

## WHY RHEUMATISM OFTEN COMES ONCE

### Britain's Tiniest Railway Systems.

The High Rocks Station between Tunbridge, Wells and Groombridge claims to be the only railway station without a staff, says a London newspaper. It has no station-master, booking clerk, porter, booking office, or waiting-room. The trains serving it are drawn by baby engines, and the guard acts in the manifold capacity of a complete station staff.

But one need not go out of London to find stations run on almost similar lines. The Waterloo-City Railway, known to tens of thousands of business men, consists of two terminal, one at Waterloo and the other in the City, and at least a third of its length runs under the River Thames.

Sufferers from rheumatism who have found their condition unrelieved or actually growing worse while using other remedies, would do well to try Dr. Williams' Pink Pills. The tonic treatment with this medicine has proved in thousands of cases that it builds up the blood to a point that enables it to cast out the rheumatic poisons through the regular channels of excretion, the bowels, kidneys and the skin. When this is done rheumatism is banished, and as long as the blood is kept pure and rich the patient will be immune from attack. This is proved by the case of Mrs. J. Hewitt, Beach P.O., Hamilton, Ont., who says: "For a number of years I was troubled with muscular rheumatism, which caused me a great deal of suffering. I would get rid of the trouble for a time, but it always came back. A friend recommended Dr. Williams' Pink Pills and I have not had an attack of rheumatism since I took them, and that is five years ago. I have since used the pills for anaemia and found them equally good, and I now recommend them to any friends who may be ailing."

There is a railway station in Derbyshire where trains stop only on one day in the week to enable the inhabitants of the village of Blackwell Mill to go shopping to Buxton!

What claims to be the shortest passenger line in the world may be seen at Grondle, not far from Douglas, Isle of Man. It is one mile long, and the gauge is only two feet. It was made to convey passengers from the entrance to Grondle Glen to the seashore. The engine looks like a toy, but is powerful and well made, and the open cars carry ten passengers.

The smallest fully working line is probably the Eskdale Railway, which runs over the seven miles which separate Ravenglass, on the west coast of Cumberland, from the foot of Scafell, the highest mountain in England.

If the engine fails to take the points and runs off the lines, passengers help the driver and guard lift it bodily back to its proper place! This novel railway carries large quantities of goods as well as passengers, reducing the cost of road transport in a very difficult country by one-half.

Discouragement is the worst misfortune that can befall a man. It is the death of his strength.

### Personal Rights

Dr. J. G. Shearer, Secretary Social Service Council of Canada.

A young man, intelligent and prosopus-looking, sitting opposite at dining car table, said to the writer, "I like a glass of beer at luncheon or dinner and if I want it I'm going to have it, wouldn't you?"

"Would you feel justified in joining a bootlegger in a violation of the law in order to get it?"

"Yes, I would." A gentleman of high standing in a certain church said recently that he sympathized with the poor bootlegger and considered it outrageous to put any man in gaol for violation of a protection law.

Of course it is legitimate for any citizen to advocate and work for the repeal of any law of which he personally disapproves. Is it lawful for him to wink at or encourage the violation of such a law? If he does, does he not become an abettor of law-breaking? Is he any better than the law-breaker himself?

That breezy Western daily, the Saskatoon Star, recently numbered such violators and abettors of the violation of the liquor laws among "Parlars, prostitutes, etc., as outlaws and outcasts!" Was not the Star justified? Is not the deliberate law-breaker a rebel, and in practice, if not in theory, an anarchist?

But what is the psychology standing back of such law-breaking on the part of otherwise respectable people, as some of them are? It is a mistaken idea about personal rights. They think

a man has a divine right to do as he pleases and that the majority have no right to limit this, his supposed liberty.

What about these personal rights? Have we as individuals many, if any rights that are "divine" or "inalienable"? Are not the great majority of personal rights simply social privileges—OK'd by society? And if bestowed by society then are they not liable rightly at any time to be limited or removed by society? Take the so-called constitutional rights guaranteed to Americans in terms of the Declaration of Independence, viz.: "to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Are these rights "inalienable"? They were suddenly removed for millions during the war, and may be so again for a similar reason. Society gave. Society can take away. But even in peace and in normal times the individual cannot use either life or liberty as he pleases nor pursue happiness any old way he chooses. He must respect his neighbor's rights. He must respect, moreover, the will of society expressed in law. Law is essential to personal liberty, and liberty is necessarily limited by every law. That is the price the individual pays for the privilege of living in a state of civilization. The more advanced the civilization, the more limited is personal liberty.

Health laws, laws of sanitation, Sunday laws, laws for the protection of life and property, and all civil rights involve invasions of the sphere the

sacred sphere of personal liberty and individual rights. And all these limitations of liberty are imposed in order to effect the conservation of liberty. The Sunday law is built on the principle that liberty of rest for each demands the law of rest for all. One's own property or life is only safe because all men's lives and property are protected by law. Law is always justified if it is for the general good, no matter what limitations of personal liberty or trampling on personal opinions or desires may be involved.

Can any man who does not recognize this fact and will not respect laws whether they are pleasing to him or not be rightly regarded as a good citizen? Can democracy be safe on any other basis?

That breezy Western daily, the Sas-

katoon Star, recently numbered such

violators and abettors of the violation

of the liquor laws among "Parlars,

prostitutes, etc., as outlaws and out-

casts!" Was not the Star justified?

Is not the deliberate law-breaker a

rebel, and in practice, if not in theory,

an anarchist?

But what is the psychology stand-

ing back of such law-breaking on the

part of otherwise respectable people,

as some of them are? It is a mistaken

idea about personal rights. They think

a man has a divine right to do as he

pleases and that the majority have no

right to limit this, his supposed

liberty.

What about these personal rights?

Have we as individuals many, if any

rights that are "divine" or "inalienable"?

Are not the great majority of per-

sonal rights simply social privileges—OK'd

by society? And if bestowed by society

then are they not liable rightly at

any time to be limited or removed by

society? Take the so-called consti-

tutional rights guaranteed to Ameri-

cans in terms of the Declaration of Inde-

pendence, viz.: "to life, liberty and

the pursuit of happiness." Are these

rights "inalienable"? They were sud-

denly removed for millions during the

war, and may be so again for a simi-

lar reason. Society gave. Society can

take away. But even in peace and in

normal times the individual cannot use

either life or liberty as he pleases nor

pursue happiness any old way he

chooses. He must respect his neigh-

bor's rights. He must respect, more-

over, the will of society expressed in

law. Law is essential to personal libe-

rty, and liberty is necessarily limited

by every law. That is the price the

individual pays for the privilege of liv-

ing in a state of civilization. The

more advanced the civilization, the

more limited is personal liberty.

Can any man who does not recog-

nize this fact and will not respect laws

whether they are pleasing to him or

not be rightly regarded as a good citi-

zen? Can democracy be safe on any

other basis?

That breezy Western daily, the Sas-

katoon Star, recently numbered such

violators and abettors of the violation

of the liquor laws among "Parlars,

prostitutes, etc., as outlaws and out-

casts!" Was not the Star justified?

Is not the deliberate law-breaker a

rebel, and in practice, if not in theory,

an anarchist?

But what is the psychology stand-

ing back of such law-breaking on the

part of otherwise respectable people,

as some of them are? It is a mistaken

idea about personal rights. They think

a man has a divine right to do as he

pleases and that the majority have no

right to limit this, his supposed

liberty.

What about these personal rights?

Have we as individuals many, if any

rights that are "divine" or "inalienable"?

Are not the great majority of per-

sonal rights simply social privileges—OK'd

by society? And if bestowed by society

then are they not liable rightly at

any time to be limited or removed by

society? Take the so-called consti-

tutional rights guaranteed to Ameri-

cans in terms of the Declaration of Inde-

pendence, viz.: "to life, liberty and

the pursuit of happiness." Are these

rights "inalienable"? They were sud-

denly removed for millions during the

war, and may be so again for a simi-

lar reason. Society gave. Society can

take away. But even in peace and in

normal times the individual cannot use

either life or liberty as he pleases nor

pursue happiness any old way he

chooses. He must respect his neigh-

bor's rights. He must respect, more-

over, the will of society expressed in

law. Law is essential to personal libe-

rty, and liberty is necessarily limited

by every law. That is the price the

individual pays for the privilege of liv-

ing in a state of civilization. The

more advanced the civilization, the

more limited is personal liberty.

Can any man who does not recog-

nize this fact and will not respect laws

whether they are pleasing to him or

not be rightly regarded as a good citi-

zen? Can democracy be safe on any

other basis?

That breezy Western daily, the Sas-

katoon Star, recently numbered such

violators and abettors of the violation

of the liquor laws among "Parlars,

prostitutes, etc., as outlaws and out-

casts!" Was not the Star justified?

Is not the deliberate law-breaker a

rebel, and in practice, if not in theory,

an anarchist?

But what is the psychology stand-

ing back of such law-breaking on the

part of otherwise respectable people,

as some of them are? It is a mistaken

idea about personal rights. They think

a man has a divine right to do as he

pleases and that the majority have no

right to limit this, his supposed

liberty.

What about these personal rights?

Have we as individuals many,