

names capable of personal application. as : Chilian, Mexican, Bolivian, Peruvian, etc., etc. (3) And they all call us *Americanos*. (4)

"Let us retain our name of AMERICAN, pure and simple, but God forbid that we should hyphenate it with *Anglo*. There is nothing English about us but our language (5) and even that is readily distinguished from the English of Albion.

"Rome grew in the early days as we did ; adventurers of all nations brought together, created the Roman character. The English, German, French and Spanish will produce the future American of the United States, who will speak English with a peculiar accent, and who, I believe, will continue to call himself *American*, until some other nation can show a better title to the name."

"(1) The terms 'America' and 'Americans' were not employed in 1776 as distinctive names of the English colonies and people on these shores. In the Declaration of Independence, the term 'these colonies' was used three times, 'these states' three times, and 'province' once. The style 'United States of America' also first appeared in that document ; but our rebellious grandfathers neither then nor at any subsequent time claimed for themselves the name of Americans.

"(2) They set themselves up as 'independent states,' named Virginia, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, etc. ; but not as one nation having a distinctive geographical or political name. On the contrary, in the Articles of Confederation they took care to deny any claim of such a thing by formally asserting that 'each state retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence.'

"(3) As the English colonies had, also.

"(4) They commonly called us *Norte-Americanos*, or *Anglo-Americanos*, to distinguish us from the other sorts of *Americanos*. They also distinguished us as *Sajones* (Saxons) but oftener as *Yankees*.

"(5) The principal things English 'about us' and of us, are : 1. Our folk-character. 2. Our world-family history and traditions. 3. Our national heritage, the basis of our political and juridical systems. 4. Our language. 5. Our literature, extending from Chaucer and Shakespeare to Bryant, Longfellow and the rest."

The point I would wish to make in connection with this letter is, that while thanking God he is not even as "these Englishmen" (*vide* Henry V., Shakespeare), he, the writer, admits that the language, folk-character, history and traditions, national heritage, political and juridical systems, and literature of the United States, all are English. I leave it to some of your readers to reconcile so great a paradox. The italics are mine. G. KNOX.

"CRONACA NERA."

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—The news that a clerical paper, called the *Cronaca Nera* (the Black Chronicle), has been started in Rome with a daily circulation of 38,000 is not a little startling. It is avowedly the champion of the lower against the higher clergy, and its object is without offending religious sentiment to give battle to the potentates of the higher ranks of the priesthood, unmasking their vices and crimes with candour and without bitterness.

The object, we are assured, is to get at the ear of the Pope, who is kept in ignorance of the grievances of the clergy and the ill-doings of their superiors.

The *Cronaca Nera* has naturally caused much excitement, particularly among the higher clergy, and their organ, the *Osservatore Romano*, is furious and even abusive. The Holy Father himself has been appealed to to put a stop to the plain-spoken journal that has dared to speak evil of dignities, but the Pope has refused on the ground that if abuses exist, it is but right that they should be exposed.

On the question of ecclesiastical morality the *Cronaca* is very outspoken, and boldly asserts that the only cure for a monstrous evil is the abolition of clerical celibacy. The attacks which it makes upon the cardinals and other ecclesiastics in high positions are not general and vague, but painfully specific as to names and details.

The opposition organ speaks of the paper as set going by men who are Protestants at heart, yet the *Osservatore Romano* calls them, as if in bitter scorn, Jesuits. The non-clerical papers in Italy are watching the duel with much interest, but quite calmly.

That such a quarrel should be taking place at Rome, and that the Pope himself should refuse to do more than give fair play to the opposite sides, is a fact worthy of consideration. The rabid anti-Romanists who gloat over the misdeeds of the scarlet lady of the seven hills will be to the front with their sapient "I told you so," but a calmer and better element in Protestant Christendom will regard it as a healthy sign of the times, and one freighted with good, not only for the correcting of abuses within the Roman pale, but also for the moral health of the world.

D. KINMOUNT ROY.

MISDIRECTED EULOGY.

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—THE WEEK of January 17th contains a paragraph from the *Spectator* commenting on a disclosure of some literary interest, lately made by the *Times*. A contributor to the great English journal, under the *nom de plume* of "An Englishman," wrote a series of letters, the first of which appeared December 20, 1851, which attracted much attention because of their extraordinary ability. They hurled severe invectives against Napoleon III., very much in the style of the celebrated "Junius." Good critics pronounced the letters superior to those of that historic but unknown writer. They were ascribed to various distinguished statesmen, but, like "Junius," their author remained *incog*. It appears that they were originally published by the *Times* in ignorance of the writer's name, but it was subsequently discovered that they were penned by Mr. H. J. Wolfenden Johnstone, a surgeon, who had lived in France from 1848 to 1850. He died recently at Ramsgate, aged eighty-one. The *Spectator* pronounces the following eulogy on this man :—"He appears to have

remained silent ever after, and it is pleasant to think that in our day of self-advertisement a man could live from middle life to old age in possession of so powerful a weapon as Mr. Johnstone wielded, yet only use it when moved out of himself by moral indignation. There was not a journal in England which would not have been proud of letters from him, and he might have destroyed ministries, but, in an age of gabble, he remained silent."

Now is this eulogy well or ill-bestowed? I venture to think that it is wholly undeserved, and that the "silence" so highly commended should rather be visited with censure. "*De mortuis nil nisi bonum*" is a good maxim sometimes, but it is inapplicable to such a case. This man possessed powers of a high order, which might have been employed for the public good. Had he a right to let them lie dormant? Does not capacity for usefulness carry with it responsibility? Is not this a conspicuous example of what our Lord condemns in the parable of the talents recorded in Matt. xxv., verse 26? Nay, is it not a worse case than is described in that parable? This man had not one talent merely, but ten talents, which he "went and hid in the earth." Christ administers a tenfold rebuke to such an one, as a "wicked and slothful servant," and where that august authority censures, we may hardly venture to commend.

This may be an age of "self-advertisement" and "gabble," as the *Spectator* alleges, but it does not follow that "silence is golden" on that account. Indeed, I venture to doubt the invariable truth of the proverb, a part of which I have just quoted. That there are times when "silence" is "golden," is perfectly true, but it is just as true that it is often culpable. There is a time to be silent, and there is also a time to speak. That silent "Englishman" lived during a period of great political activity, when burning questions were agitating the public mind, and the most beneficent reforms invited advocacy. That pen more mighty than the sword, which assailed the third Napoleon with sharp invective, and "might have destroyed Ministries," was capable of doing a vast amount of public service in battling for the right, and in promoting the reign of the "true, the beautiful and the good." Surely the world sustained serious loss by the wrapping of these talents in a napkin, and their burial in the earth. Besides, if this man did wisely and well, others ought to imitate his example. The argument proves too much, for it would silence every potent pen, squelch every mighty organ of public opinion, and (*horribile dictu!*) annihilate THE WEEK ; a journal, part of whose mission is, avowedly, to "rear the tender thought, teach the young idea how to shoot," and develop in "this Canada of ours," a literature worthy of us :

Full many a gem of purest ray serene,
The dark unfathomed caves of ocean bear ;
And many a flower is born to blush unseen,
And waste its sweetness on the desert air.

It is a patriotic task to bring these "gems" out of their hiding places, and prevent the waste of "sweetness and light" fitted to bless the land and age we live in.

Side by side with the column of THE WEEK which contains the *Spectator's* paragraph, there are some sentences in an article from the brilliant pen of Mr. N. F. Davin, which are so *apropos* to this critique that I cannot forbear quoting them. "There is a close relation between literary genius and the passion for the welfare of the people—between the desire to serve humanity, and literary studies. I cannot recall an instance of a man of genuine powers of thought and true talent of expression who, from the influence of warping profession and pursuit, was not against oppression, and for the people. No doubt one of the reasons why the fame of literary men—of course, I speak of the great ones—is more enduring than that of other great men, is because they are champions of the people, especially of the poor and oppressed, and leave evidences of this in living thoughts and words which continue their warfare after they have been resolved into the elements." The *Spectator* eulogizes one who might have taken a prominent part in such glorious work, but declined the honour and usefulness of the task. It praises him for not doing what he could. There is surely a far different eulogy more worthy to be coveted. It is that pronounced by unerring lips on one of old, and emblazoned in eternal marble : "She hath done what she could!"

WARFLECK.

WHAT IS TITHE IN QUEBEC?

To the Editor of THE WEEK :

SIR,—Will you do me the favour of allowing me to correct your correspondent, Mr. Hemming, as to what constitutes "Tithe" in the Province of Quebec?

To confound the impost with the Jewish tithe is quite erroneous in every respect. The Quebec tithe amounts only to one twenty-sixth of the grain crop, it is not levied to any extent upon any other products of agriculture ; nor does it to any degree affect those who live in towns ; it is exclusively a charge upon the farmer who grows grain. When we consider that hay, potatoes and other fruits of the earth constitute by far the larger portion of the crops in Quebec, the one twenty-sixth part of the grain grown is not so very burdensome an impost as your contributor, and the public of Ontario, imagine tithe to be in that province.

As to the justice, or policy of any such tithe I am not now concerned, but I submit that in this, as indeed in all, discussions it is a mere beating the air unless the facts are stated with exactitude. Thanking you for the courtesy of this being inserted. Yours truly,

Toronto, January 28, 1890.

JOHN HAGUE.

THE DANGERS OF ELECTRIC LIGHTING.

ELECTRICITY is dangerous in three ways. When in great quantity but of small tensity, it destroys by fusion conductors of insufficient capacity and semi-conductors by disruption or heating, or both, and has the tendency to leave the road laid down for it and cut out a new path for itself. Thirdly, whenever electricity enters or leaves an electric conductor, it, by its mere presence in one, evokes a momentary current of electricity in neighbouring conductors : that is termed induction. Voltaic electricity—the current produced between a zinc and a copper plate sunk in an oxidizing liquid—is electricity of low tension ; if the plates are large and the liquid active, the quantity will be great. Two plates coiled in a tank as big round as the dome of St. Paul's would produce electricity sufficient in quantity to light a great part of the city, to melt a bar of iron like a tallow candle ; its current, turned into a system of conductors of insufficient size, would carry fire and destruction wherever it went. Nevertheless, the intensity would be scarcely more than that of a cell made up of a brass thimble and a bit of zinc—viz., about one "volt," and would be unfelt by the human body. The equivalent of one hundred such cells, in dynamo-electric machines, is proposed for a London district. When voltaic cells are connected in sequence—i.e., so that the current passes through all in succession, the intensity is multiplied, the quantity remaining constant.

The late Dr. De la Rue, with a battery of 11,000 cells, obtained electricity of sufficient intensity at the terminals to leap across a space in the air of nearly three quarters of an inch. The shock from this battery would have caused instant death, and extraordinary precautions were taken to avoid chance contact with any part of it or its connections. Dynamo machines of nearly equal potency are being constructed. The apparatus so often seen in the streets, whereby a moderate amount of electric tetanus can be experienced for a penny, is an example of electric induction. The current of a few cells is made to circulate round a bobbin or reel of insulated wires, on its way back having to pass through a little magnetic arrangement which makes and breaks the circuit many times in a second. Outside this primary coil of wires, but not in contact with it, is wound a large coil of much finer wire, the two extremities of which are connected to brass handles to be grasped by the experimenter. There is no connection between the first and second coil. Every time the low-tension current enters or leaves the primary or inner coil a current of higher "potential" passes through the secondary or outer coil ; thus a "potential" of two or three volts is made to induce a potential (ten or fifteen volts in the case quoted) dependent on the relative length and fineness of the two separate coils. Induction coils have been made of great capacity. Dr. Spottiswoode constructed one which when worked with a few cells producing an imperceptible shock induced in the secondary coil electricity of tension sufficient to flash across four or five feet of air, and pierce glass a quarter of an inch thick.

In electric lighting induction coils of converse construction are employed, the primary coil being of fine wire, and the secondary or induction coil of the thicker wire. These coils convert high-tension into low-tension electricity, and under the name of "converters" are already in use in several electric lighting systems. Electricity for lighting and other purposes is now universally produced by means of dynamo machines founded on Faraday's discovery of magneto-electricity. Momentary currents in alternate directions are induced in coils of wire passing the poles of powerful magnets, by rotating these coils between the poles. In some machines these induced currents are immediately carried off to do the required work ; these are termed alternating-current machines. They are commonly worked at an electric tension of 1,000 volts, enabling a large number of arc or other lamps to be worked in series—or the current passes into a "converter" as above described, and is thus reduced to a tension of 100 volts. Generally, however, the alternating current is by an ingenious arrangement twisted round upon itself in the machine, so that when the separate impulses leave it they are all in the same direction. These machines are termed continuous current machines. They, like the alternating-current machines, can be made of any desired "potential" or electric pressure.

The physiological effects of alternating currents of electricity are very different from those of continuous currents. In the former case 10 to 15 volts are as much as can be borne for any length of time, whereas in the latter as much as 100 volts can be endured, though even here much depends on the quantity. Westinghouse says, "With even less than 100 volts it is painful beyond endurance to grasp firmly with the hands the brushes or any bright brass work of a large dynamo or to grasp any metal connected with the wires." A 220 volt continuous current will burn the human body if the flesh is in contact with the conductors, that is if the skin is broken. A current of 90 volts will burn meat, boil water, melt cast iron. In Mr. Edison's experiments a continuous current of 400 volts killed a dog in 40 seconds ; 304 volts did not kill in 30 seconds. A current of 1,000 volts killed a large strong dog instantly. The alternating current he found to be much more hurtful ; 120 volts killed, and 100 volts may cause death ; 200 certainly will. The hands are unable to relinquish the grasp of a conductor carrying an alternating current of more than about 20 volts ; this adds materially to the danger of this system. Death by electricity is not always instantaneous. A person fixed to the conductors by an alternating current might live