

no doubt sincere, and they may be right in thinking that science is going to supplant and banish religion; but if they think that it is going to take the place of religion they certainly are mistaken. Agnosticism tells us that, so far as we know or have any hope of knowing, this life is all. In that case to prolong this life as far as possible must be the first of all objects, and science, on the same hypothesis, seems right in maintaining that, if any knowledge conducive to this object can be obtained by putting to the most excruciating tortures thousands of our dumb fellow-creatures, no valid objection to our doing this can be assigned. But to the believer in religion this life is not all; nor is its prolongation his paramount object; his paramount object is the formation of a moral character which, if his belief be true, is destined to outlast the physical life and to prove of infinitely greater value. He therefore will decline to do for the sake of physical life anything which injures his moral being; and if he is told that by refusing to avail himself of vivisection he will miss information which might lengthen his days, his sufficient reply will be that perhaps the information may prove to be obtainable in some other way; but that in any case he is in the hands of God. Nor does it seem easy to meet the Bishop's challenge with regard to the use of human subjects, from which alone as he truly says, the most direct and trustworthy knowledge could be procured. What has evolution to say against vivisectioning a man? To vivisection an ape is lawful, and what is man but a highly developed ape? Some evolutionists are beginning to claim for certain of the higher animals a superiority over the lower grades of humanity. But supposing the organization of man to be in all cases and clearly superior, what difference does that make? The higher the organization, the more instructive will be the vivisection. Agassiz used to tell a story of a scientific man in Germany who said that the kingdom of science would have really come when it was lawful for an anatomist to go out and kill a man for his dissecting room. Regarded from the point of a believer in religion the man of science was a brute; but regarded from the evolutionist's point of view, why was he not in the right?

THE publication of Croker's Memoirs has brought his shade again before the judgment seat of criticism; and as the editor is able and judicious, the shade gains by the appeal. Croker has been identified in the imagination of most people with the "Rigby" of Disraeli's "Coningsby." It now appears that Disraeli had a personal grudge against Croker. His mode of assailing the object of his hatred, was that which he frequently adopted and of which Mrs. Manley of unsavory fame had set him the example. He libelled Croker under the cover of fiction, giving real traits enough to identify the person libelled as effectually as if the name had been printed, but mixing with them calumnies in the fabrication of which he used the boundless license of the novelist. Macaulay also attacked Croker's character as well as his literary work with intense ferocity in the *Edinburgh*; and we now know from the publication of his correspondence, that he also was actuated, and consciously actuated, by personal hatred. That his review of Croker's "Boswell" was not just has been proved, if the judgment of the public can be trusted, by the immense sale of the work. Miss Martineau also, and from similar motives, slandered the editor of the *Quarterly*, and very grossly, as now appears. Croker's reputation seems to have suffered by the over-strict observance of a principle good in itself. He refused to take any notice of attacks. This is wise when the assailant is insignificant and when his calumny, left to itself, is sure to die; but it is scarcely so wise when he is a person of mark and his calumny, if allowed to remain unconfuted, is likely to live. It is probably best, in such a case, to brand the falsehood. If you cannot prevent its repetition, you will have entered the necessary protest and you may remove misgivings from the minds of your friends. Croker was a thorough-going and perfectly sincere Tory, with the limitations of intelligence and sympathy which that character implies. Genius he had none, but he had political ability enough, when combined with undaunted courage and the force of genuine conviction, to make him almost the soul of the Tory defence. For the office of a literary critic he was disqualified by his partisanship. He was personally no friend to abuses; on the contrary, he was ready, when he could ill afford it, to forfeit place and the favour of his superiors rather than connive at an abuse in his own department; but he believed that the whole Tory system hung together; and in this he was not far wrong. He had sense enough to see that concessions must be made to the Roman Catholics and even to the demand for Parliamentary Reform. In retiring from Parliament and public life when the Reform Bill had been passed he incurred the bluff censure of the Duke of Wellington, who had no idea of throwing up the cards; yet he showed not only his disinterestedness but his insight; for true it was that Democracy had triumphed and that for Toryism there was no resurrection; the attempt to

re-establish it on a basis of demagogism, a device of political sharpers, has come to its natural end. When Peel threw over Protection, Croker, like Disraeli, turned against him; but he did not, like Disraeli, traduce him, nor had he, like Disraeli, been himself a Free Trader, or, like Disraeli, asked Peel for place. The weakest point in Croker's record is his connection with Lord Hertford, whose estates he managed, receiving payment in the equivocal form of a prospective legacy. Lord Hertford was one of the worst men of the Regency, and at his table Croker must certainly have met company, association with which would be deemed to taint a man in these days. But we must remember what the Regency permitted. Lord Hertford wore the Garter; though too idle to take a very active part in politics he was one of the chiefs of the Tory Party, recognized as such by Peel, and a man of no small intellectual power, though his ability was hideously misapplied. He has been introduced as a character in novels both by Thackeray and by Disraeli; by Disraeli in the very novel in which Croker is so venomously maligned. Thackeray strikes the obscene idol with the hand of a freeman; Disraeli lifts his hand to strike but involuntarily sinks upon his knee.

CROKER'S LIFE raises again many questions of political history: among them that question about the conduct of Peel and his friends to Canning, which bids fair to take its place as a historical conundrum, beside the questions about the authorship of Junius and the identity of the Man in the Iron Mask. It owes its angry character, as well as its revived interest, to the fierce debates on the Corn Laws, in which the charge of hunting Canning to death was hurled against Peel by Lord George Bentinck. Bentinck, though a connection and a worshipper of Canning, had been for nearly twenty years a devoted follower of Peel; and it was naturally inferred that his sudden sense of the criminality of Peel's conduct had been infused into him by some designing person who was playing on his passions. The whole mystery owes its existence to the notion that the Catholic question was the only one on which the two sections of Lord Liverpool's Cabinet differed from each other. The fact is that they differed just as much on questions of foreign policy and in their general tendencies, the Canning section being Semi-Liberal, while that of Wellington, Peel and Eldon was Tory. Under the neutral respectability and mediocrity of Lord Liverpool they had all been content to serve; but his departure snapped the tie, and the two sections then naturally fell apart, neither of them being willing to accept a leader from the other. It is difficult to tell a man with whom you have been acting for years even in uneasy union that you regard him and his opinions with general distrust. The refusal to accept Canning's leadership therefore was grounded on the specific question of the Catholic Claims; and Peel was quite right in saying that his position as Home Secretary, charged with the enforcement of the law in Ireland, would under a Pro-Catholic Premier have become untenable, while he could not have surrendered it without an open abandonment of principle. There may have been some rivalry in the affair, but there was no intrigue. At least if there was any, it was on the side of Canning, whose restless and somewhat unscrupulous ambition had already betrayed itself in his machinations against Addington, and who provoked the disgust of the Duke of Wellington by the arts to which he stooped in order to propitiate George IV. Canning's memory has been glorified by his brief career of diplomatic Liberalism and his sad end. But it must be remembered that to Tories of that day the Anti-Jacobin, when he turned Liberal, naturally seemed to be an apostate. His death was opportune. The ship of his fortunes was driving full on the rock of Parliamentary Reform, with regard to which he was as fatally pledged to reaction as were Wellington and Peel themselves.

IN "Reminiscences of My Public Life" Sir Francis Hincks expresses the opinion that Sir Charles Metcalfe was selected for the Governor-Generalship in the belief that he was "the best available statesman to crush responsible government in Canada." The late Earl of Derby, to whom Sir Charles owed his appointment, notified him that he required from him the performance of "very arduous duties." The duties of the Governor-General, when the new constitutional machinery got into smooth running order, were not arduous. But Lord Derby could not have been unacquainted with the official despatches of Lord Sydenham, the first Governor-General of Canada under the legislative union; and from their perusal, even if he saw none of the private letters to Lord John Russell and others, he might reasonably conclude that the duties of a Governor-General of Canada at that time were heavy enough to break down the strongest constitution. Sir Francis seems to infer without saying so that some plot was hatched in the interview between the Colonial Secretary and the new Governor-General when the heavy duties which Sir Charles was to undertake were