

LCCNO

Prime Minister (2)

To note

AT 28/3

PRIME MINISTER

## REVIEW OF HIGH ENERGY PARTICLE PHYSICS

To complete our exchanges on the launching of this review I thought I should just let you and our Cabinet colleagues know that it was announced on 22 March and for the record I am enclosing a copy of the official report.

I amended the terms of reference as suggested by Norman Tebbit to make explicit reference to engineering research as part of the context of the review but did not feel able to ask the ABRC to amend its advice retrospectively. It seemed to me a clear-cut choice between publishing the full exchanges or none, and I preferred full publication. In my letter to Sir David Phillips about the review I stressed its constitutional distance from Government and here and elsewhere have emphasised that the findings of the review are in no way pre-empted.

I quite take Peter Rees' suggestion that the study should cover our domestic as well as our international expenditure on high energy particle physics, and should if possible make some assessment of value for money. I will see that this matter is brought to the notice of the Group.

Finally, on Geoffrey Howe's continuing concern over the composition of the review team and the need to secure some association with a specialist in high energy particle physics, I had further discussion with the two Chairmen. The result was that Sir John Kendrew asked Dr Christopher H Llewellyn-Smith if he would be an adviser to the Group. Dr Llewellyn-Smith is a Reader in theoretical physics at Oxford and was recently elected Fellow of the Royal Society for his theoretical work in elementary particle physics. He is well known at CERN and more widely in the high energy particle physics community and I hope



that his involvement, plus full and open opportunity for the community to present evidence to the Review Group, will provide the reassurance for our CERN partners which Geoffrey was seeking.

Finally I should record some slight alteration in the composition of the Review Group. Sir Peter Hirsch was too busy to serve and I am glad to say that Professor Eric Ash FRS has agreed to fill that place.

I am copying this minute to Cabinet colleagues, and to Sir Robert Armstrong and Dr Nicholson.

14

28 March 1984



(2) if he will make a statement on the circumstances in which a North Scottish helicopter was involved in an air miss with military aircraft when the helicopter was airborne to the North sea oil platforms;

(3) if he will make a statement on the circumstances in which a British Airways helicopter was involved in an air miss with military aircraft when the helicopter was airborne to the North sea oil platforms.

**Mr. David Mitchell:** Air miss reports were filed by a British Airways helicopter on 13 March, a Bristow helicopter on 14 March and a North Scottish helicopter on 15 March. They referred to sightings of military aircraft in the area offshore north east of Aberdeen. These incidents are being investigated by the joint air miss working group, which is a joint civil-military element of the National Air Traffic Services. Its findings will be reported to me and made known to the aviation industry.

#### Hampstead Garden Suburb Report

**Dr. Twinn** asked the Secretary of State for Transport if he will now make the Hampstead garden suburb report publicly available.

**Mr. Ridley:** Yes, shortly.

#### Road Condition Survey

**Mr. Leigh** asked the Secretary of State for Transport whether he has received the report of the 1983 national road maintenance condition survey; and if he will make a statement.

**Mr. Ridley:** The report of the 1983 national road maintenance condition survey is published today. I have placed a copy in the Library of the House. This report, which does not cover motorways, shows that the general condition of roads in England and Wales has remained stable since the survey began in 1977. If anything, there has been a slight improvement.

Compared with last year the survey suggests that there has been a slight deterioration in the condition of trunk roads. It would be premature to conclude from one year's results that this will continue, but the Department will be closely monitoring the position. The structural renewal of motorways must remain our priority. The local highway authorities will, I know, be examining the condition of their own roads in relation to the national picture, as a guide to their maintenance priorities.

The standing committee on highway maintenance has established the NRMCS as an objective statistical basis for discussion of road condition and maintenance expenditure. I commend the report of the 1983 survey to all who have an interest in roads.

#### Personalised Car Numbers

**Sir David Price** asked the Secretary of State for Transport what are the current rates for the transfer of personalised car numbers.

**Mrs. Chalker** [pursuant to her reply, 19 March 1984, c. 335]: There is a single rate of £80 per transfer.

**Sir David Price** asked the Secretary of State for Transport how much revenue is raised annually by the transfer fees for personalised number plates; and what happens to it.

**Mrs. Chalker** [pursuant to her reply, 19 March 1984, c. 335]: In 1982-83 the figure was £2.1 million. The revenue is used to offset the running costs of the driver and vehicle licensing centre.

#### Severn Bridge

**Mr. Frank Field** asked the Secretary of State for Transport if he will make available details of the survey of traffic loading on the Severn bridge by time of day and day of week.

**Mrs. Chalker** [pursuant to her reply, 19 March 1984, c. 335]: A report on vehicle weight and classification data, based on a survey over 27 days in October and November 1982, was prepared by the Transport and Road Research Laboratory. I shall place a copy in the Library.

#### Transport and Road Haulage Industries

**Mr. McQuarrie** asked the Secretary of State for Transport what representations he has received from the transport industry and road haulage organisations on the effect of the Budget on this industry.

**Mr. Ridley:** None, but I have seen the Road Haulage Association's press release commenting on the changes in vehicle excise duty announced by the Chancellor in his budget speech, and also the view of the Freight Transport Association as reported in the press.

### 1091 EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

#### Advisory Board for the Research Councils

**Mr. Jackson** asked the Secretary of State for Education and Science what advice he has received from the Advisory Board for the Research Councils, in particular as it bears on United Kingdom participation in high energy particle physics research; and if he will make a statement.

**Sir Keith Joseph:** I am today publishing the advice I received during 1983 from the Advisory Board for the Research Councils, and my correspondence with Sir David Phillips the chairman; I am arranging for copies to be placed in the Libraries of both Houses. That advice includes a careful discussion of the case for greater selectivity in our priorities for research and of the corresponding need to keep under review the competing claims of current and new areas of scientific opportunity. As part of this process the board has proposed that, with the Science and Engineering Research Council, it should review United Kingdom participation in high energy particle physics. Without prejudice to the attitude the Government may take to the findings of the review and the board's subsequent advice I have informed Sir David Phillips and Professor Kingman of my concurrence in their making the review; the text of my letter follows, together with details of the proposed terms of reference and membership of the review group.

21 March 1984

Dear David,

UK Participation in High Energy Particle Physics:  
ABRC-SERC Review

In the advice of the ABRC that you submitted to me on behalf of the Board on 23 November 1983 you recorded the Board's intention to review, with the SERC, UK participation in high energy particle physics research. In recognition of the implications that such a review might have for our membership



of CERN, to whose Convention the UK Government is a party, you and Professor Kingman kindly consulted me on your detailed proposals for the review, and sought assurances that the Government did not wish to circumscribe the review; and that any savings identified by the review would be available for redeployment elsewhere in the Science Budget.

I give the assurances you seek in recognition that they are fundamental to the exercise, as being concerned with the best value for money from a given level of resources for scientific research. Thus any proposal for redeployment of resources devoted by the UK to high energy particle physics would be made on the basis that there were higher priorities in other areas of science. While the level of the Science Budget for any future year will, of course, need to be considered in the light of all the circumstances at the time, I can say definitely that any such proposal to which the Government agreed would not be made an occasion for cutting the Science Budget as a whole.

I am content with your proposal that Sir John Kendrew should chair the Review Group, and with the membership you propose. I appreciated seeing the terms of reference that you have in mind. I think that it would be helpful if they were made public when the review is announced and with your agreement and that of Professor Kingman I will do this. I am content with what you envisage but I regard the precise final form as a matter for you and Professor Kingman to settle with Sir John Kendrew.

In giving these assurances and concurring in the review I am conscious that it is to be a review by, and for, ABRC and SERC, not a Government review. I need not emphasise, for you, the constitutional distinction between the Board's advice on a matter and what the Government may decide on that advice. This distinction is particularly important in respect of any change that might be proposed in our relations with CERN, of which the UK is a full and active member. Any change in that position would be a matter for Government, to be considered by due process and in consultation with other members; and any question of change lies beyond the report of the Review Group, and any advice on that the Board and SERC may choose to offer. For now, it is business as usual.

I am sure that the Review Group will approach their task in a positive and constructive spirit and with a full appreciation of what has been achieved in this field, particularly through international collaboration, and of its future potential.

I am sending a copy of this letter to Professor Kingman.

*Yours sincerely,*  
Keith Joseph

Sir David Phillips  
Chairman  
Advisory Board for Research Councils  
Elizabeth House  
York Road  
London SE1 7PH  
**ABRC-SERC STUDY OF HIGH-ENERGY PARTICLE PHYSICS**

*Proposed terms of reference*

Having regard to the long-term health of British science and engineering research and to the Common Criteria\* for the support enunciated by the Advisory Board for the Research Councils in its Second Report, 1974-75:

- (i) to review UK participation in the study of high-energy particle physics, with particular reference to that necessarily carried out under international auspices;
- (ii) to consider possible future involvement, the role and extent of international collaboration, and the implications of reallocation of the resources in whole or in part to other areas of science;
- (iii) to report to the Chairman of the ABRC and the Chairman of the SERC.

\*see Annex.

*Membership*

Sir John Kendrew FRS will chair the Review Group. The following people have agreed to be members of the Group:— Sir Douglas Hague; Sir Jack Lewis FRS; Professor K. Pounds FRS; Sir Francis Tombs. There may be one or two more members. The Chairman has also invited Dr. Llewellyn-Smith FRS to act as adviser to the Group.

**THE COMMON CRITERIA**

1.\* Councils and their Boards/Committees/Groups are invited to use the criteria listed here to discuss and compare relative benefits. Whenever practicable, reference should be made to objective data in support of the assessment (eg demographic data; social costs; relevant government expenditure etc.) in relation to the cost of the research.

**Scientific Policy Criteria**

(1) Excellence of study field

Where benefits are attributable to a high proportion of the research being intrinsically of high intellectual value.

(2) Excellence of the research workers

Where benefits are attributable to the exceptional quality of the individuals or teams to be employed in the activity.

(3) Pervasiveness of the activity

Where benefits include the impetus to advances in other and related fields of science in addition to the primary field.

(4) Social and/or economic importance

Where expected benefits arise from the work being directed to supporting social or economic aims.

(5) Significance for the training of scientific manpower

Where benefits will include training and experience for scientific research workers.

(6) Educational importance

Where benefits will include a contribution to education.

(7) Significance in maintaining national scientific prestige

Where benefits will contribute to national reputation.

**Management Criteria**

2. A set of selected management criteria are also offered. These apply to the consideration, from a management policy point of view, of alternatives which have already been assessed on the scientific policy criteria.

A. Efficiency of operation

Where improvements in organisation and/or plant would lead to a general increase in efficiency.

B. Obsolescence

Where the maintenance of a capability (at whatever level of activity) requires replacement within the Forward Look period of a major item of obsolescent plant or equipment.

C. Timing

Where a start on a new or increased activity within the Forward Look period is critical if the expected benefits are not to be lost or much reduced.

D. Dependence on Science Budget Support

Where there is likely to be limited support, national or foreign, available for work related to the activity except the Science Budget.

E. Availability of scientific manpower

Where an activity attracts priority by virtue of greater availability of scientific manpower for it (or its execution is constrained by lack of it).

F. Scope and limits of redeployment

Where the priority accorded to an activity is conditioned by difficulties or opportunities of redeployment.

\*Extract from instructions to Research Councils, 1975 Forward Look.

1089

**School Leavers**

Mr. Teddy Taylor asked the Secretary of State for Education and Science if he will introduce legislation to permit children who have attained the age of 16 years to leave school before the appropriate school leaving date if they have a firm offer of regular employment; and if he will make a statement.

Sir Keith Joseph: The possibilities for change in the school leaving arrangements set out in the Education (School Leaving Dates) Act 1976 have been considered from time to time and remain under review. I believe, however, that the balance of advantage lies in leaving the present arrangements unchanged and in continuing to concentrate attention on making the curriculum in the final years at school more relevant to pupils' needs. Further



Science & Tech SEPT 83  
Budget

28 FEB 1984

