

THE PRESIDENTIAL CONTEST.

Both the great political parties of the United States have now their respective candidates in the field, and for the next four months little but politics will engage the attention of our neighbors. Hot and bitter, no doubt, the strife will be, and every succeeding quadrennial contest impresses upon Canadians the blessing they enjoy of freedom from the like turmoil.

The unfortunate antipathy to everything British, and to Canada, unless she elect to lay herself at the feet of a relation whom she respects and admires, but whose household methods are not such as to lead her to desire to become a member of her family and establishment, together with the ostentatious parade of the insolent Monroe doctrine, which characterize the Republican party, naturally incline Canadians to desire the success of Mr. Cleveland, who, they think, deserves well of his own country, and is certainly respected by ours.

But whatever Canada may hope, it is certain that Mr. Cleveland has no easy road to travel. We, who think we have had more to concede than the States, certainly do not look upon Mr. Cleveland's action in the Fishery Treaty as in the least degree derogatory to the dignity of the Republic. But many—for election purposes, we might, we suppose, say all—Republicans choose to think otherwise, or, at all events, will proclaim loudly enough that they do. Mr. Cleveland is also charged with humiliating his country by having offered to Italy, Austria, and Chili, as Ambassadors, men so unacceptable to those powers that they met with prompt rejection.

Mr. Cleveland certainly went in by a narrow majority in 1884 with "Civil Service Reform" conspicuously emblazoned on his banners. This pledge the Republicans assert that he has repeatedly and deliberately violated. Sober and practical men of the world are agreed in thinking that Mr. Cleveland has done the best that an honest and capable Statesman can do against tremendous odds—the natural enmity of the Republicans (whose strong point, indeed, seems to be an unlimited capacity for hating) and the venom of men of his own party, bereft of the spoils they counted on. Against these inimical forces Mr. Cleveland has made a brave fight, but he has now added to his foes every man who is interested in the Protective Policy, which is the platform adopted by the Republican Convention.

"The Republican Senate alone," says an esteemed contributor of our own, "has prevented Mr. Cleveland from taking steps that would be ruinous to the nation."

This is partisan hyperbole. Fancy the Great Republic being "ruined" by the action of any one man! To ourselves it is needless to say that the action of the Republican Senate is very far from commending itself. We dislike protection, but self-defense have been compelled to adopt it, that is if we are to have manufactories of our own. The States have no need for it. Their wealth as well as their energy place them above the requirement. But all these cries against Mr. Cleveland are well considered to catch the popular vote, and they are, many of them, such as "stick," right or wrong.

Then the Republicans have undoubtedly nominated a strong and a "clean" man. General Harrison derives strength from the position of the State from which he has been chosen; his ability is good, and his "war-record," no small matter, more than good. His family tree is historical both in England and afterwards through a long ancestry in the Provinces and the States. Though the descendant of a Regicide (which, in the case of Charles 1st, is no greater blot on his escutcheon than attaches to a blunder), and thoroughly American, we are as yet unaware that he has given any demonstrations of the sinister phase of patriotism which we connect with the idea of Mr. Blaine.

Every detail of General Harrison's position is one which will tell on the election, and we doubt if a better choice could have been made. Against these strong points, there are in Mr. Cleveland's favor his general honor, integrity, capability, and straightforwardness, and the probability that he is stronger in power in 1888, than he was seeking office in 1884.

There are elements of great strength on both sides, and the issue is at present very doubtful.

WHAT IS LUNCHEON?

This question, though it appears simple, cannot be satisfactorily solved without a considerable amount of difficulty. Some wise word-masters opine that it owes its origin to "nuncheon," the lump of bread and cheese which Hudibras kept in the basket hilt of his rapier, when "forth he rode a-colonelling," and that it is further derived from the two words "noon" and "shun," meaning the laborer's slight repast to which he withdrew when he wished to shun the heats of noon. It must be owned that this plausible etymological theory is materially helped by the circumstance that the spell of rest which is taken after dinner is termed in Lancashire the "noon-scape," and in Norfolk the "noon miss." Again, it is held that "lunch" is only another form of "lump," as "hunch" is of "hump," and "bunch" of "bump," and that it means a bit—what is termed by the Scotch a "piece"—eaten at odd times between meals. These latter grammarians say that "nuncheon" is merely a longer form of "lunch." In support of their belief they quote the poet Gay, where he says, "I sliced the luncheon from the barley loaf." The late Lord Beaconsfield, as we all know, elevated "to luncheon" to the rank of a verb, and in one of his novels speaks of "ladies luncheoning on Perigord pie." However, grammatical authorities appear to be tolerably unanimous as to "lunch" or "nuncheon" being food taken at any time except at a regular meal. But, this point being settled, the gastronomic difficulty begins. Custom, which is a weightier authority on the use of words than all the dictionary-makers put together, has long since laid down the law that an irregular meal shall be called a "snack," and that lunch should be considered as a strictly normal repast, there being only a few variations as to the hours at which it should be enjoyed. These varia-

tions depend very much upon the classes of society who take luncheon. Business men usually lunch at about 1 p.m., while in "polite society" the time is nearer 2 o'clock. In Clubland the "lunch hour" is extended to 4 p.m., as no table money is charged to a member till that hour is passed.

The subject expands, and it would be quite easy in following it up to overstep the space allotted to us by going into a discussion of the quality and the character of the entertainment itself. "A sandwich and a glass of ale" would seem to be the simplest and least expensive phase of—to use the Biblical phrase—"luncheoning," but there are luncheons hot and luncheons cold, oyster luncheons, and champagne luncheons, and other varieties without number that it would be tedious to detail.

The shorter form of the word "lunch" has long been out of favor in the fashionable world, probably because the longer form has a more euphonious sound and appearance. The disfavor may, however, have arisen from the directness of the Welsh word, from which it is derived, "llwnc," or "llwng," a gulp or swallowing, also the gullet, whence come "llynou," "llyngon," to swallow. Lunch would perhaps be a more convenient utterance on account of its brevity, but fashion will none of it, and we must needs do as she dictates till it pleases her to change her proverbially fickle mind, or whatever perception does duty for a mind with her.

THE BOYCOTT.

Bradstreet (23rd June) in an article entitled "Boycotting and Intimidation before the Law," cites the decision of the Supreme Court of New York two years ago, and a recent one of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts, both to the effect that "platooning" the streets in front of a man's place of business, posting placards and distributing circulars, denouncing him, were acts of intimidation forbidden by the law. These decisions are rendered by Courts of high repute. The point made is that there may be intimidation in a legal sense, amounting to an unlawful interference with individual rights, without the presence of the elements of direct threats or the uses of force. It is well that this broad principle should be emphatically affirmed by competent legal authority. Such affirmation is quite necessary, notwithstanding a natural amazement that there should ever exist a shadow of doubt that such means constitute more deadly injury than would be likely to result from the use of force. There seems to be here some analogy to the law of libel. If a man's character is aspersed in the ordinary ways of that offence, he has his remedy. The Boycott embodies both libel and intimidation, as well as more serious results to a man's pocket. Not only is his character damaged, though it may be only to the worthless boycotters, but his business runs a good chance of being ruined, and all this when most frequently he has been well within his legal rights.

Boycotting is nearly as bad as murder, to which it often enough leads, and worse than arson, for its effects are farther reaching. The idea has become, in the brains of people of muddled heads and weak morality, mixed up in a confusion of ideas as to its being a political offence, and it owes its envelopment in this convenient fog to the Irish League, but it cannot be too often impressed upon all men that it is an unmitigated iniquity, striking at the roots of all law and order, and at all the rights of individuality, accursed alike of Heaven and all good men whose goodness is not of the character which leaves them without a backbone, and as such it should be, everywhere and always, reprobated with a righteous indignation by all but knaves, fools and ruffians.

THE STATE OF PARTIES IN ENGLAND.

Folks who are a little "too previous" have of late been inclined to fulminate the "burden" of Lord Salisbury's Government, on account of three or four *contretemps*, two of which might certainly have been evaded by a little more tact and foresight than was displayed, while the significance of three of them was much over-rated. It was a little too soon to cry "Woe to Ariel!"

The loss of Southampton on Sir Edmund Commerell's retirement from the representation of that constituency could scarcely have been guarded against, but it signified little more than the dislike of Prohibition to any affirmation of the principle of compensation to the liquor interests. By their abandonment of the licensing clauses of the Local Government Bill the Government wisely evaded a serious issue. The loss of the Ayr election had a much more serious import.

The nominal defeats on Mr. Morley's amendment to the Local Government Bill, and that on the frequent and costly reorganizations of the Admiralty departments, might have been avoided. They were not strictly party questions, and their worst significance lay in showing how much divergence of opinion in some matters there is between Conservatives and Liberal-Unionists, but it was unwise to court even the semblance of a defeat, which need not have occurred, had the former ascertained the temper of their allies beforehand.

But when it came to a serious question offered by a false tactical movement of Mr. Gladstone's, and promptly accepted by the Government, the Division (366 to 273) on Mr. Morley's motion of censure, showed at once the strength of the determination to continue at all risks, if possible, the exclusion of Mr. Gladstone from power.

Subsequently, the Channel Tunnel Bill was rejected by the House by 307 to 165. There would have been nothing particular about this, which turned largely on the adverse opinion of military experts, had not Mr. Gladstone so openly allied himself with Sir Edward Watkin, that the adverse decision may almost be taken as another snub to the venerable plunger. These circumstances will, if nothing new adverse to the Government occurs, do much to restore the confidence shaken by the Ayr election.