

Letters to the Editor

Concern Over California Exam Legislation

Dear Editor:

I would like to share perspective and concern over the attempted [legislation change](#) to the law in California that requires applicants to take the CALE for licensure. Not all changes in life are good ones.

We must consider what could happen if this is allowed to occur. An unelected, non-governmental, private corporation [the NCCAOM] would control the licensing of acupuncturists in California. Let that sink in for a moment. There would be little or no accountability to the taxpayers on issues that present themselves. No representation.

I think of this situation as a solution in search of a problem that does not exist. If there is a problem with the exam, then change the exam, but do not eject it. This is about money, power and subverting the state of California's legislative authority.

The states regulate the laws about the licensing of health care professions according to the *U.S. Constitution*. Removing this plank will undermine the legal framework that exists.

The educational standards for CA licensure are higher than what many other programs offer. At some point, then, an erosion may occur in the educational requirements that graduates complete in order to sit for the exams. The argument for this legislative change will eventually suggest that we can lower our degree standards now. We can save students money and charge them less. As their education declines, public trust will degrade ... and so will our profession.

This legislation is not about government responsibility to the public, but simply economics. Lowering the bar is not wise and we should voice concerns about non-governmental attempts to regulate our profession. Other health care professions appear to separate ongoing certification from licensing.

Why not raise the standards of the profession to those of California?

Name Withheld by Request

Editor's Note: As of press time, an amendment is under discussion that would preserve CALE and give applicants the option of taking *either* CALE or one or more NCCAOM exams for licensure purposes. Additionally, note that the legislation does not propose eliminating the board, but merely the board exam; according to current bill language, licensure would be based on passing one or more of the NCCAOM exams "*as determined by the board based on the skills, standards, and knowledge required for licensure pursuant to this act.*" [Italics added]

Kudos for Caring About Cancer Survivors

Dear Editor:

I wish to acknowledge and applaud Pamela Ferguson for her article in your recent issue ["The Active Art of Working With Cancer Survivors," [March 2021](#)]. Being a cancer survivor, I personally received bodywork from Pam, and also modeled (noteworthy, quite an honor to be asked to lie on the table with Pam showing her skills to conference attendees) for her at a massage and bodywork conference. I was thrilled and delighted to read her article submission. Not only her known writing skills made her article so nice to read, but also the depth of information, stimulating the reader.

I would encourage more submissions such as this, and my congratulations to Pam and all the readers now being brought to appreciate her skills and all-encompassing healing philosophy.

Sally Hacking
Clearwater, Fla.

JUNE 2021