care. Furthermore, it suggests that major changes in the organisation of undergraduate medical education in London are necessary.

Some of the report's assumptions should not go unchallenged. My experience in an area of London in which there is not inconsiderable deprivation leads me to challenge the rather optimistic fashionable credo that technological advances will lead to a continuing expansion in the use of day case surgery. I also question the assertion that general medicine as it is currently practised will probably cease to exist and, perhaps more importantly, the notion that hospitals should be smaller and more specialised. It is certainly true that increasing subspecialisation together with the inexorable pressure to reduce the hours of work of junior hospital doctors means that larger groups of specialists are having to work in harmony with each other. In my view, however, the absence of other disciplines from specialist hospitals impoverishes the establishment, to the detriment of patients' care. Perhaps it is the concept of a district that serves no more than 300 000 people that has become outdated.

I also note that, according to the interpretations of the report by the serious press, two of the busiest hospitals in London, North Middlesex Hospital and West Middlesex University Hospital, are suggested for closure. Both of these hospitals cater substantially for ethnic minorities in contrast to their more peripheral sister hospitals closer to the green belt. That such an impression could be created is unfortunate, to say the least.

Let us, by all means, have a task force to study the problems of health care in London, as the commission suggests, but let its terms of reference be unrestricted.

IAN WOOLF

North Middlesex Hospital,
London N18 1QX

- 1 King's Fund Commission on the Future of London's Acute Health Services. *London health care 2010: changing the future of services in the capital*. London: King's Fund, 1992.
- 2 Smith J. London's health care again. *BMJ* 1992;304:1646-7. (27 June.)
- 3 Smith J. London's health care in 2010. *BMJ* 1992;304:1651. (27 June.)

EDITOR,—The King's Fund commission on acute health care services in London recommends a 47% reduction in acute medical beds, a conclusion poorly justified by the evidence provided.^{1,2} The estimated reductions depend on achieving rates of admission and throughput in London that are on the 50th and 75th centiles, respectively, for all English health districts. The report outlines numerous developments in investigative and surgical procedures, but these are unlikely to affect bed occupancy or bed requirements in acute medical specialties. The document also fails adequately to analyse the reasons why in acute medical specialties patients stay in hospital some 16% longer in inner London than in comparable districts elsewhere, attributing this to "hidden specialties" (p 108) and to deficits in "community based care" (p 49)—an interpretation justifiably criticised by Margaret Safranek.³

A more thorough analysis of the reasons for the greater use of beds in London would provide a more fruitful basis for future planning. Table 2.2 of the King's Fund's report shows that, despite the population of London representing around 12% of the British population, the capital has only 9.6% of Britain's geriatric and psychogeriatric beds and only 4.2% of the country's voluntary and private nursing home provision. Thus the apparent excess of acute general medical beds in London (0.38/1000 population) only partly makes up for the deficit of geriatric and psychogeriatric beds (1.06/1000 in London v 1.38/1000 in Britain) and of nursing home beds (0.91/1000 v 2.71/1000 respectively). There are, in addition, the dire

effects of capping of the community charge on the ability of local authorities to provide part 3 accommodation in inner London and the problems inherent in the increasing isolation of elderly people in the inner city, which conspire to increase the demands on hospital beds, especially acute medical beds. This makes it fatuous to suggest that increased provision of community health care centres or a new role for inner city general practitioners would permit the 47% reduction in these beds. Providing appropriate care, whether with increased support at home, in long stay hospital beds, or in nursing homes, is bound to entail additional expense for local authorities as well as health authorities, but what is likely to happen instead is that responsibility will be dumped on the patients and their families.

It seems surprising to have to condemn the King's Fund for political naivete, but do we really expect that proposals for investment in primary care to facilitate closure of some 10-15 acute hospitals will be listened to in the midst of a recession bound public spending round? The document will be taken as a justification for further cuts in beds and hospital closures, as has happened with "community care" for the mentally ill.

JOHN S YUDKIN

Department of Medicine,
University College and Middlesex School of Medicine,
Whittington Hospital,
London N19 5NF

- 1 King's Fund Commission on the Future of London's Acute Health Services. *London health care 2010: changing the future of services in the capital*. London: King's Fund, 1992.
- 2 Smith J. London's health care in 2010. *BMJ* 1992;304:1651. (27 June.)
- 3 Safranek M. London's health care. *BMJ* 1992;305:251. (25 July.)

Cigarette taxation and single European market

EDITOR,—The target decreases in cigarette smoking are central to the success of *The Health of the Nation* in its main targets to reduce mortality. As John Warden points out, the government's commitment to a tobacco tax policy is an encouraging step towards their achievement.¹ The effects of the recent agreement to harmonise tobacco taxes within the single European market need to be monitored to check that they do not undermine this policy.

Cigarette taxes have three elements: a specific rate per cigarette, an ad valorem rate (a percentage of the retail price), and value added tax. A high specific component, as in Britain, leads to a relatively high price and narrow price range. Where the ad valorem tax predominates, as in southern Europe, producers act to minimise its impact by keeping the non-tax price low, and so prices generally are lower with a wider spread. The European finance ministers agreed a minimum cigarette excise rate of 57% of the retail price, which with a minimum value added tax of 15% (that is, 13% of the retail price) makes a total cigarette tax rate of at least 70%, of which the specific element must be 5-55%. Five countries, including Britain, already conform to the requirements. No country will need to lower taxes, but some will have to raise them; overall cigarette consumption in the European Community is estimated to fall by about 3%.

The agreement theoretically leaves Britain free to increase cigarette taxes as it likes, within the limitation that the specific component is already at the maximum rate. As the minimum tax is given as a percentage with no absolute element, however, there will still be a wide range of tax levels as a high percentage of a low price is still a low tax. Without a minimum specific tax specified in European currency units (ecus) the agreement does little to

equalise cigarette prices, which currently range from about 34p a pack in Spain to £2.04 in Britain and £2.40 in Denmark (£1=1.42 ecus). Although there will be a limit on importing taxed cigarettes for personal use (normally 800 per adult), routine checks will be few and if cross border buying is extensive average prices will effectively fall and smoking will increase. The European Community's tobacco tax policy has potential to reduce the forecast deaths from smoking in Europe, including Britain.² It needs to be carefully reviewed and its effects monitored.

JOY TOWNSEND

MRC Epidemiology and Medical Care Unit,
Wolfson Institute of Preventive Medicine,
Medical College of St Bartholomew's Hospital,
London EC1M 6BQ

- 1 Warden J. Health trilogy. *BMJ* 1992;305:140. (18 July.)
- 2 Cnossen S. Intrigues around the tobacco excise in the European community. *Intertax* 1992;2:127-37.
- 3 Peto R, Lopez AD, Boreham J, Thun M, Heath C. Mortality from tobacco in developed countries; indirect estimation from national vital statistics. *Lancet* 1992;339:1268-78.

SIFTR, London, and district general hospitals

EDITOR,—The recent editorial, papers, and correspondence on the service increment for teaching and research (SIFTR) and its allocation draw attention to the changes taking place in medical students' training, particularly in London.^{1,5} Recent dramatic changes in funding for NHS hospitals have made cost effectiveness the criterion for financial support. London teaching hospitals are, it is said, less efficient owing to their teaching commitment. The inefficiency is compensated by SIFTR funds. There is a belief that, regardless of the prestige, London does not always provide good value for money.^{4,5} Numerous reports and recommendations presage further closures and amalgamations among the London medical schools and hospitals.

Faced with the need to educate large numbers of students and a decline in facilities for doing so, London has turned to provincial district general hospitals. With limited exceptions these now provide similar skills and facilities to those provided by London. Many of their consultants were, after all, trained to high standards in London. Medical students are now a regular feature of large district general hospitals in the home counties. There they spend long attachments, are taught free by local consultants, use the facilities of postgraduate centres and especially their libraries (which cost a great deal to fund), and in many cases receive free accommodation. The benefit to the students is obvious, and as SIFTR funds remain in London the teaching hospitals benefit as well by having fewer students to teach. The expense is borne by the district general hospitals.

Now, however, most large provincial district general hospitals are to become trusts. Managers of trusts will consider all the financial implications of these changes, and so will the managers of postgraduate centres. It can no longer be assumed that district general hospitals will continue to receive students without considering the effect on the service and its cost implications.

The existing SIFTR formula is heavily weighted against the district general hospitals. A total of £30 492 is allocated to medical schools for each student for each year.¹ Under present regulations, however, only £3400 of this can be transferred each year to the district general hospital to support the costs of teaching the undergraduates and their impact on services. In reality this transfer of funds rarely takes place.

This problem can only increase. We believe that the SIFTR formula needs to be changed to recognise appropriately the costs borne by

district general hospitals that teach undergraduates, and a mechanism needs to be set up to ensure that this transfer of funds actually takes place. Unless this happens the quality of services in these hospitals and of undergraduate education is threatened.

F MARCUS HALL
A J COAKLEY

Kent Postgraduate Medical Centre,
Kent and Canterbury Hospital,
Canterbury, Kent CT1 3NG

- 1 Chantler C. Service increment for teaching and research. *BMJ* 1992;305:71-2. (11 July.)
- 2 Black GB, Bevan G, Peters TJ, Eddleston ALWF. King's model for allocating service increment for teaching and research (SIFTR). *BMJ* 1992;305:95-6. (11 July.)
- 3 Smith CL. Service increment for teaching and research (SIFTR): the Southampton experience. *BMJ* 1992;305:97-8. (11 July.)
- 4 Sheldon TA. Service increment for teaching and research. *BMJ* 1992;305:310. (1 August.)
- 5 Normand C, McKee M. Service increment for teaching and research. *BMJ* 1992;305:310. (1 August.)

Prisoner of conscience in Tibet

EDITOR,—I recently worked for six months with Tibetan refugees in India and heard many accounts of repression in Tibet. I would like to draw attention to the plight of Jampa Ngodrup, a Tibetan doctor who formerly worked at the Lhasa City Barkor Clinic in the capital of the Tibetan Autonomous Region of the People's Republic of China. He was detained by the Chinese authorities in October 1989 and formally arrested in August 1990. He was accused of having "with counter revolutionary aims, collected lists of people detained in the disturbances (asserting Tibetan independence) and passed them on to others, thus undermining the law and violating the laws of secrecy." The verdict at his trial in December 1990 was that "in order to strengthen the unity of the motherland, to strengthen and protect the motherland and to enforce the democratic rights of the people, defendant Jampa Ngodrup, having committed the crime of being a spy, is sentenced to 13 years' imprisonment."

Jampa Ngodrup is reportedly detained in Drapchi prison in Lhasa. Amnesty International considers him to be a prisoner of conscience detained solely because he exercised his right freely to give and receive information. Amnesty calls for his immediate and unconditional release.

Please send appeals urging Dr Jampa Ngodrup's immediate release from Drapchi prison to Gyaltzen Norbu Zhuxi (the chairperson of the government of the Tibetan Autonomous Region), Xizang Zizhiqu Renmin Zhengfu, 1 Kang' andonglu, Lasashi 850000, Xizang Zizhiqu, People's Republic of China; and to Li Peng Zongli (the premier of the state council of the People's Republic of China), Guowuyuan, 9 Xihuangchenggen Beijie, Beijing 100032, People's Republic of China.

For further information write to Amnesty International, 1 Easton Street, London WC1X 8DJ.

ALAN MUNRO

Muir of Ord, Ross-shire IV6 7RR

Assessing GP trainees

EDITOR,—We were concerned to read that the General Medical Services Committee thought that the interim report by the Joint Committee on Postgraduate Training for General Practice was "woolly, flawed, and inconsistent."¹ We think that similar sentiments may be applied to some of the suggestions of the GMS's education and audit subcommittee.

Hospital training for general practice and the problems of the senior house officer grade are already priorities for action in our regional strategy

for general practice education in the west midlands. With the support of the regional postgraduate dean we will be endeavouring to improve the education of all senior house officers in the near future. Such improvements will include assessment of the educational and service aspects of each post.

We are puzzled as to how we would recognise fairly those trainees "unlikely at the end of their training to be competent to practice as principals" without assessing all trainees. This already takes place, with our regional assessment package assessing trainees at three, six, and 11 months in the trainee year. This concept of formative assessment should allow us to identify the trainees' strengths and weaknesses so that any shortcomings may be rectified as soon as possible. After all, under the joint committee's guidelines formative assessment is mandatory for all regions from 1 January next year.

We note the recommendation that "trainees should be selected more carefully" but bear in mind paragraph 38.5(h) of the red book, which states that the trainer is responsible for appointing the trainee. There are no restrictions at present concerning age, experience, or suitability for general practice. In this region the regional general practice education committee has included in its criteria for approving trainers that a trainer should be able to select a suitable trainee. In our assessment package candidates are reviewed before employment, which necessitates discussion with the local course organiser for all prospective trainees not on a formal vocational training scheme. The onus for appointment still, however, rests with the trainer, and any further restriction on selection of trainees would require changes in the red book.

We believe that we have failed a trainee if at the end of the year the first inkling of poor performance is the trainer's refusal to sign the VTR 1 form. Surely the purpose of formative assessment of all trainees is to identify poor performance earlier in the training and to arrange further remedial education and assessment. In this way the hurdle of summative assessment is minimised.

D W WALL

GUY HOUGHTON

Board of Postgraduate Medical and Dental Education,
Birmingham University, Birmingham B16 9SA

- 1 Beecham L. Assessing GP trainees. *BMJ* 1992;305:316-7. (1 August.)

Public health heresy

EDITOR,—Paula Whitty and Ian Jones are right to blow the whistle on the new "purchasingspeak" of "health gain" through health service contracts.¹ We agree that much of the talk about the contribution of district health authorities to the public health has been informed by ideology and ignorance rather than a real understanding of the social and economic determinants of health and disease. In this context our overall objectives in the department of public health of City and Hackney Health Authority can be summarised as threefold: to strengthen our multiagency work; to develop provider programmes (mainly on health promotion and control of communicable diseases); and to involve local agencies in implementing plans for community care and in assessing the health and health care needs of our population.

To assess the extent to which we are actively pursuing these objectives we conducted a three week prospective audit of how we spend our time. Those taking part in the audit were eight medical staff, two senior non-medical staff (a researcher and a planner), and three health promotion staff. Although there are shortcomings in the methods we used—such as agreeing definitions of activities—the table shows that both medical and non-medical staff spend only a small proportion of their time on purchasing activities. Indeed, a much

Percentage of time spent on various activities each week by staff in department of public health of City and Hackney Health Authority

Activity	Medical staff (n=8)	Non-medical staff (n=5)	Total
Multidisciplinary work (eg, joint planning)	21	28	24
Training and teaching (eg, teaching students)	27	16	23
Management and administration (eg, correspondence, interviewing)	17	28	21
Being trained (eg, courses, time with trainers)	15	5	11
Needs assessment	7	15	10
Service provision (eg, advice on infectious disease, health promotion)	7	7	7
Contract advice and purchasing	6	1	4

higher proportion of time was spent on wider public health work (for example, joint planning and preventive services). In our view, the key to maintaining this important perspective lies in integrating health promotion and communicable disease control services within public health departments. Those public health departments most at risk of a narrow purchasing perspective are those that have merged into "megadistricts" or have ceded these vital public roles to provider units.

It is wrong to assume, however, that we should not aim to influence the pattern of health care spending, especially as some of this money might be better spent on health promotion rather than acute care (which currently uses up 99.7% of district funds). We have made a start this year by ensuring that equal proportions of the district's capitation growth money will be spent on health promotion and treatment and care. We see this as a small but essential contribution that every district should make towards fulfilling its wider public health objectives.

BOBBIE JACOBSON

ANNE MACKIE

Department of Public Health,
City and Hackney Health Authority,
London N1 5LZ

- 1 Whitty P, Jones I. Public health heresy: a challenge to the purchasing orthodoxy. *BMJ* 1992;304:1039-41. (18 April.)

Treating Jehovah's Witnesses

EDITOR,—The title of a recent news item—"Court says doctors were right to treat Jehovah's Witness"—is inaccurate.¹ As the text makes clear, the patient at the centre of the decision by the Court of Appeal was not, in fact, one of Jehovah's Witnesses.

While declaring that a doctor has a duty to offer appropriate counselling and to point out any risks attendant on a patient's choice, the court affirmed that a mentally competent adult patient "has an absolute right to choose whether to consent to medical treatment, to refuse it or to choose one rather than another of the treatments being offered."² That is all that Jehovah's Witnesses ask for: the right to choose medical management that does not entail blood transfusion, accepting its risks in exchange for its benefits. We thank those doctors who respect our wishes.

All three lords justices cited with approval the Canadian case of *Malette v Shulman*, which confirmed the validity of the advance medical directive or release customarily carried by bona fide Jehovah's Witnesses, executed of their own free will as an expression of deeply and sincerely held religious scruples.³ "Doctors who treat such a patient against his known wishes do so at their peril."⁴

In an effort to be helpful and avoid confrontations Jehovah's Witnesses maintain a network of