Advice on foreign travel is not health promotion

Sir,—For some years our nurses have been telling patients travelling abroad how to avoid getting ill while they are away. There is a lot to cover: sensible precautions against food poisoning, avoiding excessive exposure to the sun, malaria, and so on. Most important of all, the nurses specifically discuss the risk of HIV infection.

Under the new contract we were able to count this 15 minute consultation as part of a health promotion clinic. Our family health services authority has now told us that advice on foreign travel no longer counts as health promotion. Sadly, we will therefore not have time to discuss these issues properly with our patients. All we can do is give them the Department of Health’s Health Advice for Travellers and hope that they read it.

We are paid £4.50 per patient for health promotion. We would probably need to prevent only one case of AIDS per 10,000 patients seen to be cost effective. Perhaps the Department of Health could explain why it would rather spend this money treating AIDS instead of preventing it.

PATRICK BOWER
London SW12 8EA

Euthanasia around the world

Sir,—Did the news items on euthanasia around the world imply a change in the position of the BMJ in line with other professional opinion worldwide, as indicated for instance by the reports of the Institute of Medical Ethics and the Remmelink Commission? A corresponding shift in public attitudes has been measured objectively by market research in elections repeating the same question over time. In Britain National Opinion Poll found that agreement with the statement “Some people say that the law should allow adults to receive medical help to an immediate peaceful death if they suffer from an incurable physical illness that is intolerable to them, provided that they have previously requested such help in writing” rose from 69% (95% confidence interval 67% to 71%) in 1975, through 72% (70% to 74%) in 1985, to 75% (73% to 77%) in 1989. Similarly, in the United States the Roper Organisation’s question “When a person has a painful and distressing terminal disease, do you think doctors should or should not be allowed by law to end the patient’s life if there is no hope of recovery and the patient requests it?” elicited support from 62% (60% to 64%) in 1986, increasing to 68% (66% to 70%) in 1991.

Evidence from Canada and Australia is available over a longer timescale and is therefore more compelling (tables I and II). It shows a trend that it would be imprudent to ignore. Though medicine should take a note of the views of three quarters of the population, however, it also needs a clear legal framework. Active euthanasia is an act of pre-emptively and gratuitously mediating homicide, which is no more acceptable under common law for doctors than for lay people, even if autonomously requested. If parliament decided that “to change the law would appear to be in keeping with the logic of respect for autonomy” a “special defence” would be needed which could then be pleaded in justification.

The Mental Health Act 1983 illustrates the advantages of statutory law in allowing doctors exceptional privileges while providing additional safeguards. It formally separates the responsibilities for an application for a section, the medical recommendations, and receipt by the hospital managers. A similar mechanism could be designed for euthanasia.

TIM HELME
Freshfield Unit, Brighton General Hospital, Brighton BN2 5EW

4 Age Concerns, Institute of Gerontology, and Centre of Medical Law and Ethics, King’s College, London. The living will. London: Edward Arnold, 1988.

Women in the NHS

Sir,—It is worth remembering that 75 years ago, on 13 February 1917, a small group of women doctors, finding that their applications for membership of the British Medical Association had been rejected because of their sex, founded the Medical Women’s Federation. The active list of the General Medical Council now includes over 40,000 women doctors. One quarter of general practice principals and over half of last year’s entrants to medical school are women. Relations with the BMA have changed since 1917—two former presidents of the Medical Women’s Federation have gone on to be presidents of the BMA, and there are close working relationships at officer level.

Caroline Langridge, head of the NHS women’s unit, has indicated ways in which women capable of filling senior management posts can be brought forward.1 Positive discrimination is rightly unlawful, but positive action to identify and encourage talent is good sense. Applicable in management and nursing, it is equally applicable in medicine. In 1989 the Advisory Committee on Medical Manpower recommended a target of 30% for women in the undergraduate training grades for one doctor. That figure must now be around £16000. A programme of positive action to ensure that the talent and training of young doctors—both men and women— is not wasted is overdue.

ELIZABETH SHORE
President, Medical Women’s Federation, Lodon WC1H 9JX

1 Diluer L. Where are the women in the NHS. BMJ 1992;304:399. (15 February.)

Hospices and the NHS

Sir,—Colin Douglas snapes again at the hospice movement in his brief article.1 In his novel’s sequel a scene of spirit can be amusing, but in this context I do not find it so.

I serve the Marie Curie Memorial Foundation in an honorary capacity, partly as a clinician and partly as an administrator. This charitable organisa
tion is unique in its field of cancer and is older than the NHS. In addition to education and research, we maintain a unique, nationwide home nursing service for patients with cancer as well as...
facilities for respite care, convalescence, and rehabilitation in 11 centres throughout the United Kingdom. These centres also provide terminal care, so that we can see a part of the greater hospice movement, which in practice is mostly, though not entirely, concerned with patients suffering from cancer.

I do not believe that Douglas would quarrel with the statement that the particularly distressing and prolonged symptoms caused by cancer call for special skills and experience in nursing and medical care—indeed, he has conceded faint praise to the hospice movement in his article—but when he writes that “The NHS should now take charge” he is being less than realistic. These special skills work best in small units where morale and esprit de corps are high; let them not be lost in a huge machine.

Douglas’s faith in the potential comprehensiveness of the NHS is touchingly naive and outmoded. Does he not realise that no health service that a British government could, on its own, support could meet all the needs and demands of the public with complete satisfaction? Sustained by charity, the hospice movement carries its share of the burden with an economy and efficiency that are exemplary. The government recognises this in making the contributions to which Douglas takes such offensive exception.

Finally, one of the finer facets of human nature is the willingness of many to help fellow creatures, espoused even in pain and trouble. This is not the prerogative of dowagers and duchesses, as Douglas implies, but is far more widespread than he seems to realise. Surely charity should be encouraged and not despised and derided.

DAVID E TULLOCH
Marie Curie Memorial Foundation, Edinburgh EH1 2AH


Sin.—Colin Douglas has written a brave, if rather brusque, article suggesting that palliative medicine and the hospice movement should be incorporated into the NHS. This is a view that many of us share but is usually expressed only quietly for fear of upsetting the founders of palliative medicine, to whom we owe so much. The arguments are stronger, however, than the mere economic issues outlined in the article. This district’s deliberations on the subject have been published, but the arguments in favour of a community service with its base in the local district general hospital should be more widely appreciated.

Sitting inpatient palliative medicine beds on the site of a district general hospital gives easy access to the local general practitioner for diagnosis and relief of symptoms. It makes it easier to provide medical cover, physiotherapy, occupational therapists, and social workers, and there are obvious economies of scale for hospital support services. One of the strongest arguments, however, is educational. It will never be the case that all patients die in hospices or that all die at home supported by their family doctors and Macmillan nurses. Most will die at home in district general hospitals, and messages about good pain relief, listening, and support are more likely to spread to these patients if the palliative medicine service is based on the same site. This service can incorporate a day centre and a base for community nurses, and patients with newly diagnosed disease who are being discharged from the ward can visit the day centre and meet their community nurse before they return home. A palliative medicine service based with a district general hospital will always attract donations and additional funds, and these can be used as a catalyst to improve services generally but also to the advantage of a wider number of patients dying in either the hospital or their own homes.

Palliative medicine should now stand alongside other specialties, be funded in the same way, and provide care to all those who need it.

MARTYN R PARTRIDGE
Whips Cross Hospital, London E11 1NR

Sin.—Colin Douglas’s charges against the hospice movement deserve reply. Hospice care teams work with general practitioners and district nurses to ensure continuity of care for patients and their families. This teamwork has evolved to prevent “care at the end of illness being so separate from all that precedes it.”

Deaths from cancer account for 20-25% of all deaths in our society; this “minority” is the particular concern of hospices. Most of these patients choose to die at home but may be denied this choice because of a lack of resources. I am surprised that Douglas decries a high standard of care for dying patients: surely we should be striving to provide de luxe care for every patient. I agree, however, that such an important part of care should not have to rely so heavily on charitable donations. Indeed, if general managers are looking for value for money they should be placing contracts with hospice services, which are so generally disregarded by the public. The lessons learnt from the larger teaching hospices have become incorporated into mainstream medicine and have transformed standards of care for patients dying not only of cancer but of other diseases. The hospice movement makes no apology for respecting the autonomy of individual patients and their families. At a time when market forces threaten personalised care and we face the challenge of AIDS we need the skills and resources of the hospices.

If Douglas was to listen to the patient’s voice he would learn that hospices are people, not buildings, and that the joy of living is as important to hospices as the quality of dying.

DAVID JEFFREY
St Richard’s Hospice, Worcester WR5 1BY

Sin.—I was dismayed and saddened to read Colin Douglas’s gloating article about the alleged impending crisis facing the hospice movement. For many years the hospice movement has provided a shining example of how to allow people to die with dignity and with reduced suffering. Its efforts may indeed be scanty and choosy, but I suggest that this is not of its own volition.

Furthermore, de luxe dying may be an appropriate term but it does highlight the stark contrast with the disgraceful state of affairs in our teaching hospitals. Standards of terminal care are still broadly lamentable, and patients are often not allowed to die with dignity (even when their treatment is deemed terminally imminent), and when they are permitted to do so they are left to pass their remaining hours without adequate support or pain relief.

Part of the problem lies in the inability and inactivity of certain members of our profession to recognise that death is imminent. For example, I recall an elderly man with acute myeloid leukaemia who was dying in a ward, but a senior registrar insisted that he should have at least six weeks of chemotherapy. This unfortunate man did not survive 48 hours of this statement. Sadly, this was not an isolated incident.

If the hospice movement is to be made redundant the appropriate time will be when standards of terminal care have been raised to those of the movement. I suggest that “a few beds for the difficult cases” is precisely why the hospice movement exists.

Douglas’s misguided attack on the hospice movement is spiteful and unworthy.

S JANKOWSKI
Surrey.

Sin.—We have heard from time to time of the “politics of envy.” Colin Douglas’s brief article epitomises the “medicine of envy.” In lecturing us on the hospice movement he asks, “Why should only the minority who die of malignancies—and precious few even of them—be siphoned out for de luxe dying?” That any doctor should use such language in writing about the care of the dying in hospices or at home under the supervision of hospices is astonishing. The fact is that the pioneers of the hospice movement, notably Dr (now Dame) Cicely Saunders, saw the needs of the dying neglected and taught many people to fulfil those needs with excellence and appropriate care.

Douglas writes of the hospice movement’s “committee loads of duchesses.” All honour to any who help. But in fact the movement draws its strength from many thousands of men and women of all ranks—doctors, nurses, housewives, farmers, clerks, shopkeepers, and those who, like me, are retired. Douglas has “doctor and novelist” appended to his name. He should keep fiction out of his BMJ column.

T D V SWINSCOW
Topsham. Exeter EX3 6DA