pharyngeal wall or uvula, and an anterior lingual polyp of this kind was reported by Miller and Owens.¹ It should probably be regarded as a congenital malformation, as was the nasopharyngeal nodule described by Kesson,² rather than as a teratoma, which is a true tumour or neoplasm composed of multiple tissues of kinds foreign to the part in which it arises. The midline of the posterior part of the tongue is certainly a most unusual site for such a polyp and probably gave rise to the polyhydramnios by interfering with fetal swallowing. It is worth noting that solid tumours in the mouth occasionally cause problems of resuscitation in the newborn infant and, if pedunculated, may readily be removed in the delivery room.

O G BROOKE

Department of Child Health,
St George's Hospital,
London SW17

ANNE NESBITT
STEPHANIE WILSON

Departments of Paediatrics and Histopathology,
St Mary's Hospital,
London W2/W9

¹ Miller, A P, and Owens, J B, *Cancer*, 1966, **19**, 1583.
² Kesson, C W, *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 1954, **29**, 254.

Lumbar disc surgery

SIR,—Mr Arthur Naylor (26 February, p 567) rightly states that simultaneous spinal fusion with disc excision is not commonly practised in Britain and that the majority of patients undergoing excision of a prolapsed disc do not require the extra procedure. Nevertheless, the necessity of wearing a lumbar support for backache following laminectomy should be considered a relative failure of surgery.

Postlaminectomy backache can be anticipated in the presence of certain features: (1) the presence of backache as well as sciatica at the time of intervention; (2) a previous long history of backache, especially when made worse by standing or sitting in one position for some time; (3) the presence of minor congenital abnormalities in the spine—for example, spina bifida occulta, unilateral sacralisation, asymmetrical interfacetal joints; (4) hypermobility at the affected level observed at operation.

Patients at risk should be placed in an operating position suitable for the combined procedure, and the Toronto frame is an excellent support for this. A convenient and effective method for fusion is to insert screws through the facet joints into the pedicles as described by Boucher¹ and to perform a posterolateral and intertransverse fusion using corticocancellous grafts from the posterior ilium. The combined procedure can be done through a median incision; no graft overlies

the laminectomy site and a healthy fusion mass develops (see figure). Although the additional surgery doubles the time of the operation the hospital stay is not prolonged and the patient immediately senses that the back is "solid." It has been shown by Jackson² that the incidence of postlaminectomy backache is not influenced by the type of laminectomy performed and a critical selection of patients for combined disc excision and fusion is likely to reduce the incidence of postlaminectomy backache without indiscriminate spinal surgery being performed.

ROGER AUSTIN

Leicester Royal Infirmary,
Leicester

¹ Boucher, M M, *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery*, 1959, **41B**, 248.

² Jackson, R K, *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery*, 1971, **53B**, 609.

Plight of young consultants

SIR,—Your leading article "Incomes policy mark 3?" (19 February, p 470) questions, quite rightly, the value of an "independent" Review Body. We have seen in the past how succeeding governments flouted the recommendations of several Review Bodies on Doctors' and Dentists' Remuneration, to which the profession always seems to agree. Even when a government does implement a particular recommendation, at a later date it may choose to annul this for political albeit economic expediency—of course, I am talking about the lengthening of the shortened (and short-lived for some) consultant incremental scale. I am surprised that in your article this unjust action on the part of the Government was not mentioned since the profession's representatives—that is, the BMA—are already discussing the phase 3 incomes policy with the Government.

The affected consultants are still waiting for the plans for action for restoring them to their correct position on the incremental scale as stipulated in the letter from the chairman of the Central Committee for Hospital Medical Services (11 September, p 657). It is now high time that the BMA produced some action. The least it can do in the meantime is to take a stand similar to that of the Hospital Consultants and Specialists Association in not supporting a pay code that does not redress this injustice. If the BMA fails to protect the rights of its individual members, not to speak of a significant minority as in this instance, then I am afraid the BMA will lose its credibility as the representative body of the profession.

A F M S RAHMAN

Lister Hospital,
Stevenage, Herts

SIR,—Groups of consultants in 17 hospitals have written to the chairman of the Review Body on Doctors' and Dentists' Remuneration pointing out that young consultants in particular have borne a heavy burden during successive phases of the Government's counterinflation policies. These consultants have also told the Review Body that they no longer have confidence in the BMA as a negotiating body because, they claim, their views are not adequately represented by the Association. I have written to each group on behalf of the BMA and because this is a matter of concern to hospital doctors generally I am

sure that my comments will be of interest to a wider audience.

I told them that their views are the same as those which the BMA has unequivocally expressed to the Review Body about the plight of consultants in general and younger consultants in particular. But the main reason for the anomalies is the Government's incomes policy. All the independent Review Bodies have been asked to have regard to this policy and it follows that representations to the Review Body alone are not enough.

Within a few days of my election as chairman of Council I met the Prime Minister and (among other things) impressed upon him the urgent need for some alleviation of the anomalies which had been imposed on consultants by successive stages of incomes policy. As a result of this meeting the incremental payments were resumed during phase 2 of the pay policy. On 9 February I saw the Secretary of State for Social Services about the next stage of incomes policy and I was strongly supported at that meeting by the chairman of the Central Committee for Hospital Medical Services, Mr A H Grabham.

The general case we put could be summarised as follows. Any further incomes policy should permit: (1) a generous percentage increase in gross remuneration; (2) no upper limit in cash terms as in the present policy; and (3) that there should be a substantial raising of the level of taxable income at which the higher tax bands come into operation.

We expressed the fear that remuneration that adequately rewards the skill of members of the profession is unlikely to be achieved in one step within the confines of an incomes policy but we strongly urged that any further stage of such a policy must not only ensure that there is no further deterioration in professional living standards but should go at least a substantial way towards correcting that which has taken place so far. We also insistently urged that the anomalies which have arisen as a result of incomes policy so far be corrected forthwith.

In support of our statement I handed the Secretary of State written details of the anomalies which had occurred in the profession. On 1 March I had a further meeting with the Secretary of State on the same subject and I was again supported very strongly by the chairman of the CCHMS and my other chairmen. We have not, of course, overlooked the need to influence other bodies which are party to consultations on incomes policy, and we have had a meeting with the General Secretary of the Trades Union Congress for the purpose of making the same points.

Finally, notwithstanding the constraints placed upon the Review Body by incomes policy, I want all consultants to know that we have represented these points in our written document of evidence and argued them most forcefully before the Review Body itself on 2 February. Indeed, during the many years when I presented the general practitioners' case before the Review Body, when I was chairman of the General Medical Services Committee, I cannot remember a case which was better presented than that argued by the CCHMS negotiators—Mr A H Grabham and Mr D E Bolt—on the need to achieve an immediate alleviation of the unfair anomalies which have been imposed on consultants as a result of successive stages of the Government's incomes policy.

J C CAMERON
Chairman of Council, BMA

BMA House,
London WC1

Fusion at three months.