

of inquiry. There is, probably, no other country in the world, certainly not in Europe, in which the principle of liberty of speech is carried into practice to so great an extent as in England. Taking Germany, for instance, for the sake of comparison, we find that the struggle with Socialism is constantly assuming larger proportions. The Emperor, in some of his numerous speeches, has lately declared in substance that the issue is squarely joined between Socialism and the Army. Need we hesitate, taking observation and history, to say nothing of what we know of human nature, as our guides, that the struggle is growing, and is sure to grow, constantly fiercer, with a corresponding increase of those classes of crime which are the legitimate outgrowth of such a state of things. Why is not Socialism, which is undoubtedly strong in England, the same source of dread there as in Germany? Is not the difference due largely to the different manner in which its advocates are met? In England the safety valve of free speech is left, as far as possible, wide open. The law-making and peace-preserving forces of the State are directed mainly against deeds, not words. Theories, however wild and visionary, however destructive apparently of present methods of national and municipal government, are, for the most part, left severely alone. The consequence is that a great amount of the irritation inevitably aroused by what free-thinking citizens are sure to regard as unjust restriction and persecution, is escaped, and much ill-feeling, leading to violation of the law, is avoided. The moral is that it is safer and better to err on the side of too much, than on that of too little, personal liberty for the citizen.

A Dastardly
Crime.

The arrest of a number of persons in Montreal and elsewhere, on the charge of arson, is an event which may well attract a large share of public attention. The charges against individuals are not, of course, to be accepted as equivalent to proof of guilt. The accused are entitled to the full benefit of all doubts, until the question of their guilt or innocence shall have been decided by the proper courts. Without assuming, therefore, the guilt of any untried prisoner or suspect, we may say that the crime is rightly regarded in law as one of the most serious in the whole catalogue of offences against property and life. We are not ardent advocates of capital punishment, but it seems to us that if the taking-off of any class of criminals is necessary to the safety of the lives of citizens in a civilized state, Mr. Goldwin Smith's argument, in a city daily, to the effect that not even deliberate murder is more deserving of the extreme penalty than deliberate arson, is conclusive, particularly in the case of residences, or of buildings in the vicinity of inhabited residences. When these residences are in the heart of a crowded city, nothing can exceed in moral turpitude the act of setting one of them on fire. When we come to consider the matter in another light, it seems to us almost demonstrable that incendiarism must be far more common than most of us are accustomed to suspect. The ratio of fires, including those immediately suppressed by modern appliances, is surely far larger than it should be to satisfy any computation of averages or theory of accidents. If not, it must be that the precautions used to insure safety, the construction of buildings and in connection with the lighting and heating of them, and the use of fire for domestic and other industrial purposes, are far from what they ought to be. This whole matter is worthy of the closest investigation on all sides, and we hope that it is now about to receive it

A
Correction.

It seems that the paragraph in our last issue on "The Manitoba Question" was based on a misapprehension. The Globe explains that in the sentence we quoted, and on which we

commented, from its Winnipeg special, the reference was to Federal, not to Provincial legislation. We of course accept with thanks the correction, which renders our comment pointless. The glint of light was, in this case, evidently subjective, not objective.

Dr. Parkin and Upper Canada College.

THE banquet given by the National Club to Dr. Parkin, the new Principal of Upper Canada College, was in many ways remarkable, and may certainly be taken to argue well for the future of that great institution. The leading members of the Club present and the invited guests represented largely the intelligence and the wealth of the great City of Toronto, and the feeling prevalent was one of deep interest in the College, of resolute determination in every way to promote its interests, and of confident hope with regard to its future.

In the first place, there was throughout the whole proceedings, the clearest and strongest recognition of the importance of Upper Canada College as an institution, that, in a certain sense, might be said to be necessary for the completion of our educational system. Our public schools, our high schools, and our collegiate institutes are admitted, on all hands, to be first rate—about as good as could be expected or had under the circumstances. But there is an advantage in variety, and moreover there is the religious difficulty which weighs heavily on many minds. For those who believe in denominational education there are several very good schools of which Trinity College School at Port Hope is an excellent example. But there is certainly also room for a great school, like Upper Canada College, founded and conducted on religious and Christian principles without being denominational. We quite recognize the difficulty of such a system; but we believe that, where those in authority are in thorough sympathy with it, much good may result from it.

And this brings us to the principal subject of the evening—the Head Master of the College—in whose honour the banquet was given. Dr. Parkin certainly made a most favourable impression upon those who met him for the first time, while to others he was already favourably known. His speech, if, perhaps, a trifle lengthy, was yet admirable, altogether to the point, showing a most complete and thorough understanding of the whole subject, and an admirable temper in regard to the work which lies before him.

Dr. Parkin's expressions of anxiety, or at least of diffidence, in reference to the work before him, were quite natural and even creditable. It is not merely that he will have to carry a heavy burden; but he takes up the work under a certain amount of discouragement. For many reasons the school is not as prosperous as its friends would wish it to be; and commercial affairs have not yet recovered sufficiently to afford us the hope of immediate extensive improvement. And we confess that we have better hopes of a man who shows some amount of self-distrust than of one who is absolutely sure of success. And this is specially the case, when the diffidence produces no paralysis of activity. There was a hopeful ring in the Principal's voice, and that which is perhaps even better, a resolute tone which meant unmistakably: No one can be sure of succeeding; but we may at least deserve success, and we mean to deserve it.

And this resolve rests on good grounds. We know of no man, on either side of the Atlantic, who possesses, in so large a degree, the various qualifications which meet in Dr. Parkin. A mere scholar, from the English universities, however able, who knows nothing of the social conditions existing among ourselves, would be very apt to make mis-