Norwegian legislation, if the family are against organ removal their wishes must be respected even if the deceased person himself had left no relevant instructions. The proposed French law makes no provision for this eventuality. Probably few families would take the initiative of giving advance notice of their objections, but one cannot help wondering how a French doctor who had intended to harvest an organ would react if they did. Undoubtedly under the new law he would be entitled to ignore family objections. Similar legislation is in force in Sweden and is under discussion in Italy.

Reactions to proposed law

In the preamble to his Bill, Senator Caillavet pointed out that even in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church "the intangibility of the cadaver is not a dogma." He recalled that in 1956 Pope Pius XII, speaking about corneal grafts, had said that the public needed educating in these matters and that it should be explained to them that "to consent expressly or tacitly" to mutilation of a body in the interest of suffering humanity is no infringement of the pious respect owed to the dead. The Pope's use of "tacitly" indicated, the Senator said, that His Holiness did not consider the "express" consent of the defunct or of his family to be indispensable.

One of the most vigorous advocates of this law is the famous nephrologist Professor Jean Hamburger. In giving evidence before the senatorial commission studying the text, Professor Hamburger pointed out that the fact that permission for organ removal must be sought from families at the same time as they are informed of the death is prejudicial to their giving the permission. A few days later, when emotional tension is less, they often regret their refusal.

One notes that whereas removal of organs for scientific or experimental purposes from living subjects is excluded (article 1), it is authorised from cadavers (article 2).

Speaking during the Senate debate, Madame Veil, Minister of Health expressed her belief that the text satisfactorily harmonised the needs of medical treatment with the respect for the wishes of potential donors. Preparation of the decree (clause 2 of article 4) defining how doctors would be informed if a patient had refused to be a donor would, Madame Veil thought, be difficult. She added that much would have to be done to educate public opinion to ready acceptance of this legislation.

In a comment in *Le Monde* (19 November 1976) Professor Georges Heuse of Belgium, Secretary-General of the International Institute of Human Biology,* said the Caillavet Law was a logical counterpoise to the law legalising abortion; it would "restore the balance of biological ethics." The law would give new hope to the many French men and women awaiting renal transplants and to thousands of blind persons who could recover their sight by keratoplasty. France would even be able to donate corneas to countries in which trachoma was endemic. Professor Heuse recalled that in 1965 a regulation on the same lines as the Caillavet Law had been introduced in the teaching hospital of the University of Ghent, Belgium, on the initiative of Professor R Dierkens, Secretary-General of the World Association for Medical Law. Since then it had been regularly applied and had served as a model for other Belgian teaching hospitals.

*The International Institute of Human Biology, Hôpital Cochin, 75014 Paris, is a non-governmental, non-profit-making organisation that conducts surveys in preventive medicine, occupational medicine, school medicine, sports medicine, life-assurance medicine, and geriatrics. It is also responsible for the International Thanatological Programme.

Contemporary Themes

Manpower planning—the teachers' tale

STUART MACLURE

British Medical Journal, 1977, 1, 498-500

No sector of the higher education system in this country has undergone so severe a recession, or so traumatic an institutional experience, as that which is currently afflicting the colleges of education—the old training colleges.

For many years—for about as long as anyone can remember—till very recently, there has been a shortage of teachers. In fact, the excessive size of classes and the need to step up the supply of teachers were among the basic tenets of faith in postwar education. The objectives of the 1944 Education Act could be attained only with an increase in the teaching force. The postwar era opened with two developments which underlined this fact. Firstly, the minimum school-leaving age was

raised from 14 to 15 in 1947; and, secondly, in the immediate years after the end of the war the birth rate climbed sharply in what became variously known as the baby boom or the bulge.

I think it is impossible to understand—and draw the correct lessons from—the errors which have been made with regard to teacher training and teacher supply, unless the psychological attitudes engendered by the prolonged period of teacher shortage is fully borne in mind. Teacher employment was virtually guaranteed. A quota system was developed by the Ministry of Education and the local authorities, in an attempt to ration out the limited number of teachers available. It was customary to speak of shortage areas (which had difficulty in recruiting their quota, like parts of the Midlands) and the "lush" areas which attracted more than their share (in the south).

Educational planning

Training and supply went hand in hand in educational planning. The assumption has always been—and still is—that

the number of teachers trained should be related fairly closely to the number for whom there would be jobs in the schools. In North America and in Scandinavia, which have also moved from shortage to surplus with disconcerting rapidity, it has been accepted that a higher education aimed at a teaching qualification could not guarantee employment—that such a course had merits which were not restricted to the subsequent practice of teaching, and that the public service, no less than individual opportunity, benefited from allowing those who wished to, to embark upon the teacher training course, as they might any other course of higher education, content at the end to take their chance in the competition for employment.

Such a policy in Britain has been rejected for a variety of reasons. The teachers' unions have assumed that the interests of their student members, the seed corn of their future membership, could be safeguarded only by a virtual guarantee of employment as a reward for professional training. The local authorities and the Department of Education and Science have regarded teacher supply as of such importance that the manpower planning of the education service was a constant preoccupation. The specialised qualification of the teacher was, in part at least, a guarantee that, once trained, he or she would be hooked into the teaching net. Keeping teacher education as something apart was, for many years, a way of insulating educational employment from outside temptations. And for the first part of the postwar period, at least, the financial arrangements for higher education meant that the cost of the teacher training colleges showed up directly on the education budget, whereas the universities, whose teacher training activities could only with difficulty be separated from all their other forms of educational provision, were financed through the University Grants Committee from another pocket.

Central planning and market forces

If you are disposed to take a strong individualist line, you might well feel that what happened over the supply of teachers underlines many doubts about central planning and dirigiste manpower policies.

If the supply of trained teachers had been left to the market, it could be argued, the universities and the colleges of further education would have adjusted their programmes to meet the need—just as they must be assumed to have done so for lawyers or accountants or bank managers. There is no requirement for special equipment or the huge capital and current cost required by the creation of teaching hospitals, as in the case of doctors. It would have made sense early on to break down the isolation of the specialised colleges of education—end their strange, limbo-like existence half-way between the universities and the colleges of further education—and to do this at the start of the expansion period, not leave it (as has been done) till everything becomes much more painful in a time of contraction.

As everyone knows, the birth rate snaked up in the late 'forties, dipped in the early 'fifties, and began to climb again in the late 'fifties to the end of an era in 1964, since when each succeeding year has produced a smaller crop of births than the year before (figure 1).

The teacher training planners anticipated the dip which followed the bulge, but were badly caught by the second bull-market, which ran from 1955 to 1964. In the mid-'fifties, they became convinced that there was a danger of overproduction of teachers. They therefore extended the ordinary length of the teacher-training course from two years to three, at just the time when the population trend was beginning to rise again.

The early 1960s produced all the difficulties which might be expected. The age structure of the teaching profession—with a relatively low rate of recruitment before the war, a relatively high rate of recruitment after it, and considerably more women than men entering each year—meant that large numbers of young married women teachers were themselves helping to swell

FIG. 1—Actual births in England and Wales in 1960-74 and projections to 1995.

The 1974 and 1975 "central" projections both incorporated an assumption that in the long-term the number of live births per woman would be 2.2. The three variants were based on a range of different assumptions about fertility:

- A "high" variant assuming an immediate reversal of the decline in births which has taken place since 1964 and an average of 2.3 live births for women born after 1960;
- a "low" variant assuming a further decline in annual births and an average of 2.1 births for women born after 1960 (2.1 births per woman is about the level of fertility which in the long-run would lead to the population just replacing itself);
- a "continuing low" variant assuming the same short-run trend in annual births as in the "low" variant but an average of 1.8 births for women born after the early 1950s (the current annual fertility rate is around 1.8).

Reproduced from *DES Report on Education*, No 80, June 1976.

the birthrate figures and, as they did so, removing themselves from the classroom for an indeterminate period of years.

These were the years of high wastage—the years when, as the then Sir Edward Boyle put it, teacher training policies were based on the Paschendale principle. In a series of hasty steps the intake into teacher training courses was increased. In 1962 about 20 000 teachers were admitted. By 1969 this had risen to more than 43 000. A year later it topped 45 000.

Causes of wastage

The causes of wastage were not just to be found in the family-rearing habits of young women teachers. The 'sixties also saw other developments in the educational field. Improvements in secondary education led logically to a bigger demand for all postsecondary opportunities. A substantial part of what appeared as teacher wastage was made up of transfers from one part of the system to another—from school teaching to teacher training or further education or university work.

The euphoria of expansion reached fever pitch in the period of the first and second Wilson governments. Mr Antony Crosland's great achievement as Secretary of State for Education was to lick the teacher shortage. But the irony is that, by the

time he gave expansion its biggest shove, the birthrate had already begun to go down. The Robbins Report still fuelled the expansion of higher education, but, as the second Wilson government wore on, the money began to run out, and Mr Roy Jenkins, as Chancellor, introduced tough controls on public expenditure. Since 1970 the growth of higher education has been repeatedly scaled down. Present plans provide for a continuing rise in numbers but not for any rise in higher education teaching staff.

As for the supply and training of teachers, the combination of a lower birth rate and lower wastage rapidly stepped up the net rate of growth in the total number of teachers employed. The Paschendale losses ceased. Women teachers, like other women, had fewer babies and expected to spend less time out of employment looking after them. The teacher population rose in the early 1970s by around 15 000 a year net. The total number grew from about 289 000 in 1962 to about 363 000 in 1970; by 1976 this had risen to 440 000. The shortage of teachers was at an end. There were more available teachers than there was money to pay for them, and getting on for half of the young men and women emerging from the colleges with teaching qualifications last year were unable to get jobs as teachers. Even this greatly understated the turn around: many part-time teachers lost their jobs, and the pool of available but not employed teachers included a growing number of married women, ready and willing but unable to return to the classroom after raising their families.

In retrospect, of course, it is obvious that the planners should have foreseen what happened and taken steps earlier to turn off the tap (that is, if you hold to the view that supply should be geared to expected demand). Some of those who are now saying this are among those who most vociferously opposed every move to cut the number of college entrants. But there was a failure of firmness at the Department of Education and Science by Mrs Thatcher and her successors, who allowed the teacher-training lobby, aided by the teachers' unions, to hold up needed decisions and, at a critical period, held back the statistics which justified cuts as early as 1971. (Admittedly, the birth rate figures gave a hiccup in 1971 and everybody has had their fingers burned by deceptive demographic trends often enough to be extremely cautious).

Revolutionary proposals

In 1971 a committee set up by Mrs Thatcher, with Lord James of Rusholme in the chair, proposed a complete re-organisation of teacher education with revolutionary proposals for in-service training and a new structure of initial teacher training designed to incorporate it within the fabric of the rest of advanced further education (meaning, in many cases, new links with the polytechnics.) Confidential projections of school population and staffing needs (the latter, of course, depend on policy judgments as well as pupil numbers) were available to the James Committee, but they were not allowed to use them to back up their arguments. The structural changes they proposed—designed, in large measure, to put teacher education on a two-part basis, the first part being general higher education, the second being professional training—were intended to postpone the point at which the student actually committed himself to teaching. If, for example, the first two years could be a general course of higher education leading to its own diploma, some who took it might at that stage leave and go into employment in industry or commerce; others might enrol for other courses of higher or professional education, of which a teacher training course would be one.

This would have the advantage of cutting the time it would take to adjust teacher output to changes in demand. Under the present arrangements, a decision to cut entry to the colleges now does not reduce the number of qualified teachers emerging from the colleges till 1980—the James scheme would have cut the lead time from three years to one.

Getting planning right

Of course, in the James view there were other important advantages, but all became caught up in a lengthy controversy about the future of the colleges of education, which helped to delay the hard but necessary decision which should then have been taken and which could have cut the output by 1974. The delay, however, illustrates what I take to be a general truth about manpower planning: that even in the case of manpower for teaching, where demands can be accurately forecast at least five years ahead, and estimated with a fair degree of assurance a few years beyond that, getting the planning right depends as much on political nerve as it does on statistics. Manpower planning is no better than its political direction, and few politicians are farsighted enough, or courageous enough, to take unpopular decisions on the strength of what their forecasters tell them.

So it now seems that between the mid-1970s and the mid-1980s the school population will drop from just over 9 million to around 7.5 million (fig 2). It looks, too, as if the teaching profession has peaked at around 440 000 and, so long as the present economic stringency continues, will follow the downward trend of the school population. And the plan for the colleges of education is for their teacher training numbers to fall from the present 100 000 to what still looks like an optimistic figure of 45 000. This includes some 10 000 places needed on the hypothesis that the in-service education of existing teachers will quadruple and help to take up some of the slack.

FIG 2—Actual school population in England and Wales in 1960-74 and projections to 1995. Reproduced from *DES Report on Education*, No 80, June 1976.

The result of all this is going to be a long period of weeping and gnashing of teeth for the staff of the colleges. Many of them are specialist teacher trainers, unable to turn their hands to other courses which the colleges are now frantically trying to develop in order to diversify their recruitment and complete their merger with the rest of further education. Perhaps when the agonizing reappraisal is complete good will come out of it, because the isolation of teacher education always was a nonsense. But not till well into the 'eighties, when things have settled down, and morale has had the chance to recover.