

WHY NOT APPRENTICED TECHNICIANS?

By John Larke, O.L.S.

I have read with great interest the articles concerning the training and certification of Survey Technicians. It would be an asset to the Professional Surveyor to have a body of trained personnel to complement the functions required of him. In order to facilitate the organization of such an educational body, why not take advantage of the already existent Provincial Institute of Trades in Toronto? This School has been offering a basic night school course in surveying for three years, and this year added a second or advanced year of study to the basic one. The courses have been well-attended, and the graduates who are successful in passing a written set of examinations are granted a Certificate from the School. The majority of students have been from Municipalities, the remainder from Surveying and Engineering Consulting firms, builders, and some who have been interested in getting into the surveying field.

The curriculum for the first or basic year is quite extensive covering both field and office work. The field work consists of levelling work, and a transit and chain survey. The lecture and lab work covers the theory and practice of levelling, chaining, transit work, the errors and prevention thereof. Logarithms, functions and solution of right angle triangles, bearing and azimuth, closure and accuracy of closures, latitude and departure calculations, contouring, drawing and interpolation of contours, grade calculations, staking of proposed buildings with cuts, simple curves, including the staking of a curve, are included in the study work.

The second year enlarges on the simple curve calculations, compound and reverse curves, vertical curves, recording and observation of Polaris and Sun with the required calculations, instrument adjustments, cut and fill

calculations, stadia surveys as well as general information concerning Townships and types, and general survey practices.

This course is entirely a night school endeavour, held one night per week over a period from October to March. This night school course could conceivably be the basis for a Day Course, which could be much more extensive, embodying more mathematics, tree identification, mineralogy, etc. and giving a very complete background for a survey technician.

The night course is very capably handled by Mr. Ray Lawson, who is a qualified U.K. surveyor, and who gained a high reputation at the Ontario Hydro before being appointed as Head of the Drafting Department at the Trades School.

Student-apprentices who would attend a day course at this School, do so at no expense to their employers. The Provincial Government grants a set amount which is paid to the apprentice during the periods he is attending the School. Should the apprenticeship system be followed by the Survey Technicians, the course of study, the entrance requirements, classification and grades could be mutually agreed upon by the Professional Surveyors and the Technician Groups in accordance with the policy laid down by the Provincial Government. The apprentice would sign an agreement with a Professional Surveyor, and during the three year term would attend two ten-week study periods at the Provincial Institute of Trades, during which time he would be paid by the Government who would also foot the tuition expenses.

This system would of course require a very close association between the Professional Surveyor and the Technician

and this relationship would no doubt have many drawbacks, but on the other hand may also produce a stronger, more definite basis for many responsible people who would enter the surveying field but who cannot "go all the way". We can't all be Doctors, but all Doctors would prefer Nurses with the back-

ground and training which would be of maximum assistance to them.

Editor's Note: Ontario Land Surveyors or members of the Association of Survey Technicians desiring further information are urged to get in touch with Mr. Ray Lawson, Provincial Institute of Trades, 21 Nassau Street, Toronto, or Mr. J. Larke, O.L.S. 9 Aylesford Drive, Toronto, 13.

"METES AND BOUNDS" IN THE CASE OF THE QUEEN VS. FLORENCE CRAWFORD

By Richard F. Dore, O.L.S.

Ruling That Expropriation Invalid May Have Far-Reaching Effects

Surveyors are familiar with the process of describing property by metes and bounds but Section 9 of The Expropriation Act, R.S.C. 1952, Chapter 106, requires that "lands taken for the use of His Majesty shall be laid off by metes and bounds."

A judgment handed down by the President of the Exchequer Court of Canada on November 12th, 1959, in the case of The Queen vs. Florence Crawford has ruled that the expropriation of Mrs. Crawford's farm was invalid because it had not been thus laid off. The Crawford property was expropriated in the same manner as hundreds and perhaps thousands of other properties have been taken, so that this judgment could have far-reaching effects if upheld. It is being appealed to the Supreme Court of Canada.

The Crawford farm was one of many properties included in the expropriation which embraced some eight (8) whole Gloucester Township lots and parts of twenty-five (25) others, comprising an area of about five and one-half (5-1/2) square miles on the south-eastern outskirts of Ottawa. It was effected by the registration of a plan and description in the Carleton County Registry Office on November 3rd, 1947, as Number 44101. The plan showed a portion of the Township with the required lands tinted RED. There were no dimensions

on the plan and the properties of individual owners were not shown. The description was in the form that surveyors generally refer to as a metes and bounds description. It commenced at the North-East Angle of Lot "A", Concession "V", Rideau Front, and thence westerly along the north limit of the said Lot "A" and so on, around the whole area without describing each individual's property. The court found as a fact that no field work was done.

It was the opinion of the court that "the laying off of lands by metes and bounds means the physical art of laying off of the land on the ground and the placing of monuments or marks at the corners of the land so that it can be physically identified." The court found in favour of the suppliant because neither her land nor the lands in which it was included had been laid off by metes and bounds.

It is interesting to note, however, that one of the reasons for judgment was that it would make it incumbent on the Attorney-General of Canada to appeal the case to the Supreme Court of Canada, whose decision would finally settle the matter. Proceedings for launching the appeal have already been started.

Ottawa, Ontario
December 28, 1959.