BRITISH MEDICAL JUL 1 8 1985 JULI 1 8 1985 SATURDAY 8 JUNE 1985

LEADING ARTICLES	10
The political argument on health costs KLIM McPHERSON Non-cemented hip prostheses JOHN NIXON Clinical heart and lung transplantation CHRISTOPHER G A McGRI Regular Review: Therapeutic ranges in anticoagulant administra	
CLINICAL RESEARCH • PAPERS AND SH	HORT REPORTS • PRACTICE OBSERVED
Obesity: new insight into the anthropometric classification of fat distr	N, B F CLARKE, L J P DUNCAN
Complications of ileal conduit diversion in adults with cancer followed Effects of age, cigarette smoking, and other factors on fertility: findin GEOFFREY HOWE, CAROLYN WESTHOFF, MARTIN VESSEY, DAVID YEATES.	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Abnormalities in vascular arachidonic acid metabolism in the infant of	f the diabetic mother A SETTY
Chronic myeloid leukaemia associated with impairment of hearing C Seroconversion of human T cell lymphotrophic virus III (HTLV-III)	K O WILLIAMS, O OGAN
Rhabdomyolysis and acute renal failure in sickle cell anaemia S DEVEI Accidental ingestion of sterilising tablets by children M Z SIODLAK, M J Is repeated flushing of Hickman catheters necessary? H GILLIES, H J R Correction: Total and high density lipoprotein cholesterol GOLDBOUR	REUX, S M KNOWLES
Computer assisted screening: effect on the patient and his consultation. Use of medications on the restricted list by the elderly NORMAN J VETT Is the Jarman underprivileged area score valid? JOHN R H CHARLTON, A	m MIKE PRINGLE, SALLY ROBINS, GEORGE BROWN
MEDICAL PRACTICE	
Measles immunisation: results of a local programme to increase vaccing Green College Lectures: Educating the doctor: basic medical education Clinical Algorithms: Hyponatraemia MICHAEL JAMES JAMIESON	1723 SER SMITH 1729 nd why?—II RAANAN GILLON 1734 1722, 1736 1728 1737
CORRESPONDENCE—List of Contents	OBITUARY
NEWS AND NOTES Views 1750 Medical News 1751 BMA Notices 1753 One Man's Burden MICHAEL O'DONNELL 1754	SUPPLEMENT The Week

CORRESPONDENCE

Not the right way to make decisions R G Notley, FRCS	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Surgical treatment of malignant skin conditions NPJ Walker, MRCP, and PL Bailin, MD 1747
Peer review at work R Eban, FRCR; H A F Dudley, FRCS; T Sherwood,	MRCP	Dispenserisation for all A W Cameron, MRCGP
FRCR	Drug regimens and fasting Moslem patients M Aslam, PHD, and M A Healy, PHD 174	
Coagulase negative staphylococcal infections K G Kristinsson, CAND MED, and others 174	The limited list: first month in a teaching hospital	hypokalaemia
Acute otitis media: a new treatment strategy J. E. Osborne, FRCS, and others; J. Siegler, FRCS; E. L. van Brushem, t. D. and others	Trial of relaxation in reducing coronary risk R. I. Salmon, MRCGP, C. Patel, MRCGP, and M. G.	Who cares? J V Conway, MB 1748
F L van Buchem, MD, and others	Marmot, PHD	6 Occult advanced cervical cancer A Curtain, FRCS, and D Jenkins, FRCOG 1748
M C Gulliford, MRCP	in ethnic minorities in Britain MCK Chan, FRACP	Longer term geriatric hospitals 7 NK Coni, FRCP(C)
arteriovenous malformations G G Hartnell, MRCP, and D J Allison, FRCR 17-	4 Benzodiazepines in general practice: time for a	Surgical implants and rugby studs N Shieff, MB, and C Shieff, FRCS
Treatment of pneumonia M A Woodhead, MRCP, and J T Macfarlane, MRCP	decision Mairi G B Scott, MRCGP, and J Hosee, MRCP; M J Aylett, MRCGP	Points Counselling problem drinkers in medical wards (B D Hore); Drugs and the elderly (C M Linter); General versus spinal anaesthesia (I P
Death of a volunteer J W Dundee, FFARCS 17-	Benign skin tumours S K Jones, MRCP, and others	Alexander); Under-reporting of adverse drug
* / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /		

Because we receive many more letters than we have room to publish we may shorten those that we do publish to allow readers as wide a selection as possible. In particular, when we receive several letters on the same topic we reserve the right to abridge individual letters. Our usual policy is to reserve our correspondence columns for letters commenting on issues discussed recently (within six weeks) in the BMJ.

Letters critical of a paper may be sent to the authors of the paper so that their reply may appear in the same issue. We may also forward letters that we decide not to publish to the authors of the paper on which they comment.

Letters should not exceed 400 words and should be typed double spaced and signed by all authors, who should include their main degree.

Not the right way to make decisions

SIR,—I have just witnessed a piece of direct political interference in a National Health Service appointment the like of which I have never seen before. The appointment in question is that of general manager to the South West Surrey health district

In the Autumn of 1984 the South West Surrey health district, in which I work as a consultant surgeon, set out to appoint a general manager as directed in the recent reorganisation according to Griffiths. An unusually extended advertisement programme drew something in the order of 60 applicants from inside the National Health Service, from industry, and from business. These individuals were assessed, and a shortlist was interviewed. The district administrator of the South West Surrey health district was appointed. All these arrangements were made and the final decision reached with appropriate consultation with the senior medical staff of the district, and the selection of the district administrator as the new general manager was blessed with their approval. The appointment was approved by the South West Thames Regional Health Authority and passed to the Department of Health and Social Security for final ratification. A hiatus of between eight and nine weeks then occurred without response from the DHSS. Finally, in mid-February 1985, we learnt that our district administrator was not acceptable as the general manager for the South West Surrey health district and that the district had been instructed to seek further applicants.

A firm of management consultants was engaged

to produce suitable individuals from outside the health service. In due course four men were produced and, presumably, invited to apply for the post. They visited our hospitals and a group of interested senior medical staff met them informally. These four men were interviewed by a committee consisting of the chairman and vice chairman of the South West Surrey District Health Authority, a consultant surgeon and member of the district health authority, the general manager of the South West Thames Regional Health Authority (himself recently elevated from the position of regional administrator), and a member of the management consultant firm. The committee was chaired by the chairman of the South West Surrey District Health Authority. The district administrator, who had been chosen in appropriate competition as general manager in 1984, was also granted a further interview. Before this interview took place the senior medical staff of the district had made it clear to the appropriate members of the committee that they saw no reason to alter the decision reached in 1984 and that the district administrator remained their chosen candidate as general manager. The consultant surgeon member of the appointment committee was acting as the representative of the consultant staff in this respect. Despite these representations one of the new applicants was appointed, not the district administrator.

My concern in this matter has been the interference in the appointment by the DHSS. I am not particularly concerned with the details of the

recent appointment and I accept the judgment of the committee that the individual appointed would make a worthy general manager for the South West Surrey Health District. It will, of course, be most difficult for the medical staff to support a man with no knowledge of our local problems and no experience in the National Health Service and who has been given the job in defiance of the medical staff's clearly expressed views. I find the direct intervention of the DHSS in the original appointment very disquieting. The appointed candidate for the December 1984 interviews fulfilled all the requirements and was appointed after proper advertisement and consultation, and the appointment was made with the full involvement of the district health authority, the senior medical staff of the health district, and the regional health authority. The refusal of the DHSS to ratify the appointment, however, lacks any such proper logic and is a direct interference by central government.

I have been involved in hospital and district administration for many years, as district management team consultant representative, as district medical committee chairman, and currently as chairman of the phase II project team in the Guildford hospital development. During these years I have seen, made, and been party to many decisions concerning the running of the National Health Service in Surrey. Never before have I seen a decision such as this made by an "administrative body." I and my colleagues find it most disturbing to see this sort of development in the management of the National Health Service and we find such