

London Advertiser.

(Established by JOHN CAMERON, in 1863.)
 LEADING DAILY IN WESTERN ONTARIO.
 Advertising and subscription rates furnished on application.
 THE LONDON ADVERTISER COMPANY
 (Limited),
 LONDON, ONTARIO.

London, Saturday, Nov. 23.

The Petition of the Medical Profession to the Hospital Trustees—Remarkable Unanimity.

The petition, presented on behalf of the medical profession to the hospital trustees by Drs. Wishart and Eccles, had the signatures of 58 out of 60 medical men. We have been accustomed to the saying, "Doctors differ," but all rules fall sometimes.

The desire of the petitioners was not to give to the public, through the press, any matters that might come before the trustees calculated to injure the hospital. They explained that if a charge was made, the charge alone should not go to the press, but that the explanation and all the facts connected with it should go too. In this way injustice to the hospital might be avoided. Dr. Eccles gave a case in point. He said a mother had her daughter in the hospital for treatment; she heard the daughter ask the nurse for water, and was refused; again she asked, and was again refused. The mother thought the nurse hard-hearted, and was prepared to go out and denounce the whole institution, nurse included, for such harsh treatment. Her daughter could not even get a glass of water! Let that charge go out, said the doctor, and some people would not understand it. But let the explanation go with it—that the nurse was following the doctor's orders, and that there are cases when, though the thirst may be extreme, they keep the patient from getting water for 24 hours. This is for the patient's good, he said, and what seemed to the mother hard-hearted, was the greatest kindness.

The course that has been followed hitherto in the hospital is in reality the one recommended by the medical profession. If any question arose calculated, if published, to do harm, or to hurt the feelings of those whose case was being considered, the reporters were asked not to insert anything in the report regarding it. The reporters in no instance did so. This is as it should be, and is quite in keeping with the request in the petition.

The trustees recognized the soundness of the principle of the petition, and the necessity for loyalty to the hospital, not only on the part of the trustees, but of the medical profession and the press as well. The hospital, though a public institution, was, in its private ward, and in some respects in its public ward, nothing more or less than a home. The room occupied by a patient is for the time being his home. The fact that it is in a hospital does not give the doctor or the nurse, or anyone else, the right to violate the sacredness with which the doctor's knowledge has always been regarded by all medical men and nurses. Medical men, as a rule, are very conscientious in observing the well-established rules of secrecy.

The trustees met the deputation of medical men and exchanged views. It was found that there was no difference of opinion; that publicity that would do harm and work injustice should be avoided; that publicity that caused all connected with the hospital to do right was to be welcomed. So far the trustees had found that the reporters complied with their wishes.

The petition emphasizes the fact that much injury may be done to a hospital without any cause whatever. The Advertiser has been pointing out just what Dr. Eccles' illustration makes so plain. To accuse is not to condemn. Many things are capable of explanation, and he who would condemn on mere accusation, and refuse the right and opportunity for explanation, is unjust. Before coming to any conclusion it is always necessary to first ascertain the facts. If this well-established rule is followed by all interested in the hospital, the press included, in future the hospital will continue to hold in the estimation of the public the high position it now does.

The Selfish Pewholder.

A correspondent complains that on a recent Sunday he entered a fashionable church, and seeing a pew standing empty, took a seat in it. By and bye, a gentleman, whom he took to be the lessee of the pew came along, with his family, and looked at him so hard that he felt he was indeed an intruder, and was caused so much discomfort that he got no good from the sermon. It is to be feared that this is not an unusual incident. Some people who rent sittings in churches come to regard them as so entirely their own that they strongly resent the intrusion of any stranger, and the consequence is that if such a one dropped into church, his reception is such that, if he is inclined to be sceptical about the anxiety of Christians to have their numbers increased, he readily reaches the conclusion that the church has no "open door" for the sinner, but is an exclusive club, something the Great Founder of the Christian religion never intended it to be. Apropos of this experience, Dean Farrar mentions the following story, told by the late Arch-

bishop Magee, when speaking of the Parish Churches Bill: "As soon as a person succeeds in appropriating a pew, he puts in a hassock and a Prayer Book, and after that it is sacred forever to him. These are the idols of British pewdom, the symbols and forms by which seign and livery of part of the parish church are taken forever. Very early in my clerical life I was curate in a parish church where there were large, old-fashioned pews, owned by different persons. After service one Sunday the holder of one of these pews came to me in a state of great irritation and rage, because of the intrusion of a single stranger into his pew, which was a large one, with seats for eight or nine persons, of which he was the sole occupant. 'Sir,' he said, 'I would not dare to disturb divine service to put him out of my pew, but I took the slight liberty of sitting upon his hat.' Of course, the great mass of the pewholders in our churches are not like this man; they gladly welcome the stranger, and will put themselves about to insure his comfort. But it is not by the conduct of the majority of Christians, who do right, but by the attitude of the minority, whose conduct cannot be said to accord with the tenets of the great Exemplar. In the majority of churches nowadays, much friction is avoided by the appointment of efficient ushers, who learn by experience how best to provide seats for strangers, while in others all seats are free, and no question of even temporary ownership or control can arise. The simplest way is the best, and in any case, no one can err who treats with kindness a temporary sojourner in a place of worship; indeed, consideration under such circumstances ought to be a powerful aid to the success of the congregation in adding to its numbers and influence.

What We and Others Drink.

By the publication of the report of the Canadian Minister of Inland Revenue for the year ending June 30, 1901, we are able to make an interesting comparison of the drink bill of the Dominion with that of the United Kingdom, France, Germany and the United States, as recently compiled by the London Standard. Beginning with wine, and taking the year 1900 for three of these countries, the consumption was as follows:

	Total Consumption, Gallons.	Per head, Gallons.
Canada (1900).....	15,816,000	3.90
United Kingdom.....	18,153,000	3.73
France (1900).....	31,829,000	1.45
Germany (1899).....	25,346,000	1.33

It will be seen that more wine is consumed per head in Canada than in the United States or Great Britain, though less than in Germany. The consumption in all four countries is, however, infinitesimal, compared with the French Republic, which is the great wine producing and consuming country of the continent. Of other countries Portugal averages about 20 gallons per head, Spain 19 gallons, Italy 18 gallons and Switzerland 15 gallons. The consumption in Austria-Hungary is a little over 3 gallons per head, in Belgium less than a gallon, and in Holland about the same as in the United Kingdom.

Though the consumption of beer has doubled in Canada in the last 30 years, the consumption per head is still only a tithe of what it is in the United Kingdom, Germany and the United States, where beer is the staple drink, and it is considerably less than in France, where the great mass of the people have wine as their stock beverage. Here are the facts:

	Consumption, Gallons.	Per head, Gallons.
Canada (1901).....	4,757	0.25
United Kingdom (1900).....	1,288,756,000	31.7
France (1900).....	2,282,354,000	10.2
Germany (1899).....	1,527,878,000	27.5
United States (1899).....	364,210,000	13.3

The consumption per head in the United States, it will be seen, is only half that of Germany, which is itself less than that of the United Kingdom. In each of the three southern states of Germany, however, Bavaria, Wurttemberg and Baden, the consumption per head is greater than in the United Kingdom. Of other countries not included here, Belgium is easily first, with a consumption in 1899 of nearly 47 gallons per head, which, however, falls short of the Bavarian consumption of 54 gallons per head. Nearly all these figures show evidence of a tendency to increase in recent years.

In the United Kingdom the average consumption was, roughly, 27 gallons per head from 1885 to 1888, and in the next two years rose to 30 gallons per head, remaining at or near this point up to 1895. Beside this consumption, Canada's four odd gallons is a very small quantity, indeed.

Spirits are not nearly so popular as a beverage as formerly. The consumption is as follows:

	Consumption, Gallons.	Per head, Gallons.
Canada (1901).....	8,725	0.12
United Kingdom (1900).....	45,900,000	1.12
France (1900).....	78,432,000	2.02
Germany (1899).....	12,936,000	1.24
United States (1899).....	81,038,000	1.06

The inference to be drawn from these figures is that Canada is the soberest country of all. Only in wine, which may be accounted for by the fact that our French-speaking population follow the habits of their race on the European continent, is our consumption per head greater than in the countries named, while our consumption of beer and spirits is very small compared with that annually drunk by the inhabitants of Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States. Indeed, we know of no country in Europe or on this continent where less alcoholic liquor is consumed or where law and order are better observed than in this Dominion. Let us, then, keep it in the van.

Black and White.

The race problem in the Southern States is apparently as momentous and troublesome as in the days of slavery. Black and white, oil and water, it seems, will not mix. The New York Journal in a recent issue publishes a couple of articles from the pens of two southern women, one affirming and the other negating the idea of education being a success in regard to the negro. There would seem to be hardly room for a division of opinion on the benign influences of education. It is true that education does not always bring happiness; it, however, always brings with it a measure of satisfaction, especially to the mind properly constituted. Yet there is also an unrest, a reaching out after something, which leads one on. The source of satisfaction consists chiefly in the consciousness of advancing, not in a finally when the object is attained. It is natural, then, that the effect upon the negro would be somewhat disturbing to his white neighbors. The awakening is apt to be unpleasant, but once his eyes are wide open and he can look forth with undimmed vision, there is no reason why the negro should not take a high stand among mankind. He has ever flourished even amid the worst of surroundings. The Indian, on the other hand, cannot be properly civilized; under the influence of civilization he becomes a degenerate; he loses his agility and picturesqueness. The negro has demonstrated his fitness to survive. We must judge the possibilities of a race by its best specimens. When we consider such men as Frederick Douglass, Alexander Dumas and Booker T. Washington, we must certainly be impressed with the great possibilities of the negro race. As a writer of short stories and pathetic poems, in his native doric, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, the colored poet, has attracted the favorable attention of no less a person than the literary critic, W. D. Howells. His negro dialect is full of feeling and appeals to sympathetic natures.

Coming closer home, we find noble specimens among the colored races. Ex-Ald. Holden, of Chatham, was born in servitude, yet in spite of the shackles incident to slavery he rose to a prominent position in the municipality of his adoption. Social distinction is, as Carlyle hints, merely a matter of clothes. Innate ability is really the standard of the man. The time is, we believe, approaching when personal worth will be prized before an aptitude for catering to social usages. When that time comes a quondam slave may dine with a president or with a prince. And what will bring such a condition of affairs about better than education in the truest sense of the term? The commonwealth of letters is the common ground upon which all will meet, and "only man will remain."

IT IS INTRA VIRES!

What the Lords Said About the Manitoba Liquor Law—
 Court of King's Bench Judgment Reversed—
 Views of Prominent Men in Canada.

London, Nov. 23.—The judicial committee of the Privy Council, at the sitting yesterday, advised the King to discharge the judgment of the Court of King's Bench of Manitoba, dated Feb. 23, 1901, and declaring the Manitoba liquor or prohibition act to be unconstitutional and void, on the ground that power of the province to pass such legislation does not come within section 92 of the British North America Act, wherein the province is authorized to legislate in regard to property and civil rights. Lord MacNaghten delivered the judgment, in which the law lords said that, although the questions submitted to the Court of King's Bench in Manitoba numbered eleven, only one question was considered in the Court of King's Bench, and their lordships had considered

ONLY ONE QUESTION in the judicial committee of the Privy Council. That question was: "Has the Manitoba Legislature power to pass the act? If not, in what particular respect had the legislature exceeded its power?" Referring to section 119 of the Manitoba liquor act (this section appears to recognize such limitations of section 92 of the British North America Act imposed upon the power of the province), their lordships declare that the provisions of section 119 are as much a part of the act as any other section, and that these provisions must have their full effect in exempting from the operation of the act all bona fide transactions in liquor which come within its terms.

THE KING'S BENCH VIEW.
 The Court of King's Bench in Mani-

toba, in declaring the liquor act to be unconstitutional, said: "It is enough to say that the provisions of the act are extremely stringent, more stringent, probably, than anything to be found in any legislation of a similar kind, and that unless the act is to become a dead letter it must interfere with the revenue of the Dominion, which licensed trades of the Province of Manitoba, and indirectly with business operations beyond the limits of provinces." These words represent the grounds on which the Court of King's Bench of Manitoba declare the liquor act to be unconstitutional and in excess of the powers conferred by section 92 of the British North America Act, authorizing the province to legislate in regard to property and civil rights.

JUDGMENT OF THE LORDS.
 The judgment, as delivered by Lord MacNaghten, notes the objections, but goes on to say that in the opinion of their lordships these objections are removed by the judgment of the judicial committee of the Privy Council in the case of the Attorney-General of Ontario vs. the Attorney-General of the Dominion. Lord MacNaghten declared that the five law lords of the judicial committee who heard the case (Lords Hobhouse, MacNaghten, Davey, Robertson and Lindesay) would advise his majesty the King that the judgment of the King's Bench of Manitoba, dated Feb. 23, 1901, be discharged, substituting the committee's answer to the eleven questions.

ONE QUESTION COVERS THE ELEVEN.
 The judicial committee of the Privy Council declared the Legislative As-



Special Boot and Shoe Sale.

Today is boot day. Special reduced prices on all lines of Ladies' Boots and Shoes, Rubbers and Felt Goods. All our new and up-to-date Ladies' Boots will be sold today at special prices. Every pair guaranteed. Read the partial list below and you will see how they are going:

Ladies' Fine Rubbers, round toes, regular 35c, today 25c.	Ladies' Genuine Kid Lace Boots, up to date, regular \$1 35, today \$1 10.	Ladies' Box Calf Lace Boot, solid leather, waterproof, regular \$1 35, today \$1 10.	Ladies' Kid Boots, lace and Buttoned, regular \$2, today 99c.
Special display on tables of all kinds of Boots at special sale prices. Inspect them.	Ladies' Felt Slippers, cork soles, comfort for bedroom wear, regular 30c, today 23c.	Ladies' \$3 Boots, lace, chocolate, Goodyear welt, turn sole, to clear today \$1 25.	Ladies' Leggings, from 50c to \$1 25 pair, special prices today.
Men's Working Boots, regular \$1 50, to clear at, per pair, 75c.	Children's Box Calf Lace Boot, regular \$1 50, today \$1 20.	Children's Dongola Kid Lace Boots, also buttoned, regular \$1, today 85c.	Infants' Buttoned Boots, genuine kid, good wearers, regular 65c, today 50c.

Monday Flannel Day

Twenty-Six Hundred and Thirty Yards

8c FLANNELETTE, 5½c
 900 yards in Fancy Stripes, wide width, assorted colors, and sold everywhere at 7c and 8c; our special sale price Monday and Tuesday, 5½c.

12½c FLANNELETTE, 10c
 1,250 yards Heavy English Goods, 33 inches wide, fancy stripes, assorted colors and perfectly fast; regular close price 12½c; our special sale price Monday and Tuesday, 10c.

20c CEYLON FLANNEL, 15c
 480 yards American Ceylon Flannels, 26 and 34 inches wide, assorted colors; regular price 20c; our special sale price Monday and Tuesday, 15c.

Satisfactory Skirtmaking

In making skirts for 50c we have always given satisfaction. Therefore we need offer no further inducements.

Our skirts are not factory-made upstairs, but put together and fitted by first-class city dressmakers.

And the ladies of London know where to come to HAVE A SKIRT MADE FOR 50c. Not the store that ORIGINATES EVERYTHING, but the store that gives satisfaction.

208, 210,
 210½, 212
 Dundas St.

The Runians
 Carson McKee & Co.

208, 210,
 210½, 212
 Dundas St.

sembly of Manitoba had jurisdiction to enact the liquor act. Their lordships were of opinion that their answer to question one answers all the questions from two to eleven, and that therefore no useful answer can be given to these questions.

Their lordships further order that there shall be no costs between the parties to this case, the appeal of the Attorney-General of Manitoba against the Court of King's Bench.

Views of Interested Parties.

MR. F. S. SPENCE.
 Toronto, Nov. 23.—Mr. F. S. Spence gave out the following statement yesterday: "The decision will be hailed

with a good deal of satisfaction by all temperance people, as being in accord with the generally accepted views of the judgments already given. It will put us in a position of advantage by giving a definiteness to our work and objects. The temperance cause in the Dominion has been handicapped by the aversion of the French people to prohibition. Now we are practically freed from the impediment that the hostile vote in Quebec has been to us."

Mr. Spence added a reference to the figures of the plebiscite, remarking that a total of 249,444 votes had been cast for prohibition and 141,333 against it, the vote polled being 44 per cent of the registered vote. In 148 constituencies outside of Quebec, 121 gave a majority for prohibition, and only 27 against it. The average majority for it was 1,034 and the average majority against it in the 27 constituencies was 633.

Hamilton, Ont., Nov. 23.—Dr. Emory, Dominion secretary of the Royal Templars of Temperance, said there would be an early move made to secure prohibition for Ontario. In any event, the temperance people would now stop looking to Ottawa for such relief and would turn their attention to the legislature at Toronto.

COUNSEL FOR LICENSE-HOLDERS

Toronto, Nov. 23.—James Haverson, the solicitor who represents the license-holders of the Province, has little to say regarding the judgment of the privy council. "What effect will it have on Manitoba?" was asked. "The effect will be to take the bars in the Province of Manitoba out of the hotels and put them in the drug stores, and will bring upon that province all the evil effects of the Scott act, with which this province is very familiar."

Mr. Haverson explained that the new law would only come into force upon the proclamation of the Lieutenant-governor.

Winnipeg, Man., Nov. 23.—Regarding the decision of the privy council in the Manitoba liquor act, P. H. Phippin, K. C., counsel for the Manitoba License-holders Association, states: "The privy council has apparently decided that the subject of the liquor traffic is something which affects the private individuals of the Dominion as a whole. The decision of the court of King's Bench was that the act affected interests beyond the province, and was therefore ultra vires."

RESULTS IN HUDSON BAY COMPANY'S TERRITORY.

"You will notice that the committee has not dealt with the principal questions referred to the courts—that is, the right of the legislature to legislate away the liquor business of the Hudson Bay Company. When the court of King's Bench decided that the act was defective on other grounds, it became unnecessary to consider the Hudson Bay Company question. On the appeal to the judicial committee the arguments were directed entirely to the questions discussed by the court below, and no expression of opinion in the judgment has been given of the Hudson Bay Company point. The result is that the government is entirely in the dark on the principal difficulty on which it desired an opinion of the court."

GOVERNMENT MUST TAKE ACTION.

W. E. Perdue, who appeared for the Hudson Bay Company before the Manitoba courts, states: "An amendment to the liquor law was passed last session and assented to in March, declaring the act in force by the proclamation of the Lieutenant-governor. In view of the validity of the act upheld by the privy council, it will be necessary for the government at once to declare its intention to enforce the law."

if, or to declare its intention of introducing a repeal at the next session of the legislature. Until the act is either proclaimed or repealed there will be a disturbing effect on credit in general."

THE MATTER OF COMPENSATION.
 No doubt most strenuous efforts on the part of those most injuriously affected by the bringing into force of the act will be put forth to have compensation made to them by the government. This agitation for compensation will be kept up persistently by people who are interested until it is all settled."

IN DOUBT.

Local hotelkeepers are feeling uneasy. The present license was issued on June 1, and in the ordinary course of events would be good until June 1, 1902, but whether the licenses were issued after the liquor act had been adopted or while its validity was being questioned in court, they are fearful that they may be deprived of the right of selling liquor at any time. Others feel that even if the proclamation is issued forthwith they will be permitted to conduct their business undisturbed until their licenses have expired.

HUGH JOHN'S VIEWS.

Hon. Hugh John Macdonald, ex-premier of the province, said: "I only hope that it will be so plain a judgment that there need be no further litigation in the matter. There is a danger of a judgment being in such a shape that it will require legal opinion as to exactly what it means, as was the case with the decision of the courts, about six or seven years ago, when Ontario was given certain provincial rights."

"You believed at the time you took part in the framing of the act that it was within the rights of the province? Or what grounds did you take that stand?"

"On the decision I mention in regard to the rights of provincial legislatures, as given to the Ontario Government." "Have your views altered at all since the act was framed?" "No," said Mr. Macdonald, "they have not. I NEVER WAS IN FAVOR OF PROHIBITION. I believed at the time it rested in the hands of the people, and I believe that temperance advocates are away in the majority in this province. I do not believe that there is anything in the act that upsets any of the provisions of the British North America act. The Manitoba liquor act was framed and was intended to be put in force simply as an experiment. On this ground I was in favor of letting it go through. If it was found not to be practicable in administration or detrimental to the country, why it could be repealed by the government. It was to be enforced to the letter of the law. On the surface I think the act looks as if it would interfere with Dominion trade and commerce, but it will require to be put to the test before this will be known. Licensed manufacturers will be given, I should think, a certain length of time before the act is enforced, but the law allows it to be put in force tomorrow by proclamation by the Lieutenant-governor."

A True Nerve Tonic acts not only upon the nerves themselves as upon the digestive functions, and the abundant formation of rich, red blood. The nerves cannot be fed on medicine. They can be fed and strengthened by digested and assimilated food. Ferrogene's marvelous action arises from its power over the digestive and assimilative functions of the body. You take it, the blood grows richer, redder. You feel strength and vigor, digestion ceases to be noticed, for it has become good. Work is easier, for you have the strength to do it. In a short time you have health. Use Ferrogene. Sold by W. T. Strong & Co.

BETTER THAN COD LIVER OIL
PHYSICIANS SAY SO

Angier's Petroleum Emulsion not only quickly relieves the most obstinate cough, and soothes and heals the throat and lungs, but at the same time it promotes appetite, aids digestion, and greatly improves the general health.

Angier's Petroleum Emulsion

Is equally good for the cough of chronic bronchitis, with profuse expectoration, the dry harsh throat cough, the irritating cough of influenza, and for whooping cough and croupy coughs of children. To those who are subject to bronchial attack it is an especial boon. The cough and breathing are made easier almost immediately, the irritation in throat and bronchial tubes is soothed, the character of the expectoration is altered and a general improvement effected in all the symptoms. We have hundreds of reports from all parts of the English-speaking world attesting its remarkable power to relieve and cure troublesome coughs.

BRONCHITIS.—I have used Angier's Petroleum Emulsion in my own family, and find it is without an equal in either acute or chronic diseases of the air passages. I also find it has a beneficial action on the digestive organs. I have a case now in this city of bronchitis with profuse and fetid expectoration, and he had, previous to my being called, tried various preparations of cod liver oil and croscote without avail. I put him on your Emulsion, and his improvement was apparent from the beginning. He is now able to attend to his duties. I will continue to recommend Angier's Emulsion, as I deem it a very valuable preparation.

R. F. BROWN, M. D., New Britain, Conn.

CAUTION.—The phenomenal success of ANGIER'S PETROLEUM EMULSION has been the means of producing many untried and worthless imitations. Always be sure you get the genuine ANGIER'S Petroleum Emulsion, as imitations made with the ordinary Petroleum do not have the same effect. Angier's Petroleum Emulsion is made from oil obtained from particular wells and refined by a peculiar process, which is known only to the manufacturers of Angier's Petroleum Emulsion. All druggists sell it. Two sizes, 50 cents and \$1.00 a bottle.

YOUR NAME AND ADDRESS on a postal card will bring you a free copy of a valuable booklet entitled, "ABOUT YOUR THROAT AND LUNGS." It tells how to care for the Throat, Lungs, and Digestive Organs. It gives good advice as to Diet and Hygiene, also Exercises, which are illustrated.

ANGIER CHEMICAL COMPANY, BOSTON, MASS.