

# THE ROYAL PHARMACEUTICAL SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN

## Transcript of the Public session of the Special Council meeting held on 16 May 2007

NB: Decisions in square brackets and narrow type are taken from the unconfirmed minutes of Council and therefore are subject to amendment].

*The Transcript of the public meeting of the Council is not the formal record of the meeting. The formal record comprises the papers presented to the meeting and the minutes as subsequently approved. The policy of the RPSGB is actively debated at the meeting. The views expressed in the transcript do not necessarily represent the Society's agreed policy.*

### Present

President	Mr H Patel
Vice-President	Mr G Alexander
Treasurer	Mr J Jolley
Mr M Astbury	Mr J Buisson
Mr D Carter	Dr B Curwain
Mr S Dajani	Professor S Denyer
Mrs D Drury	Mrs D Eustace
Dr P Entwistle	Mr J Gentle
Mr A Gush	Mr J Hanlon
Mrs S Hikins	Mrs C Hunt
Mrs L Jacobs	Mr A Kershaw
Professor B Michell	Mrs L Morgan
Mr G Phillips	Mr C Ranshaw
Ms Marcia Saunders	Mr D Simpson
Mr D Thomson	Mr S Wells

### In attendance

Mr Paul Bennett, Chairman, English Pharmacy Board, Dr Rose Marie Parr, Chairman, Scottish Pharmacy Board, Mr Peter Jones, Chairman, Welsh Pharmacy Board

## PUBLIC BUSINESS

**The President, Mr Hemant Patel:** Good afternoon Council. We are in public business. There has been quite a bit of paperwork circulated today in order to keep you up to date. We will come to that paperwork later on. What I would like to do is to reflect on an event the Society hosted yesterday, the first Fellows dinner ever. It was a splendid event and well recognised. Liz Griffiths and her part-time assistant did the Society proud. I think there were 110 people. Considering there are only 700 Fellows, I would consider it as a very good success. We have a new Fellows reception at 4.30 so our time-table is pretty tight. What I would like to do firstly is to welcome newly elected members of the Council and the layperson, who unfortunately is not here today. Jane Ramsey is not here. Steve Acres is here. Steve is a pharmacy technician and has been elected to be on the Council in the coming term. Mrs Cathryn Brown is here. Mr Steve Churton is not here, but Mrs Sue Kilby, who we all know, is here. Also can I take this opportunity to welcome Mr Frank Owens, Vice-Chairman of the Scottish Pharmacy Board? We are fortunate to have other Vice-Chairs here today. Beth Taylor from the English Board and Mark Donovan from the Welsh Board, welcome. Also in the audience we have Chris Martin, pharmacist from Wales, who is going to be receiving his Fellowship award later. We have been through so much paperwork, I hope you are in a forgiving mood today, if things go slightly wrong, but I hope they will not.

### 1. Apologies for absence

We have apologies, from Seema Agha, Ray Jobling and Michael Schofield.

## **2. Declarations of interest**

Can I ask Council members to declare relevant interests at the beginning of each relevant item? I talked about the amount of paperwork circulated to you earlier on. The final report of Lord Carter's Working Party was released this morning and the Department of Health has issued a press release to accompany the Working Party report, or rather Lord Carter's Working Party report. The Society has also issued a report which is entitled 'Pharmacy must determine its own future'. We welcome the publication of this report and the recognition in it that the Society will form a major component of a future professional body. The Society hopes that the Working Party's report will help the pharmacy profession to realise its full potential in improving patient care and safety. We are working already with PSNI and other bodies towards this aim.

**Secretary & Registrar, Miss Ann Lewis:** This was published this morning and so Council members will have had little time to read it up to now. What is before you is the report, together with the executive summary, of the NERA report. We have not printed off the report from the Kings Fund seminar. That is already available and I think you have it already. I hope, President, that Council members will understand that from this morning.

**Mr Douglas Simpson:** President, in the press release from the Department of Health it says "changes to the regulations of the pharmacy profession announced earlier had been *endorsed* by the independent working party". I wondered what the word *endorsed* meant and whether you were happy with that word.

**The President:** Those are the words of the Department of Health.

**Secretary & Registrar:** We should bear in mind that we are in public business.

**The President:** Are there any other comments or questions on that item? Before I move to the next item, may I take this opportunity to warmly welcome Professor Jayne Lawrence, who has joined us as a Chief Scientific Officer.

## **3. Motions for debate**

Mr John Gentle and Mr Andrew Gush have presented a motion to the Society.

**Mrs Lesley Morgan:** I have a declaration of interest.

**The President:** Any other declarations of interest?

**Mr John Gentle:** What is the interest?

**Mrs Lesley Morgan:** I am an ATP member and I am on the executive of the APTUK.

**Mrs Corinne Hunt:** I would have to make the same declaration, being an APTUK member.

**The President:** Any other declarations? **(None)** This motion before us I think is causing quite a bit of emotion and discussion. I would like to invite John Gentle and Andrew Gush to present the motion to the Council.

**Mr John Gentle:** Since the Council called representatives of the branches to Lambeth on 9<sup>th</sup> March, a process of engagement with members has gone on. The Society has been consulting widely with RPSGB members and others as to their opinions on the many aspects of a body akin to a Royal College. There are a wide variety of views on almost all aspects of these Government proposals. Dr Catherine Duggan, the Chairman of the UKCPA, commented at the most recent of its meetings on 30<sup>th</sup> April ----

**The President:** If you going to quote somebody in public business, then you should take a bit of care. Do you have her permission to quote her?

**Mr John Gentle:** I have not actually.

**The Chairman:** In that case you can delete that.

**Mr John Gentle:** A person there at the meeting said that her organisation, like many others, had difficulty to committing to a concept of a Royal College, because they did not know what they were committing to, and that Council had to start to put some proposals in place so people had a better idea of what they were committing to, or not committing to, as the case may be. This motion is the first step in a long process and does not commit the Council to any course of action, other than to begin a course of investigation, but it gives people an idea of the direction of travel that we may want to go in. Various people have erroneously, in my view, indicated that the Council specifically, and the Society in general, have not been as inclusive as they could have been when forming policy in the past. People have felt ignored. People have felt bypassed and left out of the process. It does not matter, to an extent, what we have actually done, because that is their perception and that is what they are saying and we have no right to tell them how they should feel about it. We must ensure that these people are well aware of our commitments to be inclusive when consulting and meaningful when we say we want to hear their views. I think there is a need for the Council to formalise a relationship with other bodies, and I think we should do so publicly. We should set up formal links by affiliating ourselves with other bodies in a very public way to demonstrate this commitment. We do not have to wait until 2010, 2011 or 2012 when the Royal College probably will be formed. There is nothing in the Society's rules to say we cannot begin to align ourselves with the function of a Royal College now. If we believe it will benefit us (and I do) we can start to do this from today. Things may change in the the future, but if we decide to look at this today, with our strategy days booked until the end of June, we may well have a clear idea of where this could go and we could send a clear message to those within and without the Society as to our intentions.

Here I must comment that I am disappointed with some of the comments in the paper that is before us today. They seem to indicate that unless we have all of the answers before us, we should not agree to this. Such an attitude I felt would close down almost all public discussion on the processes in this area. The Council should say what it feels about moving forward and bring other pharmacists into the fold. I commend this to Council as a way of doing so.

**Mr Andrew Gush:** I welcome the opportunity to second this positive and proactive motion. In principle I believe affiliation for bodies whose members are non-pharmacists is the preferred option for all parties. It is the salad bowl approach and not the melting pot approach. I believe in co-operation and not collocation. Bodies such as the ATPUK should retain their unique identity and stance. I am a great advocate of the development of the technicians' role and responsible use of skill mix and believe the ATPUK would serve their members and potential members more fruitfully by working and of course challenging a pharmacist-focused Royal College as a robust independent organisation affiliated to such a Royal College. Of course, hopefully the Academy of Pharmaceutical Science would be another important affiliated body. The APS would be able to argue unhindered for the points of view that their members subscribe to. How would they benefit from being subsumed within the mass of a Royal College membership? It has been argued that their members would join both organisations. Would they? I foresee a situation where many such organisations could wither on the vine as they fight the College for membership fees, and what good would that do? Affiliation would speed up access to the Society's resources (library services, information department, educational material). All of these could be available to affiliate bodies much sooner under such a system. It is a win-win situation, as the Society would also benefit from increased revenues. Whether through the individual or through the affiliated body, whether annually or per item, the services provided would generate welcome additional revenue.

In conclusion, what would such a motion communicate? The Affiliation of non-pharmacist bodies would communicate and demonstrate that the Society is genuine in both its aspirations and stated intentions of being inclusive. It sends a clear signal to others that the Society is proactively developing firm proposals on the way forward. It indicates that pharmacists should start shaping the future look and role of a Royal College now rather than wait. Pharmacists must set their own agenda for its own representative body. Finally, affiliation rightly speeds up the access to some of the resources to non-pharmacists and it generates the income from a broader base for the Society. For these reasons and more, I am happy to second this motion and commend it to Council.

**Professor Alistair Michell:** I do not have a view on this, and I do not think you would expect me to, as it is a matter for pharmacists. What I want to point out is that to me there is a conundrum here, which is this. The Society (i.e. the Council) has already welcomed the *Scoping the Profession* report. That report identified the fact that there are a large number of organisations out there that would like to work with the Society, be affiliated to it, but not be taken over by it. The problem that I therefore have as a bystander -- because I truly do not intend to vote on this -- is that the first half of the motion suggests that there is some problem with doing that. If there was, I am surprised we did not hear it when we discussed the *Scoping the Profession* report. The second half demands that there should be some passage of money, which would seem to exclude affiliation of bodies that are not benefiting for paid services. I have a problem in understanding the significance of both halves of the motion. I would therefore, and because I am not a pharmacist, intend to abstain.

**The President:** We note those points and hope that in summary you will be able to respond to Bob's points. Are there any other comments?

**Mr Martin Astbury:** I think my comment is a brief one and it probably follows on from what Bob said. I think this is a positive move. It is suggesting that we make sure that we begin the process. Bob probably is saying the processes may already be there, but if they are not let us make it explicit. Let us get the process underway, and if there is not an obvious process for how we can have these affiliations, then let us get it going. I support the motion.

**The President:** Before going further, I understand from the Chairman of the Welsh Pharmacy Board that there was a discussion. Peter, do you want at this stage to report what was discussed by your Board?

**Mr Peter Jones, Chairman, Welsh Pharmacy Board:** If I could explain to Council members, the first meeting of the Board was prior to the release of the White Paper, so a strategy day this Monday was the first opportunity we had to look at the White Paper and we actually looked at the motion before Council today as well. I would like to give you the views of the Welsh Board and I will read it out:

"Council should be cautioned against making decisions or setting in train actions that could preclude any type or category of membership of a professional leadership body at this stage. In asserting knowledge that the Boards and the profession have not yet been fully informed we are gravely concerned at the undue haste with which the Council and the AGM are being pressed to take a decision. In what sense is this either in the interest of the public or the profession? The profession needs to undertake a fully informed debate based on factual information and argument. The aim is to develop an organisation which engages with existing bodies and organisations, many of which already include non-pharmacist members. The Welsh Board believes it is imperative that the Society remain inclusive both whilst the debate on purpose and function of the professional leadership body develops."

Those were the views of the Board.

**The Vice-President:** Was there unanimity amongst your Board?

**Mr Peter Jones:** Yes. I spoke on the phone to the three members who could not attend that day.

**Mr Martin Astbury:** In a lot of the things you are saying now, you appeared to be taking in the explanatory notes. You have discussed around the explanatory notes, rather than solely looking at the motion.

**Mr Peter Jones:** Yes.

**The President:** From what was said, it seems to me that they are looking at a wider approach than just looking at one particular sector. Are there any other questions for Peter?

**Dr Brian Curwain:** I do not think I can support this motion. It makes me feel uneasy. I need to explore briefly the reasons why. I do not think it is a necessary motion for us to have at this time, and although the proposers and seconders have mentioned inclusivity in their speeches, I think it could be taken as something which is really more about exclusivity than inclusivity. That is what disturbs me about it. Essentially it could be interpreted as saying that this body will be solely for pharmacists and other people can be on the edges and I do not think that is a view that we have really come to as a Council yet. If it is the view that Council believes, let us vote for the motion. Echoing the response from Wales, which I heard for the first time just now, it may be used to constrain actions in the future. Personally, my views about this are that the body should be inclusive. I think there is a very important role, not only for technicians, very likely as associates of affiliate members. I think we can discuss all those details. That is not a problem. But also pharmaceutical scientists, many of whom will have very high academic qualifications, higher than most of us (including myself) in this room. At this stage to preclude people who were not pharmacists who may well be Fellows from the Royal Society from being members of this body I think would be unnecessarily tying our hands. For that reason, I will not be able to support the motion as it stands.

**The President:** I did not get the sense, when looking at the motion, that it is about excluding anybody. Can you explain?

**Dr Brian Curwain:** I have only explained my feelings about it, which is all I can really say. If others do not pick that up, I am content with that.

**The President:** Can I correct that I think it is about enabling something to be done, but it is not excluding anybody, is it? Can I ask the proposer, is this motion excluding anybody?

**Mr John Gentle:** Criminals, ne'r do wells, those kind of people.

**Professor Stephen Denyer:** I can appreciate the spirit of the motion and would applaud the fact that it is intended to find one of several mechanisms by which to engage organisations with this one. It is just one of several potential mechanisms of engagement. I think we are all recognising that in the discussions on the leadership role of the Society or a future body, we want to ensure that we have suitable mechanisms for the various organisations and persons that we wish to engage with. I have reservations therefore about being restrictive to one type and form of engagement. I am discomforted about the linkages with named organisations which you have presented in your support of this. I understand they are examples, but I think that Brian's anxieties about messages can come from the use of examples. I do think that the spirit is right for this, which is to make sure there are ways of affiliating organisations. I think perhaps it is premature, in that we should be looking at what affiliation might mean, what it brings to various organisations and the additional mechanisms that might be available.

**Mr Sid Dajani:** To be honest, I received this motion and I thought it was a no-brainer. I did not really believe anybody would be able to talk against it, because what it is saying is that it is starting a proactive process ahead of its time. Therefore, when we go nearer the time, towards the end, we could be doing a lot wrong in order to get something out in a rush. It is an extremely important issue. Bob mentioned Scoping the Profession. I see this as part of that proposal. It is nothing new. I am surprised we have not started a lot earlier. All the comments I have heard against the motion seem to be exercises in befuddlement and obfuscation, because quite frankly it is an extremely important and helpful motion that is basically telling us how to define affiliation. It is setting up a process; a process of responsibility and a process of how best to engage and not exclude but include. I think if we vote against the motion, we would be voting against the membership and the best interests of this organisation, the members and the profession. I would support this motion.

**Mrs Lorna Jacobs:** My views echo a bit of what Bob said, whether we need to begin a process to recognise affiliation, as we have already talked about it, of where does that leave people who are not getting paid services. My other concern is that this relates to the Society and yet many of the comments have actually related to a potential Royal College.

I think we do need to be very clear which of these two we are referring to and being clear that in terms of talking about the Society, we are not trying to tie the hands of a potential Royal College. There have been comments that that should not be the Society by another name.

**Mr Jonathan Buisson:** It is very easy to talk against this motion. This motion is not about inclusivity. This is not about inviting people to the party. This is about saying, "Sorry son, you're not on my guest list. You're not a member. You're an affiliate. There's a tradesman's entrance round the corner, why don't you try down there." This motion derives in part from a motion that was attempted to be presented to a previous session of Council, which fortunately was not. It has been very carefully worded to look lovely, but the explanatory notes give it away. This is not about inclusion; this is about saying "members only; the current members only, for now, forever." This is not the position that this Society needs to be in as it attempts to form the core of a body akin to a Royal College, whatever that may look like. Council is far too far away from being in any position to decide what that body looks like, who should be in, who should be out, what status they should have, how they transition from one status to another, what specialist status might be available in the future, where it should be, how much they should pay and so on and so forth.

**Mr Colin Ranshaw:** I have to look at this motion. The way it is written does not say an awful lot that we should not be doing. It is asking us to identify groups to include. I see no problem with that, particularly reading the letter in the PJ this week from one pharmacy technician who turned round and said the APT does not necessarily represent all pharmacy technicians. It tends to represent those employed in the secondary care sector. So it is for us as a Council of this organisation to identify who we should be talking to, for example, to represent that group. Should we be looking at another group, for example the British Pharmacological Society as an affiliate body that we should be talking to? These bodies were not identified in Scoping the Profession, because that was particularly looking at pharmacy, at organisations that were splintering off from pharmacy and were, in the main, pharmacists. So we really do have to start that process to say: who are the groups out there we should be talking to. I have no problem with the first part of the motion as written. I have a problem with the paid services, and we have always to consider catch 22 situations. When I started out in hospital pharmacy pharmacists we went on to the wards to do ward topping up. We made it available in the budget of the Pharmacy Directorate. Eventually the nursing staff and the medical staff paid for it from their own budgets. Unless you look at doing the job first, rather than asking for the money first, you may get yourself into trouble and may not be able to develop, expand and evolve. The only difficulty I have with the motion as written is the paid services issue.

**The President:** That is something for the proposer and seconder to consider whether they want to amend.

**Mr Alan Kershaw:** Like other lay members, I do not want to get too involved in this, but it seems to me there is a problem of a perception here about this motion. The Welsh Board perceived there to be a problem and three members Council this afternoon have, because of what the motion does not say, rather than what it does. I wonder if those who object to the motion as it stands would find it easier to accept if an amendment were made. I would be happy to propose that amendment. I am not sure whether to think on my feet and deal with the paid services now, but maybe others should talk to that, as I am not sure of that. If a number of words were added to the end to clarify the meaning of this, it may head off the kind of perception that I think is causing the fears expressed that individuals here would perhaps, on behalf of other organisations whose members might be concerned at seeing the motion in the form it is. I am not sure of the procedure, but I can give you a form of words.

**The President:** You need to propose it and see if there is seconder.

**Mr Alan Kershaw:** This is done on the wing, but the spirit of it would be expressed like this. The motion, as it stands -- we will have to come back to the paid services, but let us take it we leave it in at the moment: "Paid services are agreed to be provided by the Society, and who as individuals would not thereby later be excluded should it be so decided, from associateship membership of a new professional leadership body for pharmacy."

**The President:** Have you written it down?

**Mr Alan Kershaw:** I will write it down.

**The President:** Can you repeat it?

**Mr Alan Kershaw:** The motion, as written, but then: "... and who as individuals would not thereby later be excluded should it be so decided, from associate membership of a new professional leadership body for pharmacy." Whether that gets general agreement, I do not know. I do note in Lord Carter's working group report the idea of individual associateship or associateship is actively canvassed, and the fear may be that the motion as it stands is intended to, or could have the effect of excluding discussion of that possibility.

**The President:** I think in simple terms what you are saying is that no individual or groups would in the future be excluded as a result of discussion today.

**Mr Alan Kershaw:** What I would intend by that is that by our avowedly working towards affiliate membership with a wide range potentially of other bodies, we are not ruling out the possibility yet to be determined as to categories of membership for individuals of the body in the future.

**Secretary & Registrar:** Can I make a comment before there is a seconder? Mr Gentle, who is proposing the motion, said he was disappointed in the notes attached because it seemed to close down the discussion. That is not the intention at all. I think what is being made clear is that what those notes are intended to do is to draw to the attention of Council a number of things which need to be considered before this could be taken forward in any way. I think we are talking here about affiliates, but other categories which are mentioned I think in the Carter report itself. I think what the Council is asked to consider are these points and to take them into account as they deliberate whether this is the way forward at this time or not. So it is not exclusive and they are points that will have to be considered, because actually there are a lot of questions to be answered before it could go forward anyway.

**The President:** As Chairman of the meeting, I think it would be very helpful if we can separate what is being asked of the Society and what is being asked of the future proposed body, which may or may not happen. We hope it will happen. What I am hearing is so confusing, because sometimes we are talking of what the Society should do now, and other times we are talking about what a future body should do. Can we focus on the motion, because the motion is about what the Society should do now as it is written. I think Alan has proposed an amendment. Before we go further, do you have a seconder? (Mrs Hunt). We will debate the amended motion before us. What I would like to do is make sure that the correct wording is on the screen. Please bear with me, it slows things down, but then we will not waste time. The wording now is going to be put on the screen. In the meantime, John, do you want to make a comment?

**Mr John Gentle:** Two comments. Firstly, in response to what the Secretary and Registrar commented, I cannot agree with her. Under Points to Consider it talks about "it would be necessary to have a clear definition of affiliate to ensure clarity in the expectations of both parties in debating this motion." It also says it would be necessary to set out clearly what services were being offered. I would contend neither of those are necessary at all. Those are the kind of things that the discussion the motion is trying to prompt would decide. Those things come after passing the motion. Pass the motion and in the discussions following the motions those things would be set out. The explanatory notes appear to me to say that you have to decide this before you consider the motion. That is what it says: "In debating the motion." The assumption is that you must decide on this before voting on the motion and I do not agree. If I could comment quickly on the amendments. I am not sure whether you can rule it out of order, because it seems to me that an amendment should add something to a motion or change a motion. This does neither. There is nothing in that amendment that cannot be done by simply passing the original motion. I wonder what is the point of passing that amendment.

**The President:** The amendment has been proposed and seconded.

**Mr John Gentle:** It seems to me to be superfluous.

**The President:** The proposer is not accepting your amendments. There are a number of people who have spoken. Forgive me if I take people who have not spoken first.

**Ms Marcia Saunders:** President, I think you and Lorna are right to draw the distinction between ourselves as a Society and a future Royal College. I think that is terribly difficult. We could do that here, but I think it would be terribly difficult to persuade people outside this room that that line was clearly drawn. I think that this is a very delicate time for the Society in terms of setting up its role in setting up a professional leadership organisation, and I think we need to be very careful not to give impressions to others outside that we have made some fairly grand or robust assumptions about that. This is time for subtlety, delicacy and persuasion and achieving confidence amongst others. On that ground as well, frankly, as well as that spoken about by Jonathan (with whom I agree) I think this is quite a seriously pre-emptive motion which will be misunderstood outside the room.

**The President:** Are you talking about the original motion or as amended?

**Ms Marcia Saunders:** Both.

**Mr Stephen Wells:** I wanted to talk on the original motion, so where do I stand, President.

**The President:** We have moved on.

**The Treasurer, Mr John Jolley:** I fully support the principles of consultation with all sectors of pharmacy in order to look at the membership of a future Royal Society type organisation. I feel, as has already been expressed, this motion has certain underlying implications, even that amendment, to my mind, implies that there could possibly be exclusion from such a future Royal Society if a member was not registered as a practising pharmacist. I think if that were the case, then certainly any future Royal Society, any professional organisation, would be the weaker because the strength of any future such professional body will be improved by having representation from all sectors of pharmacy -- pharmacy, not necessarily just pharmacists. For that reason, I would have to oppose this amendment and the motion as well.

**Secretary & Registrar:** In a way, the Treasurer has picked up the point I was going to make, but I think it is important to make it. What we are doing at the moment is debating the amendment, and whether or not it should be accepted. We then take a vote on the amendment. If it is won, the amendment is incorporated and becomes a motion. If not, we revert to the original motion. We are now debating the amendment.

**Mr Graham Phillips:** Can I ask a procedural question, because there are rules around what is an appropriate basis on which to amend a motion, and there are rules which say that actually this is not an amendment to a motion, it is an entirely new motion. Is it clear that within the normal rules of debate this amendment is actually constitutionally acceptable?

**Secretary & Registrar:** The question about whether it is acceptable is, as you said, whether it alters the nature of the motion entirely. I do not think it does alter the nature of the motion entirely; it adds to it, in my view.

**The President:** Can I say that what we can talk about is what we can do now. We cannot bind the future Council to any decision taken by this Council, because they will have to judge for themselves what needs to happen. I think fears about binding or not binding a future Council needs to be properly taken into account.

**Mr David Thomson:** I want to speak on the original motion.

**Mr Douglas Simpson:** I can speak to either, because I do not think the amendment makes any difference to the motion at all. Sorry, Jonathan (old Journal colleagues and all that), but I really do not think it helps to treat this in a flip kind of way, talking about skirmishes in flowerbeds and tradesmen's entrances and all that. This is a very serious topic, as is obvious from the tenor of debate.

I have an end point that I want to achieve out of all this; that when the process has been completed, we have a body which is capable of representing, in a democratic fashion, the views of pharmacists as pharmacists. Their interests overlap, but they are not identical with those of other bodies which are mentioned, including the one in the background notes we have been given. They are not the same as technicians. Technicians also need a distinctive voice too, if their voice is to be heard in the debate about how the pharmacy profession should be organised. In summary, what I am saying is that as long as we end up with a body somewhere, somehow that is able to represent the views of pharmacists as pharmacists in a democratic and distinctive fashion, then I am in favour of it. Any mechanism which allows that to be the state of affairs in the future I support.

**Mr John Hanlon:** It is on both the motion and the amendment. As a lay member of Council, this is a personal view and a conscience view and I consider it would be improper for me to vote on this I will not be voting on it. The one comment I would like to make on the future of the Society is that the Society is composed of its members, and the members at some stage will have to decide their self-determination, where they want to go in the future at this momentous time for pharmacy. I think that a good message from today's meeting would be to say that whatever the Council proposes or disposes that at some stage you are going to ask your membership what they want. I think that is the important point. To do that, you do have to give them a range of options. At that stage I think that is the appropriate time to be saying to the members, the members should be in control of the future of the Society. I think that is certainly the position of the Charter and the position of how you are setting up. Your members are King. I think you can have discussions around the table today, but at the end of the day your members must decide.

**The President:** What I would like to do is to conclude this part, because time is running out. Sylvia indicated she wants to speak, then I want Bob to speak, because I think as Chairman of the group that looked at *Scoping the Profession* work, I would like to hear from him. Then we will conclude it.

**Mrs Sylvia Hikins:** I have listened carefully to the debate and some alarm bells have gone off in my head, particularly the comments from the Treasurer, who said if exclusion of membership were for people that are not practising pharmacists, he would be against it. I think that is a very, very strong recommendation at this stage not to support this motion. Also Andrew Gush, who seconded the motion, whose actual words (which I wrote down) were where he referred to "a pharmacist-focussed Royal College" and talks about other organisations being "subsumed with a mass of pharmacist organisations and would wither on the vine". I think those phrases scare me a little. They are pre-emptive and I think you actually could agree with things we have read in White Paper that accuses us of being an organisation unable to take a collaborative approach to leadership. It worries me. At this stage of the game I think it is best that we do not pass this motion in Council.

**Professor Alistair Michell:** I am even more puzzled after listening to debate than I was beforehand. I want to ask a serious question for clarification. If in December I -- not me, but A. N. Other -- had written to the Society, to you and said I was honorary secretary of (let us say) the Association for the Study of Folk Remedies in Pharmacy. We have read the *Scoping the Profession* report and we would like to be recognised by the RPS as an affiliate body. How would you have answered that letter? Would you have said, "Well, we can't do that"? Would you have said, "We have never been asked before. We will see how to do it"? How would you have answered that letter?

**The President:** We would have to consider it in terms of bringing the matter to the Council. But I think affiliation indicates some benefit to both of working jointly together. I think the matter would have to be decided.

**Professor Alistair Michell:** What I am getting at is that this assumes there is some obstruction in our way in doing it at present. I am trying to be clear whether that is the case or not.

**The President:** I think, as long as the Charter objectives are honoured, I cannot see a problem with affiliating with anybody.

**Secretary & Registrar:** The problem is that answering these questions on-the-hoof is not the best way to answer them.

I think the answer is that it would have to be considered and investigated, because we do not have a definition of 'affiliate' at the moment. I am not saying they should not happen. We have talked about two, three different categories. Here we shall talk of associates and affiliates. There would have to be better definition before we go forwards.

**The President:** We have discussed it. I think there is some confusion and some discussion. First, what I would like to ask the proposer and the seconder and Alan, who has amended the motion, is: would you be happy (considering that we are under time constraint) to leave the motion on the table, so that some discussions can take place and later on, perhaps in June we are return to it, or do you want to press for a vote?

**Mr John Gentle:** We want to press for a vote. I think it is pertinent to refer to the comments made by Bob Michell about *Scoping the Profession*, where he talks about we have mentioned this and discussed this and affiliate bodies have been mentioned before. To the best of my knowledge, we have sat back and done nothing. I think it is the ultimate irony that most of the people who do not like this motion who have said they are going to vote against it have begun the process that this motion wants, because they have been discussing what is going to happen in the future during this debate and then said they are going to vote against the motion, which wants the debate to carry on and to be prompted. I want something to be done. I want something to move on. I do not want the people who would analyse this to death and the *syntax kings* who will sit there talking of commas here and amendments there and whatever. You can analyse this to death. Those people with feet of clay will hold us back in an atmosphere of moving forward. That is why I would not be prepared to leave it lying on the table now.

**Secretary & Registrar:** Then it needs to be voted on and, depending on outcome of that, the motion.

**The President:** All those in favour of the amendment which has been underlined for you on the screen, please show. **(Vote taken: lost)**

**Secretary & Registrar:** The amendment is lost and the Council will now be invited to vote on the motion.

**The President:** I would like the Council to vote on the original motion which was put before you. The original motion is now before you. Because of time constraints, we need to move to the vote.

**Mr Sid Dajani:** A named vote President?

**The President:** We are in public business. Do you have a seconder? **(Martin Astbury)** All those in favour of a named vote, please show. **(Vote taken: carried)** We will go to the original motion that is before you. All those in favour of the original motion please show and hold your hands up, as we need to record your name. All those in favour of the original motion.

**The Vice-President, Mr Gerald Alexander:** I abstain on the basis that I have an alternative form of words prepared....

Council voted on the motion as follows:

*In favour:* Mr M Astbury, Mr D Carter, Mr S Dajani, Mrs D Drury, Mrs D Eustace, Mr J Gentle, Mr A Gush, Mr G Phillips, Mr D Simpson, Mr D Thomson, Mr S Wells.

*Against:* Mr J Jolley, Mr J Buisson, Dr B Curwain, Professor S Denyer, Dr P Entwistle, Mrs S Hikins, Mrs C Hunt, Mrs L Jacobs, Mr A Kershaw, Mrs L Morgan, Ms M Saunders.

*Abstentions:* Mr G Alexander, Mr J Hanlon, Professor B Michell, Mr C Ranshaw.

**The President:** There appears to be a tie. We will take a vote again.

**Dr Brian Curwain:** President, you have a casting vote here.

**The President:** I am going to vote for a status quo but, having said that, I am going to concentrate on the spirit of the motion rather than anything else, because it is very, very important that this Society is seen to be engaging with all sectors of pharmacy and those outside. So I think the process we have begun already with meetings on 9<sup>th</sup> March and 30<sup>th</sup> April clearly demonstrated Council's will and the Society's will to engage with all the parties. For me, that is very important. So discussions with all these bodies will continue. I think in terms of what those organisations want from the Society and what we would want in order to work with the Society, based on the work Bob and his group did in *Scoping the Profession*, needs to be re-examined. Does the Council support that view? **(Agreed)**

#### **Motion lost**

**Professor Stephen Denyer:** I think that truly the spirit of this motion, which is to make sure that we have the right set of mechanisms available to be inclusive, is right. I do not think there is single detractor from that in the discussions of today. I think it is timely that we look at all those mechanisms and I know that the procedures are in place and feel reassured that those proceedings are started.

**The President:** We note the comments. The work will continue.

**Secretary & Registrar:** All that has been said this afternoon is helpful in determining the thinking that needs to be explored to take this forward. It is not the time, because we are short of time, but the work which Eileen Neilson has done in mapping many of the other bodies, if she could tell you what she has done now, that would be helpful, but we do not have the time. Actually, a lot of work has been done to help to promulgate this, because we need to tease out what is exactly meant by this and other ways of including people.

#### **4. Order of business for the 2007 Annual General Meeting**

**The President:** Whilst votes are counted, can I take item 4, order of business for the 2007 AGM? Can I ask the Council to receive recommendations and receive the order of business for 2007?

**Mr Jonathan Buisson:** I would like to publicly record that I understand this may be taken in hand anyway at the officers meeting, but I do not want to see the long, dull and boring bits of the AGM, however necessary they are, prolonged unnecessarily. The AGM is a meeting for members, and the bits members have put forward should be done at the earliest opportunity within the meeting.

**The President:** I would respond to it, but I think we will note the comments.

#### **5. Any other business**

**The President:** I am going to curtail any more discussion on this. I would like Council to concentrate on item 6 and note the item. I would like to go to any other business.

#### **6. The implementation of the new Recognition of Professional Qualifications Directive (Directive 2005/36/EC) and consequences of a three-part register**

**Professor Alistair Michell:** I think item 6 is too important to fly over. It is far more important than what we have just been talking about. I know time is precious, but I therefore make the following machine gun points. First of all, if European nationals can escape CPD, because it is not compulsory in their own country ----

**The President:** Bob, would it help if we brought the item back to you in June? I want to give it adequate time to note the comments and also if there are points to take.

**Professor Alistair Michell:** I am content, provided it is not too late. I notice it all has to be done and dusted by October.

**Secretary & Registrar:** Can I ask the Council to accept the paper and if they have further questions to contact Martha, who is the expert in the field, and say that it is coming back to you. Because we have, separately and together and through AURA, made representations and the group did meet with

the Minister, Philip Hunt, to put the points. If Council can accept what you have is information in advance of an opportunity further to discuss this in June. **(Agreed)**

**The President:** We are in open business in AOB. I would like to take this opportunity to thank some retiring Council members. First of all, Chairman of Practice Committee, Sultan Dajani is retiring. Sultan, thank you very much for all the work that you have done. The place will not be the same! Then Davan Eustace. Thank you for all the work that you have done, particularly in ensuring that the voice of prison pharmacists was heard, and for your contribution on the community pharmacist group. Corinne Hunt too. Thank you for the contributions you have made formally and informally. Stephen Wells, who is also stepping down. Stephen, on behalf of the Council, thank you very much for all the contributions you have made and the passion that you have shown in trying to represent the voice of pharmacists at grass roots level. We also note the retirement of Mike Schofield, who is away.

We are going to confidential business.