

the two groups in the government report suggests that the required skills would not be easily interchangeable. And in many cases even a first job will have a threshold of skill too high for young people without specific training.

One U.S. senator has proposed that the seriousness of the situation warrants a White House conference on the subject. He would solicit citizen interest at local levels and build up a consensus of strong public opinion until "the Nation speaks to Washington."

Certainly the information and the means of meeting such circumstances should be of concern to everybody, says the Christian Science Monitor. One trouble is that estimates of jobs eroded through technology have varied widely. The public impression has become one of vague threat and vague promise. While-collar workers might be strictly a blue-collar problem, until they began saying good-bye to their colleagues. Executives thought that they at least would be immune, until the predictions of management by computer began here and there to come true.

It would be tragic if these new labor-saving devices, promising so much in the way of technological progress, should bring widespread hardship in their wake. The problem could be serious in Canada as well as the United States, if constructive efforts are not made to grapple with it in time.

Year-Round University

After much talk in educational circles, the long-discussed project of operating a university on a year-round basis will be tried out in British Columbia. The location of the experiment is in Burnaby, a suburb of Vancouver, where the newly established Simon Fraser University is planning to admit 3,000 students in the fall of 1965. It is expected that within six years the enrolment will increase to 7,000.

The new university will have three 16-week terms. Ordinarily, students will attend two terms; but voluntary attendance for three terms will be permitted. Such attendance will permit a student to complete a four year course in two years and eight months.

Admitting that traditionalists may accuse him of favoring mass production methods, Chancellor Gordon Shrum insists that his objective is, not quantity, but quality. "This idea of taking five months off from university studies to do working as a cook somewhere," he says, "is no way to cope with the great increase in the amount of knowledge to be mastered. We could cut a four year course to at least three for gifted students if they had the chance to study the year round."

There may be defects as well as advantages in this plan, since in actual practice it might not suit all students to adhere to the arduous schedule proposed. But even in wealthy provinces, the resources of expanding university facilities are limited, and year-round operations, permitting more complete use of existing facilities, may be the only long-term solution to the problem. The new system is already in operation in some universities in the United States, but it is still in the experimental stage. All that can be said for it at present is that it is an experiment worth trying.

EDITORIAL NOTES

Scientists have discovered a 10 legged beetle in the 2,650 foot deep Spizgia dei Preta caverns near Verona, Italy. They call it a living fossil—for nothing like it has ever been found before. They believe it to be a "leftover" species which has lived in the dark pits since the mesozoic period—which ended 70 million years ago.

The world "cheque" used thousands of times daily across Canada could be called a modern word. It did not come into use until well on in the last century. Its forerunner, as exhibited in a banking museum recently opened in London, England, was the letter from a customer asking the goldsmith to pay any individual or bearer a particular sum and debit their account. According to a BBC newswriter these were known as "drawn notes" and were frequently signed in such a personal manner as "your loving friend."



"TEXAS-STYLE BARBEQUE, PARTNER?"

OTTAWA REPORT by Patrick Nicholson

Liberal Eyes On Saskatchewan Voters

Saskatchewan a year soon have a representative in the federal cabinet, although at present is represented by a Liberal M.P. Top Liberals here are mulling over the proposal to appoint the late Saskatchewan mayor Sid Ruskold to the cabinet, perhaps replacing the late Jack Gardland of Nipissing, Ontario as Minister of National Revenue. Ruskold is not now an M.P.; he was badly beaten in last year's election by the Tory opponent, the late Harry Jones. The strategy might be to appoint Mr. Ruskold to the cabinet before the calling of the bye-election in Fall. Harry Jones' seat and the Liberal Party's prestige of cabinet rank to entice the voters of Saskatchewan to elect a Liberal. Ruskold has a continuing representative in the cabinet. His Conservative opponent, Mr. Jones, has a large personal following, but this availed him nothing against the well-entrenched Harry Jones.

PEARSON RETREAT

The Pearson Government is not at all intent on enacting legislation which would protect Canadian magazines against competition from split runs and special editions of foreign magazines, "Readers Digest" in the English speaking provinces and "Readers Digest" in the French speaking provinces. Since then, substantial opposition to this proposal has built up among other parties in the House, and has even split the governing Progressive Conservative Party. Now comes evidence of the extent to which Canadian magazines are being marketed in operations this year, largely because of the deflection of advertising expenditures from Canadian companies into these two readers. It is estimated that publishers have lost \$26,000,000 this year on Maclean's, Chateleine

and Saturday Night. Apparently, Weekend Magazine, the Toronto Star Weekly and the Farm Herald are joining those others in protesting to the government about its proposed favour for the U.S. publications. There is a grave risk that the Canadian periodicals will perish through their heavy losses. If the Canadian magazine industry folds, the entire blame—and it would be small blame—would be laid squarely on the shoulders of Prime Minister Pearson. It seems likely here that he will be an ignominious retreat into a position of greater loyalty to and support for Canadian magazines.

NO CRADLE RENEGE

A recent article by Mr. Ruskold in the Toronto Globe and Mail contains some interesting and significant figures relevant to the partnership between English speaking and French speaking Canadians which the royal commission on bilingualism and biculturalism has been set up to consider. The article bluntly asks: "With all the goodwill in the world, is it possible to have equal partnership between a 71 per cent majority that is winning, and a 29 per cent minority that is waning?"

The article uses Dominion Bureau of Statistics reports covering the year 1963 to back up its contention that "in population terms, the English speaking Quebec is falling behind the nine English speaking provinces generally, and behind Ontario specifically." Thus, it says, the estimated figure of the revenue of the cradle of 1759 by outbreeding and eventually outgrowing the English speaking Canadians—no longer holds. According to the figures quoted, Quebec's population in 1963 was 3,400,000. In 1964 it was 3,500,000. In 1965 it was 3,600,000. In 1966 it was 3,700,000. In 1967 it was 3,800,000. In 1968 it was 3,900,000. In 1969 it was 4,000,000. In 1970 it was 4,100,000. In 1971 it was 4,200,000. In 1972 it was 4,300,000. In 1973 it was 4,400,000. In 1974 it was 4,500,000. In 1975 it was 4,600,000. In 1976 it was 4,700,000. In 1977 it was 4,800,000. In 1978 it was 4,900,000. In 1979 it was 5,000,000. In 1980 it was 5,100,000. In 1981 it was 5,200,000. In 1982 it was 5,300,000. In 1983 it was 5,400,000. In 1984 it was 5,500,000. In 1985 it was 5,600,000. In 1986 it was 5,700,000. In 1987 it was 5,800,000. In 1988 it was 5,900,000. In 1989 it was 6,000,000. In 1990 it was 6,100,000. In 1991 it was 6,200,000. In 1992 it was 6,300,000. In 1993 it was 6,400,000. In 1994 it was 6,500,000. In 1995 it was 6,600,000. In 1996 it was 6,700,000. In 1997 it was 6,800,000. In 1998 it was 6,900,000. In 1999 it was 7,000,000. In 2000 it was 7,100,000. In 2001 it was 7,200,000. In 2002 it was 7,300,000. In 2003 it was 7,400,000. In 2004 it was 7,500,000. In 2005 it was 7,600,000. In 2006 it was 7,700,000. In 2007 it was 7,800,000. In 2008 it was 7,900,000. In 2009 it was 8,000,000. In 2010 it was 8,100,000. In 2011 it was 8,200,000. In 2012 it was 8,300,000. In 2013 it was 8,400,000. In 2014 it was 8,500,000. In 2015 it was 8,600,000. In 2016 it was 8,700,000. In 2017 it was 8,800,000. In 2018 it was 8,900,000. In 2019 it was 9,000,000. In 2020 it was 9,100,000. In 2021 it was 9,200,000. In 2022 it was 9,300,000. In 2023 it was 9,400,000. In 2024 it was 9,500,000. In 2025 it was 9,600,000. In 2026 it was 9,700,000. In 2027 it was 9,800,000. In 2028 it was 9,900,000. In 2029 it was 10,000,000. In 2030 it was 10,100,000. In 2031 it was 10,200,000. In 2032 it was 10,300,000. In 2033 it was 10,400,000. In 2034 it was 10,500,000. In 2035 it was 10,600,000. In 2036 it was 10,700,000. In 2037 it was 10,800,000. In 2038 it was 10,900,000. In 2039 it was 11,000,000. In 2040 it was 11,100,000. In 2041 it was 11,200,000. In 2042 it was 11,300,000. In 2043 it was 11,400,000. In 2044 it was 11,500,000. In 2045 it was 11,600,000. In 2046 it was 11,700,000. In 2047 it was 11,800,000. In 2048 it was 11,900,000. In 2049 it was 12,000,000. In 2050 it was 12,100,000. In 2051 it was 12,200,000. In 2052 it was 12,300,000. In 2053 it was 12,400,000. In 2054 it was 12,500,000. In 2055 it was 12,600,000. In 2056 it was 12,700,000. In 2057 it was 12,800,000. In 2058 it was 12,900,000. In 2059 it was 13,000,000. In 2060 it was 13,100,000. In 2061 it was 13,200,000. In 2062 it was 13,300,000. In 2063 it was 13,400,000. In 2064 it was 13,500,000. In 2065 it was 13,600,000. In 2066 it was 13,700,000. In 2067 it was 13,800,000. In 2068 it was 13,900,000. In 2069 it was 14,000,000. In 2070 it was 14,100,000. In 2071 it was 14,200,000. In 2072 it was 14,300,000. In 2073 it was 14,400,000. In 2074 it was 14,500,000. In 2075 it was 14,600,000. In 2076 it was 14,700,000. In 2077 it was 14,800,000. In 2078 it was 14,900,000. In 2079 it was 15,000,000. In 2080 it was 15,100,000. In 2081 it was 15,200,000. In 2082 it was 15,300,000. In 2083 it was 15,400,000. In 2084 it was 15,500,000. In 2085 it was 15,600,000. In 2086 it was 15,700,000. In 2087 it was 15,800,000. In 2088 it was 15,900,000. In 2089 it was 16,000,000. In 2090 it was 16,100,000. In 2091 it was 16,200,000. In 2092 it was 16,300,000. In 2093 it was 16,400,000. In 2094 it was 16,500,000. In 2095 it was 16,600,000. In 2096 it was 16,700,000. In 2097 it was 16,800,000. In 2098 it was 16,900,000. In 2099 it was 17,000,000. In 2100 it was 17,100,000. In 2101 it was 17,200,000. In 2102 it was 17,300,000. In 2103 it was 17,400,000. In 2104 it was 17,500,000. In 2105 it was 17,600,000. In 2106 it was 17,700,000. In 2107 it was 17,800,000. In 2108 it was 17,900,000. In 2109 it was 18,000,000. In 2110 it was 18,100,000. In 2111 it was 18,200,000. In 2112 it was 18,300,000. In 2113 it was 18,400,000. In 2114 it was 18,500,000. In 2115 it was 18,600,000. In 2116 it was 18,700,000. In 2117 it was 18,800,000. In 2118 it was 18,900,000. In 2119 it was 19,000,000. In 2120 it was 19,100,000. In 2121 it was 19,200,000. In 2122 it was 19,300,000. In 2123 it was 19,400,000. In 2124 it was 19,500,000. In 2125 it was 19,600,000. In 2126 it was 19,700,000. In 2127 it was 19,800,000. In 2128 it was 19,900,000. In 2129 it was 20,000,000. In 2130 it was 20,100,000. In 2131 it was 20,200,000. In 2132 it was 20,300,000. In 2133 it was 20,400,000. In 2134 it was 20,500,000. In 2135 it was 20,600,000. In 2136 it was 20,700,000. In 2137 it was 20,800,000. In 2138 it was 20,900,000. In 2139 it was 21,000,000. In 2140 it was 21,100,000. In 2141 it was 21,200,000. In 2142 it was 21,300,000. In 2143 it was 21,400,000. In 2144 it was 21,500,000. In 2145 it was 21,600,000. In 2146 it was 21,700,000. In 2147 it was 21,800,000. In 2148 it was 21,900,000. In 2149 it was 22,000,000. In 2150 it was 22,100,000. In 2151 it was 22,200,000. In 2152 it was 22,300,000. In 2153 it was 22,400,000. In 2154 it was 22,500,000. In 2155 it was 22,600,000. In 2156 it was 22,700,000. In 2157 it was 22,800,000. In 2158 it was 22,900,000. In 2159 it was 23,000,000. In 2160 it was 23,100,000. In 2161 it was 23,200,000. In 2162 it was 23,300,000. In 2163 it was 23,400,000. In 2164 it was 23,500,000. In 2165 it was 23,600,000. In 2166 it was 23,700,000. In 2167 it was 23,800,000. In 2168 it was 23,900,000. In 2169 it was 24,000,000. In 2170 it was 24,100,000. In 2171 it was 24,200,000. In 2172 it was 24,300,000. In 2173 it was 24,400,000. In 2174 it was 24,500,000. In 2175 it was 24,600,000. In 2176 it was 24,700,000. In 2177 it was 24,800,000. In 2178 it was 24,900,000. In 2179 it was 25,000,000. In 2180 it was 25,100,000. In 2181 it was 25,200,000. In 2182 it was 25,300,000. In 2183 it was 25,400,000. In 2184 it was 25,500,000. In 2185 it was 25,600,000. In 2186 it was 25,700,000. In 2187 it was 25,800,000. In 2188 it was 25,900,000. In 2189 it was 26,000,000. In 2190 it was 26,100,000. In 2191 it was 26,200,000. In 2192 it was 26,300,000. In 2193 it was 26,400,000. In 2194 it was 26,500,000. In 2195 it was 26,600,000. In 2196 it was 26,700,000. In 2197 it was 26,800,000. In 2198 it was 26,900,000. In 2199 it was 27,000,000. In 2200 it was 27,100,000. In 2201 it was 27,200,000. In 2202 it was 27,300,000. In 2203 it was 27,400,000. In 2204 it was 27,500,000. In 2205 it was 27,600,000. In 2206 it was 27,700,000. In 2207 it was 27,800,000. In 2208 it was 27,900,000. In 2209 it was 28,000,000. In 2210 it was 28,100,000. In 2211 it was 28,200,000. In 2212 it was 28,300,000. In 2213 it was 28,400,000. In 2214 it was 28,500,000. In 2215 it was 28,600,000. In 2216 it was 28,700,000. In 2217 it was 28,800,000. In 2218 it was 28,900,000. In 2219 it was 29,000,000. In 2220 it was 29,100,000. In 2221 it was 29,200,000. In 2222 it was 29,300,000. In 2223 it was 29,400,000. In 2224 it was 29,500,000. In 2225 it was 29,600,000. In 2226 it was 29,700,000. In 2227 it was 29,800,000. In 2228 it was 29,900,000. In 2229 it was 30,000,000. In 2230 it was 30,100,000. In 2231 it was 30,200,000. In 2232 it was 30,300,000. In 2233 it was 30,400,000. In 2234 it was 30,500,000. In 2235 it was 30,600,000. In 2236 it was 30,700,000. In 2237 it was 30,800,000. In 2238 it was 30,900,000. In 2239 it was 31,000,000. In 2240 it was 31,100,000. In 2241 it was 31,200,000. In 2242 it was 31,300,000. In 2243 it was 31,400,000. In 2244 it was 31,500,000. In 2245 it was 31,600,000. In 2246 it was 31,700,000. In 2247 it was 31,800,000. In 2248 it was 31,900,000. In 2249 it was 32,000,000. In 2250 it was 32,100,000. In 2251 it was 32,200,000. In 2252 it was 32,300,000. In 2253 it was 32,400,000. In 2254 it was 32,500,000. In 2255 it was 32,600,000. In 2256 it was 32,700,000. In 2257 it was 32,800,000. In 2258 it was 32,900,000. In 2259 it was 33,