for friends and for relatives. Those who use radioiodine must be properly trained and have practical experience in selection and follow-up of patients, administering iodine and the precautions needed when dealing with such patients.

The report also states that in only 62% of cases does the responsibility for prescribing radioiodine rest with the doctor attending the patient. It is not clear if the term 'prescribing' relates to the doctor who requests iodine to be given, or the person who authorises its administration. Those who authorise the administration must be medical practitioners who hold a certificate to give treatment with ^{131}I, issued on the advice of the Administration of Radioactive Substances Advisory Committee (ARSAC) by Health Ministers. To do otherwise contravenes the Medicines (Administration of Radioactive Substances) Regulations 1978 [1]. Other hospital staff may work under the responsibility of the ARSAC certificate holder, but he or she must define clearly what they may or may not do. The Ionising Radiation Regulations 1988, known colloquially as POPUMET [2,3] place responsibility for ensuring that the administration is in accordance with accepted therapeutic practice with the persons clinically and physically directing the exposure. However, overall responsibility for the regulation rests with the person clinically directing and this is interpreted as being the ARSAC certificate holder.

Holding an ARSAC certificate carries both responsibility and liability.

References

1 1978 No. 1006: Medicines. *The Medicines (Administration of Radioactive Substances) Regulations* 1978.

2 1988 No. 778: Health and Safety. *The Ionising Radiation (Protection of Persons Undergoing Medical Examination or Treatment) Regulations* 1988.

3 Harding LK. POPUMET. Ionising radiation regulations. *J R Coll Physicians Lond* 1991;**25**:280–1.

L K HARDING
Chairman, ARSAC

So, what is a clinical oncologist?

Sir—I read with my customary despair the correspondence pursuant on Professor Kaye's paper 'So, what is a clinical oncologist? (July 1992, 314–5 and October 1992, page 459).

Dr Shaw quite rightly observes that mere possession of the MRCP does not a medical oncologist make but neither does it a physician make. It is merely the first step on the journey to higher medical training: nonetheless, since his unfortunate experiences in 1979, the pattern of recruitment to radiotherapy and oncology has changed and many trainees and newly appointed consultants in clinical oncology now have substantial experience of medical oncology.

These recruits have chosen to be 'compleat oncologists' in the sense that they wish to provide total care for their patients and this aim is best served by training in chemotherapy, radiotherapy in all its aspects and palliative care. Treating patients with cancer is rather like an old-fashioned marriage 'in sickness and in health until death (or cure) do us part'.

In many centres lymphoma clinics are a happy meeting place of haematologists and clinical oncologists, providing a forum for informed discussion and consensus management; similarly good working relationships are encountered with head and neck surgeons, gynaecologists and those enlightened enough to believe that multidisciplinary management improves the care of those with cancer. But someone has to provide the discipline and that is most frequently the clinical oncologist whose training in all aspects of cancer management provides him or her with the broadest perspective.

The future of cancer medicine in the UK is best served by a common training programme in which the future specialists are trained in the basic sciences of cancer: pathology, radiobiology, the pharmacology of chemotherapeutic pathology, radiobiology, the pharmacology of chemotherapeutic agents, statistics and, most importantly, exposed to the gamut of therapeutic modalities employed in the management of malignant disease. The final choice of cancer specialists as to whether they are primarily chemotherapists or radiation oncologists should be left to the trainee rather than determined by the prejudices of self interest groups. All oncology trainees should be pluripotent.

J M RODRIGUEZ
Chief of Oncology, Al-Hada Armed Forces Hospital, Taif, Israel

Collecting, communicating and using information

Sir—The article by Williams *et al* (October 1992, pages 385–7), on the need for changes to the medical undergraduate curriculum to improve information handling, knowledge and skills amongst students, raises a number of important issues. Computer literacy amongst students and the availability of computers is obviously fundamental to any improvement in the teaching of these topics. A recent survey of medical students in Hong Kong [1] showed a clear link between computer ownership, computer literacy and use of computers. Forty seven percent of first to third year students claimed to own a computer. As might be expected, this group used computers more frequently and for a greater range of applications than other students. Seventy five percent of students in Hong Kong [1] and seventy percent of students in Glasgow [2] felt that their curriculum should contain more about the use of computers in the health service.

How can this be brought about? Most medical schools do not have enough computers. For example, in Glasgow there are over 200 students in each of five years but only two medical 'clusters' with 40 micro-