form curriculum in which students seeking entrance to a university would follow only two externally examined courses. The university representatives at the vice-chancellors' meeting were right to argue that these proposals would narrow and not broaden the education of students reaching the universities, but this seems not to be the present interest of the schools. Obviously it will be hard for the universities now to push them in the direction of extra examinations. The fact that the examinations may be less exacting will not entirely comfort those schools in which teachers value jealously their right to mimic the universities in the sixth forms. Evidently the universities will need not merely a reasonable and coherent case to put to the Schools Council in the spring, but tact as well. If they are wise, they will pay close attention to Professor Butler's argument for deliberate experiment, and there is, of course, no reason why the universities should not elect, without further discussion, to embark on some of the controlled experiments which the introduction of a more liberal curriculum in the schools will make essential. But if this is to be the method, the universities will have to hurry. Britain has waited too long already for a more sensible pattern of education in the schools. If there are to be experiments, there is no reason why they should not begin in September 1968.

Hung Jury

ALTHOUGH it is too soon properly to assess the first report of the Select Committee on Science and Technology appointed by the House of Commons, one thing is already clear—the committee has done its reputation a great disservice by coming out with a report which is crudely divided on party grounds. The committee's credibility has already suffered from its lack of the professional assistance that would have enabled it to ask more penetrating questions. Its failure to agree on proposals for the reorganization of the civil nuclear power industry is a greater setback. The committee might have done better to contain its ambitions within its capabilities, on this first exercise at least.

"In present circumstances, the best interests of the country would be served by the combination in a single organization or company of the skill and resources of those now separately engaged in the design and construction of nuclear boilers." With this sentence the Select Committee on Science and Technology finally resolved discussion of its examination of the nuclear power industry in Britain. The report of the committee, published on November 22, comes down, by a majority of 7 to 5, in favour of what has become known as a "central design authority". The consortium system, it says, should be phased out, and the generating boards should be free to place contracts with individual companies for nuclear stations in the same way as they do for conventional stations. The commercial research and development of the AEA should go to the single nuclear boiler organization or company. The AEA should, however, retain its responsibility for pure research, and the Government should carry out a full review to make sure that it is concentrating on pure research, and that any functions not "inextricably linked" to the primary task are passed to more appropriate organizations. This clearly is a reference to the diversification into fields such as desalination which the AEA has been engaged on.

In the production of fuel, the AEA monopoly should be broken by the establishment of a new British fuel supply and manufacturing company, which should include the AEA and others—Rolls-Royce is one possibility. In the export market, the British Nuclear Export Executive should be wound up, but the committee proposes no new organization to take its place. Instead, there should be a survey by the Board of Trade of export markets—hardly an inspiring rallying cry. The committee seems enthusiastic about high temperature reactors—partly on the evidence of the sub-committee which visited Europe—and says that high temperature reactor research should be supported, and that the Dragon reactor should be kept going, if necessary by Britain alone. Water reactors, the committee says, and particularly the steam generating heavy water reactor, should be speeded up. Finally, marine nuclear power is given support, if only in the recommendation that a departmental committee should be set up to examine the possibilities. As for fusion, the committee says that the Ministry of Technology should review the whole field of fusion research to ensure that Britain takes advantage of any technological breakthrough.

The committee seems keen to chip away at the power of the AEA. The AEA holds, it says, "a position of considerable advantage". In another place, it is described as "virtually unassailable". To counteract this, a technical assessment unit should be set up to advise the Government on the merits of AEA projects. The committee would also like to see the emergence in Britain of a body like the United States Joint Congressional Committee, with an expert staff.

The questions which the report leaves unanswered give plenty of room for further argument. If the AEA is to be divided, where will the division fall? Will the change in responsibility of the AEA need parliamentary legislation? And the greatest ambiguity of all—will the central design authority be an organization like the AEA is now, or will it be more like a nationalized industry? Throughout the report, it is referred to as a "single organization or company", no doubt in part to give way to Conservative critics. The saddest thing about the report is that it is not unanimous; the division along party lines may well have the effect of reducing the argument to party terms.

Counting Heads

IN Britain, more graduates are going on to further study or training than are entering industry. This situation, first documented by the Swann Committee report, has been substantiated by a report just issued by the University Grants Committee. But there has been a narrowing of the gap between the two careers —the number going on the postgraduate training or research rose from 12,084 in 1964–65 to 13,417 in 1965–66, while the number going into industry went up from 10,904 to 12,851. If the trend continues, industry will this year be taking almost exactly as many graduates from British universities as choose to remain in academic life or teaching. The balance, almost 20 per cent, includes overseas students going home, British students going abroad, married women