

No. 35.

The Marquis of Salisbury to the Marquis of Dufferin.

My Lord,

Foreign Office, May 13, 1892.

As your Excellency is aware, from the printed correspondence forwarded to Her Majesty's Embassy at Paris in January last, it was not found possible by the Delegates of Her
Majesty's Government to accept, in their entirety, a code of Regulations for the treatment in Egypt of suspected or infected ships and their passengers in the form in which it was presented by the Representative of France at the recent Sanitary Conference at Rome. The points at issue partake rather of the nature of technical medical details, such as the contamination of the healthy by the sick, and can only be settled satisfactorily by experts.

I have lately been discussing these matters with the Ambassadors of France and Austria, and it has now been arranged that they will nominate Delegates to discuss these outstanding questions in Paris on or about the 19th instant.

I have arranged with Mr. Ritchie, the President of the Local Government Board, that their Medical Officer, Mr. R. Thorne Thorne, shall proceed to Paris as British Technical Delegate. He is familiar with the question, and was one of the Representatives of Her Majesty's Government at the Rome Conference in 1883.

I propose also, subject to your Excellency's concurrence, to appoint Mr. Phipps to act as joint Delegate with Mr. Thorne Thorne, and I have to request you to convey an intimation to that gentleman to the above effect.

Instructions will shortly be prepared for the guidance of the joint Delegates, which will in due course be supplied for your Excellency's more complete information.

I am, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 36.

Foreign Office to Local Government Board.

Sir,

I AM directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to request that you will inform Mr. Ritchie that his Lordship will be glad to avail himself of his permission to employ Mr. R. Thorne Thorne, the Medical Officer of the Local Government Board, to discuss certain points of detail with regard to the treatment of suspected and infected ships wishing to pass through the Suez Canal, which remained unsettled at the recent Conference at Venice.

Lord Salisbury has selected Mr. Constantine Phipps, Secretary of Embassy at Paris, to act in conjunction with Mr. Thorne in these negotiations. These two gentlemen will be placed en rapport in Paris with Representatives named for a similar purpose by France, and probably also by Austria-Hungary.

Lord Salisbury would be glad to receive the formal assent of Mr. Ritchie to the proposed arrangement, in order that instructions may be prepared for the guidance of the Delegates, who should arrange to be in Paris, if possible, on the 19th instant.

I am, &c.
(Signed) JAMES W. LOWTHER.

No. 37.

The Marquis of Salisbury to M. Waddington.

M. l'Amassadeur,

WITH reference to the note verbale which your Excellency did me the honour to leave with me on the 11th instant, I beg leave to acquaint you that Her Majesty's Government readily assent to the suggestion, that they should depute Delegates to discuss in Paris, with a Representative of the Government of the Republic and with a Representative of the Government of Austria-Hungary, the various points in regard to which a complete accord was not reached at the recent Conference at Venice.

With this object in view, Her Majesty's Government will arrange that Mr. Phipps, who is already accredited as Minister Plenipotentiary at Paris, will be instructed to act in conjunction with Dr. R. Thorne Thorne, the Medical Adviser to the Local Government Board, who will proceed to Paris, and they will be prepared to confer with the Representatives chosen by the French and Austrian Governments. I should be glad to learn from your Excellency in due course at what date it is proposed that the discussion shall take place.

I have, &c.
(Signed) SALISBURY.
No. 38.

Local Government Board to Foreign Office.—(Received May 14.)

Sir, Local Government Board, Whitehall, May 14, 1892.

I AM directed by the Local Government Board to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday's date, stating that the Marquis of Salisbury will be glad to avail himself of the services of Dr. Thorne Thorne, the Medical Officer of the Board, as a Delegate, in conjunction with Mr. Constantine Phipps, to confer in Paris with Representatives of other countries respecting certain points of detail with regard to the treatment of suspected and infected ships wishing to pass through the Suez Canal.

The Board direct me to state that they have much pleasure in assenting to the proposed arrangement, and have instructed Dr. Thorne Thorne accordingly.

I am, &c.

(Signed) HUGH OWEN, Secretary.

No. 39.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Count Deym.

M. l'Ammbassadeur,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Excellency's note of the 11th instant, suggesting that the period within which it may be open to States not parties to the Convention, signed at Venice in January last, to signify their adhesion thereto, should be extended from the 31st instant for a further period of four months, viz., down to the 30th September next.

I beg leave to acquaint your Excellency, in reply, that Her Majesty's Government readily accede to this proposal, in the hope that, before the expiration of the period in question, a satisfactory solution may be arrived at of the points at issue.

I have, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 40.

M. Waddington to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received May 17.)

M. le Marquis,

M. LE Ministre des Affaires Etrangères me fait savoir que la première Conférence pour discuter certains points relatifs à la Convention de Venise aura lieu, sur la proposition du Comte Hoyos, Jeudi prochain, à Paris.

J'ai l'honneur d'en informer votre Seigneurie.

Veuillez, &c.

(Signé) WADDINGTON.

My Lord,

THE Minister for Foreign Affairs informs me that the first Conference to discuss certain points relative to the Conference of Venice will, at the suggestion of Count Hoyos, take place next Thursday at Paris.

I have the honour to inform your Lordship accordingly, and I avail, &c.

(Signed) WADDINGTON.

No. 41.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. Phipps and Dr. Thorne.

Gentlemen,

THE French Government having intimated that they thought it desirable to discuss with Representatives of Her Majesty's Government and of the Austro-Hungarian Government the points upon which the Venice Conference was unable to
agree, Her Majesty has been pleased to appoint you to represent the British Government in this discussion.

The Protocols of the Venice Conference, and the correspondence which passed between the Foreign Office and Her Majesty's Delegates at that Conference, will place you in possession of the questions upon which it was found impossible to come to an agreement within the limited time which was at the disposal of that assembly.

There has always been, as you are aware, a considerable divergence of view between the teaching put forward by medical authorities, and accepted by public opinion in England and in India, and that which has prevailed upon the Continent, as to the efficacy of quarantine as a safeguard against the contagion of cholera and some other diseases. The tendency of English opinion has been rather to look to measures of sanitary improvement as the best prophylactic against cholera, and to rely on the application of quarantine for that purpose only to a very limited degree; whereas upon the Continent the belief in quarantine, though apparently diminishing, retains still much of its ancient force.

There has always been a wish on the part of Continental Powers to treat the Suez Canal as an international domain which the majority of the European Powers were at liberty to open or close, according to their discretion, for the purpose of preventing the communication of cholera to their shores. Great Britain, on the other hand, has contended that no restrictions are legitimate except such as the Khedive of Egypt, the lord of the soil, may find it necessary to interpose in order to protect those parts of his own dominions which are touched by the Suez Canal and its approaches. Great Britain, no doubt, is more sensitive to an exaggerated application of the Continental views upon quarantine from the fact that she is specially affected by the disturbance of commercial intercourse which they are calculated to produce. Of the tonnage passing through the Canal, 77 per cent. is British, the remaining 23 per cent. being distributed among the other nations. Great Britain has always, therefore, insisted that the authority by which the application of quarantine to ships passing through the Canal is controlled should be one in which the special weight of authority is given to the territorial Ruler, the Khedive of Egypt. Such has been the composition of the Sanitary Council up to this date. In practice the result has been not unsatisfactory to this country. A somewhat stringent Quarantine Law has been administered in a temperate and considerate manner, and the inconveniences to which British commerce have been exposed in consequence have not been found to be excessive.

Great efforts, however, have been made by several of the Mediterranean Powers, especially Austria and Italy, to procure such a reconstitution of the Council as would diminish the Khedive's influence by a diminution of his voting power, and would proportionally increase the influence of other nations. The object of this proposal avowedly is that the Quarantine Regulations, whatever they are, should be more uniformly and rigorously enforced. Without this object the proposed change can have no meaning; and in considering the probable effect in the future of any Quarantine Regulations with respect to the Canal, this intention must be borne in mind. No forecast can be made of the future action of the reconstituted Council from the course which has been pursued in the past. The composition of the Council will have been changed, with the declared purpose of changing its policy in this one matter. It is for the Khedive to decide whether this change in the Council will be acceptable to him, and it is not possible to predict with certainty the view that his Government will take. But before joining with other Powers in urging any such modification upon His Highness, Her Majesty's Government thought that it was a paramount duty to take precautions that the new Regulations should be such as would of themselves, in their most literal application, be an adequate protection to the commerce of this country. They must be such as could be endured if administered in an exact and even in a rigorous spirit.

It appeared to Her Majesty's Government that a remedy for the apprehensions that were felt with respect to the passage of infected ships might be found in the practice of passing ships through the Canal in quarantine. No evidence of any value has been produced to show that adequate precautions cannot be taken to prevent any communication with the shore during that passage. In this view the Government of Austria-Hungary was willing to coincide, and the Anglo-Austrian Protocol was framed for the purpose of permitting all ships, whether infected or not, which were destined for a British or any other open port, to pass the Canal in quarantine. This proposal, however, which was the basis upon which the Conference was summoned, received the strongest opposition from the Delegates of France, and they unfortunately received
the support of the majority of the Powers. We are not of opinion that they showed any ground for believing that communication with the shore could not be prevented. But they were little affected by the argument that this form of precaution would be less injurious to commerce than a detention on the Asiatic side of the Canal. Indeed, Dr. Proust openly intimated that such a liberty would constitute a commercial advantage for ships bound for British ports which were not afraid to receive them, that ought not, in fairness to the ships of other nations, to be allowed. In place of it he proposed that all ships on which a case of cholera had shown itself within seven days of the arrival at Suez should disembark at the lazaretto not only the patient, but all passengers and crew who had been in the same portion of the ship, and if a mail- or troop-ship, continue its course without them, passing through the Canal in quarantine.

This is the proposal to which Her Majesty's Government took the greatest objection, and to which in its present form it is impossible for them to accede. The hardship and the danger of confining passengers who are still in health in a lazaretto on the Red Sea, with all the insanitary conditions, physical and moral, likely to attach to such a sojourn, constitutes a grave objection to the proposal. On the other hand, we think that no objection can be reasonably taken to regulations for the fumigation and disinfection of the ship, or of the passengers, and probably the disembarkation of the actual patient would be desirable on every ground. Other points may very possibly be raised in the discussions to which you are invited, on which you may think that some action ought to be taken, and on which you will no doubt refer to Her Majesty's Government for instructions. But the main point of difference is the proposal to send healthy persons to the lazaretto, when the system of passage in quarantine gives an ample security against their being the means of communicating contagion to those who are living on the shore. In several other respects the Regulations advocated by the French Delegates, and which received the support of the majority of the Conference, are an improvement upon any which have hitherto been in force. On that ground it would be satisfactory to Her Majesty's Government if an agreement on the disputed points could be arrived at. Even, however, when this has been done, there will still remain behind financial questions of a very difficult kind, and on these it is not desirable that you should pledge this country. The increased expense involved in the erection of the proposed lazaretto at Moses' Wells, and the yearly cost of its maintenance, must either be borne out of the revenues of His Highness the Khedive, or else must be defrayed by a tax levied upon the commerce passing through the Canal.

It is by no means certain that either the Egyptian Government or the ship-owners using the Canal will willingly accept this augmented burden, and until more is known of their disposition in this respect no definitive instructions can be given.

It is impossible to give you more than this general indication of the field which the discussion is likely to cover, as no indication has been given of the mode in which the French Government propose to meet the objections of Her Majesty's Government. No notice had been given of the vital modifications in the Protocol which Dr. Proust originally proposed at the Conference; and it is possible that the proposals which will be made will be equally unexpected. The question is one of great importance; and you should insist on having sufficient time for the full consideration of any new suggestions.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.
No. 43.

The Marquis of Salisbury to the Marquis of Dufferin.*

My Lord,  

I Transmit herewith, for your Excellency's information, copies of correspondence, as marked in the margin,† with the Austrian Ambassador at this Court respecting an extension of the period within which it may be open to States not parties to the Convention, signed at Venice in January last, to signify their adhesion thereto.

I am, &c.  

(Signed)  

SALISBURY.

No. 44.

Sir A. Paget to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received May 21.)

My Lord,  

WITH reference to your Lordship's despatch of the 11th instant, I have the honour to acquaint your Lordship that Count Kálnoky informed me yesterday that he was sending Count Kuefstein to Paris to confer with the English and French Delegates on the question still at issue respecting the passage of vessels in quarantine through the Suez Canal.

I have, &c.

(Signed)  

A. PAGET.

No. 45.

Mr. Phipps and Dr. Thorne to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received May 21.)

(Extract.)  

A PRELIMINARY meeting of the Delegates appointed by Her Majesty's Government, the French Government, and the Austro-Hungarian Government to discuss the points on which the Venice Sanitary Conference were unable to agree, took place at the French Foreign Office this morning; the French Representatives being M. Barrère and Drs. Proust, Brouardel, and the Austro-Hungarian, Count Kuefstein.

After a few formal observations from M. Barrère and Count Kuefstein expressive of their earnest desire, in which we fully coincided, to arrive at a settlement of the disputed points, Mr. Phipps proceeded to read to the Delegates a statement which he had drawn up on his arrival from London this morning, indicating the stage at which the negotiations had arrived and the points on which divergence appeared to exist between Her Majesty's Government and the majority of the Powers. This paper was founded almost textually on a portion of the instructions drawn up for our guidance. A copy of it will be forwarded to your Lordship to-morrow.

The proceedings then assumed a purely conversational form, as we had decided that this first meeting should only involve a preliminary and informal exchange of views.

Dr. Proust then stated that there were two contingent cases.

First Case.—A ship which should have had cholera cases before the seven days' period, but which should, at the moment of arrival at Suez, have no actual cases of sickness on board.

In such a case no disembarkation would be, in his opinion, required.

Second Case.—Ships on which cholera cases were, on arrival at Suez, actually in existence.

We (the English), Dr. Proust continued, admitted the disembarkation of the actual sick; would we be disposed to admit disembarkation of the healthy for a certain number of hours for purposes of disinfection and observation?

A conversation ensued on these points, and from it we have derived the following impression.

France seems willing to allow troop and postal vessels actually having cholera on board, or having had cases within seven days, to pass without quarantine detention of the healthy, after landing of cholera cases, and after such period of detention of vessel as

* Also to Sir A. Paget.  
† Nos. 34 and 39.  
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is necessary for purposes of disinfection, and for observation to see if fresh cases will arise. If landing of any healthy should be necessary to such disinfection of the vessel or part of the vessel, the healthy will be allowed to return to the vessel on completion of its disinfection, pending completion of detention for observational purposes; after which, the vessel will pass the Canal in quarantine.

We stated that this period of detention, either for disinfection or for observation, must be limited by the actual necessities of the case to a definite maximum number of hours.

We feel inclined to accept a maximum of twenty-four hours for disinfection of infected vessel, and a maximum of a second additional period of twenty-four hours for observation.* This extreme period of forty-eight hours observation for the "infected" ship agrees with the period in the Local Government Board Regulations as to persons actually suspected. (Article 14, General Cholera Order, 28th August, 1890.)

France wished to deal with all other infected vessels under Article 3, "Navires infectés (a);" but we contended that there should be differentiation of vessels (other than postal and troopers) according (a) to the number of days which had elapsed since any case of cholera, (b) to the number who had sickened, (c) to the precautions that had been taken as to cleansing and disinfecting by the captain.

Drs. Proust, Brouardel, and Thorne are to meet to-morrow to see if any basis of action on these lines can be devised.

We are hoping to secure some relaxation for vessels without a doctor but having a disinfecting stove, where single cases of cholera only have arisen, the last case having sickened or died some five days before arrival at Suez. If we fail, all vessels other than postal and troopers will have to come under Article 3 (a). On this point we must ask for instructions. Would your Lordship be disposed to abandon this class of vessels to their fate and admit their treatment under the full rigour of Article 3 (a) ("Règlement contre le Cholera," p. 326 Procs-verbaux), if we find, in the course of the negotiations, that it is absolutely impossible to secure any indulgence for them?

M. Proust has explained to Dr. Thorne in private that France will, on no consideration, assent to an immediate passage of any vessel directly she has landed one or more cholera cases; hence the proposal for a brief detention of infected vessels, even postal and troopers, with a view to be certain that adequate measures of disinfection have been taken, and also for observational purposes.

All the Delegates will meet again on Saturday at 10 A.M., to see if the Technical Delegates have been able to formulate a scheme on the above lines.

It will be seen that any disinfection and detention at Moses' Wells for quarantine purposes, in the case of suspected but still healthy persons, would thus be avoided at least for postal vessels and troopers, and in most cases we hope, probably, no temporary disembarkation of healthy will be needed.

It must be borne in mind that if the statement made to us by Dr. Proust to-day can be relied on, no vessel has for seven years passed through the Canal with cholera on board, so that the risks of detention would appear to be very slight.

No. 46.

Mr. Phipps to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received May 21.)

My Lord, Paris, May 20, 1892.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith to your Lordship a statement which I read to the Delegates at the Sanitary Conference yesterday, indicating the stage at which the negotiations at Venice had arrived, and the principal objections of Her Majesty’s Government to the decisions of the previous Conference.

I have, &c.

(Signed) E. C. H. PHIPPS.

Inclosure in No. 46.

Statement read by Mr. Phipps.

IL n'est point nécessaire pour moi d'exposer en détail la divergence d'opinion entre a doctrine avancée par les autorités médicales et adoptées par l'opinion publique en

We contemplate in the first instance proposing twelve hours only as the maximum for this second period.
Angleterre et aux Indes et celles qui l'emportent sur le continent au sujet de l'efficacité de la quarantaine comme sauvegarde à la contagion du choléra et autres maladies.

Il est encore inutile de faire allusion aux limitations que la Conférence de Venise a cherché à imposer au Khédive, en diminuant le nombre de ses voix au Conseil Sanitaire, Conseil qui avait administré et exécuté une loi de quarantaine assez sévère d'une façon tempérée et modérée. Toutes ces questions ont été traitées en détail à Venise, et le Délegué Anglais y fit allusion plus d'une fois à la sensibilité, toute naturelle du reste, de la Grande-Bretagne à l'égard d'une application exagérée de l'opinion des Puissances continentales au sujet de la quarantaine, vu qu'elle absorbe les quatre cinquièmes du tonnage qui traverse le Canal.

Une question importante séparait nos opinions de celles de la majorité: le principe du passage en quarantaine et les conditions que l'on y appliquerait.

Le Gouvernement de la Reine croyait pouvoir trouver un remède aux craintes éprouvées au sujet du passage de vaisseaux infectés en les faisant passer le Canal en quarantaine.

On n'a pu produire aucun témoignage important pour démontrer qu'il n'est pas possible de prendre des précautions suffisantes afin d'empêcher toute communication avec la côte pendant le passage. Le Gouvernement de l'Autriche-Hongrie était disposé à adhérer à cette manière de voir, et le Protocole Anglo-Autrichien fut rédigé afin de permettre aux vaisseaux infectés ou non-infectés, destinés à un port Anglais ou tout autre port ouvert de traverser le Canal en quarantaine. Cette proposition, qui était la base de la Conférence, a été opposée de la manière la plus prononcée par les Délégués de la France, dont les vues ont été appuyées, malheureusement, par la plupart des Puissances. Nous ne sommes pas d'avis qu'elles aient montré que la communication avec la côte ne pût pas être empêchée, mais notre raisonnement que cette manière de prévention serait moins nuisible au commerce que la détention à la côte Asiatique du Canal semble avoir produit peu d'impression sur les Délégués. Dr. Proust a même soutenu qu'une telle liberté constituerait un avantage commercial pour les vaisseaux destinés à des ports Anglais qui ne craignaient pas de les recevoir, avant que le navire ne quitte cette partie du Canal, et que la communication avec la côte serait moins nuisible au commerce que la détention à la côte Asiatique du Canal.

Cette proposition était celle à laquelle le Gouvernement de la Reine s'opposait tout particulièrement et il lui est impossible de l'accepter dans son état actuel.

Les dangers et les rigueurs subis par les passagers jouissant d'une parfaite santé mais enfermés dans un lazaret de la Mer Rouge dans les conditions malsaines, physiques et morales qui s'attachent naturellement à un pareil séjour constituent une objection grave à cette proposition.

D'autre part, nous sommes d'avis qu'on ne saurait s'opposer avec raison à la fumigation et la désinfection du navire ou des passagers. Probablement aussi la mise à terre du malade actuel serait à désirer sous tous les points de vue.

Les avis diffèrent surtout au sujet de la proposition d'envoyer les personnes saines aux lazarets, tandis que le système de trajet en quarantaine donne une ample garantie que l'infection ne puisse pas être ainsi communiquée aux habitants de la côte. Sur plusieurs autres points de vue les Règlements préconisés par les Délégués Français et qui ont reçu l'appui de la majorité de la Conférence l'importent sur ceux qui ont été adoptés jusqu'ici. C'est pourquoi le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté désirait vivement qu'on pût s'accorder sur les questions en dispute.

(Translation.)

IT is not necessary for me to show in detail the difference of view between the doctrine put forward by medical authorities and adopted by public opinion in England and India, and those which prevail on the Continent regarding the efficacy of quarantine as a safeguard against the contagion of cholera and other diseases.

Again, it is useless to refer to the limitations which the Venice Conference endeavoured to impose on the Khedive in diminishing the number of his votes on the Sanitary Board which had administered and executed a rather harsh Quarantine Law temperately and with moderation. All these questions were treated in detail at Venice, and the English Government referred more that once to the feeling entertained, very naturally indeed, by Great Britain in regard to an exaggerated application of the opinion of the Continental Powers on quarantine, seeing that she absorbs four-fifths of the tonnage passing through the Canal.
An important question separated our opinions from those of the majority: the principle of passage in quarantine, and the conditions to which it should be subject.

Her Majesty's Government thought they could find a remedy for the fears felt with regard to the passage of infected ships by obliging them to pass in quarantine.

No important evidence could be produced to show that it is not possible to take sufficient precautions to prevent all communication with the coast during transit. The Government of Austria-Hungary was prepared to adhere to this view, and the Anglo-Austrian Protocol was drawn up to allow vessels, infected or not, bound for an English or any other open port, to pass the Canal in quarantine. The proposal, which was the basis of the Convention, was opposed in the most marked manner by the French Delegate, whose views were, unfortunately, supported by the greater number of the Powers. We are not of opinion that they showed that communication with the coast could not be prevented, but our argument that this manner of prevention would be less harmful to commerce than detention on the Asiatic coast of the Canal seems to have produced little effect on the Delegates. Dr. Proust even maintained that such freedom would create a commercial advantage for vessels bound to English ports which did not fear to receive them, an advantage which should not be tolerated out of regard for vessels bound to other ports. He proposed that ships on board which a case of cholera should occur seven days before reaching Suez should be obliged to land at a lazaretto not only the patient, but also all the passengers and all the crew who had been on the same part of the ship, and in the case of a postal vessel or a troop-ship, to continue the voyage without the infected passing the Canal in quarantine.

It was this proposal to which the Queen's Government made more particular objection, and they cannot accept it as it now stands.

The dangers and hardships undergone by passengers in perfect health, but shut up in a lazaretto on the Red Sea, in the unhealthy physical and moral conditions which would naturally attach to such a sojourn, form a grave objection to this proposal.

On the other hand, we are of opinion that no objection can justly be made to the fumigation and disinfection of the vessel or the passengers. Probably, too, the landing of the actually sick would be desirable from all points of view.

Opinions differ, especially on the subject of the proposal to send healthy persons to the lazarettos, while the system of passage in quarantine furnishes an ample guarantee that infection cannot thus be communicated to the inhabitants of the coast. On many other points of view the Regulations recognized by the French Delegates, which received the support of the majority of the Conference, are preferable to those hitherto adopted. For this reason Her Majesty's Government would wish that it might be possible to come to an agreement on the question in dispute.

No. 47.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. Phipps and Dr. Thorne.

Gentlemen,

I HAVE received your despatch of the 19th instant informing me of the discussions which took place on the 19th instant at an informal meeting between yourselves and your French and Austro-Hungarian colleagues, in regard to certain points of the recommendations made by the Venice Sanitary Conference.

The practical effect of the concessions which the French Delegates are likely to agree to in the case of "infected" postal and troop-ships, would be a substitution for the five days' detention on shore (provided for by the Venice Rules) of a forty-eight hours' detention on board. Such detention would, however, not be strictly comparable to the forty-eight hours' detention provided in this country by the Local Government Board's Cholera Order. Persons detained under that Order are persons who, on the expiration of the forty-eight hours, will disperse over the country; this will not be the case at Suez, as the persons affected by the detention will be passengers continuing their journey in the ship, which will pass through the Canal in quarantine without touching in order to land passengers at any Egyptian port. I am of opinion that if we admit a maximum detention of twenty-four hours for the purpose of ascertaining whether disinfection has been properly carried out and for disinfecting the parts of the ship out of which the choleraic sick have been landed, the ship ought not to be detained for any further period for the purpose of observation.

With regard to the question of what vessels should benefit by the concessions you
are endeavouring to obtain, all vessels classed as "infectés" arriving at Suez seem to divide themselves into the following categories:—

(A.) Those which carry neither doctor nor stove.
(B.) Those which carry a stove but no doctor.
(C.) Those which carry a doctor but no stove.
(D.) Those which carry both a doctor and a stove.

Their treatment should be proportional to the sacrifices which they make for the purpose of insuring the health of their passengers and crew, and for providing against possible spread of the disease.

Judged by this criterion, class (A) may be dealt with under the Rules recommended at Venice in Article 3 (a).

Class (B) may be similarly dealt with if, in consequence of their being no doctor, there were any doubt as to their sufficient disinfection.

Class (D) should be exempt from any detention at Suez, except such as is necessary for the landing of the choleraic sick, and for the verification of the disinfection which has already been carried out on board, and for the disinfection of the parts of the ship out of which the sick have been removed.

As to class (C), the obligation upon a ship of carrying a doctor is a harsher requirement than that of carrying a stove, and you should endeavour to get such ships treated in a manner almost similar to that of class (D). Their detention should be limited to the time necessary to land the sick and to make a rigorous disinfection of the affected parts of the ship, and of the dirty linen.

This classification will get rid of the words "troop and postal vessels," which is undesirable, as it might exclude many first-class passenger-ships which are not under mail contracts.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.

No. 48.

Mr. Phipps and Dr. Thorne to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received May 26.)

My Lord,

Paris, May 25, 1892.

We have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's despatch of the 23rd instant, containing further instructions to us in regard to the advantages sought to be obtained for certain classes of infected vessels arriving at Suez, with a view of insuring passage in quarantine for the healthy passengers on board without detention, excepting for purposes of disinfection.

Your Lordship's despatch further divides such vessels into four classes, designated by the letters A, B, C, and D.

It is unnecessary for us to recapitulate all the discussions which have taken place between us and M. Barrère, Professors Bourdel and Proust, and Count Rüfstein at our Conferences on the 19th, 21st, and 24th instant. They extended over a period of more than seven hours, exclusive of the private meetings which took place between the Technical Delegates.

We, therefore, only propose to explain to your Lordship the stage at which we at present have arrived; the modifications of the original Regulations which we have been able thus far to insure; and the obstacles to such a solution as might be entirely satisfactory to Her Majesty's Government, which we have been unable as yet to surmount.

The principal point achieved in our first Conference consisted in a material modification, both as regards duration and other circumstances, of the detention of healthy passengers for so-called observational purposes.

When we transmitted to your Lordship our despatch No. 1 of the 19th instant, we hoped that that period of observation might be limited to a maximum of twenty-four hours in addition to the period demanded for disinfection.

But we soon found that Dr. Proust, notoriously the final Arbiter of the French opinions, was not disposed to accept such a hard and fast period for observation, irrespective of the time which might have elapsed since the appearance of the last case of cholera during the seven days immediately preceding the arrival of an infected vessel at Suez.

The reason for Dr. Proust's unyielding attitude is obvious. According to the French view the period of incubation of cholera extends to four full days, and no French medical authority is prepared to risk the breaking out of a fresh case of cholera after the already infected vessel has left Suez for the Mediterranean.
The French Technical Delegates therefore insisted in their private Conference with the British Technical Delegate on a modification, as to periods, of a sliding scale of observation, founded on the term which might have elapsed since the last case of cholera before the arrival of the infected vessel at Suez.

That sliding scale of observation will be found in the paragraph of the revised "Règlements Sanitaires Spéciaux," of which we have the honour to inclose a copy, and which we have undertaken to submit to your Lordship. We intend, however, to raise the point anew, with a view of rectifying the sliding scale in a sense more favourable to our views. (See paper annexed to inclosure.)

But we believe that several other relaxations of the original Regulations have been secured, especially in the sense of more precise definitions throughout the document, modifications which it is our conviction will leave little, if any, latitude to the medical men at Suez of interpreting with undue rigour those Regulations.

Another important point has also been secured. If an infected vessel, with doctor and store on board, is ready to abandon its choleraic sick, it is at liberty to transit the Suez Canal in quarantine, leaving behind those passengers still healthy, but regarded as contaminated by actual contact with choleraic sick, not under restrictions so akin to quarantine at Moses' Wells as formerly proposed, but subjected to a restricted period of observational detention, either on a specially appointed vessel, or on land in a place apart from the actual sick, as those on board may prefer.

It will be seen that it is no longer left to the local authority at Suez to decide who is to be disembarked on the ground of sickness. Any such disembarkation is now limited to those whom the doctor on board certifies to be actually choleraic patients.

The classification of ships is also amended in the sense of your Lordship's instructions of yesterday.

It appears to us, moreover, on reference to the correspondence carried on between your Lordship and the French and Austro-Hungarian Governments, that several of the objections put forward by your Lordship against the French proposals are, if not removed entirely, to a large extent met.

For instance, in your Lordship's despatch No. 9 of the 15th March to Sir A. Paget, it is stated that the application of the relaxations in regard to the disembarkation of persons "who have been in contact" with the infected part of a ship is entirely at the discretion of the sanitary authority.

Such discretion appears to us now to have been limited, and in some cases altogether abolished.

As regards the last paragraph of the Board of Trade letter of the 20th instant, it is clear that the new Regulations (if they should be agreed to by Her Majesty's Government) will not be subject to any change by the Egyptian Quarantine Board "involving further stringency without the consent of Great Britain."

We must finally call attention to the phrase in the concluding paragraph of M. Waddington's note verbale of the 9th May: "Il n'entre pas dans notre pensée de porter atteinte au système sanitaire organisé par la Conférence de Venise." All the efforts we made to insure more extensive modifications of the "Règlements" were met by arguments corresponding to this sentence; and it was pointed out to us that it would be quite hopeless to induce certain Powers to go further in the direction of concessions without a complete abandonment of that sanitary system. We therefore did not press for more at our last sitting.

We have, &c.

(Signed) E. C. H. PHIPPS.
R. THORNE THORNE.

Inclosure in No. 48.

CONVENTION SANITAIRE INTERNATIONALE DE VENISE.

Annexe IV.

RÈGLEMENTS SANITAIRES SPÉCIAUX.

Règlement contre le Choléra pour les Provenances de l'Extrême-Orient.

ARTICLE I.

Navires Indemnes.—Tout navire indemne, quelle que soit la nature de sa patente, qui n'a pas eu à bord, au moment du départ ou pendant la traversée, de cas de choléra, est
admis immédiatement à la libre pratique après visite médicale favorable. Dans aucun cas cette disposition ne peut être appliquée à un navire porteur de pèlerins.

**ARTICLE II.**

*Navires Suspects.*—C'est-à-dire ayant eu des cas de choléra au moment du départ ou pendant la traversée, mais aucun cas nouveau depuis sept jours. Ces navires seront traités d'une façon différente suivant qu'ils ont ou n'ont pas à bord un médecin et un appareil à désinfection (étuve).

(a) Les navires ayant un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuve) remplissant les conditions voulues seront admis à passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine dans les conditions du Règlement pour le transit.

(b) Les autres navires suspects n'ayant ni le médecin ni l'appareil de désinfection (étuve) seront, avant d'être admis à transiter en quarantaine, retenus aux Sources de Moïse, pendant le temps nécessaire pour opérer la désinfection du linge sale, du linge de corps, et autres objets susceptibles, et s'assurer de l'état sanitaire du navire.

S'il s'agit d'un navire postal ou d'un paquebot spécialement affecté au transport des voyageurs, sans appareil de désinfection (étuve), mais ayant un médecin à bord—si l'autorité locale a l'assurance, par une constatation officielle, que les mesures d'assainissement et de désinfection ont été convenablement pratiquées, soit au point du départ, soit pendant la traversée, le passage en quarantaine sera accordé. S'il s'agit de navires postaux ou de paquebots spécialement affectés au transport des voyageurs, sans l'appareil de désinfection (étuve), mais ayant un médecin à bord ; si le dernier cas de choléra remonte à plus de quatorze jours et si l'état du navire est satisfaisant, la libre pratique pourra être donnée à Suez, lorsque les opérations de désinfection seront terminées.

Pour les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours, les passagers à destination de l'Égypte seront débarqués aux Sources de Moïse et isolés pendant vingt-quatre heures, et leur linge sale et leurs effets à usage désinfectés. Ils recevront alors la libre pratique.

Les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours, et demandant à obtenir la libre pratique en Égypte, sont également retenus pendant vingt-quatre heures aux Sources de Moïse.

Lorsque le choléra se montrera exclusivement dans l'équipage, la désinfection ne portera que sur le linge sale de l'équipage, mais sur tout le linge sale de l'équipage, et s'étendra aux postes d'habitation de l'équipage.

**ARTICLE III.**

*Navires Infectés.*—C'est-à-dire ayant du choléra à bord, ou ayant présenté des cas nouveaux de choléra depuis sept jours. Ils se divisent en navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuve), et navires avec médecin et appareil de désinfection (étuve).

(a) Les navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuve) seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse, les personnes atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée cholérique débarquées et isolées dans un hôpital. La désinfection sera pratiquée d'une façon complète. Les autres passagers seront débarqués et isolés par groupes aussi peu nombreux que possible de manière à ce que l'ensemble ne soit pas solidaire d'un groupe particulier, si le choléra venait à se développer. Le linge sale, les objets en usage, les vêtements de l'équipage et les passagers seront désinfectés ainsi que le navire.

Il est bien entendu qu'il ne s'agit pas du déchargement des marchandises, mais seulement de la désinfection de la partie du navire qui a été infectée.

Les passagers resteront cinq jours à l'établissement des Sources de Moïse ; lorsque les cas de choléra remonteront à plusieurs jours, la durée de l'isolement sera diminuée. Cette durée variera selon l'époque de l'apparition du dernier cas.

Ainsi, lorsque le dernier cas se sera produit depuis sept jours la durée de l'observation sera de quarante-huit heures ; s'il s'est produit depuis six jours l'observation sera de trois jours, s'il s'est produit depuis cinq jours l'observation sera de quatre jours, s'il s'est produit depuis moins de cinq jours l'observation sera de cinq jours.

(b) Navires avec Médecins et Appareil de Désinfection (Étuvés).—Les navires avec médecins et étuvés seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse.

Le médecin du bord déclarera sous serment quelles sont les personnes à bord atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée cholérique. Ces malades seront débarqués et isolés.

[518]
Après le débarquement de ces malades, le linge sale du reste des passagers et de l'équipage subira la désinfection à bord, la partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l'hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés seront désinfectés, et seront complètement désinfestés. On entend par "partie du navire" la cabine du malade, les cabines attenantes, le couloir de ces cabines, le pont, les parties du pont sur lesquels le ou les malades auraient séjourner.

Lorsque le choléra se sera montré exclusivement dans l'équipage la désinfection du linge ne portera que sur le linge sale de l'équipage et le linge des postes de l'équipage.

S'il est impossible de désinfecter la partie ou le compartiment du navire qui a été occupé par les personnes atteintes du choléra ou de diarrhée cholériforme sans débarquer les personnes logées dans cette partie ou ce compartiment, ces personnes seront ou placées sur un autre navire spécialement affecté à cet usage, ou débarquées et logées dans l'établissement sanitaire, prévu dans l'Annexe I de la Convention sous le titre : "Organisation de la Surveillance et de la Désinfection à Suez et aux Sources de Moïse," sans contact avec les malades, lesquels seront placés dans l'hôpital.

La durée de ce séjour sur le navire ou à terre pour la désinfection sera aussi courte que possible et n'excédera pas vingt-quatre heures.

Ces personnes compléteront la durée de l'observation indiquée à l'alinéa 4 du paragraphe (a), soit sur leur bâtiment, soit sur le navire affecté à cet usage. Le temps pris par les opérations de désinfection est compris dans la durée de l'observation.

Le passage en quarantaine pourra être accordé avant l'expiration des délais indiqués au paragraphe précédent si l'autorité Sanitaire le juge possible.

Lorsque la désinfection aura été accomplie, si le navire abandonne ses malades et ses suspects, il sera libre de transiter sans retard le Canal en quarantaine. On entend par suspects les personnes qui ont été en rapports avec des cholériques.

Une étuvée placée sur un ponton pourra venir accoster le navire pour rendre plus rapides les opérations de désinfection.

Les navires infectés demandant à obtenir la libre pratique en Égypte, sont retenus cinq jours aux Sources de Moïse, à compter du dernier cas survenu à bord.

ARTICLE IV

Passagers.—

(Translation.)

Annex IV.

SPECIAL SANITARY REGULATIONS.

Regulations against Cholera for Ships coming from the Extreme East.

ARTICLE I.

Healthy Ships.—Every healthy ship, whatever its bill of health, which has not had on board, either at the moment of departure or during the voyage, any case of cholera, is immediately admitted to free pratique, if the medical examination is favourable. In no case can this provision be applied to a ship carrying pilgrims.

ARTICLE II.

Suspected Ships.—That is, such as have had a case of cholera on board at the moment of starting or during the voyage, but no fresh case within seven days. Such ships shall be treated differently, according as they have or have not a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus ("évéve") on board.

(a.) Ships having on board a doctor, and a disinfecting apparatus ("évéve") fulfilling the desired requirements, will be allowed to pass through the Canal in quarantine under the conditions stated in the Transit Regulations.

(b.) Other suspected ships, having neither a doctor nor a disinfecting apparatus ("évéve"), will, before being allowed to pass through the Canal in quarantine, be stopped at Moses' Wells during the time necessary for disinfecting the soiled linen, body linen,
and other susceptible articles, and for ascertaining that the ship is in [good] sanitary condition.

In the case of a mail-steamer, or of a packet specially engaged in the carriage of passengers, not having a disinfecting apparatus ("étuve") on board, but carrying a doctor, transit in quarantine will be allowed if the local authority has an assurance, derived from an official certificate, that sanitary measures and disinfection have been properly carried out, either at the place of departure or during the voyage.

In the case of mail-steamers or of packets specially engaged in the carriage of passengers, without a disinfecting apparatus ("étuve"), but carrying a doctor, free pratique may be granted at Suez after the operation of disinfection has been completed, if the last case of cholera occurred more than fourteen days previously, and if the state of the ship is satisfactory.

In the case of ships having had a voyage of less than fourteen days, passengers for Egypt shall disembark at Moses’ Wells and be isolated for twenty-four hours, and their soiled linen and the effects they have used shall be disinfected. They will then receive free pratique.

Vessels having had a passage of less than fourteen days wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt will also be stopped twenty-four hours at Moses’ Wells.

Soiled linen shall extend only to that occupied by the crew, but it will extend to all the soiled linen of the crew, and to the parts occupied by the crew.

ARTICLE III.

Infected Ships.—That is to say, those which have cholera on board, or which have had fresh cases of cholera within seven days. They are divided into ships without a doctor and disinfecting apparatus ("étuve"), and ships with a doctor and disinfecting apparatus ("étuves").

(a.) Ships without a Doctor and a Disinfecting Apparatus ("étuve") will be detained at Moses’ Wells; persons suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea will be disinfected, and isolated in a hospital. Disinfection will be carried out a thorough manner. The other passengers will be disinfected, and isolated in groups of as few as possible, in order that the whole number may not be affected by a particular group, should cholera occur. Soiled linen, effects that have been used, the clothing of the crew and of the passengers, will be disinfected as well as the ship.

(b.) Ships with a Doctor and Disinfecting Apparatus ("étuves").—Ships with doctors and disinfecting apparatus ("étuves") will be detained at Moses’ Wells.

The ship’s doctor shall declare on oath which persons on board are suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea. These sick persons will be disinfected and isolated.

The passengers will remain for five days at the establishment at Moses’ Wells; in cases where the cholera occurred several days previously, the period of isolation will be shortened. The period in question will vary according to the date of the occurrence of the last case.

Thus, if the last case occurred within seven days, the period of observation shall be forty-eight hours; if within six days, the observation will last three days; if within five days, the observation will last four days; if within less than five days, the observation will last five days.

The ship’s doctor shall declare on oath which persons on board are suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea. These sick persons will be disinfected and isolated.

After the disembarkation of these sick, the soiled linen of the rest of the passengers and of the crew will undergo disinfection on board, the part or compartment of the ship, in which the sick persons or persons have been carried will be pointed out under oath and completely disinfected. “Part of the ship” is understood to be the cabin of the patient, the adjoining cabins, the deck, and the parts of the deck on which the sick person or persons may have stayed.

When cholera has shown itself exclusively among the crew, the disinfection of the linen shall extend only to the dirty linen of the crew and the linen of the crew’s quarters.

If it is impossible to disinfect the part or compartment of the ship occupied by persons suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea without disembarking the persons lodged in such part or compartment, those persons shall either be placed on another vessel especially used for the purpose, or shall be disinfected and lodged in the sanitary establishment provided under Annex I of the Convention under the head, “Organization of Control and Disinfection at Suez and at Moses’ Wells,” without contact with the sick, who shall be placed in the hospital.
The duration of their sojourn on the ship or on land shall be as short as possible, and shall not exceed twenty-four hours.

These persons will complete the period of observation shown in paragraph 4 of section (a), either on their own ship or on the ship used for the purpose. The time taken by the operations of disinfection is included in the period of observation.

Passage in quarantine may be granted before the expiration of the periods shown by the preceding paragraph if the Sanitary authority judges it possible to do so.

When disinfection is completed, if the ship abandons its sick and its suspects, she may pass the Canal, without delay, in quarantine. "Suspects" are understood to be those who have been in communication ("en rapports") with cholera patients.

A disinfector placed on a pontoon may come alongside the ship to expedite the operations of disinfection.

Ships wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt are detained five days at Moses' Wells, counting from the last case on board.

**ARTICLE IV.**

No. 49.

The Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. Phipps. (Telegraphic.)

*Foreign Office, May 28, 1892, 11:30 P.M.*

The draft Article 3 you have sent is no great advance as regards interference with the healthy on the terms proposed at Venice. The question is that of the persons the ship must abandon before being allowed to pass the Canal in quarantine, and not of those who are to leave the ship to enable her to be disinfected. I wish to see exact words defining the former unfortunate class of persons.

No. 50.

Mr. Phipps to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received May 31.)

My Lord,

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Lordship's telegram of the 28th instant relative to questions arising at the Paris Sanitary Conference.

The points raised by your Lordship have been the subject of careful consideration by Dr. Thorne and myself, as well as of discussion in the Conference sitting of Saturday, the 28th instant.

The question arises whether "Extremé-Orient" is inclusive of Bombay.

When we first admitted that expression, we did so in order to define beyond all question that the Rules were to be applicable to vessels proceeding from beyond the Red Sea in the Mediterranean direction.

In French the term "Extremé-Orient" is understood to include the east of the Red Sea and, therefore, of course, the whole of British India.

On Saturday, we were induced to abandon any idea of altering that expression to, for instance, "au delà du détroit de Bab-el-Mandeb," by an observation of Count Kuefstein (who is disposed to regard himself as somewhat representing the interests of the Powers who have no Delegate at Paris), that it might raise an objection on the part of Italy as regards its African ports.

Your Lordship then inquired who will determine whether it is necessary for passengers to leave a ship in order that it may be properly disinfecte.

We were unable to achieve that the medical officers on board should determine that point. The powers here accorded to them were regarded as being very extensively enlarged, and no further concession on that point could be achieved.
Your Lordship's telegram of the 28th instant sought at insuring a less loose definition of the term "suspects."

This we have insured, as your Lordship will observe in the accompanying revised draft Rules.

"Suspects" are those still healthy persons who are regarded with suspicion as having occupied or frequented the portion or compartment of the vessel, and the section of the hospital ward in which the choleraic sick may have been transported.

A clear definition is also supplied of what precisely constitutes the word "portion."

I trust that it will render clear to your Lordship that no ship is forced to abandon any persons except actual cholera patients. A ship, in order to avoid a term of observational detention, may leave behind such persons as may have been in defined contact with those patients, but if the term of detention, prescribed by the sliding scale, be a brief one, the ship will probably, if they are passengers, wait for them. If they be left behind, their fate is a less hard one, as regards treatment, than they would have undergone under the Venice Rules.

Finally, I venture to express a hope that the Comparative Table which I have now the honour to inclose, and which has been very carefully drawn up by Dr. Thorne, will convince your Lordship that, since the Conference sitting of the 28th instant, a considerable advance beyond the Venice Conference has been made in the matter of interfering with healthy persons. I also have the honour to inclose the draft Rules again revised since the Conference sitting of the 28th instant, which, I fear, must be regarded as embodying the extreme limit of concession obtainable.

I venture to add that the French Technical Delegates informed Dr. Thorne that they had consulted their Government, and that no further concessions could be granted except at a future Conference and after a lapse of some years, and even then such good terms would be unattainable if a prevalence of cholera should intervene.

M. Ribot also stated to me privately yesterday that he feared that, if we did not now come to an agreement, it would be impossible to call together a third Conference.

I have, &c.

(Signed) E. C. H. PHIPPS.

Inclosure 1 in No. 50.

NAVires INFECTëS. ARTICLE 3.

SUMMARY Table showing Principal Points of Contrast and Resemblance between the Results of the Venice Conference, 1892, and the Results of the Paris Conference (up to May 28), 1892.

Vessels without either a Doctor or Means of Disinfection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of the Venice Conference, 1892</th>
<th>Results of the Paris Conference (up to 28th May), 1892</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a.) The actual cholera sick to be disembarked and removed to hospital.</td>
<td>(a.) The same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b.) The linen, clothing, &amp;c., of passengers and crew to be disinfected.</td>
<td>(b.) Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c.) The vessel to be disinfected.</td>
<td>(c.) Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d.) All the other passengers to be regarded as suspect, to be disembarked, isolated in groups, and kept under observation.</td>
<td>(d.) Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e.) These passengers to be detained at Mores' Wells for a period of five days. This period of detention may be reduced at the discretion of the local authority.</td>
<td>(e.) These passengers to be detained at Mores' Wells for a period varying, under a sliding scale, from forty-eight hours to five days. The conditions controlling these shorter detentions are no longer at the discretion of the local authority, but are strictly defined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vessels with a Doctor and Means of Disinfection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of the Venice Conference, 1892.</th>
<th>Results of the Paris Conference (up to 28th May), 1892.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) The actual cholera sick to be disembarked and removed to hospital.</td>
<td>(a) The same; but it is the doctor on board who is to decide who are the persons actually suffering from cholera.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The linen, clothing, &amp;c., of passengers and crew to be disinfected.</td>
<td>(b) The same; but the process may be carried out on board. If cholera has appeared only among the crew, the linen, &amp;c., of the crew only to be disinfected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) The vessel is to be disinfected. This disinfection may, in the case of postal-vessels and of troop-ships, be limited to certain portions of the vessel; but this is only at the discretion of the local authority.</td>
<td>(c) Only limited and strictly-defined portions of the vessel need be disinfected, and the doctor on board is to decide which are such portions. No detention of a vessel for disinfection purposes can exceed twenty-four hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) All the rest of the passengers to be detained under observation at Moses' Wells, unless in the case of postal-vessels and troop-ships; the number to be thus disembarked and detained may be limited. Any such limitation to be at the discretion of the local authority.</td>
<td>(d) No passengers other than cholera patients need be landed for observation. No quitting of the vessel to be compulsory except when necessary for disinfecting a special portion of the vessel. Even then the people in question can go on board a ship alongside; they have the right to return to their vessel within twenty-four hours at the outside, and if they should be landed, they will be placed for the same number of hours in a building distinct from the cholera hospital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) All persons on board are regarded as &quot;suspects&quot; unless the local authority chooses to decide, in the case of postal-vessels and troop-ships, that the number may be limited to those who have occupied certain undefined parts of the vessel only.</td>
<td>(e) No one to be regarded as among the &quot;suspects,&quot; and to be dealt with as such, except those whom the doctor on board declares to have occupied the same part of the vessel as the cholera patients, and such part of the vessel is strictly limited under a definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) The detention under observation of the &quot;suspects&quot; at Moses' Wells is to last five days, unless the period be diminished at the discretion of the local sanitary authority.</td>
<td>(f) The detention of the limited number of &quot;suspects&quot; may be either on the vessel itself or on a ship alongside. It will vary, according to a second sliding scale, from a period of &quot;24 à 48 heures&quot; to &quot;cinq jours,&quot; according to the date of the occurrence of the last case of cholera. Even these diminished periods of detention may be further reduced at the discretion of the local sanitary authority. Any detention of the vessel for disinfecting purposes is to be included in the period for the detention under observation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) The vessel shall, after completing its disinfection, be allowed to pass the Canal in quarantine if it abandons its &quot;suspects&quot; as well as its cholera patients.</td>
<td>(g) The vessel shall, after completing its disinfection, which is not to exceed twenty-four hours in duration, be allowed to pass the Canal in quarantine, if it abandons its &quot;suspects&quot; (as limited by definition under e) as well as its cholera patients.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N.B.—According to the Report of Mr. Lowther and Dr. Mackie (31st January, 1892), only two out of a total of 16,491 vessels would, during the preceding five years, have come within any of these restrictions as being "navires infectés;" and Mr. Miéville’s Table of 15th December, 1891, shows that even as regards these two vessels the detention for disinfection and for the limited number of "suspects" under observation combined could not have exceeded "24 à 48 heures," and might have been further reduced by the local authority.

Inclusion 2 in No. 50.

(b.) Navires avec Médecins et Appareils de Désinfection (étuves).
Le médecin du bord indiquera aussi sous serment la partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l'hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés.

Il déclarera également sous serment quelles sont les personnes qui auront occupé la partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l'hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés. Ces personnes, seulement, seront considérées comme "suspectes."

La partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l'hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés seront complètement désinfectés. On entend par partie du navire la cabine du malade, les cabines attenantes, le couloir de ces cabines, le pont, les parties du pont sur lesquels le ou les malades auraient séjourné.

Lorsque le choléra se sera montré exclusivement dans l'équipage, la désinfection du linge ne portera que sur le linge sale de l'équipage et le linge des postes de l'équipage.

S'il est impossible de désinfecter la partie ou le compartiment du navire qui a été occupé par les personnes atteintes du choléra ou de diarrhée choléiforme sans débarquer les personnes logées dans cette partie ou ce compartiment, ces personnes seront placées sur un autre navire spécialement affecté à cet usage ou débarquées et logées dans l'établissement Sanitaire prévu dans l'Annexe I de la Convention sous le titre :

"Organisation de la surveillance et de la désinfection à Suez et aux Sources de Moïse," sans contact avec les malades, lesquels seront placés dans l'hôpital. La durée de ce séjour sur le navire ou à terre pour la désinfection sera aussi courte que possible et n'excédera pas vingt-quatre heures.

Ces personnes compléteront la durée de l'observation soit sur leur bâtiement, soit sur le navire affecté à cet usage, d'après le tableau suivant.

Lorsque le dernier cas de choléra se sera produit dans le cours du septième, du sixième, ou du cinquième jour avant l'arrivée à Suez, l'observation sera de vingt-quatre à quarante-huit heures.

S'il s'est produit dans le cours du quatrième jour avant l'arrivée à Suez l'observation sera de deux à trois jours.

S'il s'est produit dans le cours du troisième jour avant l'arrivée à Suez, l'observation sera de trois à quatre jours.

S'il s'est produit dans le cours du deuxième jour avant l'arrivée à Suez, l'observation sera de quatre à cinq jours.

S'il s'est produit un jour avant l'arrivée à Suez, l'observation sera de cinq jours.

Le temps pris par les opérations de désinfection est compris dans la durée de l'observation.

Le passage en quarantaine pourra être accordé avant l'expiration des délais indiqués dans le tableau ci-dessus, si l'autorité Sanitaire le juge possible ; il sera, en tous cas, accordé lorsque la désinfection aura été accomplie si le navire abandonne autre ses malades, les personnes indiquées ci-dessus comme "suspectes."

Une étuve placée sur un ponton pourra venir accoster le navire pour rendre plus rapides les opérations de désinfection.

Les navires infectés demandant à obtenir la libre pratique en Égypte sont retenus cinq jours aux "Sources de Moïse," à compter du dernier cas survenu à bord.

(Translation.)

(b) Ships with a Doctor and Disinfecting Apparatus ("Etue").

SHIPS with doctors and stoves ("étuves") will be detained at Moses' Wells.

The ship's doctor will declare on oath which persons on board are suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea. These sick persons will be disembarked and isolated.

After the disembarkation of these sick, the soiled linen of the rest of the passengers and of the crew will undergo disinfection on board.

The ship's doctor will also indicate on oath the part or compartment of the ship and the section of the hospital to which the patient or patients have been conveyed. He will also declare, on oath, which persons have occupied the part or compartment of the ship and the section of the hospital in which the sick person or persons stayed. These persons alone shall be considered as "suspect."

The part or compartment of the ship and the section of the hospital to which the patients have been conveyed will be thoroughly disinfected. By "part of the ship" is understood the cabin of the patient, the adjoining cabins, the passage of the cabin, the deck, and the parts of the deck which the patient or patients may have occupied.

When cholera has occurred among the crew only, the disinfection of the linen
shall extend to that of the crew only, and to the linen of the parts occupied by the crew.

If it is found impossible to disinfect the part or compartment of the ship which has been occupied by persons suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea without disembarking the persons lodged in that part or compartment, these persons will be placed on another ship specially set apart for this purpose, or disembarked and lodged in the sanitary establishment provided for in Annex 1 of the Convention under the title, “Organization of Superintendence and Disinfection at Suez and at Moses' Wells,” without coming in contact with the patients, who will be placed in the hospital. The duration of this stay on the ship or on land for disinfection shall be as brief as possible, and shall not exceed twenty-four hours.

These persons shall complete the period of observation either on their own ship or on the ship set apart for the purpose, according to the following Table:

When the last case of cholera occurred in the course of the seventh, sixth, or fifth day before reaching Suez, the observation shall be from twenty-four to forty-eight hours.

If it occurred in the course of the fourth day before reaching Suez, the observation shall be from two to three days.

If it occurred in the course of the third day before reaching Suez, the observation shall be from three to four days.

If it occurred in the course of the second day before reaching Suez, the observation shall be from four to five days.

If it occurred one day before reaching Suez, the observation shall be five days.

The time occupied by disinfecting operations is included in the period of observation.

Passage in quarantine may be granted before the expiry of the periods above indicated if the Sanitary authority judges it possible; it will in every case be granted when the disinfection is completed, if the vessel abandons, in addition to her patients, the persons above defined as "suspect."

A disinfecting apparatus ("étuve") placed on a pontoon may come alongside the ship to expedite the disinfecting operations.

Infected ships wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt are detained for five days at Moses' Wells, reckoning from the last case which occurred on board.

No. 51.

Mr. Phipps and Dr. Thorne to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received June 5.)

My Lord,

Paris, June 4, 1892.

We venture to express a hope that the modifications which we have insured in Article 3 (b) of the "Règlements pour le choléra" will have met the objections which were expressed by your Lordship in the interview which you did us the honour of having with us at the Foreign Office on the 2nd instant.

Your Lordship's first objection had to do with the wording of Article 3 (b); § 4, where the words "occupé la partie ou le compartiment" . . . were considered too vague as a definition controlling the question as to whether persons were to be held to be "suspects" or not.

We debated this point for over an hour, and at last the paragraph dealing with it was altered as follows:—

"Il déclarera également, sous serment, quelles sont les personnes qui ont été en rapport avec le cholérique, soit par des contacts directs, soit par des contacts avec des objets capables de transmettre l'infection. Ces personnes seulement seront considérées comme suspects."*

The definition of "suspects" being no longer governed by the occupation of a portion of the vessel, but being now distinctly limited to those who have been in actual contact with infected persons or infected things, the great objection which your Lordship had as to possible disembarkation for a few hours for the purposes of disinfecting a part of the vessel appeared to us to be practically removed. Indeed, persons may now have even occupied cabins contiguous to the cholera patient, and yet not be regarded, ipso facto, as "suspects."

* (Translation.)—"He will also declare, on oath, who are the persons who have been in communication with the cholera patient, either by direct contact or by contact with objects capable of transmitting the infection. These persons only will be considered suspects."
On dealing with the next point, our colleagues opposed an insuperable difficulty to the
erasure of the whole of the section at the top of p. 4 as to the disembarkation of certain
persons for purposes of disinfecting the vessel, whenever it was found impossible to perform
this operation properly, so long as they were on board.

They contended that “personnes suspectes” under the fresh definition were indi-
viduals who had actually come into contact with infected persons or infected things; hence,
that the mingling of such persons with others in a different part of the vessel, during the
process of disinfection, must necessarily bring about conditions favourable to the further
spread of the disease. Hence, when it was really impossible to perform the disinfection of the infected “partie ou compartiment” without such risk, these “suspects” ought to be
dismarked pending the operation.

We then stated that, instead of disembarking “les personnes loggées dans cette partie ou ce compartiment,” any such action must be limited to “les personnes déclarées suspectes,” according to the new and restricted definition. This was, after lengthened
discussion, assented to.

The only other alteration of importance had to do with the power of abandoning this
limited number of “suspects” in case the vessel could not stay. Thus, a vessel might
not choose to be detained at Suez under observation merely because a person who had been
in actual attendance on a cholera patient wanted to remain on board or return to the
vessel. The alteration effected shows that, under certain circumstances, the “autorité du
bord,” obviously the captain, will have a right to proceed in quarantine, immediately the
disinfection is completed, without any breach of contract with such a person left behind.

We beg leave to inclose a copy of Article 3, amended in accordance with the
arrangements arrived at to-day, and we trust the Article will now meet with your
Lordship’s approval.

The Conference meets again on Tuesday, the 7th instant.

We have, &c.

(Signed) E. C. H. PHIPPS.
R. THORNE THORNE.

Inclosure in No. 51.

CONVENTION SANITAIRe INTERNATIONALE DE VENISE.

Annexe IV.

RÈGLEMENTS SANITAIRES SPÉCIAUX.

Règlement contre le Choléra pour les Provenances de l’Extrême-Orient.*

ARTICLE I.

Navires Indemnes.—Tout navire indemne, quelle que soit la nature de sa patente, qui
n’a pas eu à bord, au moment du départ ou pendant la traversée, de cas de choléra, est
admis immédiatement à la libre pratique après visite médicale favorable. Dans aucun cas
cette disposition ne peut être appliquée à un navire porteur de pèlerins.

ARTICLE II.

Navires Suspects.—C’est-à-dire ayant eu des cas de choléra au moment du départ ou
pendant la traversée, mais aucun cas nouveau depuis sept jours. Ces navires seront traités
d’une façon différente suivant qu’ils ont ou n’ont pas à bord un médecin et un appareil à
désinfection (étuve).

(a.) Les navires ayant un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuve) remplissant
les conditions voulues seront admis à passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine dans les
conditions du Règlement pour le transit,

(b.) Les autres navires suspects n’ayant ni le médecin ni l’appareil de désinfection
(étuve) seront, avant d’être admis à transiter en quarantaine, retenus aux Sources de Moïse,
pendant le temps nécessaire pour opérer la désinfection du linge sale, du linge de corps, et
autres objets susceptibles, et s’assurer de l’état sanitaire du navire.

* N.B.—On entend par Provenances de l’Extrême-Orient, celles originaires d’au-delà du détroit de Bab-el-
Mandeb.
S'il s'agit d'un navire postal ou d'un paquebot spécialement affecté au transport des voyageurs, sans appareil de désinfection (étuves), mais ayant un médecin à bord—si l'autorité locale a l'assurance, par une constitution officielle, que les mesures d'assainissement et de désinfection ont été convenablement pratiquées, soit au point du départ soit pendant la traversée, le passage en quarantaine sera accordé.

S'il s'agit de navires postaux ou de paquebots spécialement affectés au transport des voyageurs, sans l'appareil de désinfection (étuves), mais ayant un médecin à bord ; si le dernier cas de choléra remonte à plus de quatorze jours, et si l'état du navire est satisfaisant, la libre pratique pourra être donnée à Suez, lorsque les opérations de désinfection seront terminées.

Pour les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours, les passagers à destination de l'Égypte seront débarqués aux Sources de Moïse et isolés pendant vingt-quatre heures, et leur linge sale et leurs effets à usage désinfectés. Ils recevront alors la libre pratique.

Les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours et demandant à obtenir la libre pratique en Égypte sont également retenus pendant vingt-quatre heures aux Sources de Moïse.

Lorsque le choléra se montrera exclusivement dans l'équipage, la désinfection ne portera que sur le linge sale de l'équipage, mais sur tout le linge sale de l'équipage, et s'étendra aux postes d'habitation de l'équipage.

ARTICLE III.

Navires Infectés.—C'est-à-dire ayant du choléra à bord ou ayant présenté des cas nouveaux de choléra depuis sept jours. Ils se divisent en navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuves) et navires avec médecin et appareil de désinfection (étuves).

(a.) Les navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuves) seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse, les personnes atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée cholérique débarquées et isolées dans un hôpital. La désinfection sera pratiquée d'une façon complète. Les autres passagers seront débarqués et isolés par groupes aussi peu nombreux que possible, de manière à ce que l'ensemble ne soit pas solidaire d'un groupe particulier, si le choléra venait à se développer.

Le linge sale, les objets en usage, les vêtements de l'équipage et des passagers seront désinfectés ainsi que le navire.

Il est bien entendu qu'il ne s'agit pas du déchargement des marchandises, mais seulement de la désinfection de la partie du navire qui a été infectée.

Les passagers resteront cinq jours à l'établissement des Sources de Moïse ; lorsque les cas de choléra remonteront à plusieurs jours, la durée de l'isolement sera diminuée. Cette durée variera selon l'époque de l'apparition du dernier cas.

Ainsi, lorsque le dernier cas se sera produit depuis sept jours la durée de l'observation sera de quarante-huit heures ; s'il s'est produit depuis six jours l'observation sera de trois jours, s'il s'est produit depuis cinq jours l'observation sera de quatre jours, s'il s'est produit depuis moins de cinq jours l'observation sera de cinq jours.

(b.) Navires avec Médecins et Appareil de Désinfection (étuves).—Les navires avec médecins et étuves seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse.

Le médecin du bord déclarera sous serment quels sont les personnes à bord atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée cholérique. Ces malades seront débarqués et isolés.

Après le débarquement de ces malades, le linge sale du reste des passagers et de l'équipage subira la désinfection à bord.

Le médecin du bord indiquera aussi, sous serment, la partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l'hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés. Il déclarera également, sous serment, quelles sont les personnes qui auraient occupé la partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l'hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés qui ont été en rapport avec le cholérique, soit par des contacts directs, soit par des contacts avec des objets capables de transmettre l'infection. Ces personnes seulement seront considérées comme "suspectes."

La partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l'hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés seront complètement désinfectés. On entend par "partie du navire" la cabine du malade, les cabines attenantes, le couloir de ces cabines, le pont, les parties du pont sur lesquels le ou les malades auraient séjourné.

*Lorsque le choléra se sera montré exclusivement dans l'équipage la désinfection du linge ne portera que sur le linge sale de l'équipage et le linge des postes de l'équipage.

* This paragraph will now come after the third paragraph so as to preserve the proper sequence of subjects.
S'il est impossible de désinfecter la partie ou le compartiment du navire qui a été occupé par les personnes atteintes du choléra ou de diarrhée choléritique sans débarquer les personnes logées dans cette partie ou ce compartiment déclarées suspectes, ces personnes seront ou placées sur un autre navire spécialement affecté à cet usage, ou débarquées et logées dans l'établissement Sanitaire, prévu dans l'Annexe I de la Convention sous le titre : Organisation de la surveillance et de la désinfection à Suez et aux Sources de Moïse, sans contact avec les malades, lesquels seront placés dans l’hôpital.

La durée de ce séjour sur le navire ou à terre pour la désinfection sera aussi courte que possible et n’excédera pas vingt-quatre heures.

Ces personnes complèteront la durée de l’observation, soit sur leur bâtiment, soit sur le navire affecté à cet usage, d’après le tableau suivant : la durée de cette observation variera selon le Tableau suivant :

Lorsque le dernier cas de choléra se sera produit dans le cours du septième, du sixième, ou du cinquième jour avant l’arrivée à Suez ... ... ...
S’il s’est produit dans le cours du quatrième jour avant l’arrivée à Suez ... ... ...
S’il s’est produit dans le cours du troisième jour avant l’arrivée à Suez ... ... ...
S’il s’est produit dans le cours du deuxième jour avant l’arrivée à Suez ... ... ...
S’il s’est produit un jour avant l’arrivée à Suez ... ... ...

L’observation sera de 24 à 48 heures.
L’observation sera de 2 à 3 jours.
L’observation sera de 3 à 4 jours.
L’observation sera de 4 à 5 jours.
L’observation sera de 5 jours.

Le temps pris par les opérations de désinfection est compris dans la durée de l’observation.

Le passage en quarantaine pourra être accordé avant l’expiration des délais indiqués dans le Tableau ci-dessus si l’autorité Sanitaire le juge possible ; il sera en tout cas accordé lorsque la désinfection aura été accomplie, si le navire abandonne, entre ses malades, les l’autorité du bord décide que ces personnes indiquées ci-dessus comme “suspectes” seront abandonnées.

Une étuve placée sur un ponton pourra venir accoster le navire pour rendre plus rapides les opérations de désinfection.

Les navires infectés demandant à obtenir la libre pratique en Égypte sont retenus cinq jours aux Sources de Moïse, à compter du dernier cas survenu à bord.

ARTICLE IV.

(Translation.)

INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION OF VENICE.

Annex IV.

SPECIAL SANITARY REGULATIONS.

Regulation against Cholera for Ships coming from the Extreme East.*

ARTICLE I.

Healthy Ships.—Every healthy ship, whatever its bill of health, which has not had on board, at the moment of departure or during the voyage, any case of cholera, is immediately admitted to free pratique after a favourable medical examination. In no case may this provision be applied to a ship carrying pilgrims.

ARTICLE II.

Suspected Ships.—That is, such as have had a case of cholera on board at the moment of starting or during the voyage, but no fresh case within seven days. Such ships shall be treated differently, according as they have or have not a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus (“étuve”) on board.

* N.B.—“Ships coming from the Extreme East” are understood to be those from beyond the Straits of Bab-el-Mandeb.
(a.) Ships having on board a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus ("étuve"), fulfilling the desired requirements, will be allowed to pass through the Canal in quarantine under the conditions stated in the Transit Regulations.

(b.) Other suspected ships, having neither a doctor nor a disinfecting apparatus ("étuve"), will, before being allowed to pass through the Canal in quarantine, be stopped at Moses’ Wells during the time necessary for disinfecting the soiled linen, body linen, and other susceptible articles, and for ascertaining that the ship is in [good] sanitary condition.

In the case of a mail-steamer, or of a packet specially engaged in the carriage of passengers, not having a disinfecting apparatus ("étuve") on board, but carrying a doctor, transit in quarantine will be allowed if the local authority has an assurance, derived from an official certificate, that sanitary measures and disinfection have been properly carried out, either at the place of departure or during the voyage.

In the case of mail-steamers, or of packets specially engaged in the carriage of passengers, without a disinfecting apparatus ("étuve"), but carrying a doctor, free pratique may be granted at Suez after the operation of disinfection has been completed, if the last case of cholera occurred more than thirteen days previously, and if the state of the ship is satisfactory.

In the case of ships having had a voyage of less than fourteen days, passengers for Egypt shall disembark at Moses’ Wells, and be isolated for twenty-four hours, and their soiled linen and the effects they have used shall be disinfected. They will then receive free pratique.

Vessels having had a passage of less than fourteen days wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt will also be stopped twenty-four hours at Moses’ Wells.

In case where the cholera has occurred exclusively among the crew, disinfection will extend only to the soiled linen of the crew, but it will extend to all the soiled linen of the crew, and to the parts occupied by the crew.

ARTICLE III.

Infected Ships.—That is to say, those which have cholera on board, or which have had fresh cases of cholera within seven days. They are divided into ships without a doctor and disinfecting apparatus ("étuve"), and ships with a doctor and disinfecting apparatus ("étuve").

(a.) Ships without a Doctor and a Disinfecting Apparatus ("Étuve") will be detained at Moses’ Wells. Persons suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea will be disembarked and isolated in a hospital. Disinfection will be carried out in a thorough manner. The other passengers will be disembarked, and isolated in groups of as few as possible, in order that the whole number may not be affected by a particular group, should cholera occur. Soiled linen, effects that have been used, the clothing of the crew and of the passengers, will be disinfected as well as the ship.

It is clearly understood that there is no question of discharge of merchandise, but only of disinfecting the infected portion of the ship.

The passengers will remain for five days at the establishment at Moses’ Wells; in cases where the cholera occurred several days previously, the period of isolation will be shortened. The period in question will vary according to the date of the occurrence of the last case.

Thus, if the last case occurred within seven days, the period of observation will be forty-eight hours; if within six days, the observation will last three days; if within five days, the observation will last four days; if within less than five days, the observation will last five days.

(b.) Ships with a Doctor and Disinfecting Apparatus ("Étuve").—Ships with doctors and disinfecting apparatus ("étuves") will be detained at Moses’ Wells.

The ship’s doctor will declare on oath which persons on board are suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea. These sick persons will be disembarked and isolated.

After the disembarkation of these sick persons, the dirty linen of the rest of the passengers and of the crew shall be disinfected on board.

The ship’s doctor shall also declare, on oath, to what part or compartment of the ship and section of the hospital the patient or patients have been taken. He will also declare on oath which are the persons who occupied the part or compartment of the ship and section of the hospital to which the patient or patients have been taken who have been in communication ("en rapport") with the cholera patients, either by direct contacts, or by contacts with things capable of transmitting the infection. These persons shall alone be considered as "suspects."
The part or compartment of the ship and the section of the hospital to which the sick person or persons have been carried will be completely disinfected. "Part of the ship" is understood to be the cabin of the patient, the adjoining cabins, the passage to these cabins, the deck and the parts of the deck on which the sick person or persons may have stayed.

When cholera has shown itself exclusively among the crew, the disinfection of the linen shall extend only to the dirty linen of the crew and the linen of the crew's quarters.

If it is impossible to disinfect the part or compartment of the ship occupied by persons suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea without disembarking the person or persons declared to be suspected, those persons shall either be placed on another vessel specially used for the purpose, or shall be disembarked and lodged in the Sanitary Establishment provided under Annex I of the Convention, under the head "Organization of Control and Disinfection at Suez and at Moses' Wells," without contact with the sick, who shall be placed in the hospital.

The duration of their sojourn on the ship or on land shall be as short as possible, and shall not exceed twenty-four hours.

These persons will complete the duration of "suspects" will undergo an observation, either on their own ship or on the ship set apart for the purpose, according to the following scale: the duration of this observation will vary according to the following scale:

- When the last case of cholera occurred during the seventh, sixth, or fifth day before reaching Suez...
  - The period of observation will be from 24 to 48 hours.
- If it occurred during the fourth day before reaching Suez...
  - The period of observation will be from 2 to 3 days.
- If it occurred during the third day before reaching Suez...
  - The period of observation will be from 3 to 4 days.
- If it occurred during the second day before reaching Suez...
  - The period of observation will be from 4 to 5 days.
- If it occurred one day before reaching Suez...
  - The period of observation will be 5 days.

The time taken by the operations of disinfection is included in the period of observation.

Passage in quarantine may be granted before the expiration of the period shown by the preceding scale if the Sanitary authority judges it possible to do so; it will in case be granted when disinfection is completed, if the ship abandons the sick person in command of the ship decides that the persons classed above as "suspects" shall be abandoned.

A disinfector placed on a pontoon may come alongside the ship to expedite the operations of disinfection.

Ships wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt are detained five days at Moses' Wells, counting from the last case on board.

**ARTICLE IV.**

---

No. 52.

_The Marquis of Salisbury to Mr. Phipps._

Foreign Office, June 6, 1892, 4:30 P.M.

(The following is a draft of a despatch to Mr. Phipps, which has been sent in reply to his despatch of the 4th instant.)

The term "suspects," as defined in your despatch of the 4th instant, is much more satisfactory: it may be accepted; but as the definition is now drafted, it might be taken to include among the "suspects" persons who had been in contact with the choleraic sick before the disease appeared. Something must be added to show that the "rappor" is "rappor" after the disease appeared.

The alteration in the last paragraph but two of the enclosure in your despatch will not touch a right of action on the part of the "suspects" against the Navigation Company in the event of the "suspect" being left behind, and is of doubtful value. Unless notice has been given to the "suspect" on taking his passage, he will retain the right of action. The words added in the draft you send may, however, cause misconception, although they be ineffective. It would be better to leave the paragraph without the proposed alteration.
No. 53.

Mr. Phipps to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received June 7.)

(Telegraphic.)

Paris, June 7, 1892.

YOUR Lordship's telegram of yesterday.

Clause last but two will stand as printed. We have inserted "after the first appearance of the disease" in the fourth paragraph of (b), thus amending the definition of "suspects."

We are sending a despatch by post.

Unless I hear to the contrary, I propose to sign a Minute on Thursday, recording the results arrived at.

No. 54.

Mr. Phipps and Dr. Thorne to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received June 8.)

My Lord,

Paris, June 7, 1892.

At the Conference sitting this morning, the only modifications introduced into Article 36 (as previously amended) were in accordance with the suggestions contained in your Lordship's telegram of yesterday.

In what is now the 5th paragraph (beginning "le médecin"), the following words are inserted after "cholérique" in the 5th line: "depuis la première manifestation de la maladie."

This will insure that the "rapport" with the cholera patient, by which a person is rendered "suspect," will have been only subsequent to the manifestation of the disease.

In the paragraph last but two, the words run as printed in the copy of the Annexé transmitted in our previous despatch.

We have, &c.

(Signed) E. C. H. PHIPPS.

R. THORNE THORNE.

P.S.—I have the honour to inclose a printed copy of the whole of Annexes I, II, III, IV, and V, as modified up to the 4th instant. The additional alterations made to-day are inserted in writing, with a foot-note as to alterations which will now be necessary in Annexé V.

E. C. H. P.

Inclosure in No. 54.

CONVENTION SANITAIRE INTERNATIONALE DE VENISE.

Modifications introduites dans les Reglements Annexes a la Convention.

Annexe I.

Organisation de la Surveillance et de la Desinfection a Suez et aux Sources de Moise.

1. Trois etuves a desinfection, dont une sera placee sur un ponton;
2. Un hopital d'isolement de douze lits pour les personnes atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhee choleraiforme. Cet hopital sera disposee de facon a ce que ces malades, les hommes et les femmes soient isoles les uns des autres;
3. Des batiments, ou des tentes-hopital ou des tentes ordinaires pour les personnes decoupees non comprises dans le paragraphe precedent.
4. Des baignoires et des douche-lavage en nombre suffisant;
5. Les bâtiments nécessaires pour les services communs, le personnel médical, les gardes, &c., un magasin, une buanderie;
6. Un réservoir d’eau;
7. Ces divers bâtiments seront disposés de telle façon qu’il n’y ait pas de contact possible entre les malades, les objets infectés ou suspects, et les autres personnes.

Annexe II.

Annexe III.

Composition, Attributions, et Fonctionnement du Conseil Sanitaire, Maritime, et Quarantenaire d’Égypte.

(Décret, Arrêté, Règlement Général.)

Article 32 (ex 37).
Si, pendant la durée de l’isolement des personnes débarquées, un nouveau cas douteux ou confirmé de choléra se produit parmi les personnes isolées, la durée de l’isolement recommence pour le groupe de personnes restées en communication avec la personne atteinte.

Article 35 (ex 40).

Annexe IV.

RÈGLEMENTS SANITAIRES SPÉCIAUX.

Règlements contre le Choléra.

ARTICLE I.

Navires Indemnes.—Tout navire indemne, quelle que soit la nature de sa patente, qui n’a pas eu à bord, au moment du départ ou pendant la traversée, de cas de choléra, est admis immédiatement à la libre pratique après visite médicale favorable. Dans aucun cas cette disposition ne peut être appliquée à un navire porteur de pèlerins.

ARTICLE II.

Navires Suspects.—C’est-à-dire ayant eu des cas de choléra au moment du départ ou pendant la traversée mais aucun cas nouveau depuis sept jours. Ces navires seront traités d’une façon différente suivant qu’ils ont ou n’ont pas à bord un médecin et un appareil à désinfection (étuve).

(a.) Les navires ayant un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuve) remplissant les conditions voulues seront admis à passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine dans les conditions du règlement pour le transit.

(b.) Les autres navires suspects n’ayant ni le médecin ni l’appareil de désinfection (étuve) seront, avant d’être admis à transiter en quarantaine, retenus aux Sources de Moise, pendant le temps nécessaire pour opérer la désinfection du linge sale, du linge de corps, et autres objets suspects, et s’assurer de l’état sanitaire du navire.

S’il s’agit d’un navire postal ou d’un paquebot spécialement affecté au transport des voyageurs, sans appareil de désinfection (étuve), mais ayant un médecin à bord, si l’autorité locale l’assure, par une constatation officielle, que les mesures d’assainissement et de désinfection ont été convenablement pratiquées, soit au point du départ, soit pendant la traversée, le passage en quarantaine sera accordé.
S’il s’agit de navires postaux ou de paquebots spécialement affectés au transport des voyageurs, sans l’appareil de désinfection (étuve), mais ayant un médecin à bord ; si le dernier cas de choléra remonte à plus de quatorze jours et si l’état du navire est satisfaisant, la libre pratique pourra être donnée à Suez, lorsque les opérations de désinfection seront terminées.

Pour les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours, les passagers à destination de l’Égypte seront débarqués aux Sources de Moïse et isolés pendant vingt-quatre heures, et leur linge sale et leurs effets à usage désinfectés. Ils recevront alors la libre pratique.

Les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours et demandant à obtenir la libre pratique en Égypte sont également retenus pendant vingt-quatre heures aux Sources de Moïse.

Lorsque le choléra se montrera exclusivement dans l’équipage, la désinfection ne portera que sur le linge sale de l’équipage, mais sur tout le linge sale de l’équipage, et s’étendra aux postes d’habitation de l’équipage.

**ARTICLE III**

**Navires Infectés.**—C’est-à-dire ayant du choléra à bord ou ayant présenté des cas nouveaux de choléra depuis sept jours. Ils se divisent en navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuve) et navires avec médecin et appareil de désinfection (étuve).

(a.) Les navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuve) seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse, les personnes atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée choléiforme débarquées et isolées dans un hôpital. La désinfection sera pratiquée d’une façon complète. Les autres passagers seront débarqués et isolés par groupes aussi peu nombreux que possible, de manière à ce que l’ensemble ne soit pas solidaire d’un groupe particulier, si le choléra venait à se développer. Le linge sale, les objets à usage, les vêtements de l’équipage et des passagers seront désinfectés ainsi que le navire.

Il est bien entendu qu’il ne s’agit pas du déchargement des marchandises, mais seulement de la désinfection de la partie du navire qui a été infectée.

Les passagers resteront cinq jours à l’établissement des Sources de Moïse ; lorsque les cas de choléra remonteraient à plusieurs jours, la durée de l’isolement sera diminuée. Cette durée variera selon l’époque de l’apparition du dernier cas.

Ainsi, lorsque le dernier cas se sera produit depuis sept jours la durée de l’observation sera de quarante huit heures ; s’il s’est produit depuis six jours l’observation sera de trois jours. Si s’est produit depuis cinq jours l’observation sera de quatre jours, s’il s’est produit depuis moins de cinq jours l’observation sera de cinq jours.

(b.) Navires avec Médecins et Appareil de Désinfection (étuvés). Les navires avec médecins et étuvés seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse.

Le médecin du bord déclarera sous serment quelles sont les personnes à bord atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée choléiforme. Ces malades seront débarqués et isolés.

Après le débarquement de ces malades, le linge sale du reste des passagers et de l’équipage subira la désinfection à bord.

Lorsque le choléra se sera montré exclusivement dans l’équipage la désinfection du linge ne portera que sur le linge sale de l’équipage et le linge des postes de l’équipage.

Le médecin du bord indiquera aussi, sous serment, la partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l’hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés. Il déclarera également, sous serment, quelles sont les personnes qui ont été en rapport avec le cholérique depuis la première manifestation de la maladie, soit par des contacts directs, soit par des contacts avec des objets capables de transmettre l’infection. Ces personnes seront considérées comme "suspects."

La partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l’hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés seront complètement désinfectés. On entendra par "partie du navire" la cabine du malade, les cabines attenantes, le couloir de ces cabines, le pont, les parties du pont sur lesquels le ou les malades auraient séjourné.

S’il est impossible de désinfecter la partie ou le compartiment du navire qui a été occupé par les personnes atteintes du choléra ou de diarrhée choléiforme sans débarquer les personnes déclarées suspects, ces personnes seront ou placées sur un autre navire spécialement affecté à cet usage, ou débarquées et logées dans l’établissement Sanitaire, prévu dans l’Annexe I de la Convention sous le titre : **Organisation de la surveillance et de la désinfection à Suez et aux Sources de Moïse**, sans contact avec les malades, lesquels seront placés dans l’hôpital.
La durée de ce séjour sur le navire ou à terre pour la désinfection sera aussi courte que possible et n'excédera pas vingt-quatre heures.

Ces suspects subiront l'observation, soit sur leur bâtimet, soit sur le navire affecté à cet usage ; la durée de cette observation variera selon le Tableau suivant :—

- Lorsque le dernier cas de choléra se sera produit dans le cours du septième, du sixième, ou du cinquième jour avant l'arrivée à Suez ...
- S'il s'est produit dans le cours du quatrième jour avant l'arrivée à Suez ...
- S'il s'est produit dans le cours du troisième jour avant l'arrivée à Suez ...
- S'il s'est produit dans le cours du deuxième jour avant l'arrivée à Suez ...
- S'il s'est produit un jour avant l'arrivée à Suez ...

L'observation sera de 24 à 48 heures.

Le temps pris par les opérations de désinfection est compris dans la durée de l'observation.

Le passage en quarantaine pourra être accordé avant l'expiration des délais indiqués dans le Tableau ci-dessus si l'autorité Sanitaire le juge possible ; il sera en tout cas accordé lorsque la désinfection aura été accomplie, si l'autorité du bord décide que les navires abandonnent leurs malades, et les personnes indiquées ci-dessus comme suspectes seront abandonnées.

Une étuve placée sur un ponton pourra venir accoster le navire pour rendre plus rapides les opérations de désinfection.

Les navires infectés demandant à obtenir la libre pratique en Égypte, sont retenus cinq jours aux Sources de Moïse, à compter du dernier cas survenu à bord.

**ARTICLE IV.**

**Passagers.**

Les différents groupes de personnes admises à la station Sanitaire sont séparées les unes des autres suivant la date de l'arrivée et l'état sanitaire de chaque groupe.

Les personnes atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée cholérique sont strictement séparées des autres personnes et reçoivent les soins médicaux que réclame leur état.

Les convalescents de choléra, quel que soit le nombre des jours qu'ils aient passés à la station Sanitaire, ne reçoivent libre pratique que sur la déclaration du médecin de la dite station constatant l'absence de danger à l'accorder.

Les individus morts de choléra seront inhumés dans le cimetière affecté à la station Sanitaire, ou, à défaut de cimetière dans un endroit isolé, et avec toutes les précautions requises. La fosse devra être de 2 mètres de profondeur.

Les appartements occupés par les cholériques dans les stations Sanitaires seront, après leur évacuation, désinfectés avec le plus grand soin.

**ARTICLE V.**

**Annexe V.**

* * * * * * *

Mesures de Prévention à prendre à bord des Navires au moment du Départ, pendant la Traversée et à l'Arrivée à Suez.

* * * * * * *

III.—Mesures à prendre lors de l'Arrivée du Navire à Suez.

1. Tous les bâtiments subiront une visite médicale avant d'entrer dans le Canal de Suez.
2. Cette visite sera faite par l'autorité Sanitaire de Suez.
3. Si le navire est infecté, les personnes atteintes du choléra ou d'accidents douteux seront débarquées et isolées dans un local spécial construit à proximité de Suez.

[518]
Seront considérés comme douteux les individus ayant eu des symptômes de choléra, notamment de la diarrhée.


Sont considérés comme suspects les habits, objets de literie, matelas, tapis, et autres objets qui ont été en contact avec le malade; les vêtements de ceux qui lui ont donné des soins; les objets contenus dans la cabine du malade et dans les cabines attenantes; le couloir de ces cabines; le pont ou les parties du pont sur lesquelles le malade aurait séjourné.

[Note.—The words in italics in Annexe V will now obviously require alteration, consequent on the modifications made in the definition of “suspects.” The insertion of the words “cabines attenantes” in this printed paper appears to be due to an oversight, which will be rectified before Thursday.—É. C. H. Phipps. June 7, 1892.]

(Translation.)

INTERNATIONAL SANITARY CONVENTION OF VENICE.

Alterations made in the Regulations annexed to the Convention.

Annex I.

Organization of Superintendence and of Disinfection at Suez and at Moses’ Wells.

1. Three disinfecting stores ("étuves"), one of which shall be on a pontoon;
2. An isolating hospital with twelve beds for persons suffering from cholera or from choleraic diarrhcea. This hospital shall be so arranged that the patients, male and female, are isolated from one another;
3. Buildings, hospital or ordinary tents for persons disembarked other than those included in the preceding section.
4. Baths and shower baths in sufficient number.
5. Buildings required for the common service, medical staff, guards, a warehouse, a
6. A water reservoir.
7. These buildings shall be so arranged that there can be no possible contact between the sick, infected, and suspected objects and other persons.

Annex I1.

Annex III.

Composition, Functions, and Manner of Working of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt.

(Decree, Order, and General Regulation.)

Article 32 (ex 37).

If, during the isolation of persons landed, a fresh doubtful or decided case of cholera occurs among the isolated persons, the period of isolation recommences for the group of persons who were in contact with the persons attacked.

Article 35 (ex 40).
Annex IV.

SPECIAL SANITARY REGULATIONS.

Regulations against Cholera.

ARTICLE I.

Healthy Ships.—Every healthy ship, whatever be her bill of health, which has not had on board at the moment of departure or during the voyage any case of cholera, is immediately admitted to free pratique after a favourable medical examination. In no case may this provision be applied to a ship carrying pilgrims.

ARTICLE II.

Suspected Ships.—That is, such as have had a case of cholera on board at the moment of starting or during the voyage, but no fresh case within seven days. Such ships shall be treated differently, according as they have or have not a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus (“étuve”) on board.

(a.) Ships having on board a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus (“étuve”) fulfilling the desired requirements, will be allowed to pass through the Canal in quarantine under the conditions stated in the Transit Regulations.

(b.) Other suspected ships, having neither a doctor nor a disinfecting apparatus (“étuve”), will, before being allowed to pass through the Canal in quarantine, be stopped at Moses’ Wells during the time necessary for disinfecting the soiled linen, body linen, and other susceptible articles, and for ascertaining that the ship is in [good] sanitary condition.

In the case of a mail-steamer, or of a packet specially engaged in the carriage of passengers, not having a disinfecting apparatus (“étuve”) on board, but carrying a doctor, transit in quarantine will be allowed if the local authority has an assurance, derived from an official certificate, that sanitary measures and disinfection have been properly carried out, either at the place of departure or during the voyage.

In the case of mail-steamers, or of packets specially engaged in the carriage of passengers, without a disinfecting apparatus (“étuve”), but carrying a doctor, free pratique may be granted at Suez after the operation of disinfection has been completed, if the last case of cholera occurred more than fourteen days previously, and if the state of the ship is satisfactory.

In the case of ships having had a voyage of less than fourteen days, passengers for Egypt shall disembark at Moses’ Wells, and be isolated for twenty-four hours, and their soiled linen and the effects they have used shall be disinfected. They will then receive free pratique.

Vessels having had a passage of less than fourteen days wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt will also be stopped twenty-four hours at Moses’ Wells.

In cases where the cholera has occurred exclusively among the crew disinfection will extend only to the soiled linen of the crew, but it will extend to all the soiled linen of the crew, and to the parts occupied by the crew.

ARTICLE III.

Infected Ships.—That is to say, those which have cholera on board, or which have had fresh cases of cholera within seven days. They are divided into ships without a doctor and disinfecting apparatus (“étuve”), and ships with a doctor and disinfecting apparatus (“étuve”).

(a.) Ships without a Doctor and a Disinfecting Apparatus (“Étue”) will be detained at Moses’ Wells; persons suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea will be disembarked, and isolated in a hospital. Disinfection will be carried out in a thorough manner. The other passengers will be disembarked, and isolated in groups of as few as possible, in order that the whole number may not be affected by a particular group, should cholera occur. Soiled linen, effects that have been used, the clothing of the crew and of the passengers, will be disinfected as well as the ship.

It is clearly understood that there is no question of discharge of merchandise, but only of disinfecting the infected portion of the ship.

The passengers will remain for five days at the establishment at Moses’ Wells; in cases where the cholera occurred several days previously, the period of isolation will be
shortened. The period in question will vary according to the date of the occurrence of the last case.

Thus, if the last case occurred within seven days, the period of observation shall be forty-eight hours; if within six days, the observation will last three days; if within five days, the observation will last four days; if within less than five days, the observation will last five days.

(b.) Ships with a Doctor and Disinfecting Apparatus ("Étue").—Ships with doctors and disinfecting apparatus ("étue") will be detained at Moses' Wells.

The ship's doctor will declare on oath which persons on board are suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea. These sick persons will be disembarked and isolated. After the disembarkation of these sick, the soiled linen of the rest of the passengers and of the crew will undergo disinfection on board.

When cholera has occurred among the crew only, the disinfection of the linen shall extend to that of the crew only, and to the linen of the parts occupied by the crew.

The ship's doctor will also indicate on oath the part or compartment of the ship and the section of the hospital in which the patient or patients have been conveyed. He will also declare, on oath, which persons have been in communication with the choleraic sick after the first appearance of the disease, either by direct contact, or by contact with articles capable of conveying infection. These persons alone shall be considered as "suspect."

The part or compartment of the ship and the section of the hospital in which the patients have been conveyed will be thoroughly disinfected. By "part of the ship" is understood the cabin of the patient, the adjoining cabins, the passage of the cabins, the deck and the parts of the deck which the patient or patients may have occupied.

If it is found impossible to disinfect the part or compartment of the ship which has been occupied by persons suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea without disembarking the persons declared to be "suspect," these persons will be placed on another ship specially set apart for this purpose, or disembarked and lodged in the Sanitary establishment provided for in Annex I of the Convention under the title, "Organization of Super-intendence and Disinfection at Suez and at Moses' Wells," without coming in contact with the patients, who will be placed in the hospital. The duration of this stay on the ship or on land for disinfection shall be as brief as possible, and shall not exceed twenty-four hours.

These suspects shall undergo observation, either on their own ship or on the ship set apart for the purpose; the period of this observation shall vary according to the following Table:

When the last case of cholera occurred in the course of the seventh, sixth, or fifth day before reaching Suez...
If it occurred in the course of the fourth day before reaching Suez...
If it occurred in the course of the third day before reaching Suez...
If it occurred in the course of the second day before reaching Suez...
If it occurred one day before reaching Suez.

The observation shall be from 24 to 48 hours.
The observation shall be from 2 to 3 days.
The observation shall be from 3 to 4 days.
The observation shall be from 4 to 5 days.
The observation shall be of 5 days.

The time occupied by disinfecting operations is included in the period of observation. Passage in quarantine may be granted before the expiry of the periods above indicated if the Sanitary authority judges it possible; it will in every case be granted when the disinfection is completed, if the person in command of the ship decides the vessel abandons, in addition to her patients, the persons above defined as suspect shall be abandoned.

A stove ("étue") placed on a pontoon may come alongside the ship to expedite the disinfecting operations.

Infected ships wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt are detained for five days at Moses' Wells, reckoning from the last case which occurred on board.

ARTICLE IV.

Passengers.

The different groups of persons admitted to the Sanitary station shall be separated from one another according to date of arrival, and the sanitary condition of each group. Persons having cholera or choleraic diarrhoea are strictly separated from other persons, and receive the medical treatment which their condition requires.
Cholera convalescents, however many days they may have spent at the Sanitary station, receive free pratique only on the declaration of the doctor of the said station to the effect that there is no danger in granting it.

The bodies of those who have died of cholera shall be buried in the cemetery attached to the Sanitary station, or, in default of a cemetery, in an isolated spot, with all requisite precautions. The depth of the grave must be 2 metres.

The apartments tenanted by cholera patients in the Sanitary stations shall, on being vacated, be disinfected with the greatest care.

ARTICLE V.

Annex V.

Precautionary Measures to be taken on board Ships on Departure, during the Passage and on Arrival at Suez.

III.—Measures to be taken on Arrival at Suez.

1. All ships shall undergo a medical visit before entering the Suez Canal.
2. This visit shall be made by the Sanitary authority of Suez.
3. If the ship is infected, the persons suffering from cholera, or classed as doubtful, shall be disembarked and isolated in a special building near Suez.
4. All contaminated objects, or objects suspected of being contaminated, shall be disinfected before the ship enters the Suez Canal.

The following shall be considered as suspected: clothes, bed clothes, mattresses, carpets, and other objects which have been in contact with the patient, the clothes of those who have tended him, the objects in the patient’s cabin and in the adjacent cabins, the passage to those cabins, the deck or the parts of the deck which the patient may have occupied.

[Note.—The words in italics in Annex V will now obviously require alteration, consequent on the modifications made in the definition of “suspects.” The insertion of the words “cabines attenantes” in this printed paper appears to be due to an oversight, which will be rectified before Thursday.—E. C. H. Phipps. June 7, 1892.]

No. 55.

Mr. Phipps and Dr. Thorne to the Marquis of Salisbury.—(Received June .)

My Lord,

We have the honour to transmit herewith the original procès-verbal, embodying the results of the Paris Sanitary Conference, which was signed this morning by all the Delegates of Great Britain, Austria-Hungary, and France.

We have, &c.

(Signed) E. C. H. PHIPPS.
R. THORNE THORNE.

Procès-Verbal relatif à la Convention Sanitaire de Venise du 30 Janvier, 1892.

A LA suite de pourparlers engagés par le Gouvernement Austro-Hongrois, les Délégués soussignés de l'Autriche-Hongrie, de la France, et de la Grande-Bretagne ont été désignés par leurs Gouvernements respectifs pour se réunir à Paris et examiner, d'un commun accord, les points au règlement desquels le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique subordonne son adhésion à la Convention Sanitaire Internationale signée à Venise, le 30 Janvier, 1892.

Les Délégués Soussignés ont constaté que la divergence de vues qui a retardé jusqu'ici
la signature de la cité Convention par le Gouvernement Britannique porte sur l’interprétation à donner aux dispositions des Articles 2 et 3 du Règlement spécial concernant le choléra inséré dans l’Annexe IV de la Convention.

Après examen de ces Articles, ils ont reconnu que, sans modifier dans leur essence les Articles précités, il est possible, pour satisfaire le Gouvernement Britannique, de leur donner une forme plus précise et plus explicite. Ils sont donc tombés d’accord pour substituer les deux Articles ci-après à ceux portant les mêmes numéros 2 et 3, dans le Règlement intitulé: “Règlement contre le Choléra,” et inséré dans l’Annexe IV de la Convention Sanitaire Internationale de Venise.

ARTICLE II.

Navires Suspects.—C’est-à-dire ayant en des cas de choléra au moment du départ ou pendant la traversée mais aucun cas nouveau depuis sept jours. Ces navires seront traités d’une façon différente suivant qu’ils ont ou n’ont pas à bord un médecin et un appareil à désinfection (étove).

(c.) Les navires ayant un médecin et un appareil de désinfection (étuve) remplissant les conditions voulues seront admis à passer le Canal de Suez en quarantaine dans les conditions du Règlement pour le transit.

(b.) Les autres navires suspects n’ayant ni le médecin ni l’appareil de désinfection (étuve) seront, avant d’être admis à transiter en quarantaine, retournés aux Sources de Moïse, pendant le temps nécessaire pour opérer la désinfection du linge sale, du linge de corps et autres objets susceptibles, et s’assurer de l’état sanitaire du navire.

S’il s’agit d’un navire postal ou d’un paquebot spécialement affecté au transport des voyageurs, sans appareil de désinfection (étuve), mais ayant un médecin à bord—si l’autorité locale l’autorise, par une constatation officielle, que les mesures d’assainissement et de désinfection ont été convenablement pratiquées soit au point du départ, soit pendant la traversée, le passage en quarantaine sera accordé.

S’il s’agit de navires postaux ou de paquebots spécialement affectés au transport des voyageurs, sans l’appareil de désinfection (étuve), mais ayant un médecin à bord—si le dernier cas de choléra remonte à plus de quatorze jours et si l’état du navire est satisfaisant, la libre pratique pourra être donnée à Suez, lorsque les opérations de désinfection seront terminées.

Pour les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours, les passagers à destination de l’Égypte seront débarqués aux Sources de Moïse et isolés pendant vingt-quatre heures, et leur linge sale et leurs effets à usage déséptique. Ils recevront alors la libre pratique.

Les bateaux ayant un trajet de moins de quatorze jours et demandant à obtenir la libre pratique en Égypte sont également retenus pendant vingt-quatre heures aux Sources de Moïse.

Lorsque le choléra se montre exclusivement dans l’équipage, la désinfection ne portera que sur le linge sale de l’équipage, mais sur tout le linge sale de l’équipage, et s’étendra aux postes d’habitation de l’équipage.

ARTICLE III.

Navires Infectés.—C’est-à-dire ayant au choléra à bord ou ayant présenté des cas nouveaux de choléra depuis sept jours. Ils se divisent en navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuves), et navires avec médecin et appareil de désinfection (étuves).

(c.) Les navires sans médecin et sans appareil de désinfection (étuves) seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse, les personnes atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée cholérique débarquées et isolées dans un hôpital. La désinfection sera pratiquée d’une façon complète. Les autres passagers seront débarqués et isolés par groupes aussi peu nombreux que possible, de manière que l’ensemble ne soit pas solidaire d’un groupe particulier, si le choléra vomi à se développer. Le linge sale, les objets à usage, les vêtements de l’équipage et des passagers seront désinfectés ainsi que le navire.

Il est bien entendu qu’il ne s’agit pas du déchargement des marchandises, mais seulement de la désinfection de la partie du navire qui a été infectée.

Les passagers resteront cinq jours à l’établissement des Sources de Moïse ; lorsque les cas de choléra remonteront à plusieurs jours, la durée de l’isolement sera diminuée. Cette durée variera selon l’époque de l’apparition du dernier cas.

Ainsi, lorsque le dernier cas se sera produit depuis sept jours, la durée de l’isolement sera de quarante-huit heures ; s’il s’est produit depuis six jours, l’observation sera de trois jours ; s’il s’est produit depuis cinq jours, l’observation sera de quatre jours ; s’il s’est produit depuis moins de cinq jours, l’observation sera de cinquante-six heures.

(b.) Navires avec Médecin et Appareil de Désinfection (Étuvres).—Les navires avec médecins et étuvres seront arrêtés aux Sources de Moïse.

Le médecin du bord déclarera sous serment quelles sont les personnes à bord atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée cholérique. Ces malades seront débarqués et isolés.

Après le débarquement de ces malades, le linge sale du reste des passagers et de l’équipage subira la désinfection à bord.

Lorsque le choléra se sera montré exclusivement dans l’équipage, la désinfection du linge ne portera que sur le linge sale de l’équipage et le linge des postes de l’équipage.

Le médecin du bord indiquera aussi, sous serment, la partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l’hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés. Il déclarera également, sous serment, quelles personnes ont été en rapport avec le cholérique depuis la première manifestation de la maladie, soit par des contacts directs, soit par des contacts avec des objets capables le transmettre l’infection. Ces personnes seulement seront considérées comme “suspectes.”
La partie ou le compartiment du navire et la section de l'hôpital dans lesquels le ou les malades auront été transportés seront complètement désinfectés. On entend par "partie du navire" la cabine du malade, les cabines attenantes, le couloir de ces cabines, le pont, les parties du pont sur lesquels le ou les malades auront séjourné.

Ceux suspects subiront une observation, soit sur leur bâtimnet, soit sur le navire affecté à cet usage; la durée de cette observation variera selon le Tableau suivant:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cas de choléra</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Commentaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Le temps pris par les opérations de désinfection est compris dans la durée de l'observation.

Le passage en quarantaine pourra être accordé avant l'expiration des délais indiqués dans le Tableau ci-dessus si l'autorité Sanitaire le juge possible; il sera en tout cas accordé lorsque la désinfection aura été accomplie, si le navire abandonne, outre ses malades, les personnes indiquées ci-dessus comme "suspects."

Une étuve placée sur un ponton pourra venir accoster le navire pour rendre plus rapides les opérations de désinfection.

Les navires infectés demandant à obterner la libre pratique en Egypte sont retenus cinq jours aux "Sources de Moïse," à compter du dernier cas survenu à bord.

Comme conséquence de l'interprétation donnée aux dispositions des Articles 2 et 3, primitivement rédigés par la Conférence de Venise, les Délégués Soussignés ont dû, pour établir la concordance requise, modifier également le libellé des dispositions ci-après:—

I. Règlement contre le Choléra, Article 4.

**Article 4.** *(Passagers).*

Les différents groupes de personnes admises à la station Sanitaire sont séparés les uns des autres suivant la date de l'arrivée et l'état sanitaire de chaque groupe.

Les personnes atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée cholériforme sont strictement séparées des autres personnes, et reçoivent les soins médicaux qui recette leur âge.

Les convalescents de choléra, quel que soit le nombre des jours qu'ils n'ont pas passés à la station Sanitaire, ne reçoivent libre pratique que sur la déclaration du médecin de la dite station constatant l'absence de danger à l'accoster.

Les individus morts de choléra seront inhumés dans le cimetière affecté à la station Sanitaire, ou, à défaut de cimetière, dans un endroit isolé, et avec toutes les précautions requises. La fosse devra être de 2 mètres de profondeur.

Les appartements occupés par les cholériques dans les stations Sanitaires seront, après leur évacuation, désinfectés avec le plus grand soin.

II. Annexe I à la Convention, au titre suivant:—

**Organisation de la Surveillance et de la Désinfection à Suez et aux Sources de Moïse.***

1. Trois étapes à désinfection, dont une seule placée sur un ponton.
2. Un hôpital de quatre douze lits pour les personnes atteintes de choléra ou de diarrhée cholériforme. Cet hôpital sera disposé de façon que ces malades, les hommes et les femmes, soient isolés les uns des autres.
3. Des bâtiments, ou des tentes-hôpital, ou des tentes ordinaires, pour les personnes débarquées, non comprises dans le paragraphe précédent.
4. Des baignoires et des douches-débarquement en nombre suffisant.
5. Les bâtiments nécessaires pour les services communs, le personnel médical, les garides, etc., un magasin, une buanderie.
6. Un réservoir d'eau.
7. Ces divers bâtiments seront disposés de telle façon qu'il n'y ait pas de contact possible entre les malades, les objets infectés ou suspects, et les autres personnes.

III. Annexe III de la Convention, au titre suivant:

*Mise en exergue, Britannique.*

In dite Convention, le *technique applicable,* les autres combiné contact personnel, les autres malades, les objets contamnés dans un local spécial construit à proximité de Suez.

Sont considérés comme douteux les individus ayant eu des symptômes de choléra, notamment la diarrhée cholérique.

4. Tous les objets contaminés et les objets suivants seront désinfectés avant l'entrée du navire dans le Canal de Suez, c'est-à-dire, les habits, objets de literie, matelas, tapis, et autres objets qui ont été en contact avec le malade ; les vêtements de ceux qui lui ont donné des soins ; les objets contenus dans la cabine du malade et dans les cabines attenantes ; le couloir de ces cabines ; le pont ou les parties du pont sur lesquelles le malade aurait séjourné.

En ce qui concerne la procédure à suivre pour porter à la connaissance de tous les autres Gouvernements qui ont pris part à la Conférence de Venise la nouvelle rédaction interprétative des Articles 2 et 3 du "Règlement contre le Choléra," et les modifications de détail introduites dans le libellé des Annexes de la Convention, et qui sont reproduites ci-dessus, les Délégués soussignés sont convenus de ce qui suit :

Ils sont d'avis de confier au Gouvernement Austro-Hongrois le soin de communiquer aux dites Puissances les modifications susindiquées, en les priant, si elles les approuvent, de les substituer, aux textes primitifs des Annexes, dans l'instrument des ratifications de la Convention Sanitaire, signée à Venise le 30 Janvier, 1892.

Il démeure entendu que la communication du Cabinet de Vienne sera d'ailleurs appuyée, auprès de ces Gouvernements, par une note des Gouvernements Français et Britannique.

Les Délégués soussignés rappellent que le délai fixé par la Convention, pour l'échange des ratifications, expire le 1er Août prochain.

Ayant constaté, d'autre part, que dans l'Annexe IV de l'instrument diplomatique de la dite Convention, le "Règlement concernant l'Institution d'un Corps de Garde Sanitaires," a été omis, ainsi que le Secrétariat de la Conférence en a informé les Délégués, le 25 Février, 1892, ils émettent l'avis que le Gouvernement Austro-Hongrois transmette également aux Puissances le texte complet de la Convention et des Annexes, en mettant en caractères spéciaux les changements de forme résultant du présent procès-verbal.

En foi de quoi les Délégués soussignés ont dressé le présent procès-verbal en triple exemplaire, à Paris, le 9 Juin, 1892.

(Signé) E. CONSTANTINE H. TRIPPS.
R. THORNE THORNE.
KUEFSTEIN.
CAMILLE BARRÈRE.
Dr. BROUARDE.
A. PROUST.
(Translation.)

Minute respecting the Sanitary Convention of Venice of January 30, 1892.

AS the result of communications made by the Austro-Hungarian Government, the undersigned Delegates of Austria-Hungary, France, and Great Britain have been appointed by their respective Governments to meet at Paris to examine together those points which the Government of Her Britannic Majesty require to be settled as a condition of their accession to the International Sanitary Convention, signed at Venice on the 30th January, 1892.

The undersigned Delegates observe that the divergence of views which has hitherto delayed the signature of the Convention by the British Government bears on the interpretation to be given to the provisions of Articles 2 and 3 of the Special Regulations respecting cholera, inserted in Annex IV to the Convention.

After examining these Articles, they agree that, without altering the essential nature of the above-mentioned Articles, it is possible, in order to meet the views of the British Government, to give to those Articles a more precise and explicit form. They have, therefore, agreed to substitute the two following Articles for those similarly numbered 2 and 3 in the Regulations headed, "Regulations against Cholera," inserted in Annex IV to the International Sanitary Convention of Venice:

ARTICLE II.

Suspected Ships.—That is, such as have had a case of cholera on board at the moment of starting or during the voyage, but no fresh case within seven days. Such ships shall be treated differently, according as they have or have not a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus ("étau") on board.

(a.) Ships having on board a doctor, and a disinfecting apparatus ("étau") fulfilling the desired requirements, will be allowed to pass through the Canal in quarantine under the conditions stated in the Transit Regulations.

(b.) Other suspected ships, having neither a doctor nor a disinfecting apparatus ("étau"), will, before being allowed to pass through the Canal in quarantine, be stopped at Moses' Wells during the time necessary for disinfecting the soiled linen, body linen, and other susceptible articles, and for ascertaining that the ship is in [good] sanitary condition.

In the case of a mail-steamers, or of a packet specially engaged in the carriage of passengers, not having a disinfecting apparatus ("étau") on board, but carrying a doctor, transit in quarantine will be allowed if the local authority has an assurance, derived from an official certificate, that sanitary measures and disinfection have been properly carried out, either at the place of departure or during the voyage.

In the case of mail-steamers or of packets specially engaged in the carriage of passengers, without a disinfecting apparatus ("étau"), but carrying a doctor, free pratique may be granted at Suez after the operation of disinfection has been completed, if the last case of cholera occurred more than fourteen days previously, and if the state of the ship is satisfactory.

In the case of ships having had a voyage of less than fourteen days, passengers for Egypt shall disembark at Moses' Wells and be isolated for twenty-four hours, and their soiled linen and the effects they have used shall be disinfected. They will then receive free pratique.

Vessels having had a passage of less than fourteen days wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt will also be stopped twenty-four hours at Moses' Wells.

In cases where the cholera has occurred exclusively among the crew disinfection will extend only to the soiled linen of the crew, but it will extend to all the soiled linen of the crew, and to the parts occupied by the crew.

ARTICLE III.

Infected Ships.—That is to say, those which have cholera on board, or which have had fresh cases of cholera within seven days. They are divided into ships without a doctor and disinfecting apparatus ("étau"), and ships with a doctor and disinfecting apparatus ("étau").

(a.) Ships without a doctor and a disinfecting apparatus ("étau") will be detained at Moses' Wells; persons suffering from cholera or choleric diarrhea will be disembarked, and isolated in a hospital. Disinfection will be carried out in a thorough manner. The other passengers will be disembarked, and isolated in groups of as few as possible, in order that the whole number may not be affected by a particular group, should cholera occur. Soiled linen, effects that have been used, the clothing of the crew and of the passengers will be disinfected as well as the ship.

It is clearly understood that there is no question of discharge of merchandise, but only of disinfecting the infected portion of the ship.

The passengers will remain for five days at the establishment at Moses' Wells; in cases where the cholera occurred several days previously, the period of isolation will be shortened. The period in question will vary according to the date of the occurrence of the last case.

Thus, if the last case occurred within seven days, the period of observation shall be forty-eight hours; if within six days, the observation will last three days; if within five days, the observation will last four days; if within less than five days, the observation will last five days.
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(b.) Ships with a Doctor and Disinfecting Apparatus ("Étuvres").—Ships with doctors and stoves ("Étuvres") will be detained at Moses' Wells. The ship's doctor will declare on oath which persons on board are suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea. These sick persons will be disembarked and isolated.

After the disembarkation of these sick, the soiled linen of the rest of the passengers and of the crew will undergo disinfection on board. When cholera has occurred among the crew only, the disinfection of the linen shall extend to that of the crew only, and to the linen of the parts occupied by the crew.

The ship's doctor will also indicate on oath the part or compartment of the ship and the section of the hospital in which the patient or patients have been conveyed. He will also declare, on oath, which persons have been in communication with the choleraic sick after the first appearance of the disease, either by direct contact, or by contact with articles capable of conveying infection.

These persons alone shall be considered as "suspect."

The part or compartment of the ship and the section of the hospital in which the patients have been conveyed will be thoroughly disinfected. By "part of the ship" is understood the cabin of the patient, the adjoining cabins, the passage of the cabins, the deck, and the parts of the deck which the patient or patients may have occupied.

If it is found impossible to disinfect the part or compartment of the ship which has been occupied by persons suffering from cholera or choleraic diarrhoea without disembarking the persons declared to be "suspect," these persons will be placed on another ship specially set apart for this purpose, or disembarked and lodged in the sanitary establishment provided for in Annex I of the Convention under the title, "Organization of Superintendence and Disinfection at Suez and at Moses' Wells," without coming in contact with the patients, who will be placed in the hospital.

The duration of this stay on the ship or on land for disinfection shall be as brief as possible, and shall not exceed twenty-four hours.

These suspects shall undergo observation, either on their own ship or on the ship set apart for the purpose; the period of this observation shall vary according to the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period of Observation</th>
<th>Cessation of Disinfection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From 24 to 48 hours</td>
<td>After 24 hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 2 to 3 days</td>
<td>After 3 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 3 to 4 days</td>
<td>After 4 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For 4 to 5 days</td>
<td>After 5 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The time occupied by disinfecting operations is included in the period of observation.

Passage in quarantine may be granted before the expiry of the periods above indicated if the sanitary authority judges it possible; it will in every case be granted when the disinfection is completed, if the vessel is abandoned, in addition to her patients, the persons above defined as "suspect." A stove ("étuve") placed on a pontoon may come alongside the ship to expedite the disinfecting operations.

Infected ships wishing to obtain free pratique in Egypt are detained for five days at Moses' Wells, reckoning from the last case which occurred on board.

In consequence of the interpretation placed on the provisions of Articles 2 and 3, as originally drafted by the Venice Conference, the undersigned Delegates have been obliged to modify the wording of the following provisions in order to bring the whole into harmony:

I. Regulation against Cholera, Article 4.

The different groups of persons admitted to the sanitary station shall be separated from one another according to date of arrival, and the sanitary condition of each group.

Persons having cholera or choleraic diarrhoea are strictly separated from other persons, and receive the medical treatment which their condition requires.

Cholera convalescents, however many days they may have spent at the sanitary station, receive free pratique only on the declaration of the doctor of the said station, to the effect that there is no danger in granting it.

The bodies of those who have died of cholera shall be buried in the cemetery attached to the sanitary station, or, in default of a cemetery, in an isolated spot, with all requisite precautions. The depth of the grave must be 2 metres. The apartments tenanted by cholera patients in the sanitary stations shall, on being vacated, be disinfected with the greatest care.

II. Annex 1 to the Convention, under the following heading:

Organization of Superintendence and of Disinfection at Suez and at Moses' Wells.

1. Three disinfesting stoves ("étuvres"), one of which shall be on a pontoon.
2. An isolating hospital with twelve beds for persons suffering from cholera or from choleraic diarrhoea. This hospital shall be so arranged that the patients, male and female, are isolated from one another.
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. A sufficient number of baths and shower-baths ("douches-lavages").

. Buildings necessary for the common services, the medical staff, the guards, &c., a store, and a
laundry.

. A reservoir of water.

. The various buildings shall be so arranged that no contact be possible between invalids,
infectcd or suspected objects, and other persons.

III. Annex III to the Convention, under the following heading:—

Composition, powers, and working of the Maritime, Sanitary, and Quarantine Board of Egypt.

(Alterations in the Regulations for maritime, sanitary, and quarantine police.)

Article 32 (ex 37).

If, during the isolation of persons landed, a fresh doubtful or decided case of cholera occurs
among the isolated persons, the period of isolation recommences for the group of persons who were in
contact with the person attacked.

IV. Annex V to the Convention, under the following heading:—

Precautionary Measures to be taken on board Ships on departure, during the passage and on arrival
at Suez.

III. Measures to be taken on arrival at Suez:—

1. All ships shall undergo a medical visit before entering the Suez Canal.

2. This visit shall be made by the sanitary authority of Suez.

3. If the ship is infected, the persons suffering from cholera, or classed as doubtful, shall be
disembarked and isolated in a special building near Suez.

Persons having had choleric symptoms, notably choleric diarrhoea, shall be classed as doubtful.

4. All contaminated objects and the following objects shall be disinfected before the entry of the
ship into the Suez Canal, namely, clothes, bed clothes, mattresses, carpets, and other objects which
have been in contact with the patient, the clothes of those who have tattooed him, the objects in the
patient's cabin and in the adjacent cabins, the passage to those cabins, the deck, or the parts of the
deer which the patient may have occupied.

In regard to the manner of communicating to the other Governments which took
part in the Venice Conference the new declaratory drafting of Articles 2 and 3 of the
"Regulations against Cholera" and the modifications of detail made in the wording of
the Annexes of the Convention, which are reproduced above, the undersigned
Delegates have agreed upon the following:—

They are of opinion that the communication of the above-mentioned modifications
to the said Powers should be intrusted to the care of the Austro-Hungarian Govern-
ment, begging them, should they approve, to substitute them for the former texts of the
Annexes in the ratifications of the Sanitary Convention, signed at Venice the
30th January, 1892.

It is understood that the communication to be made by the Cabinet of Vienna
shall be supported, as regards these Governments, by a note from the Governments of
France and of Great Britain.

The undersigned Delegates call attention to the fact that the term fixed by the
Convention for the exchange of the ratifications expires on the 1st August next.

Having observed, moreover, that in Annex IV of the diplomatic document
containing the said Convention the "Regulations concerning the Formation of a Corps
of Sanitary Guards" have been omitted, as the Secretaries of the Conference informed
the Delegates on the 25th February, 1892, they express the opinion that the Austro-
Hungarian Government should likewise transmit to the Powers the complete text of
the Convention and of the Annexes, printing in distinguishing type the changes of
form resulting from the present Minute.

In faith whereof, the undersigned Delegates have drawn up the present Minute in
three originals at Paris, the 9th June, 1892.

(Signed) E. CONSTANTINE H. PIIPPS.

R. THORNE THORNE.

KUEFSTEIN.

CAMILLE BARRÈRE.

D. BROUARDEL.

A. PROUST.
Gentlemen,

I HAVE to acknowledge the receipt of your despatches of the 9th instant, the one transmitting the procès-verbal recording the conclusions arrived at by the Delegates who met in Paris to deal with certain points left outstanding at the Sanitary Conference held at Venice in January last, and the other forwarding the draft of a note explanatory of this procès-verbal.

I have much pleasure in conveying to you the approval of Her Majesty's Government of your proceedings on this occasion, and I have likewise to express the satisfaction of Her Majesty's Government at the result of the meeting in Paris which you attended.

I am, &c.

(Signed) SALISBURY.
COMMERCIAL. No. 7 (1892).
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