Idiopathic infantile arterial calcification in two siblings: failure of treatment with diphosphonate

The Council of the British Cardiac Society has endorsed the suggestion for a regular newsletter in the journal. This will appear monthly, or at least in most issues. We hope that members will write to the editor or to any of the council members about matters of special interest or concern; views will be published in the newsletters whenever it seems appropriate to do so. But more important, the newsletter will give the members of the society an opportunity to keep current with the work of the society and members informed of recent discussion and decisions. In these difficult days we will have no shortage of topics.

The council will continue to guide the society in all matters of importance, but any of the committee members will be enlarged and strengthened. The Joint Training and Manpower Group that was set up last year will liaise closely with the Specialist Advisory Committee—and indeed will have some members in common. The Audit Committee is also already in existence. Both of these bodies have representation from the Cardiology Committee of the Royal College of Physicians of London. We will also have groups with responsibility for data management, for liaison with technicians, and for public relations. Others may follow as and when the need arises. We will give more details in the next newsletter.

The meeting in Torquay seemed to go well, and it proved a popular venue. We are confident that Glasgow and Harrogate will be equally successful. The question now is whether or not members wish to have such meetings in London. We will be seeking your views.

Anxieties about staffing and training continue. We believe that the new proposals for training set out in the May issue of the journal and discussed at the business meeting in Torquay are important if we are to maintain the standards that are comparable to the best in Europe. But at the time of writing we have not achieved an agreement with the Royal College of Physicians of London or with the Department of Health. In order to strengthen our case—especially with regard to registrars—we were asked by the college to provide us with up to date information on staffing levels at consultant and registrar level in time for a meeting of the Manpower Group in June. We accepted the importance of this, but it gave us a little over two weeks to conduct the 1990 biennial survey that was originally scheduled for July: previous surveys have been taken up to a year for information to be completed. To compound our problems, the group at the University of Sussex who helped with previous surveys was not available on this occasion. Richard Vincent (now director of the Manpower Group) stepped in, and together we have a rough draft ready.

Our thanks to our many friends who have given their help and who have endured a number of procedural errors which would not have occurred were it not for the unevenly fast pace of the work. We are grateful for all the patient help that was given.

We must mention a small printers' error in the publication on the proposed pattern of future training that we failed to pick up at proof stage. The text referred to a period of three years after registration for general professional training: the table showed only two. The text, of course, was correct.

We have heard criticism that cardiologists have little enthusiasm for audit. We believe that we have led the field in this area. The pacemaker database was a pioneering effort, and the angioplasty register will be of comparable importance. Our own surveys of the meetings in London. We will be seeking your views.
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