

rather than to demand intensive work, and except here and there, it never really met the working class demand. The Workers Educational Association requires the students in its tutorial classes to attend for three years, to do paper work, and to carry on systematic reading; and the demand for new classes far exceeds the resources available for meeting it. And it is because the standard is high, because in the words of the Board's regulations it is comparable to "university work on an honors standard," that the movement has won its way with the universities. At the present time every university in England and Wales coöperates with the Workers Educational Association in conducting tutorial classes. The classes are managed by joint committees, normally composed of an equal number of representatives of the university concerned and of representatives of labor organizations. The cost, which is considerable, is met partly from the funds of the university—Oxford, for example, pays roughly half the cost of its classes—partly from the Board of Education and from local education authorities, and only a nominal fee is charged the students. The subjects studied vary greatly, according to the taste of the class with whom the decision rests. But they all belong to the sphere of what—to make the convenient if ambiguous distinction—may be called humane or liberal, not professional or technical, education, and taking the movement on the whole the sciences concerned with society, history, economics or sociology predominate. The students are overwhelmingly manual workers. In practice, since the men and women interested in education are naturally also the men and women who are interested in public questions, the backbone of them consists in most places of the keen young trade unionists.

Nothing is more difficult to appraise than the direct effect of education. The teacher casts his bread upon the waters and if found at all it is usually found by some one else. But good judges have described the Adult Education Movement as the most important educational contribution made in England in the past generation, and the verdict is not, perhaps, extravagant. Apart from its imponderable influence on the lives of individuals, of which only the individuals concerned can speak, it has

been followed by social results of some importance in three different directions. In the first place, it has done much to supply the world of organized labor with the educated personnel which it needs if it is to discharge its immense responsibilities. Employers and business men usually insure that the officials whom they employ to negotiate for them or prepare their case have some training in the handling of economic subjects. British trade unions have, on the whole, been very efficiently served. But, clearly, the more general the diffusion of educational facilities among their members, the more effective as organizations they are likely to be. In the second place, it has had a less obvious, but hardly less important effect on the universities. All of them now regard adult extra-mural education as a normal part of their work, and in all of them, a considerable proportion of the younger staff spend some years in coöperative study with working people. The effect can hardly be other than to bring a new range of experience into academic life and to widen the horizon of teachers who are dealing with social subjects. In the third place, the movement is altering the whole attitude toward questions of educational policy. Education is one of the causes which in the past have been caught, at least in England, in a vicious circle. To be enthusiastic about it, men must have experienced it; but when a dozen different objects are competing for public money and for the attention of politicians, they will have little chance of experiencing anything but a shoddy substitute, unless they are sufficiently enthusiastic about it to insist on obtaining the genuine article. The new feature of educational discussion in England in the last ten years is that the criticism on the deficiencies of our existing educational system, and the demand for more and better educational facilities has come, in the main, from working people themselves. Not the least important element in generating the educational enthusiasm which has made possible the considerable steps forward taken by the present government has been the existence of a body of enthusiastic and enlightened opinion on matters of educational policy which has been brought into existence by the adult education movement.

R. H. TAWNEY.

The Canadian Experiment

SENATOR LA FOLLETTE in discussing the railroad situation during the campaign has made frequent references to the government-owned lines of Canada. In reply, Republican and Democratic spokesmen pointed to an alleged annual deficit of fifty to sixty millions. A clear understanding of exactly what has taken place in Canada should be of some value in considering the current attacks upon the Esch-Cummins Act, and the in-

creasing demand for more rigid control of the American lines.

A recent and extended tour of the Canadian National Railways, and a rather close acquaintance with the history of the various lines that compose that system, have impressed the present writer with the desirability of making certain facts known to those who suffer—both financially and physically—from existing conditions in the United States.

Canada did not undertake government ownership gladly. The House of Commons has opposed such proposals with a vigor second only to that of Congress. But the extraordinarily foolish fiscal policy of the late Borden administration together with the complete collapse of certain privately owned railroads under the stress of war conditions have forced the Ottawa government to undertake the management of the largest single railroad system in the world today. The story can be briefly told.

Canada's first railroad was built, owned and operated by the government. This line, the Intercolonial, joined the Maritime Provinces with Canada proper, and was constructed in fulfillment of the terms under which Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island entered Confederation. Born of politics, it has never been weaned.

The Canadian Pacific Railroad, the first great transcontinental, was constructed by a combination of governmental grants, political graft, and the ability of its private owners. From the first it has blossomed with dividends, and it today holds an almost unrivalled position in the railroad and shipping world. It has had immense political power.

The success of the C. P. R. stimulated imitation, and the Grand Trunk, an old and solid Eastern institution, founded the second transcontinental, known as the Grand Trunk Pacific. This line, completed in 1914, failed to pay even its operating expenses and in its collapse involved the parent road. Almost coincidental with the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the notorious politico-financial firm of MacKenzie and Mann was at work on the construction of yet a third transcontinental—the Canadian Northern. This line had originally been a highly successful grain route, ending at Port Arthur on Lake Superior. Lured into the transcontinental game, the Canadian Northern also proved a complete failure—in spite of federal, provincial and municipal aid to the frenzied promoters.

By 1916 the Borden government was advancing funds to the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Northern in an endeavor to prevent an utter collapse. Yet private management continued, the Conservative majority at Ottawa refusing to admit the necessity of federal interference. Deficits accumulated, operating standards fell, wages were low, and still the Conservatives made grants, issued loans, and guaranteed railroad bonds.

When the war pressure ended in 1918 the Liberal and Progressive parties combined to force the government's hand, and a Board of Directors appointed by Ottawa was placed in charge of both lines. MacKenzie and Mann, well paid, gave up without a struggle, but it was not until 1920 that the private control of the Grand Trunk was finally broken. In that year, due to the thoroughly dis-

astrous results of private enterprise, the Canadian government found itself in control of the following railroads, in all 22,646 miles in length:

Grand Trunk	3948 miles
Grand Trunk Pacific	2840 miles
National Transcontinental (part of G. T. System)	2007 miles
Canadian Northern	9259 miles
Intercolonial	1593 miles
Miscellaneous	2999 miles

This total represents an investment of \$1,620,000,000. For all practical purposes this consolidation reduced the Canadian railroads to two major systems: the privately owned C. P. R. and the newly organized government road, the Canadian National. The latter was slightly larger than the Canadian Pacific.

Few railroad boards have undertaken a heavier burden than that presented to the directors of the amalgamated lines. Fixed charges, due entirely to the mismanagement and extravagance of private ownership, amounted in 1921 to approximately \$64,000,000. During that year operating expenses exceeded revenue by \$16,093,902—a total deficit of \$80,000,000. The task of the directors was made more difficult by the existence of duplicate lines in territory that could barely justify the operation of one. Terminal facilities were likewise duplicated in many centres.

The Liberal government of MacKenzie King, urged on by the Progressives, reluctantly but in good faith took up the burden. Sir Henry Thornton, a railroad executive thoroughly trained in the United States and in war-time England, accepted the presidency of the system in 1922. He was guaranteed a free hand. On the Board, including among its members Tom Moore, President of the Canadian Trades and Labor Council, were represented all shades of political and economic thought.

Sir Henry Thornton outlined the objectives of his policy as follows: 1, the elimination of duplicate lines and terminals; 2, the building of "feeders" for the main lines; 3, the improvement of service for successful competition with the C. P. R.; 4, a campaign of advertising to interest the citizens in the use of "their own property;" 5, a development of pride and interest in their work among the operating and clerical personnel; 6, the payment of expenses—a balanced budget.

The first of these proposals has been most difficult of fulfillment, and loud protests have been made against the abolition or even diminution of service. Terminal facilities, however, have been largely coördinated, some lines have been abandoned, and a drive for settlers has been undertaken to justify the continuance of others.

The building of feeder lines has two phases. One consists in stimulating the oceanic and coast mari-

time trade, especially the tourist traffic on the Pacific coast. The second is the building of branch lines to feed the transcontinentals. In its second phase this program met with some opposition in the Canadian Senate. For each branch line a bill had to be passed by the Commons and ratified by the Senate. The latter, a thoroughly useless and inane, though generally innocuous, collection of broken-down party hacks appointed for life, is very largely influenced by the C. P. R. and other special interests. Consequently when the Canadian National branch lines bills reached the upper house, these henchmen of privilege acting directly on the advice of counsel for the C. P. R. proceeded to vote down Thornton's proposals. Public opinion was immediately aroused and became so vigorous in its expression that the Senate finally recalled the bills and gave its assent. Had the Senate failed to do this the campaign for the total abolition of the upper house—a recurrent phenomenon in Canadian politics—might easily have accomplished its object. The position of the Senate is far from secure.

The improvement of service on the Canadian National has been phenomenal. It is quite generally stated that the C. P. R., heretofore the standard of excellence, has now been outclassed. In the trip referred to above the writer found in regular service on the Canadian National, in addition to all standard Pullman equipment, complete smoking rooms for women as well as men, excellent telephone and messenger service, a radio receiving set on each observation car (with programs from special C. N. R. broadcasting stations), and a dozen smaller conveniences nowhere else encountered. The same thing is true of the Canadian National vessels on the Pacific coast, where the government lines are distinctly better than their competitors. And beyond these physical advantages is the obliging and helpful spirit of the employees. The personnel has come to look upon the line as its own—a more competent or more enthusiastic group of employees can hardly be imagined. Decent wages, collective bargaining, and a sense of ownership have combined to produce this result. An example of this spirit is the recent offer of the executive officers of the system to pay one day's salary a month into a fund for the reduction of the operating expenses. This offer, if accepted, will cost Sir Henry Thornton \$1400 a year.

The advertising campaign has also been a success. Wherever one goes throughout Canada the same interest in the national railways exists. It is safe to say that a decided majority of the traveling public in Canada prefer, and are willing to undergo some slight inconvenience if necessary, to travel by "Our Railway." In the propaganda to disseminate this idea Thornton himself has played a considerable rôle. His annual trip over the system is punctuated by addresses stressing the idea: "Travel by the Canadian National, and reduce your taxes." So success-

ful has this missionary work proved that the president of the C. P. R. has publicly protested against it as unfair competition. (The same protest is heard also on the Pacific coast, where the government Dry Dock and Shipbuilding plant, doing its work at cost is able to underbid all competitors.)

But the supreme problem is, of course, financial. In 1921, as we have seen, the railways were still running behind both in operating expenses, and in reference to fixed charges. In 1922, the first year of reorganization, operating revenue covered operating expenses and gave a surplus of \$1,880,512. For the first time in their history the budget of these lines—exclusive of interest charges—had balanced. The improvement continued in 1923. In that year the following condition obtained:

Operating revenue	\$254,771,063
Operating expenses	234,535,000
Surplus	\$20,236,063

The figures for 1924 are not yet available, but judging by the monthly return an advance as great as that in 1923 may be confidently expected.

There still remains the legacy of bonded indebtedness left by the private management of the original lines. These charges amount to over \$60,000,000 a year, and it will not be until the system earns this amount annually that the burden will be entirely removed from the taxpayer. Sir Henry Thornton in July, discussing this matter in Vancouver, expressed the belief that over half of this sum could be paid by the railroad in 1924. It cannot be reiterated too often that this deficit is a result of private ownership and operation. Since the government took control, the lines have paid expenses for the first time.

In spite of the deficit, in spite of the competition, fair and unfair, of the C. P. R., in spite of reactionary opposition, the future is far from hopeless. As operating revenue increases, the fixed charges are being progressively reduced, and this is being achieved without the expedient of raising rates. The latter are, on the whole, distinctly lower than those of American lines. One authority has calculated that Canadian shippers are saved \$35,000,000 a year by the difference in rates north and south of the border.

One successfully operated government road does not demonstrate that government ownership should be immediately and universally adopted. The Canadian experiment does, however, give the lie to the idiotic statements of those anti-La Follette politicians who have repeatedly assured us that government ownership will inevitably result in the collapse of transportation services, in political debauchery, and in economic chaos.

HUGH L. KEENLEYSIDE.

Progressive Parents—Their Tragedy

WE are all very much in the same boat in respect to parenthood. In acute or less acute degree we share the joys and disappointments of one generation with the next. We are all fathers or mothers to the younger. It is however with parents in the usual sense that I deal, and with that portion of their tragedy which is concerned not with the cost of children—often a narrowed and cautious existence—but the fact that, whatever the cost, parents very frequently rear to maturity individuals who can bring them neither spiritual comfort nor the companionship on which they had counted. Companionship could be cheerfully foregone if altruism seemed worth while and the addition to the population good. But very often the addition is one the parents actually disapprove.

What is not commonly realized is that this is especially the doom of progressive parents, for though they are learning to lessen the cost of children, especially to the mother, they cheerfully accelerate the widening of the gulf between the two generations.

To illustrate, B—— was a progressive mother a generation ago, and is now the middle-aged mother of a grown-up family. B——, typical of progressive parents of her time, believed in the Froebel kindergarten system with its emphasis on play, freedom, and its minimization of corporal punishment. She believed in higher education for women, and their financial independence in vocations of their own choosing. She believed daughters should think for themselves, develop their individual talents and follow their own intellectual impulses, that they should, in short, be given opportunities and freedom. She believed these things and believed them hard, for had not she herself suffered because her parents had not these convictions?

She set out, with the initiative and vitality which had enabled her mother to raise eleven children, to secure these improvements for her own family.

"I do not wish my girls to go through what I did," she said, and therein hangs her tragedy, for what we "go through" makes us what we are.

She reasoned with her children instead of ordering them about, let them run where they liked and play with whom they liked; she filled them with her own ambitions which had been so thwarted. And the plan seemed to be working well.

Then came the children's adolescence and the set in of her own conservatism, and the plan was not working quite so well. Frequently she could be heard telling a child that she had never thought of addressing her parents in such a way, nor of contradicting, and in the child grew contempt for a pretense which exalted reason but would not argue.

Then came the young maturity of the children and a further settling back of the parents. The

plan had obviously worked badly judging by B——'s complaints and even more eloquent silence. The situation is summed up in her protest, "Yes, I want you to be free, but *why* do you want to do *that*?"

We have here the phenomenon of a parent protesting at an alienation for which she is responsible since she provided her children with an environment which produced tastes different from her own. Freedom, to the average optimistic mother, means freedom to have the things she herself desired. But in reality it means no such thing. What the parent desired and was denied, what she thought ends of laudable ambition, the child is given without question, and consequently takes for granted as the accepted customs of his class. He feels that real living begins only where all this leaves off.

For instance if B—— has given her children the means of choosing their vocation, she may feel curiously baffled and shut out by the ones they choose, which seem so dull, intricate, unimportant, and which absorb her children to the exclusion of herself. She may be, say, a Christian Scientist, and her son may decide to be a bacteriologist, her daughter a writer of lurid sex-scandal for the newspapers. Or religious bias may be lacking and yet she may feel strongly that certain vocations are subtly unrefined and beneath her, yet her children choose them! She is, after all, the product of the mid-Victorianism she despised—and they are not.

This freedom works out in innumerable irritating ways. A parent nowadays needs to be as thick-skinned as a dinosaur! The companions whom sons and daughters prefer to their own family! The frank criticism they make of their parents' ideas, religion, even of their own training as children! B—— had not wished artificial respect, but she had somehow banked on her children having similar points of view. What seemed good and beautiful to her was so obvious—could her children fail to see it as she did?

Pass to F——, a widow who had expected to spend her declining days in companionship with her daughters or close sympathy with their married lives. Neither married, but the elder preferred to live in a primitive way on a ranch with a woman friend, and the younger chose solitude and poverty for the better pursuit of a poorly paid art for which she knew she had no special talent.

Should a middle-aged mother, loving comforts after long deprivation, be expected to put up with poor plumbing for such unnatural children? She returns sadly to her hotel, boasts of her daughters' achievements and secretly hopes they will return to normal living.

If these little matters cause sorrow what can be said of those which affect the parent's ingrained