



## Only pharmacists as full members of new body?

Full membership of the new professional body for pharmacy should be for pharmacists only, the **branch representatives' meeting** decided.

Tony Pugh (Brighton) proposed: "That when the Royal Pharmaceutical Society is divested of its regulatory function, then full membership of the proposed body akin to a royal college should only be for those pharmacists who have obtained a pharmacy degree and are working or have worked in pharmacy."

After interventions from Edward Mallinson (Lanarkshire) and Bill Brookes (South Cheshire), the motion was revised to read "... should be for pharmacists who are, or have been, in pharmacy-related employment", acknowledging those pharmacists who registered before degree-only entry to the profession began in the late 1960s.

Opposing the motion, Amy Lepiorz (South Cheshire) said that the wording still did not include pharmacy students, even though the BRM had already agreed that they should be a major part of the new profession (see p699).

Wasim Baqir (Northumbria) added that the motion also ignored pharmacy technicians and pharmaceutical scientists. How many of the 40,000 pharmacists would voluntarily pay to join the new body? It needed other sources of revenue and should encompass all who work in the pharmacy arena.

Gordon Ross (Nottingham) suggested that full membership should be for pharmacists, pharmacy students and technicians in pharmacy-related employment, with affiliated membership for others. He proposed amending the motion to read: "... full membership of the proposed body akin to a royal college should be for pharmacists, pharmacy students and technicians".

Seconding, Carol Lange (Leicestershire) said that the attitude that registered technicians should be excluded was deplorable.

Anthony Cox (Birmingham) said that he did not agree with the motion, because the topic was one for the Transitional Committee rather than the BRM, but he opposed the amendment because it changed the motion so much that it would mean exactly the opposite.

Steven Curtis (Harrow and Hillingdon) said that the motion gave pharmacists the opportunity to defend their position and face their future careers as pharmacists "without the bloody technicians". The pharmacy body should be just for pharmacists.



David Thomas: the more the merrier



Anthony Cox: there is no "technicianophobia"

David Thomas (Thames Valley) said that the new body faced a problem of economics. Practising pharmacists would have to pay a fee to the General Pharmaceutical Council. Would they also pay to join a non-mandatory professional body? The new body would need pharmacy students, technicians and preregistration trainees — the more, the merrier.

Ken Gledhill (Harrogate) said that qualifying as a pharmacist involved a tough course and a rigorous preregistration year, and he strongly opposed the admission of technicians.

James Davis (British Pharmaceutical Students Association) said that the amendment should be opposed because, although it included pharmacy students, it did not include preregistration trainees.

John Anderson (Chelmsford) said that technicians did not belong in the new professional body. They should not be in a position to be elected to the new body's council and tell pharmacists what they should be doing and what their professional standards should be.

David Morgan (Clwyd) urged the meeting to vote against the amendment because it did not go far enough. It needed to include pharmaceutical scientists and academics, in line with the recommendations of the Clarke Report, as well as preregistration trainees.

Mrs Lange said that hospital pharmacists work alongside senior technicians who carry out clinical interventions and review patients. The meeting should support the amendment.

The reports on this and the following page are of debates at the Royal Pharmaceutical Society's **branch representatives' meeting** on 22 May. Further reports will appear next week

The amendment was then put to the vote and lost.

Speaking to the substantive motion, Mr Curtis said that it was the most important of the day because it allowed debate on the future of the profession. It was the pharmacist's profession and should not be shared. He was not interested in arguments that the new body needed other people's money. He wanted a body that would defend his position as a pharmacist. It could incorporate or affiliate with other people and set up anything it liked to get the views of other people, but he would refuse to allow other people fully in. It should be a pharmacy body for pharmacists, or he would not be interested.

Dennis Higgins (Thames Valley) agreed that pharmacists alone should have full membership, but he was not opposed to forms of associate membership for technicians, students, etc.

Gordon Ross (Nottingham) said that the the motion was bigoted to exclude technicians. The new body would represent professional growth and development and clinical expertise. Technicians were involved in that.

Mr Thomas said that anti-technician feeling saddened him. Pharmacy practice could not exist in the 21st century without technicians.

Mr Gledhill said he was not anti-technician in any way, but including them as full members would devalue the pharmacist qualification.

Laura Kenicer (Glasgow and West of Scotland) said what people seemed to be saying was that technicians needed to be involved, but not necessarily as full members. No one was anti-technician if they wanted them involved.

Dr Cox said that accusations of "technicianophobia" were utterly ridiculous. Many people who opposed technicians becoming full members worked with them all the time and greatly valued their role. But inviting them in as full members could put pharmacists off joining because they wanted an organisation to represent pharmacists. There was a value in having separate organisations for pharmacists and technicians, which could have a dialogue between them about the sort of issues that came up between them. The debate had nothing to do with the roles of technicians and pharmacists. That was a completely separate debate that would occur through several mechanisms. The motion was not "technophobic", and people should vote in that light.

A vote was then taken and the motion was carried.

# BRM backs training for all pharmacy support staff

The **branch representatives' meeting** rejected a motion seeking to exempt science students in full-time education from the requirement to undertake a Scottish/National Vocational Training course while working part-time or during vacation in a pharmacy.

Proposing the motion, Alan Hughes (Clwyd) said that pharmacies face restraints on recruiting Saturday staff because the Society requires all support staff to undertake S/NVQ level 2 regardless of the hours worked. Pharmacy students who have started their MPharm course are exempt, but the branch wanted the exemption to be extended to include sixth formers.

David Morgan (Clwyd), seconding, said that the NHS was less efficient now than at the beginning of his career because of the bureaucracy that has to be put up with on a day-to-day basis. One example was S/NVQ2 training for sixth-formers working on Saturdays or in vacations. Since they will not be

working for more than three years, they cannot even complete the training.

Angela Alexander (Slough), opposing the motion, said that she did not agree with the current exemptions, let alone want them extended. Working in a pharmacy was not like shelf-stacking in a supermarket. All pharmacy staff had responsibilities to the customer. They

needed an understanding, and they gained it from the NVQ. She worked on a Saturday in a pharmacy that employed a lot of school students, and most were keen to undertake the NVQ work. It could be done by distance learning, and Saturday's slow prescription flow allowed time to tutor them. She urged the meeting to vote against the motion.

Gordon Dykes (Glasgow and West of Scotland) said that he, too, was fed up with bureaucracy and often despaired that the S/NVQs were an evidence-gathering exercise that proved nothing. However, training improved students' ability to serve the public and provided a qualification they might be able to use later.

Training also engaged the pharmacist with the student in a structured way and helped build teamwork. And students who normally only worked Saturday mornings might become the background of a pharmacy's summer coverage. They should have training.



Angela Alexander: staff have responsibilities



Gordon Dykes: training improves service to public

## Council asked to investigate likely future fees

The Society's Council should give early consideration to the fees likely to be payable to the General Pharmaceutical Council and the new professional body, the **branch representatives' meeting** decided, so that potential members of the new body would not be deterred by the cost of joining.

Proposing a motion to that effect, Stephen Garner (Nottingham) said that recent large fee increases have given many members serious doubts about the value of the Society to them personally. To most members, the sole contact is the occasional visit of the inspector, receipt of *The Pharmaceutical Journal* and maybe attending local branch meetings. They may accept the value of continuing professional development but perceive it as something im-

posed on them. To be successful, the new professional body would need large numbers to join it voluntarily, and potential members should not be put off by the size of the fee.

Matthew Boyd (Nottingham), seconding, said that membership of a professional body would be vital for pharmacists' voice, and the strength of that voice would depend on the number of people who take part in the professional body. Pharmacists needed to be strongly conscious of how much that would cost.

Anthony Cox (Birmingham), opposing the motion, said that the Society was not in a position to determine what future fees should be. It should be left to the Transitional Committee and the shadow council of the new body.

## BRM seeks continued facility to pay Society fees by cheque

A motion calling for a choice of method for paying the Society's fees, including payment by cheque, was carried by the **branch representatives' meeting**.

Proposing a motion to that effect, Anthony Cox (Birmingham) said that the removal of the ability to pay by cheque was discriminatory towards older members.

Michael Jepson (Birmingham), seconding, said that the motion had been largely overtaken by events, but the letters sent to members on the matter could probably have been more supportively and caringly worded.

Bill Brookes (South Cheshire) said that the chequebook was still a useful means of paying. He did not like credit and debit cards.

## Pharmacy's new professional body should support BPSA

Support for pharmacy students should be part of the work of the new professional body for pharmacy, the **branch representatives' meeting** decided in a unanimous vote.

Heena Bhakta (British Pharmaceutical Students Association) proposed that the Society "should ensure that any new professional body continues to support the BPSA in the form of an academy for British pharmaceutical students". Students were the future of pharmacy, she said and the new professional body needed to engage them if it was truly to reflect the profession.

## BRM emphasises value of thriving branch structure for the future professional body

A motion asserting that a thriving local branch structure is essential to the success of the future professional leadership body for pharmacy was carried unanimously without debate at the **branch representatives' meeting**.

Proposing the motion, Jen De Val (South East Metropolitan) said that it should be a Council priority to maintain the branch structure in the transition to a new professional body. As a voluntary body, it would have to attract members, and a branch structure would be crucial to its success. It needed

a tangible local presence relevant to its grass roots members. A branch structure could achieve that and could encourage the development of new leaders for the profession.

Seconding, Fawz Farhan (South East Metropolitan) said that a branch network offered a huge potential for supporting pharmacists through training, education, continuing professional development, mentoring opportunities, meeting with peers and policy discussions. But it needed support from headquarters in terms of resources and manpower.

## OFFICIAL NOTICES

Communications to the Royal Pharmaceutical Society should be addressed, unless otherwise stated, to: The Chief Executive and Registrar, Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, 1 Lambeth High Street, London SE1 7JN (tel 020 7735 9141; fax 020 7735 7629). Official Notices also appear in the Notice-Board section of PJ Online ([www.pjonline.com/notices](http://www.pjonline.com/notices)).

### Proposed amendment to Rules: The Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain (Fees in Connection with the 2009 Registration Cycle) Rules

The Council of the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, in exercise of the powers conferred upon it by article 40(1) of the Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians Order 2007 and of all other powers enabling it in that behalf, and after consulting in accordance with article 40(4) of the Order and such persons as appear to it requisite to be consulted, hereby makes the following Rules:

#### Rule 1. Citation, commencement and extent

- (1) These Rules may be cited as the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain (Fees in Connection with the 2009 Registration Cycle) Rules.
- (2) The Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain (Fees in Connection with the 2008 Registration Cycle) Rules 2008 are hereby revoked.

#### Rule 2. Interpretation

In these Rules: "registrant" means a person whose name is registered in the Register of Pharmacists; "Registration Rules" means the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain (Registration) Rules 2007; and "retention fee" means the fee specified in Rule 4(1), (2) or (3) as appropriate.

#### Rule 3. Application fee in respect of registration in the Register of Pharmacists

The application fee for registration in Part 1 or Part 2 of the Register of Pharmacists shall be £198.

#### Rule 4. Fees in respect of retention of registration in the Register of Pharmacists

- (1) The annual fee for a registrant who wishes to retain his entry in Part 1 of the Register of Pharmacists shall be £410 or £413.

- (2) The annual fee for a registrant resident in the British Islands or the European Economic Area who wishes to retain his entry in Part 2 of the Register of Pharmacists shall be £70.
- (3) The annual fee for a registrant resident outside the British Islands or European Economic Area who wishes to retain his entry in Part 2 of the Register of Pharmacists shall be £123.

#### Rule 5. Fees in respect of voluntary removal from the Register of Pharmacists

A registrant wishing to remove his name from the Register of Pharmacists in accordance with the Registration Rules shall not pay any fee.

#### Rule 6. Fees in respect of restoration to the Register of Pharmacists

- (1) Any person (a) who does not pay the appropriate retention fee as specified in Rule 4 and who is therefore removed from the Register of Pharmacists in accordance with the Registration Rules; and (b) who subsequently wishes to restore his name to the Register, shall pay a fee of £782 in addition to the appropriate retention fee for the year in which he is restored to the Register of Pharmacists.
- (2) Any person (a) who has voluntarily removed his name from the Register of Pharmacists in accordance with the Registration Rules; and (b) who subsequently wishes to restore his name to the Register of Pharmacists; or (c) whose application for restoration to the Register of Pharmacists has been granted by the Society's Disciplinary Committee, shall pay a fee of £198, in addition to the appropriate retention fee for the year in which he is restored to the Register of Pharmacists.
- (3) The whole of the restoration fee specified in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be payable irrespective of the amount of time that the person has been removed from the Register of Pharmacists.
- (4) The whole of the retention fee in respect of the year in which the person is restored to the Register of Pharmacists, as specified in Rule 4, shall be payable, irrespective of the date on which the person is so restored.

#### Rule 7. Fees in respect of annotations in the Register of Pharmacists as a supplementary or independent prescriber

- (1) The application fee for annotating a registrant's entry in the Register of Pharmacists as a supplementary prescriber, or as an independent prescriber, shall be £51.
- (2) A registrant wishing to remove an annotation from his entry in the Register of Pharmacists in accordance with the Registration Rules shall not pay any fee.

#### Rule 8. Fees in respect of transferring to a different part of the Register of Pharmacists

- (1) A registrant wishing to transfer from Part 1 to Part 2 of the Register of Pharmacists shall not pay any fee.
- (2) A registrant wishing to transfer from Part 2 to Part 1 of the Register of Pharmacists in any calendar year shall pay the difference between any retention fee already paid by him in respect of that calendar year, and the Part 1 retention fee for that calendar year specified in Rule 4(1).

#### Rule 9. Fees in respect of change of residential status in Part 2 of the Register of Pharmacists

- (1) A registrant in Part 2 of the Register of Pharmacists who (a) is resident outside the British Islands or European Economic Area, (b) who wishes to change his status, in any calendar year, to that of a registrant in Part 2 of the Register of Pharmacists, resident within the British Islands or European Economic Area, and (c) who has previously paid the retention fee due in that calendar year, shall not pay be required to pay any additional fees, or be entitled to any refund.
- (2) A registrant in Part 2 of the Register of Pharmacists (a) who is resident within the British Islands or the European Economic Area, (b) who in any calendar year wishes to change his status to that of a registrant in Part 2 of the Register of Pharmacists resident outside the British Islands or the European Economic Area, and (c) who has previously paid the retention fee due in that calendar year, shall pay a fee of £53.

#### Rule 10. Fees in connection with certificates

- (1) The fee for replacement of a certificate of registration shall be £15.
- (2) The fee for issue of a certificate of current professional status shall be £73.

#### Rule 11. Fees in respect of assessment of qualifications of EEA applicants who are not eligible for mutual automatic recognition

The fees in respect of assessment of qualifications of EEA applicants who are not eligible for mutual automatic recognition and who are required to apply for registration through the non-compliant EEA route shall be £656.

Given under the official seal of the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain this [...]th day of [...] 2008.

**Jeremy Holmes**  
Chief Executive and Registrar

#### NOTES

1. At its meeting on 2 April 2008, the Society's Council proposed that the fees in relation to registration for pharmacists and pharmacy technicians, and fees relating to the Society's registration examination should be amended.
2. The reasoning behind the Council's proposed increases are fully set out in the document "2009 Fees Consultation". The document can be accessed via the "Consultations" button on the home page of the Society's website [www.rpsgb.org](http://www.rpsgb.org). Paper copies of the consultation are available from on application to The Registrar, Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, 1 Lambeth High Street, London SE1 7JN.
3. Fees in relation to the registration of pharmacists are now set by Rules made under the Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians Order 2007. A draft of the Rules dealing with the 2009 fee cycle is set out above for consultation (see Note 2) and the consultation closes on 6 August.
4. The retention fee proposal for practising pharmacists for 2009 is an increase of either 3.9 per cent or 4.5 per cent, depending on the outcome of the consultation on reduced fees for pharmacists on low incomes and subsequently the decision of the Council.

#### Alteration to the Byelaws: Fees payable to the Society

Notice is hereby given in accordance with section XXVIII of the Byelaws that the Council of the Society has approved proposals to alter the Fourth Schedule to the Byelaws — Fees payable to the Society — as hereunder and that it intends to make such alternations after the expiry of 60 days from the date of this notice, subject to such amendment as the

## Scottish Pharmacy Board roadshows

In the wake of the Clarke Inquiry into a future professional body for pharmacy, the Scottish Pharmacy Board is running a series of roadshows across Scotland entitled "Professional leadership — your choice". Dates and venues for the remaining roadshows are as follows:

- **9 June** University of Strathclyde, 27 Taylor Street, Glasgow
- **10 June** Royal Pharmaceutical Society, 36 York Place, Edinburgh

All roadshows will begin at 7 for 7.30pm. They will be hosted by Lyndon Braddock, director for Scotland, and will include presentations from Rose Marie Parr, SPB chairman, and Frank Owens, SPB vice-chairman. Refreshments will be provided.

Lords of the Privy Council may require.

The Fourth Schedule to the Byelaws shall be deleted in its entirety and replaced as follows:

### FOURTH SCHEDULE: FEES PAYABLE TO THE SOCIETY

#### *Fees in respect of preregistration training*

1. The fees payable in respect of Section XX (21)(b) of these Byelaws shall be £166.
2. The fees payable in respect of Section XX (26) of these Byelaws shall be as follows:
  - (a) the examination fee shall be £196;
  - (b) the late entry fee shall be £392.
3. The fees payable in respect of Section XX (27) of these Byelaws shall be as follows:
  - (a) the examination resit fee shall be £196;
  - (b) the late entry fee shall be £392.

**Jeremy Holmes**  
*Chief Executive and Registrar*

#### NOTES

1. *The fees set out in this proposed amendment to the Fourth Schedule were determined by the Society's Council at its meeting on 2 April 2008.*
2. *Fees in respect of registration are now set out in Rules made under the Pharmacists and Pharmacy Technicians Order 2007, and are the subject of a separate consultation.*

### Fees to be paid by pharmacy technicians

Fees to be paid to the Society by registered pharmacy technicians have been determined by the Council for 2008 as follows:  
Technician retention fee practising £135  
Technician retention fee non-practising £70  
Technician upgrade —

non-practising to practising £65

Technician returned application fee £44  
Application route A fee £48  
Application route B fee £198  
Application overseas (EEA and non-EEA) fee £228

**Jeremy Holmes**  
*Chief Executive and Registrar*

### Disciplinary Committee

The Disciplinary Committee of the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain met on Tuesday 27 and Wednesday 28 May 2008 and made the following directions:

1. Following a Statutory Committee inquiry into **Sanjay Janubhai Patel** (registration number 76827), the Disciplinary Committee directed the removal of Mr Patel's name from the Register. Under Section 11 of the Pharmacy Act 1954, the direction to remove Mr Patel's name from the Register is not to take effect until the expiration of a period of three months from the date on which notice of removal was given or in a case where an appeal has been brought against the direction, until the appeal is determined or withdrawn.
2. Following a Statutory Committee inquiry into **Samir Patel** (registration number 74641), the Disciplinary Committee directed that Mr Patel should be reprimanded.

### Statutory Committees Secretariat

### Disciplinary Committee

The Disciplinary Committee will meet at the Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain, 1 Lambeth High Street, London SE1, on Monday 9, Tuesday 10, Wednesday 11 and Thursday 12

Royal Pharmaceutical Society and Academy of Pharmaceutical Sciences

## Symposium: Equipping our students for a changing profession

- **Date:** Monday 10 November 2008
- **Venue:** Royal Pharmaceutical Society, London
- **Content:** This meeting will bring together academics, policy makers, employers and recent graduates in order to exchange views on how we should address current needs and future changes in the profession at the undergraduate level.
- **Fee:** £125 for members of the Society or the Academy; £140 for non-members (a reduced fee of £99 for those registering before 31 July); £50 for students
- **Further information:** Julie Churchill, Royal Pharmaceutical Society, 1 Lambeth High Street, London SE1 7JN (tel 020 7572 2261; e-mail science@rpsgb.org)

June 2008 at 9.30am to hear the following matters:

1. The Statutory Committee inquiry into a complaint by the Council of the Society against **Melvin Philip Forman** (registration number 67021) which alleges that: during the period between January 1997 and July 2002 Mr Forman endorsed NHS prescriptions for Gavison Liquid, Oilatum Emollient, E45 Cream and Diprobase Cream to indicate that small pack sizes had been dispensed, when in fact large pack sizes had been dispensed; Mr Forman caused or permitted the wrongly endorsed prescriptions to be submitted to the prescription pricing authority (PPA) for payment; as a result of the submission of wrongly endorsed prescriptions to the PPA, the pharmacies received and retained overpayments; following an investigation for false small pack endorsements, the NHS Counter Fraud Security and Management Service claimed from Mr Forman a repayment of £10,000 in respect of overpayments referred to above; Mr Forman's conduct was (a) dishonest; and/or (b) improper; and/or (c) (since July 2000) contrary to Key Responsibility 3 of the Code; and/or (d) (since July 2001) contrary to Part 2 A.2(a) of the Code, and that the particulars of misconduct alleged above individually or cumulatively may render Mr Forman unfit to have his name on the Register of Pharmaceutical Chemists.
2. The Statutory Committee inquiry into a complaint by the Council of the Society against **Jyoti Patel** (registration number 85392) which alleges that: on 24 September 2005, Miss Patel attempted to steal from Marks & Spencer Plc's store at Fosse Park, Leicester,

two tops belonging to that company; on 11 January 2006 at Hinckley Magistrates' Court, following a guilty plea, Miss Patel was convicted of the offence of having attempted to steal two tops of unknown value belonging to Marks & Spencer Plc's store at Fosse Park, Leicester on 24 September 2005 contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Attempts Act 1981 for which Miss Patel received an order of conditional discharge for 24 months and was ordered to pay £70 Crown Prosecution Service costs; on 13 January 2006, Miss Patel completed and sent to the Society over the internet an annual retention fee form for 2006 which contained the following declaration by Miss Patel: "I have read the guidance on declaring criminal convictions published by the Society, and apart from the specific categories of non-declarable offences set out therein, I confirm that I have not been convicted of a criminal offence; bound over; conditionally discharged; cautioned; or reported to a Procurator Fiscal; or been subject to an adverse fitness to practise decision made by a licensing or regulatory body about which I have not advised the Registrar previously"; the declaration was false in that at the time Miss Patel made it she had been convicted of attempted theft at Hinckley Magistrates' Court and received an order of conditional discharge as stated above; and that the particulars of misconduct alleged above individually or cumulatively may render Miss Patel unfit to have her name on the Register of Pharmaceutical Chemists.

**Statutory Committees Secretariat**

## 'Medicines, ethics and practice guide' amendments

In the first issue of each month, *The Journal* updates the guidance on the legal status of medicines published in the 31st edition (July 2007) of 'Medicines, ethics and practice: a guide for pharmacists and pharmacy technicians'. The amendments are given in **bold** type when added to the list and

repeated each month in light type. A product's legal status can be obtained by consulting first the latest amendment list and then the guide.

The abbreviations used in the list are explained in the key to annotations in the body of the guide (p39).

### Human medicines

Actonel Combi (risedronate, calcium, vitamin D3) film-coated tablets and effervescent granules sachets POM  
 Adcal D3 Dissolve effervescent tablets in packs of four 14-tablet tubes P  
 Altargo POM  
 Atriance POM  
 Bifonazole 1% cream for the treatment of athlete's foot GSL  
 Binocrit prefilled syringes POM  
 Chloramphenicol eye drops entry: delete P from end of entry

Circadin prolonged-release tablets POM  
 Doxadura XL POM  
 Eucreas tablets POM  
 Feminax Ultra tablets P  
**FerriPOX oral solution POM**  
 Galvus tablets POM  
 Gygel GSL  
 Hydrocortisone 1% cream for the treatment of insect bites and stings only, in adults and children aged 10 years and over GSL  
 Increlex POM  
 Inovelon POM

Ivemend powder for solution for infusion POM  
 Langdale's Cinnamon Essence  
 GSL: delete entry  
**Lotemax eye drops POM**  
 Midazolam CD No Reg POM  
 Naproxen entry should read: Naproxen tablets POM; but if for the treatment of primary dysmenorrhoea in women aged between 15 and 50 years, maximum strength 250mg, 500mg (MD), 750mg (MDD), for a maximum of 3 days' treatment, in a maximum pack size of 9 tablets: P

Natecal D3 tablets P  
 Nicotine inhalator as an aid to smoking cessation and also as an aid to smoking reduction prior to cessation GSL  
**Niddaryl tablets POM**  
 Orenzia injection POM  
 Pradaxa capsules POM  
 Rapydan medicated plasters POM  
 Rasilez POM  
 Rebetol (ribavarin) 40mg/ml oral solution POM  
**Tasigna capsules POM**  
 Vicks preparations GSL: delete entry  
 Yondelis POM

### DIARY

#### Headquarters meetings

The following meetings take place at the Royal Pharmaceutical Society's London headquarters

#### Monday 9 June

Disciplinary Committee. 9.30am.

#### Tuesday 10 June

Disciplinary Committee. 9.30am.

#### Wednesday 11 June

Disciplinary Committee. 9.30am.

#### Thursday 12 June

Disciplinary Committee. 9.30am.

#### Local meetings

Events listed below are meetings of Royal Pharmaceutical Society branches. Details of all future meetings notified to *The Journal* appear in the Diary section of *PJ Online* ([www.pjonline.com/diary](http://www.pjonline.com/diary))

#### Monday 9 June

**Mid Glamorgan East** "Ethical dilemmas and the new code of ethics" by Priya Sejjal (head of ethics, Royal Pharmaceutical Society). Aberdare Hall, Cathays, Cardiff. Buffet 6.30pm, meeting 7.15pm.

#### Tuesday 10 June

**Barnet** "Thyroid gland" by Mark Cohen (consultant endocrinologist, Barnet and Edgware hospitals). Education and Information Centre, Barnet Hospital. Buffet 7.15pm, meeting 8pm.

**Crawley, Horsham and Reigate** "Diabetes: insulins and blood glucose monitoring" by Mike

Soper (Novo-Nordisk Ltd) and A. Amin (LifeScan), followed by annual general meeting.

Postgraduate Medical Centre, Crawley Hospital, West Green Drive, Crawley. Buffet 7pm, meeting 8pm.

**Doncaster** "Travel medicine" by Martin Brown, followed by annual

general meeting. Holiday Inn (formerly The Moat House), High Road, Warmsworth, Doncaster. 7 for 7.15pm.

#### Thursday 12 June

**Bolton** "Brief intervention training: Part 1". Education Centre, Royal Bolton Hospital,

Minerva Road, Farnworth, Bolton. Buffet 7pm, meeting 7.30pm.

(Numbers limited — telephone 01204 842314 or e-mail [keithwilliams@tiscali.co.uk](mailto:keithwilliams@tiscali.co.uk) to register.)

**Halifax** "Summer social evening". Gimbals Restaurant, Sowerby Bridge. 7.30 for 8pm.

#### Tuesday 17 June

**Chelmsford** "POM to P switches" by Helen Darracott (director of legal and regulatory affairs, Proprietary Association of Great Britain). Cosmopolitan Restaurant, 10 Broomfield Road, Chelmsford. 7.30pm for 8pm.

#### Harrow and Hillingdon

Presentation on "Helicobacter pylori testing and medicines use reviews". Cumberland Hotel, Central Harrow. Buffet 7.30pm, meeting 8pm.



## Royal Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain

**London headquarters**  
 Switchboard 020 7735 9141; direct dialling, see 'Medicines, ethics and practice'; fax 020 7735 7629; e-mail [enquiries@rpsgb.org](mailto:enquiries@rpsgb.org); website [www.rpsgb.org](http://www.rpsgb.org)

**Scottish office**  
 Headquarters of the Society in Scotland (including library and information service) 0131 556 4386 (see also 'MEP' guide); fax 0131 558 8850; e-mail [scotinfo@rpsgb.org](mailto:scotinfo@rpsgb.org)

**Welsh office**  
 Headquarters of the Society in Wales 029 2073 0310; fax 029 2073 0311; e-mail [wales@rpsgb.org](mailto:wales@rpsgb.org)

**Information centre**  
 Book loans and information Library (loans, photocopies) 020 7572 2300; e-mail [library@rpsgb.org](mailto:library@rpsgb.org); Information pharmacists, 020 7572 2302; fax 020 7572 2499; e-mail [infopharm@rpsgb.org](mailto:infopharm@rpsgb.org)

**Pharmacists' advisory service**  
 Information on legal and ethical matters 020 7572 2308; fax 020 7572 2510; e-mail [leadvice@rpsgb.org](mailto:leadvice@rpsgb.org)

**Pharmaceutics information**  
 Information, advice and problem-solving in pharmaceutics 020 7572 2302; fax 020 7572 2499; e-mail [pharmaceutics@rpsgb.org](mailto:pharmaceutics@rpsgb.org)

**Benevolent fund**  
 Financial help for pharmacists and their dependants and information about convalescence 0161 427 9776 or 01323 890135

**Pharmacists' health support programme**  
 Confidential help and support for pharmacists who experience problems with alcohol and other drugs of addiction 01327 264531

**Listening friends scheme**  
 Help from pharmacists trained in dealing with stress 020 7572 2442

**Pharmaceutical press**  
 Purchase of books and subscriptions to journals 01767 604971; fax 01767 601640; [rps@turpin-distribution.com](mailto:rps@turpin-distribution.com); website [www.pharmpress.com](http://www.pharmpress.com)

### The Diary

Announcements of branch and regional meetings for the Diary column should reach *The Journal* by 1pm on the Tuesday before publication. Branch programme cards are welcome at the beginning of the season, provided that branches subsequently notify *The Journal* in good time about any programme changes and any essential meeting information that was not available when the card was printed.