

mote Canadian collaboration in global health research. They are sponsoring a national consultation process led by Allan Ronald of the University of Manitoba.

Several of the institutes of the Canadian Institutes for Health Research are exploring possibilities for funding global health research. For example, the advisory committee of the Institute for Public and Population Health has included global health problems in poor to middle-income countries within its mandate.

The International Development Research Centre, in collaboration with several other agencies, has announced a small grants facility, the Partnership for Global Health Equity, to explore collaborative efforts between Canada and developing countries for research concerning global health issues and to explore the processes and challenges involved in building mutually respectful and beneficial research partnerships. This initiative will be managed by the Canadian Society for International Health.

Canadian universities are also paying greater attention to global health. For example, the Liu Centre for the Study of Global Issues at the University of British Columbia is sponsoring a symposium entitled "Canada and the 19/90 Gap: Correcting the Imbalance in Global Health Research Priorities" this month. More information is available through the Centre's Web site (www.liucentre.ubc.ca).

Encouraging as these initiatives are, there are big challenges ahead. These include creating a mechanism for efficient coordination, determining a niche for a distinctive Canadian contribution to the global effort and identifying the needed leadership. As James Orbinski noted recently, "Canada now has a chance to lead the way ... the right priorities depend on the right leadership."²

Victor R. Neufeld

Professor Emeritus of Medicine
and Clinical Epidemiology
McMaster University
Hamilton, Ont.

References

1. Neufeld V, MacLeod S, Tugwell P, Zakus D, Zarowsky C. The rich-poor gap in global health research: challenges for Canada [editorial]. *CMAJ* 2001;164(8):1158-9.

2. Orbinski J. The G8 Summit: focus on neglected diseases. *Globe and Mail* [Toronto] 2001 Jul 18; SectA:13.

Talking cigarette packs are not the answer

Programs to prevent youth smoking represent the height of hypocritical foolishness.¹ Anyone with even rudimentary parenting skills knows that the message "do as I say, not as I do" leads to an increase, not a decrease, in the undesirable behaviour. We now even have the obscenely self-serving absurdity of tobacco companies placing ads that urge young people not to buy their products.

As physicians we should stop all these counterproductive, tiresome and increasingly ridiculous efforts to educate, admonish, inform and warn adolescents about smoking, such as the development of talking cigarette packages.² Through the Canadian Medical Association, we should take the eminently reasonable position that the manufacture and sale of a product known to be fatally toxic should be treated as a criminal offence. Our public efforts should be directed at encouraging our legislators to uphold the common good and put into law the required legislation.

Mark G. Leith

Department of Psychiatry
University of Toronto
Toronto, Ont.

References

1. Canada "behind eight ball" in fighting youth smoking. *CMAJ* 2001;164(10):1479.
2. A cigarette pack that talks the talk. *CMAJ* 2001; 164(10):1479.

Occupational health Web site

Our recent article on occupational health¹ contains a minor error that arose during editing of the manuscript. The second paragraph, which read, "One recent online offering is from the Physician Education Project in Workplace Health of the Ontario Workplace Safety and Insurance Board ..." should have read, "One recent online offering

is a manual from the Physician Education Project in Workplace Health (PEPWH), *Injury/Illness and Return to Work/Function: a Practical Guide for Physicians*; this is available at the Web site of the Ontario Workplace Safety & Insurance Board (www.wsib.on.ca)."

The PEPWH Steering Committee comprises a wide range of stakeholders from government agencies and worker and employer organizations. It started as an initiative of the Ontario Medical Association's Section on Occupational and Environmental Medicine and the Institute for Work and Health. Although it receives financial support from the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board, PEPWH was not initiated by that board.

Gary M. Liss

Coordinator
PEPWH
Toronto, Ont.

Lily S. Cheung

Corporate Medical Director
Stelco
Hamilton, Ont.

Reference

1. Liss G, Cheung L. Occupational health finds a home on the Net. *CMAJ* 2001;165(10):77.

Correction

The third recommendation in the text of a recently published clinical practice guideline for the care and treatment of breast cancer contains an error. The recommendation should read as follows: "Patients should be informed of the number of SLN biopsies performed by the surgeon and the surgeon's success rate with the procedure, as determined by the identification of the SLN and the false-negative rate (the presence of tumour cells in the axillary nodes when the SLN biopsy result is negative)."

This recommendation was printed correctly in the abstract.

Reference

1. Cantin J, Scarth H, Levine M, Hugi M, for the Steering Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Care and Treatment of Breast Cancer. Clinical practice guidelines for the care and treatment of breast cancer: 13. Sentinel lymph node biopsy. *CMAJ* 2001;165(2):166-73.