

RE-EVALUATE GRADUATE EDUCATION

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 7

The facts seem to underline this argument. Seventy-five per cent of the graduate Ph.D's go into university teaching; another large group go into fairly specific research with government. It's fashionable in graduate circles to look down on the graduate who goes into industry, to suggest he's just there for the money and has abandoned "pure" (and therefore "better") research.

This year, the National Research Council made a small effort to counter this trend by offering industrial post-doctoral fellowships where the NRC would pay the salary of a PhD graduate for one year's research in industry. Despite the tight job situation, the NRC received only 25 applications; only 18 were from acceptable candidates.

It's inevitable that a growing num-

ber of PhDs will have to find work outside the universities. And most of the jobs outside universities need a broadness of approach the present doctorate programs are unlikely to engender.

The fact that more and more regional colleges are springing up across the country also demands a broadening of the PhD is people with doctorates want to teach at the college level. Colleges tend to be far more concerned with teaching than with research.

The problem, it seems, has to be attacked on a broad front. Cancellation of Operation Retrieval, reductions in immigration, advertising of university positions, reexamination of graduate education — all appear to be necessary actions. Together, say those directly concerned,

they provide a more effective answer than the other panacea often advanced, the launching of government manpower studies followed by direct efforts to reduce the flow of graduates in one field, while increasing it in another. Manpower studies, after all, may be pretty, but they're usually so hedged about by "ifs" and "maybes" that they're little more than educated guesses.

That's not to say that university officials aren't concerned about a possible waste of highly trained manpower. They are. But by their very nature, stringent manpower policies would take several years to take effect. And by then it could be a whole new ball game. Or a whole new brain drain. □

The trickle down your armpits.

Some things make us nervous.

Some things turn us into a kind of stranger to ourselves. The old dryness of the mouth sets in. The sweat starts down.

How about those job interviews, where all of a sudden you've got to stand out very clearly from the herd? Inside half an hour you've got to establish yourself to a world you never made and may not even like.

Does the prospect make you just a little nervous? No? You're lucky.

Oh, it does? Join the club. It gets us all, even those over thirty.

You could write a book about being nervous about interviews. As a matter of fact, we have written a book. A little one: "How to separate

yourself from the herd". It's packed with practical tips on how to go to an interview *on your own terms*.

We wrote it because we've been there. Without any modesty whatsoever we can tell you we're a company whose very life depends on our skill at coming face to face with strangers.

Our little book is tucked into a bigger one: The Employment Opportunities Handbook, a kind of dictionary of the companies who are looking. This brand new handbook is yours for the asking at the placement office.

"How to separate yourself from the herd" won't work any magic between now and your first interview.

But it just might help.

LONDON LIFE
Insurance Company, London, Canada

the inside october 23, 1970 page 8

pr
as
se
d
fo
T
Afr
inn
con
sev
am
(L
pu
au
wi
"a
by
tra
ne
cc
b
ri
tr
N
t
LA
C
The la
graduates
the hill
Beaverbro
fall Con
Prime Mi
issue a c
the indivi
ence of e
ping the
laced wit
wit.
Stress
ation on
prepared
fellow m
lined his
comitme
present t
in helpin
There
that pri
for eve
the para
dividual
STUDE
Vice Pres
Donal
Ronald
Spoile
Business
Richar
Thom
Spoile
Cannibu
Yes
No
Senate
Paul C
Thom
Donal
Micha
Peter
Electec
Vaugh