

professional committees and collaborate on investigational work, possibly at international level.

Notes: (1) Since the testing of dressings requires special techniques, use should be made of established organizations, for example, the Manchester Chamber of Commerce Testing House and Laboratory. (2) Specialized testing of materials by bioassay techniques will involve the co-operation of established organizations capable of making such tests.

LEGISLATION

It is not the purpose of this Committee to indicate in detail what legislation is involved, but it directs attention to the following matters. Consolidating legislation would have to be introduced to correlate and extend the existing legislation under the Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1933, the Food and Drugs Act, 1955, the National Health Service Acts, the Pharmacy Act, 1954, and to provide the powers necessary to permit the Executive Organization to conduct its affairs in an efficient and responsible manner.

Right of entry and inspection. The inspectors must be given the necessary powers to carry out their duties properly both as regards sampling and the inspection of premises and records.

Test results. A procedure must be developed whereby information on the results of the tests are transmitted to the source from which the sample was obtained.

Sanctions. In addition to the usual legal penalties the following sanctions might be applied: (a) withdrawal of licence; (b) removal of name from approved list of supervisory staff; (c) stock recall, impounding or destruction.

Appeals. There must be included some means of appeal against decisions of the inspectors or the director.

FINANCIAL

Whereas a detailed consideration of the financial aspects of the scheme is beyond the terms of reference of the Committee, attention is directed to the following points:

Expenditure. (1) Administrative expense of Executive Organization. (2) Administrative expense of Directorate and Inspectorate, including laboratory services. (3) Fees to outside analysts (for example, analysts responsible for bio-assays, public analysts, National Health Service analysts, Manchester Chamber of Commerce Testing House).

Income. (1) From registration and licensing fees (except dispensing areas). (2) From the Treasury.

INTERPRETATION

A drug (or pharmaceutical preparation) is any chemical or natural product or mixture of substances, including natural products, sold, offered for sale or represented for use in: (a) the diagnosis, treatment, mitigation or prevention of disease, abnormal physical state or the symptoms thereof in man or animal; (b) restoring, correcting or modifying organic functions in man or animal.

Drug in bulk. A chemical or natural product stored in bulk quantity intended directly for use in the manufacture of medicinal products.

Formulated product. A drug or mixture of drugs suitably prepared for administration as a medicine. A single chemical substance in small quantity, pre-packed for distribution.

Pharmaceutical specialty. A simple or compound drug ready for use, available under a special trade designation or in some characteristic form and containing one or more drugs which may or may not have official (that is, B.P., B.P.C., B.Vet.C.) recognition.

Proprietary preparation. A pharmaceutical specialty.

Surgical dressings, surgical sutures. Materials for application to wounds or lesions for therapeutic use or for their protection.

Dispensed medicine. Medicine dispensed for an individual patient in accordance with a prescription.

Medicated cosmetic or toilet article. A toilet article for external use on any part of the body, whether in liquid, solid or any other form and medicated so as to bring it within the requirements of the Pharmacy and Medicines Act, 1941.

THE SCIENCE COMMITTEE (PHARMACEUTICAL ANALYSIS)

The Science Committee (Pharmaceutical Analysis) of the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences consists of: Dr. D. C. Garratt (chairman), Mr. J. Allen, Dr. A. L. Glenn, Mr. C. A. Johnson, Mr. E. I. Johnson, Dr. R. F. Milton, Dr. H. D. C. Rapson, Mr. S. G. E. Stevens and Mr. G. Sykes. Not all members are pharmacists, but all in their day-to-day activities are intimately concerned with the quality of pharmaceutical materials; some have had experience of drug testing under the present restricted schemes.

THE FISHERY LIMITS BILL

THE Fishery Limits Bill, which received its second reading in the House of Commons on June 15, establishes the fishery régime in British waters for which the Fisheries Convention resulting from the fisheries conference some months ago provides. As the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food, Mr. C. Soames, explained in moving the second reading, the Convention, which has since been signed by twelve countries including the United Kingdom, allows the coastal State a twelve-mile fishery zone measured from base-lines, and within this zone the State has power to regulate the fisheries. In the inner six miles the fishing is reserved for the fishermen of the coastal State, subject to a short transitional period for foreign fishermen who have traditionally fished within it. In the outer six miles the fishing is in principle reserved for fishermen of the coastal State and other parties to the

Convention who have habitually fished in that area. In this way such foreign fishermen will be restricted to the stocks and grounds which they have already fished.

Mr. Soames emphasized that while Britain had consistently favoured the doctrine of narrow limits, the Government had concluded that some extension of limits could no longer be denied to Britain's fishermen. The Government's sole motive had been to secure more scope for Britain's fishermen in Britain's coastal waters. As regards conservation, the Government considered that the proper way to conserve fish stocks was by international action equitable to all in the conservation commissions which had been set up and in whose work Britain played a leading part. Mr. Soames said that there were some two or three countries which were not parties to the Convention but had some interest in the fisheries around

Britain's coast, although the extent of that fishing was not very great and Britain would need to consider with them what their position should be. It was hoped that the new arrangements could be brought into full operation by September.

The kernel of the Bill was in Clause 1, which provided for the extension of Britain's limits and for her control of access by foreign fishermen to the fisheries within these limits. The Convention provided that to qualify for recognition to be able to continue fishing between six and twelve miles this foreign fishing must have been carried on habitually during the ten years up to and including 1962 and that it must not be directed in future towards new grounds or new stocks of fish. In drawing up the designation orders, Mr. Soames said that Britain would, of course, need to take account of the fact that fish move round and that many species are often found on the same ground, but we would be able to distinguish between herring fisheries, fisheries for white fish and shell fisheries. The power of designation was not limited to the vessels of countries which were party to the convention, and Britain's fishery agreement with Norway provided that if Britain established a fishery zone she would be prepared to make for Norwegian vessels arrangements corresponding to those which that agreement made for British vessels off Norway. The new base-lines which Britain was drawing were in conformity with the 1958 Geneva Convention and she would be able to close bays with straight lines up to 24 miles in length, whereas at present 10 miles are the maximum lengths for a bay closing line. Until the Bill came into full operation there would be a transitional period for traditional foreign

fishing between three and six miles from base lines. This was dealt with in Clause 2.

The right to enforce conservation measures on British and foreign vessels was one to which Britain attached great importance, but it did not require new powers from the House. It was simply a question of adapting the powers which existed under present legislation to apply conservation regulations to British vessels. This was done in the first schedule to the Bill. Mr. Soames emphasized that Britain now had a modern instrument for promoting conservation through international co-operation in the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission of which all countries fishing in the north-east Atlantic without exception were members. It was the responsibility of this Commission to take all the measures that conservation demanded. At a meeting of the Commission in June on the initiative of Britain a special committee was set up which would be concerned with making collective arrangements for enforcing conservation measures on the high seas. This Committee would apply conservation measures to foreign vessels when they were fishing within Britain's own fishery limits as well as to British vessels. Mr. M. Noble expressed the hope that members of the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission, which included Poland and other countries not signatories to the Convention, would be able to work together so that, while Britain could enforce within her twelve-mile limit the conservation measures which she thought right, these other countries would at the same time be able to work out conservation measures and internationally the same measures could be adopted and brought into force.

NUCLEAR POWER IN BRITAIN

IN the debate in the House of Lords on June 10 on the White Paper, *The Second Nuclear Power Programme* (*Nature*, 202, 1247; 1964), Lord Coleraine was concerned with the reasons for Britain losing her commanding lead in this field to the United States, which he attributed to the organization of the nuclear power programme. This he thought was far less efficiently organized in Britain than in the United States and this was partly because each power station carried an enormous load of research and development charges. He was concerned that the ordering of an American reactor system would mean that American technology would dominate the nuclear industry in Britain and that in effect she was opting out of that industry. He urged that the Government should take a hard look at the organization of the nuclear programme and particularly at the position of the Central Electricity Generating Board. He thought it was the function of that Board to provide the consumer in Britain with adequate supplies of cheap electricity, but that this function could not conceivably be combined with pioneering a new, expensive and complex industry. He did not think that a healthy nuclear industry could survive simply on the basis of copying designs. He suggested that the Atomic Energy Authority should be responsible for development until the first commercial station was in operation and proved, and then sell it to the Central Electricity Generating Board at a price which would meet the subsidy requested by the chairman of that Board. This was the system adopted in Canada.

Lord Champion agreed that Britain did not have all the information which should be available when considering a matter of this immensity and importance. Moreover, she had not yet resolved the problem of the extent to which the Board and the Authority should bear the responsibility for research and development of civilian types of reactors and the legislation required to amend the Authority's statute. Nevertheless, he thought

that *The Second Nuclear Power Programme* was right in its flexibility, but Viscount Caldecote thought that it was doubtful whether technical resources had been as well used as they could have been and that the responsibilities had not always been shared in the best way among industry, the Atomic Energy Authority and the Central Electricity Generating Board. He thought it essential to see that scarce national technical resources were utilized to the best advantage, electrical power supplied as economically as possible, that there was an active research and development programme and that an efficient industry should be allowed to make reasonable profits on the capital involved. The proper use of national resources, he pointed out, required a stable policy and that there should be no duplication between industry, the Authority and the Generating Board as well as a much better delineation of responsibility. A suitable administrative set-up in the Government was required to control the Generating Board, the Authority and research and development and production work as well as the share done in industry. Viscount Caldecote suggested that the research functions of the Authority should be left under the Ministry for Science and Education and the responsibility of the Authority for development and collaboration with industry in their field reviewed. He entirely agreed with Lord Champion that Britain could not reject a system which was clearly and obviously more economic because it had been designed in the United States and not in Britain, but it was all too clear that it was very easy to have too much competition in these difficult technological and rapidly advancing fields.

Lord Stonham reiterated that not sufficient information was generally available for a proper judgment and that Britain should not reject an American system purely on the grounds that it was American. Lord Wolverton referred to the higher efficiency of the new station at Bradwell in Essex which had a thermal efficiency of 26.5