

Pensions And Politics

It may be just a coincidence, but the Pearson Government's announce-

ment that it will go ahead with its contributory pensions plan despite the

apparent unwillingness of some provinces to co-operate came just

on the heels of Liberal Leader John Wintermeyer's opening speech in

the Ontario provincial election cam-

paign. Mr. Wintermeyer charged Premier Robarts with exposing the

policy of private companies who are trying to "sabotage" the federal

scheme, and said that if Ontario voters want it they would have to

vote Liberal on September 25.

The Ontario Liberal leader argued that the national plan could

proceed without Quebec, but not without Ontario and Quebec. This

is not a statement, we note, on which Prime Minister Pearson had

no comment to make at his news conference as reported yesterday.

Premier Lesage has asked that Ottawa amend its program to enable

Quebec to "contract out," and it is hard to see how the plan could

operate on a pay-as-you-go basis without Quebec's participation. Certainly it

would lead to a collision that would dissipate the good feeling developed

out of the last federal-provincial conference on the municipal local

governance.

It would be worse, of course, if both the big provincial provinces

insisted on remaining aloof. Mr. Pearson says he hopes this will not

happen, and Health Minister Judy LaMarsh is confident it won't. But

what grounds have they for their optimism? Ontario voters, at least,

will find it hard to dissociate this matter from Mr. Wintermeyer's

campaign appeal, which he made the chief subject of his keynote

address.

Apart from politics, several of the provincial premiers at the recent

conference expressed doubt about the feasibility of a scheme in which

no effort will be made to build up a large pension fund. They also pointed

out that the money to be taken from the employers and employees

would be more that is being diverted in many cases from con-

tributions now being made into private pension plans. These savings,

now with assets reported to be around \$4 billion, have been an important source of money for invest-

ment in Canadian securities.

But Miss LaMarsh has undertaken to explain all about this when the federal provincial conference of

welfare ministers meets at Ottawa on September 10. She hopes she can do so satisfactorily for there is

nothing in the federal scheme to be commended—if only it can be made to work. Keeping partisan fireworks

out of it as much as possible would help.

Dr. Teller's Figures

Dr. Edward Teller, the nuclear physicist who is the most outspoken critic of the nuclear test ban agreement at the Senate committee hearings at Washington, says he has a program which would "protect" some 90 percent of Americans in case of a nuclear war. The cost? \$50,000 million.

The Teller plan would combine antimissile missile production with a mammoth shelter-building drive. The shelter plan alone—excluding shelter against atomic blast and fire as well as atomic fallout—would cost some \$20,000 million. That's the estimate, but other experts have put the cost as high as \$35,000 million. As for the drive to perfect an antimissile missile, Dr. Teller suggests

\$50,000 million but concedes that it has an unknown price tag.

Human lives are worth saving at almost any cost, of course. But granting that these expenditures proved

as effective as Dr. Teller says they would be in protecting Ameri-

cans lives, what about the rest of us? A nuclear war would be a global

war, in which every nation would be involved. In the hell that would

be created who would want to survive? That is why it is essential to

insure that such a conflict does not break out, and why the enthusiasm

of nuclear scientists for their brain-children needs to be kept within

limits.

President Kennedy has been a quick to defend the nuclear test ban

treaty against the attacks of Dr. Teller, notwithstanding the eminence

this scientist has attained in his field. And it looks as though the

American people were solidly behind him. Now that the experts

have been heard, debate on the treaty is expected to begin in the

Senate early next month. The treaty needs a two-to-one majority for

approval, and the prediction is that it will pass by a safe margin.

That will be the first step in getting away from the nation's need

of spending \$50,000 million on the prospect of keeping alive amid the

ruins of a devastated world.

Outmoded And Unfair

Why, except in a few isolated cases, is Canada not engaged in any

long range educational planning at the national level? This question was

raised in a recent address by Dr. Z.S. Phinister, director of education

for Toronto; and, of course, the answer goes back to the fact that

under the British North America Act education has been left to the

provinces. Since so much is being said about amending the constitution

in other ways, why aren't we hearing more about remedying this stultify-

ing anomaly?

Traditions are excellent things, but not where they create privileged

classes in so vitally important a matter as education. Canada has 10

different departments of education, with 10 different sets of standards.

Children in some provinces do not have nearly as much educational

opportunity as children in other provinces. Even in Ontario, the

wealthiest province, there is gross inequality of opportunity because of its

antiquated schoolboard system.

Like most educationists, Dr. Phinister believes that education should

be a national responsibility. Unfortunately, he doesn't suggest how

the necessary constitutional reform is going to be effected. The

only way this can be done is by the politicians getting together and

putting it through. The problem is how to make them see that this is

a matter of grave national importance, and that it is getting more

serious all the time. We are hoping to see the subject debated when

Parliament resumes, but the chances are that it will be sidetracked

once again.

Meanwhile, as Dr. Phinister points out, Canada and Switzerland

are the only two well-established nations who do not consider that

education needs a national outlook. With the mounting demand for

levels, and better education at all levels, it is surely time that we

begin to function as a nation in meeting this challenge.

EDITORIAL NOTES

From Dundee, Scotland—of all places—comes this report: "In the

france dress show at Carnoustie Beach Hall, two local children

paraded as 'Keeler and Profumo'. The judges awarded them first prize."

First prize for what?

Dr. Edward Teller, the nuclear physicist who is the most outspoken

critic of the nuclear test ban agreement at the Senate committee

hearings at Washington, says he has a program which would "protect"

some 90 percent of Americans in case of a nuclear war. The cost?

\$50,000 million.

The Teller plan would combine antimissile missile production with

a mammoth shelter-building drive. The shelter plan alone—excluding

shelter against atomic blast and fire as well as atomic fallout—would

cost some \$20,000 million. That's the estimate, but other experts have

put the cost as high as \$35,000 million. As for the drive to perfect an

antimissile missile, Dr. Teller suggests

TACKLING THE LEAK

OTTAWA REPORT by Patrick Nicholson

Canada Withdraws Its Overflight Charge

was charged, to cover the use of the airfield and attendant facilities,

such as the control tower, the meteorological services, the navigational aids,

and even the use of the terminal building by transient passengers. This

was assessed \$208 for foreign aircraft using our navigational aids

during non-stop flights to and from across Canada's huge air traffic

zone.

Now, after three and a half years embittered by international

legal wrangles, the federal government has withdrawn this

aided collected levy.

In the early days of transatlantic passenger flying, nearly every

aircraft landed under the airport in Newfoundland. A few

years ago, however, the

costly safety aids

Canada imposed the "overflight charge" with effect from

January 1, 1960, and was un-

derstandably flocked by some bureaucratic

jobber at \$64.

Several foreign airlines paid this charge willingly; others

paid it under protest. From these airlines was collected about

\$1.5 million. Doubt that this sum is owed by foreign airlines

which refused to pay it. Two of these, the U.S. Pan American

and the Dutch K.M.M. airlines, were sued for \$75,000.

USA does not levy any comparable charge. Apart from

Canada, the only countries which do so are a few small countries

such as Syria and White China.

This Canadian charge was widely regarded in air transport circles

as a dangerous precedent. If Canada could charge a fee

for overflying its air space, without protest, then why shouldn't

some small country strategically sited hold the airlines of the world

to ransom with an arbitrary charge of perhaps \$1,000?

A careful study has revealed that such a government has

announced, "there were serious doubts that existing legislation

was adequate to support the charge in its present form." Canada

was on weak ground.

So the government has taken the prudent and overdue course

of withdrawing the charge; it will not be enforced against

those airlines which have fought it. It will be refunded to those

which paid it.

But Canadian air space covers an important bridge in the

world's overtravelled air route—that crossing the Atlantic.

The world's international airlines have contributed largely to

the magnificent record on that route which has been maintained

for over 50 years. It is not surprising that the Minister of Transport,

Hon. George McRath, has decided to withdraw the charge. It is

logical that the charge should be collected and distributed on a

worldwide basis according to a standard scale by the international

regulatory bodies.

Meanwhile the \$64 question hangs in the air.

Readers Make Suggestions

By Dr. Theodore R. Van Dellen

One of our readers shares a pet peeve of mine and it's well

along with what he will put in "Diet" you think would be a

good idea to include an article now and then against the practice

of blowing out candles on a cake?"

Old customs are difficult to change and this is one of the most

unsanitary. Bacteria from the mouth are sprayed over the

children, especially by children, who do not appreciate the

problem. Many objections are aesthetic but certain diseases

could be spread in this way. In addition, the objections are

not only unsanitary but also a bad place for micro-organisms

to multiply and the least we can do is to throw out what is left

when the party is over.

The following suggestion comes from A. W. Rochelle, N.Y. man:

"I have had minor foot troubles for more than 50 years. Three years ago I found they

disappeared when I stopped wearing the same pair of shoes

two days in a row. I have six pairs of shoes, and I rotate them

regularly. Swelling, soreness, and pain are completely gone.

It is a good practice. Alternating the footwear means the

feet are not subjected to the same pressures or rubbed along

the same areas day after day. In addition, the shoes have

chance to dry out while not being worn.

This is good practice. Alternating the footwear means the

feet are not subjected to the same pressures or rubbed along

the same areas day after day. In addition, the shoes have

chance to dry out while not being worn.

This is good practice. Alternating the footwear means the

feet are not subjected to the same pressures or rubbed along

the same areas day after day. In addition, the shoes have

chance to dry out while not being worn.

This is good practice. Alternating the footwear means the

feet are not subjected to the same pressures or rubbed along

the same areas day after day. In addition, the shoes have

chance to dry out while not being worn.

This is good practice. Alternating the footwear means the

feet are not subjected to the same pressures or rubbed along

the same areas day after day. In addition, the shoes have

chance to dry out while not being worn.

This is good practice. Alternating the footwear means the

feet are not subjected to the same pressures or rubbed along

the same areas day after day. In addition, the shoes have

chance to dry out while not being worn.

This is good practice. Alternating the footwear means the

feet are not subjected to the same pressures or rubbed along

the same areas day after day. In addition, the shoes have

chance to dry out while not being worn.

This is good practice. Alternating the footwear means the

feet are not subjected to the same pressures or rubbed along

the same areas day after day. In addition, the shoes have

NOTES BY THE WAY

"Look here," said the employer

to a prospective job applicant, "what did you mean by

telling me you had five years' experience when you've never

had a job before?" "Well, against

the bright young man, "you advertised for a man with imagination

— Galt Reporter.

A young man down Gaspé way

wrote his name in Montreal on

the 1958 race "rally" in the

Montreal on U.S. 100? He

wrote. On file replied: "Sure,

That's the only thing you can

do."—Financial Post.

The American Ordeal

By Doug Marshall

Canadian Press Staff Writer

Much as the United States

would like to keep the Negro

people in the struggle there

are too stark for outsiders to

ignore.

Communist China's messages

of support to U.S. Negro leaders

have been emphatically re-

buffed but it has been easy

to reject the platitudes of

loophole Bertrand Russell

based as they are on ethical

rather than ideological princi-

ples.

In Britain, anti-communists

have been particularly con-

vinced by the fact that the

Communist Party in the U.S.

is in the background of men's

brinds.