

headedness inseparable from government under the old two-party system, the conception of a House with a third party, independent of the two old ones, and organized with a view to the bringing about of certain definite reforms, is not without its attractions. It is easy to see how the presence of such a body, having no ambition to obtain for itself possession of the Treasury benches, and, consequently, no desire to overthrow the existing government for the sake of taking its place, might become, with judicious and unselfish management, a power for good. In fact, such a body, well organized and under competent leadership, might force the Government of the day to adopt and carry out almost any desired reform. With the increase of such parties, the power of each would become less, but the possibilities of combination would increase in proportion, until presently strict party government would become an impossibility.

The question which we are merely suggesting for the consideration of the thoughtful, is by no means a purely theoretical or imaginative one. It is very clear that the trend of the popular movement just now is away from the time-honoured two-party system, and in the direction of an indefinite number of small but more or less coherent bodies, each intent on its own particular reform or hobby. To say nothing of what has happened in France, which can, perhaps, hardly be taken as affording a normal instance of parliamentary evolution, and passing by Germany, where a large admixture of the autocratic element complicates the evolutionary process, we need only to glance at the parliament of the Mother Country to see the working of the centrifugal forces. As has been pointed out by a London editor, time was, and that no longer ago than in Mr. Gladstone's earlier days, when a majority of fourteen or fifteen, such as that on which the existence of Lord Rosebery's Administration depends, would have been deemed ample for the security of any government. But now, when even Liberalism is subdivided laterally by English, Scotch, Irish, and Welsh lines, "besides being split vertically, so to speak, into independent labour opinion, capitalist opinion, and land-owning opinion," the case is very different. "A very slight disturbance in such a precarious balance of forces will dispose of a majority of fifteen." To come nearer home, it is already pretty certain that one result of the approaching Dominion election will be a House composed of at least three distinct parties, instead of the two to which we have so long been accustomed, and on the assumption of which the whole system of governmental procedure is, in a large measure, based. That such a change in the conditions of the problem must render necessary some new method of working it out is evident. What will be the form of the new system?

Had we time to inquire into the causes which are rapidly and surely bringing about these changes, those causes would not be far to seek. They are wrapped up in the meaning of one word, "Democracy." With the triumph of democracy and the decadence of the opposite principle, aristocracy in government, the old fissure of cleavage, developed through ages of struggle into an almost impassable chasm separating the two great parties, has gradually grown narrower and narrower, until it has at length almost disappeared. There is no longer, in English-speaking countries, a real aristocratic party able to wield any considerable influence in political life. With no one supereminent issue to cleave the political opinion of the nation in twain, there is no longer any sufficient cause for the existence of two and only two great parties. It seems likely, it is true, that the question of Protection *vs.* Free-trade may, for a time, have a supreme place in Canadian politics, but a very few years of struggle will no doubt settle the question in one way or another.

It was no part of our plan to attempt to show what

shall take the place of the dying party system in self-governing countries. May it not be, however, that something akin to the method which was at one time outlined and advocated, if we mistake not, by Mr. Goldwin Smith—a method in which the Government shall be a sort of Parliamentary Committee, elected by the whole body of representatives without reference to party, and kept in office during the pleasure of the House—may suggest a possible alternative?

* * *

Education and Culture.

SOME time ago an attempt was made in an editorial paragraph of THE WEEK to define "education" and "culture," treating them as synonyms, by saying that "the culture of the schools, apart from the training of the physical faculties and the moral nature, is threefold: (1) The culture of skill, (2) the culture of knowledge, and (3) the culture of taste." It was further stated that "the culture of skill is acquired only by the practice of original invention, the culture of knowledge only by the practice of original investigation, and the culture of taste only by acquaintance at first hand with works of art that are embodiments of the beautiful." The *Educational Journal* is disposed to regard this classification as not exhaustive, and to add "the culture of power." On the assumption that a very fair definition of "culture" was given by the late Sir Morrell Mackenzie, when he remarked that "culture is not amassed knowledge, but a condition of intellect," it will be easy to show that the culture of power is implied in the three kinds mentioned above, and that the enumeration is exhaustive.

By "skill" is meant capacity to make use of means in any sphere of life or department of activity to bring about some desired result. Obviously this demands thought, often of the most intense kind. To realize an ideal is always a work of difficulty, and it can never be perfectly done. A great modern painter is reported to have said that in order to paint well all one needs to do is to put a little color in the right place. Another painter, when asked what he mixed his paints with, replied:—"With brains, sir." Any adequate conception of skill must include the idea of intellectual power of a very high, if not the highest order. All the great inventors have possessed such power, and without it they would have been quite unable to do what they did. All great writers have possessed it, for a great literary composition is, as to form at all events, a work of skill. Thoughts may come spontaneously, or by suggestion, rather than at call, but they must be arranged and re-arranged; they must be made to assume some evolutionary order; they must be massed in effective ways; and they must be embodied in effective forms, if they are to be regarded as products of "skill." In the education of the child he should be required to invent, as far as possible, all his own processes, not merely in physical experiments, but also in performing operations on numerical and geometrical magnitudes, and above all in the expression of his own thoughts. No child should ever be told how to write or speak what he has to say until he has had a chance to select his own mode of expression, and he should then have the first chance to criticize and improve it.

The culture of "knowledge," like the culture of "skill," is practically the culture of "power" under another name. "Knowledge" means either (1) an acquaintance with isolated facts, or (2) an acquaintance with general principles under which facts are co-ordinated. The child may be made, too often is made, acquainted with both through his memory alone, and it was against this practice that Archbishop Walsh, of Dublin, inveighed in the remark that was the occasion of our first paragraph on this subject. The only way to secure