independent trust, which could be responsible for providing nursing care on a named practice basis. This arrangement would be most acceptable to the nursing profession, as they would have a greater input in a community trust. Out-of-hours nursing care and holiday care, as well as specialized nursing care, for example paediatric nurses, would be better provided for from a community trust.

However, a number of members felt that the fifth option, in which all community nursing services would be controlled by the primary health care team, was the most appropriate. The general practitioner would have a greater say in the choice of nurse he or she employed and would also provide the necessary funding for postgraduate training. They would also be in a position to offer facilities for training student nurses with an interest in community/practice nursing.

All members rejected the concept of a multidisciplinary partnership. The general practitioners applauded the concept of the primary health care team and extensive liaison with all members within it and felt that it had contributed enormously to the progress of general practice. However, general practitioners are normally the most consistent people in the lives and continued care of many of the patients and they are best placed (in consultation with the other members of the primary health care team) to make the decisions which affect their patients. While this may be regarded by many as a step back in the progress and development of general practice, we feel that it is a valid point and should be considered before further changes in the structure and management of the primary health care teams are made.

U M HUTCHINSON

Pendle View Medical Centre
Arthur Street
Brierfield
Nelson
Lancashire BB9 5RZ

Fellowship of the RCGP

Sir,

I trust that Dr Dowden (letters, November *Journal,* p.481) is incorrect in his suggestion that the Royal College of General Practitioners is intending that all honorary fellows will eventually undergo assessment. As an honorary fellow without a medical qualification I should have a problem. Nevertheless, I take his point about distinguishing honorary fellows from fellows by assessment. On the very few occasions when I have used FRCGP after my name I have always used the prefix 'Hon'.

JOHN MAYO

38 Marryat Road
Wimbledon
London SW19 5BD

Membership of the RCGP

Sir,

The number of members leaving the Royal College of General Practitioners, particularly in the under-35 year old and the 50–60 year old age groups, has reduced the overall rate of increase of new members. This was reported in the RCGP annual report of Council 1990/91,[1] but no reasons were given for their leaving.

A decade ago membership had just passed the 10 000 mark, opinion from the College was increasingly being sought by outside bodies and by government, and College organization seemed to be outdated. While the pyramidal structure introduced by Dr Donald and Dr Hasler met immediate needs it created a balance of power which had previously been eschewed: the greatly increased influence of the general purposes committee and chairman of council. I do not challenge the good intentions of the various people who have wielded this influence since then. However, the outcome of their efforts suggests that the checks and balances which should operate in a good constitution have somehow been lost.

As chairman in succession to Dr Donald, Dr Irvine promoted the quality initiative with the laudable intention of encouraging clinical self-criticism. This led, unsuspectingly, to a position where quality was equated with a consensus of 'good'. In turn, mismanagement of the discussions preceding *Quality in general practice*[2] led, in 1986, to the green paper[3] which revealed a College leadership out of touch with its members. At the same time there was division over the conduct of the College examination, with the departure of the chief examiner and the subsequent resignation of Dr Hasler. In 1988, Dr Gray and Dr Styles had to resolve problems over relationships with the Joint Committee on Postgraduate Training for General Practice.

In an attempt to correct a discernible trend, the next annual general meeting approved a motion to examine the powers of the general purposes committee. The result, however, was a further concentration of power at the top of the pyramid, the general purposes committee being succeeded by the council executive committee, which was one third smaller, to 'adapt to the ever-increasing pace of change'. Some of this ever-increasing pace of change is of our own making. Our political naivety invited the government to exploit the differences between the College and the British Medical Association, and, while we have belatedly repaired relationships, the General Medical Services Committee has been left to cope with the changes that have been made to the health service.

With luck, we will have learned from the mistakes of the past decade but members will continue to be frustrated by the sense of impotence engendered by these events and which I suspect prompted those of our colleagues who have decided to leave us. Checks and balances existed prior to the past decade in the form of a president who carried weight in council as the representative of the membership (rather than as the outside representative of council on behalf of the College), and a body of fellows of great diversity available at all levels (in a smaller College) as a sounding board of senior opinion when wise decisions had to be made. The balance represented by these influences will not be recovered.

How then do we remedy matters to reduce future risk from centralized power and human error? Finding new checks and balances is of greatest importance to young members. Currently the membership examination is very sophisticated. However, doctors have little idea of the workings of the constitution of the College they are applying to join. If the membership examination were to contain one compulsory question on the College constitution, new members would find their feet more quickly. We might then lose fewer of these new members.

P GORDON GASKELL

17 The Green
Pencaitland
East Lothian EH34 5HE

Reference

1. Royal College of General Practitioners. Annual report of council 1990/91. In: RCGP. *1991 Members' reference book.* London: Sabrecrown, 1991: 27.
2. Royal College of General Practitioners. *Quality in general practice. Policy statement 2.* London: RCGP, 1985.
3. Secretaries of State for Social Services, Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland. *Primary health care: an agenda for discussion (Cmnd 9771).* London: HMSO, 1986.