

be continued in office for another year and congratulated upon their report. (Carried with applause).

THE PRESIDENT: These reports are valuable and I am anxious to have the chairman of committees present when they are discussed. I think pending their attendance we will suspend this part of the work until the afternoon and go on now with general business.

On the request of Mr. Leofred, the secretary read a communication from the Quebec branch with respect to the insertion in the Criminal Code of a clause protecting civil engineers in the performance of their duties in the same manner that land surveyors are protected.

MR. LEOFRED: Mr. President, the provincial land surveyors are applying to the Minister of Justice to get a clause inserted in the Criminal Code for their protection, the same as is afforded to Dominion land surveyors. Before Confederation, there was such a clause in the Law, but after Confederation there was only a reference to it left in the Dominion Lands' Act. There is nothing at all protecting a civil engineer and there is nothing in the Code making it a criminal offence to interfere with a land surveyor in each province. The boards of land surveyors in Ontario and Quebec have taken the matter up and they have had answers from the Minister of Justice that he is considering the subject and will likely insert such a clause, giving the provincial land surveyor the same protection as the Dominion. I think, therefore, that this would be a good time to have a clause inserted protecting the civil engineer. The spirit of the law before Confederation was to protect civil engineers as well as land surveyors. In fact, there were but few civil engineers then, and they worked as surveyors.

Moved by Mr. Schwitzer, seconded by Mr. John Kennedy, that the communication be referred to the incoming council to deal with it as they see fit. (Carried.)

MR. LEOFRED: Another matter that was referred to by the Quebec society was a publication in the Quebec papers reproducing part of a speech by Mr. Warburton of Prince Edward Island, where he compared the salaries paid to engineers in India, Australia and other countries with the salaries paid to engineers employed in Ottawa. His comparison shows that here, they are paid about one-third of what they receive in other countries. The Quebec branch thought it right that the society should bring the matter to the attention of the Government.

Mr. Warburton's speech can be found in Hansard.

THE PRESIDENT: I think the society considers it a very worthy subject. The matter is to be further discussed before many hours are over, and we may, therefore, leave it until later.

MR. LEACH: Mr. President, I will endeavor not to detain the meeting very long, but for the benefit of the members present now who were not here this morning, it might be well to briefly outline the point I raised in regard to the paragraph summoning the meeting. The gist of the argument is that at 10 a.m., on Thursday or as soon afterwards as possible the new Council is elected and at 3 p.m., or as soon as possible afterwards, there is a meeting of the Council. Last year's summons read:

"At 2.30 p.m. an informal meeting of the Council." I take it as a constitutional point that a Council elected by a corporation such as the Canadian Society of Civil Engineers cannot legally meet until every member of that Council has been officially notified of his election and given the opportunity of attending. A member may be in Montreal, Vancouver or Halifax and unless he attends on the speculation that he may be elected to the Council at this annual meeting, he is disfranchised. I claim that it is unconstitutional for the Council to meet and proceed to business until every member has been summoned to attend.

By-law 33 is that the Council shall meet within one week after its election. The spirit of that is that that week is sufficient for the members to be notified of their election. Now on Thursday, ten minutes after the Council is elected they will appoint committees on finance and the other committees and appoint the officials of this society. I claim that they are not entitled to proceed with that business and I will go to the extent of taking the sense of this meeting that it should be an instruction from the annual meeting that the Council shall not proceed to the business of the society until after every member has been notified of his election and summoned in proper order.

MR. TOMLINSON: Seconds this motion.

LT.-COL. ANDERSON: Mr. Chairman, while Mr. Leach may be quite correct technically, it seems to me that he is only splitting hairs. For any advantage he will gain by the adoption of his motion he will lose a great deal more. It is very difficult for any Council of the society to get outside members to attend the meetings. Immediately after the annual meeting is the one opportunity of the year when it is possible to have a good representation of the outside members. (Hear, hear.) I don't quite understand why Mr. Leach brings up this point. Technically he may be right, but in practice the adoption of this motion would be a detriment and not an advantage to this society.

DR. GALBRAITH: I quite agree with Col. Anderson that while Mr. Leach may be right technically or right in the spirit rather of the by-laws, yet I think the practice is quite within the letter of the by-law. There is no by-law to the effect that no meeting of council shall be called unless every member is notified. Nothing is said about notification. Therefore, I think there has been no illegal meeting, and it is true that we have a better chance of getting outside opinion after the annual meeting than at any other time. I think the Council have worked out the by-laws in such a way as to be a benefit to the society, although I admit that Mr. Leach has indicated a point that might be open to abuse, still I do not think that has occurred.

MR. JOHN KENNEDY: Mr. President, I have been on the council for more than half the years of its existence and the practice has worked exceedingly well. For the reasons that have already been given I think it should be continued.

MR. SHERWOOD: Mr. Chairman, could not the objection be overcome by having the election before the annual meeting, with a provision that the incoming council shall not take office until after the annual meeting?

LT.-COL. RUTTAN: Mr. Chairman, I will ask Mr. Leach, if he knows of a specific instance where hardship has occurred from the way council has managed the matter.

MR. MCCALL: Mr. President, the mover overlooks the fact that a member who is nominated has to accept nomination. Therefore, he knows about the meeting and if he can be here he will be. It is the custom in most institutions to hold a meeting of the directors immediately after the annual meeting. If there is anything wrong the better way would be to legalize the present practice by changing the by-law.

MR. FRANCIS: Mr. Chairman, I would ask Mr. Leach if his objection is confined entirely to the words "formal" or "informal." As I understand him the whole matter turns on those two words.

MR. LEACH: Mr. President, I have not anything to add. I notice that last year the words were "an informal meeting of the council" and this year merely "a meeting of the council". I asked for information whether business took place at an informal meeting, I found that it did and consequently I raised a constitutional objection against the council proceeding to business when the members had not been notified. I did not suppose that I would carry the meeting with me but I am still of opinion that the members of the council should have this franchise. It may be that you get a larger meeting, but there are other members who are absolutely disfranchised.

THE PRESIDENT: I would like to say a word with respect to this motion. There is a notice in the programme that there will be a meeting of the newly elected council. If two members were here from Vancouver and a third who has been elected is in Edmonton and cannot get here, it would take two weeks to notify him and bring him here; meantime the Vancouver members would not stay, so that we would gain one and lose two. Again at the next meeting the minutes as read will have to be adopted.

MR. SCHWITZER: I agree with what Col. Anderson has said. By having the meeting immediately after the annual meeting we get a larger attendance and get members from a wide territory. If the course proposed is adopted we would have only local members.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you ready for the question?

MR. LEACH: It is not necessary to put the motion, Mr. President. I will withdraw the motion.

MR. IRVING: I would ask, Mr. President, whether the committee dealing with the standardization of specifications has been disbanded?

THE SECRETARY: I think it died a natural death. I do not think it was reappointed at the last annual meeting.

MR. IRVING: I would suggest, Mr. President, that a committee be formed to consider the standardization of cast iron water pipe specifications. Nearly every engineer in this country at some time or other has to do with cast iron water pipe and when he looks into the specifications, he finds that in Canada we have no recognized standards. The result is that he gets up a specification of his own and as a rule it is rather a weird sort of thing. The pipe foundries refer back to him two or three times and he is probably told that they have not this design in stock. Again a standard specification would be a good thing for the foundry because they could stock their pipe and if an engineer wanted pipe in a hurry he could order the Canadian Society specification and get it. There are two or three specifications in use in the States; those of The American Waterworks' Association, the New England Waterworks' Association and the American Society for Testing Material. I think if we standardized the cast iron water pipe specifications in this country, it would be beneficial both to the engineers and the manufacturers. I have spoken to several engineers and they are heartily in favor of it.

MR. LEOFRED: I have often felt the want of such a standard specification. I make a speciality of waterworks and we have always to make our specifications ourselves. Frequently the dealers when they sell you pipes find a way out of their contract because there is no standard specification. I believe it would be advisable to have a committee to investigate the matter and make a specification for Canada.

THE PRESIDENT: I would like to hear Mr. Ker on that if he is here. (Not present.)

MR. JOHN KENNEDY: Mr. President, I think we should go very cautiously about standardization, because it means stereotyping. Our profession is essentially one of progress and therefore we should be careful about standardizing. A most instructive lecture has been given on that matter by Prof. Unwin lately. Good specifications have been adopted by the American Waterworks Association and by the New England Association. It is very easy to take one of those and adapt them to particular conditions. I think it would be better to be very cautious about matters of this sort; let us rather get at the underlying principles of a good pipe and then adapt it to the particular work in hand, and not stereotype matters in the form of a standard specification.