

Our Contributors.

CONCERNING OLD SHOE POLITICIANS.

BY KNOXONIAN.

The statesmen and politicians of Canada are divided into four parties—Conservatives, Liberals, McCarthyites and Patrons. The Conservatives of Quebec are, we believe, sub-divided by an ecclesiastical line, on one side of which are the Ultramontanes and on the other men who, though conservative in politics, are liberal in their views on church questions. The Ultramontanes, if we understand the matter right, are very high church in their views. They believe in the absolute supremacy of the Pope in church and state, and in a number of other doctrines that D'Alton McCarthy has no great respect for. They used to be a powerful body in the Province of Quebec and when they sat on a Conservative candidate who held liberal views on church matters, he had hard work to save his deposit. It is said that they defeated Sir George Cartier in Montreal in 1872, and that they can, with the aid of the Hierarchy, defeat any man that they want to defeat. We shall soon see. Sir Charles Tupper's Quebec colleagues in the new government are Catholics of the Ultramontane type, and if they put the out-going ministers and the Laurier party behind the light house, we may conclude that they are just as powerful in Quebec as they ever were.

There is another class of politicians that we do not hear so much about. We refer to the old shoe variety. These are men that spent their time, money and strength in working for the party, and when they had spent all were cast out in much the same way as we throw an old shoe into the back yard in these house-cleaning times. They stand in about the same relation to the party as the old overshoes of last winter stand to a man's Sunday suit. On a very muddy day you might go into the yard, hunt up the old shoes and wear them a short time to save something better. In the heat of an election contest an old shoe politician might be noticed a little to get his vote, but on a fine day in politics, when the spoils are being divided, the party is pretty sure to leave him in the yard.

The old shoe politician is described by several names more or less suggestive. The most modern and perhaps least offensive name is "back number." Sometimes the unfortunate man is described as "played out." Occasionally he is pleasantly alluded to as an "old fogey." People who don't want to use slangy terms, put on an expression of sadness strongly spiced with hypocrisy and say, "his usefulness is gone." The facts simply are that the man destroyed his business, wasted his time, spent his money and perhaps injured his reputation working for the party, and now the party throw him over board with less regret than you throw your last winter's over shoes into the backyard.

There is no kind of a combination on this earth so ungrateful as a political party. Most of the members, individually considered, are well enough, but the party as a party will sacrifice anybody that party exigencies seem to point out for slaughter. Exceptional cases might of course be named, but the exceptions do nothing more than accentuate the rule. Past services, past loyalty, past suffering, as a rule, all go for nothing if a new man seems to be able to bring more grist to the party mill than an old one. Over all this country may be found men who wrecked their business working for the party, and who are now almost if not altogether in want. They are of no more use to the party, and they must work their way towards the cemetery as best they can.

Perhaps such things are unavoidable under free institutions. Politicians, like all other men, use the agencies that seem to them most likely to accomplish their present purposes. The use of these agencies may

necessarily involve what seems to be and often is the blackest kind of ingratitude. All the same, it is sad to see a good business wrecked and a decent family in want, just because the head of the household gave too much of his time, money and labor to politics. About one man in a hundred may better his position by taking an active and absorbing interest in politics. The ninety-nine suffer sooner or later.

A nice question would be whether the Conservatives or Liberals display the most ingratitude to their wrecked friends. On the whole we should be inclined to give the black ribbon to the Grifts, though we have known Tory politicians and Tory journals to receive treatment from the machine that might fairly be described as brutal. If the Patrons live long enough as a party, they will in all probability out-rank both the old parties in the matter of ingratitude.

The moral seems to be that no man should neglect his business and imperil the bread and butter of his family for the sake of party politics. In a self-governed country every citizen should take an interest in the affairs of the country, at least to the extent of polling his vote. A few must manage election affairs and instruct their fellow citizens from the platform, but all that can be done without wrecking the business of anybody. The man who "gives up everything until the election is over," may by some be considered a good party man. By a few he may be considered a patriot. As a matter of fact, if he is not very careful he will soon be regarded by all as an old shoe politician.

LONELINESS.

BY L. C. C.

I suppose we have all been lonely at some time or other; we have all felt forsaken, deserted and "left out," and all longed for human sympathy and love. It is only natural and human. Our Saviour, we know, often felt this loneliness during the years of His ministry. We have evidence of it in the touching words "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head." No home! How lonely! Yet it is not always they who have no real home who are lonely. Some of us who live in boarding-houses, think as we pass large brightly-lighted houses, and catch glimpses of happy families inside, "Oh if we too were only such as they!" little realizing that some member of that family is perhaps more forsaken than we are in a house full of strangers. I have in my personal experience known more than one person who owned that they lived a lonely life in the midst of a large family, because of the utter lack of sympathy between them and their brothers and sisters. Their pursuits are different, their likes and dislikes, they lead separate lives and consequently seek the love and sympathy that they need outside the home circle, if so be they find anyone to respond.

We all know the dreary feeling of walking along the crowded streets of a strange city, meeting face after face utterly unknown to us. I have myself felt far lonelier at a crowded gathering than sauntering alone through a deserted forest where the only voices are those of the birds, the only passers-by are the friendly chipmunks, while the wind in the pines plays symphonies far lovelier and grander than any performed by a world-renowned stringed orchestra. I would rather sit on some rocky headland and watch the waves dash up and up, where kind and gentle nature takes you by the hand and leads you nearer to nature's God, than make one at a fashionable reception where I am "out of touch" with the people and their ways. Solitude is not always loneliness. Yet it is against one's natural disposition to wish to be always alone. Some sensitive nervous people grow morbid and so called "blue," when left too much to themselves. They become self-centred, they magnify their feelings, brood over their ailments and imagine things, till

everything about them becomes distorted and they live in an unhealthy atmosphere created by themselves. When you feel yourself sinking into this undesirable state, be up and doing, my friend, and throw off the unnatural cloud which is settling upon you. After all, are not some forms of loneliness only selfishness? A great deal is said, sung and written about the loneliness of "old maids." Are not the "old maids" often to blame for this themselves? Need one be lonely simply because God in His great wisdom sees that it is best for some women to lead single lives? Surely not. Each one of us has her own little circle to keep pure, to beautify and brighten. Each of us can say a helpful word, do some little act, pray daily for those we love or in some way raise the moral tone of our atmosphere. Can we not have

"A heart at leisure from itself,
To soothe and sympathize?"

"Ah!" you say, "my case is not like that of others, my trials are peculiar, you must not judge for me, I am different. I cannot help my loneliness."

Can you not? We are not so unlike each other after all. Our cases are not so peculiar as we think, as we would find, if we only took the trouble to look into the hearts of others and listen to their experiences. Let us make the spot in this big world that we call home, so full of peace, rest and love, that our friends, both men and women, will come to us when they are sad and weary, and perhaps God will give us the privilege of helping them along the rough road which leads to their own "Long Home." Women do not need to be wives and mothers to make homes. Let us go to someone less favored than ourselves and see if we cannot sink self in trying to make an other's lot in life less dreary.

"Seldom can the heart be lonely.
If it seek a lonelier still,
Self-forgetting, seeking only,
Emptier cups of love to fill."

We all stand alone in the world to a certain extent. It is impossible for even our dearest earthly friends to understand the very innermost feelings of our hearts, and how helpless we feel when they fail to grasp what we are trying to explain. Certain sorrows, certain pains, certain disappointments and certain perplexities must be met, fought down, and borne without earthly aid. We can sympathize with a bereaved one and the sympathy is indeed sweet, but the great All-Father alone can enter into that heart and say, "My child, I know it all." Need we be lonely for one moment if we stop to realize the constant companionship of the Divine Friend who never leaves us night or day?

E'en as a friend with friend,
Cheered to the journey's end,
Walking with Thee.

MOSLEMS AND CHRISTIANS.

BY HISTORICUS.

The *Interior*, a periodical of Chicago, Ill., has said during the first half of this month, when speaking of the true religion: "Mohammedanism, both in theory and practice, is earthly, sensual and devilish. It fills all the specifications of devil-worship. The Moslems are Monotheists—they worship one god, but that god is not God, it is the devil."

Of course these remarks are meant chiefly for the Turks, whom I would be the last to defend in their present or past evil actions. Yet all Moslems are not Turks, nor are all Turks "devilish"; and certainly some Moslems have been superior not only to the Turks, but even to many nominal Christians. As the *Interior*, which is a religious and evangelical paper, has laid particular stress on the practical side of religion, I will not now compare the Koran with the Old and New Testament more than to say that the titles of the Moslem's god in the former include such names as the following:—"Merciful, Compassionate, Forgiver, Acceptor of Repentance, Pardoner, and Patient," which certainly are a very fair reflection at least of the Mosaic doctrine.

Let us then compare the conduct of Mohammedans with Christians in the middle ages. In Chambers' Encyclopædia under the word "Crusades," we read: "When Palestine was conquered by the Arabs [Saracens] in the seventh century, that fierce but generous people respected the religious spirit of the pilgrims, and allowed them to build a church and hospital in Jerusalem." So much cannot be said of the nominally Christian invaders of Syria and Palestine at the end of the eleventh century, for Chambers adds: "As on the occasion of all the triumphs of these first Crusaders, a horrible massacre ensued," on their capture of Jerusalem; and in the kingdom founded by these Westerners the toleration of Islam was a crime.

Again we read in Charlotte Yonge's "History of Christians and Moors in Spain," of 711 and the following years: "These first Saracen conquerors were the most merciful invaders that the world had yet seen, and great as was the terror of their name, they were found to be kindly and generous masters. The Christians were left unmolested in their houses, convents and churches, on the payment of a tribute; they were only forbidden to ring church bells, have religious processions or raise new churches without special permission. They were allowed their own laws and judges. These conditions had been made at Jerusalem, Alexandria and everywhere else, and were readily accepted. There was no persecution of the inhabitants as Christians, and they retained their clergy and the old liturgy, called Mozarabic."

Contrast the above with the conduct of the English Government and Church in Ireland as described in Reid's Presbyterian Church, vol. 2, p. 511, as follows: "No Presbyterian could henceforth [after March, 1704] hold any office in any department of the army or navy, nor in the customs, excise or post office, nor in or about any of the courts of law, nor in the magistracy of the kingdom, without conforming to the Established Church. They were also excluded by this bill (the Test Act) from all municipal offices in the corporate towns in Ireland." This Act, which was sanctioned by the English (not yet British) Parliament, was not repealed till March, 1780, about five years after the revolt of the North American Colonies. Moreover Sir E. Southwell writes from London of the arguments used in the Commons when in Committee on the bill, saying it had been urged "that it was an ill requital to the (evangelical) dissenters who had so signalized themselves in the defence of Derry and the Northern parts in the late revolution in that kingdom." It is also well known that before 1719 these Presbyterians had no legal toleration for their public worship, that the marriages performed by their clergy were not all legalized till 1844, and that, except in a few cases, till 1869 the use of bells was prohibited at their places of worship.

If space permitted I might contrast the Moorish with the Castilian rule in Spain and Portugal, the Arab conquest of Egypt with the Spanish conquest of Peru, in each case to the advantage of the former; but I will content myself with citing only one example, in which Mohammedan rule contrasts so unfavorably with a Christian. It is the case of Solymán, the magnificent, Sultan of the Ottoman Turks, 1520-1566, contrasted with Louis XIV., the "most Christian" king of France and Navarre, 1643-1715. Johnson's "Universal Cyclopædia" says of Solymán: "He had a real love of justice, never broke his word, was honest in all his dealings, and worked with zeal, and not without success, for the introduction of justice and honesty in the Turkish administration. He was industrious and energetic, and the goal of his gigantic exertions was by no means the gratification of his personal ambition." The same writer says of Louis in regard to his wars: "They are blamable on account of the arrogance and entire disregard of international rights with which they were commenced, and the almost unexampled barbarity with which they were conducted."