

as to leave the surveyor free to exercise judgement during the conduct of his work. The one assurance the surveyor can give ethically should relate to the quality and acceptability of his work, - that it will be fully satisfactory for the client's purpose. This implies, of course, that the land surveyor is fully aware of the client's purpose as well as all aspects of his responsibility in that regard.

Finally then let us face the hard facts of life and discuss an appropriate professional approach to the matter of fees, such that will (ideally) enable the land surveyor to deal in good faith with the client and enable the client to have a realistic appraisal of his costs for land surveying services.

The following suggestions are made toward this problem and are also intended to provoke further discussion on it:

1. Bids and tenders (or estimates which can be interpreted as such) shall be prohibited by our Association by By-Law.
2. The manner in which "estimates" (or some preferable expression such as "Indicated Fee") may be submitted to prospective clients shall be restricted by By-Law. Among other things, any submission should include a statement by the land surveyor, which undertakes to provide a valid survey which is fully acceptable for the intended purpose.
3. Land surveyors should prepare standard forms for estimating costs for general use. Such forms should cover all possible phases of a survey. Since any type of estimate will benefit from attention to detail, that a formal approach be taken to estimating appears justifiable. This could well serve to improve the efficiency with which the work is ultimately done.

In conclusion it must be admitted that in land surveying we have a problem in fees that is dissimilar from most of the other professions. This is so because the clients motive is generally profit and the minimizing of his costs is a legitimate objective for him. In this situation, we land surveyors have a serious need for clear thinking about our own legitimate objectives within our profession.

THE INTERCHANGE OF SURVEYORS' NOTES

by Andrew Gibson, O.L.S.

Clearly, surveyor's opinions on this subject depend entirely upon the size of their own stock of notes. An old-established firm will inveigh against the upstart new surveyors, (who, it is rumored in hushed tones, operate from a recreation room and whose wives answer the telephone) who will take everything but can give nothing-while the latter firms are resentful about the lack of co-operation on the part of their less "progressive" confreres. Then there is a large group of middle sized firms, neither too young nor too old, but just right, who get about as much information as they give, and are friends to all without getting ulcers about the vexing subject.

Certainly it merits attention, because the anomalous position in Ontario of private surveyors, who must perform all the impartial functions of public servants while acting in a private capacity, will not survive much impairment of

efficiency. An impairment it surely is, if a person who is qualified to perform a survey is unable to do so with the best information available, or if the release of survey information in an acceptable manner, depends upon who asks for it.

It is evident that the affairs of surveyors - especially private surveyors - are now undergoing a period of change and it is also clear that to a great extent this change is being imposed upon us from outside the profession. For instance, the stipulation that boundaries should close mathematically has induced traumatic experiences in some cases. There have been ominous rumbles about the franchise that we enjoy to perform surveys and the possibility that the exclusiveness of that franchise is not divinely ordained. There is no doubt that it must be the constant concern of private surveyors to keep their collective efficiency at such a high level that it will not be in the public interest to effect any changes in the system. Further, this efficiency must be regulated by the regional groups in certain matters, among which is the exchange of notes.

Consider the following cases as typical of this subject:

1. An old established and highly reputable firm finds that the notes which it has loaned have been photostated in wholesale lots.
2. A new but well-organized and efficient company finds that survey information in a certain area is available only in such unpleasant circumstances that it must be rejected.
3. An older firm finds that its carefully prepared and indexed notes are in such demand that an employee is busy during a great part of the time looking after surveyors who are steady customers.

Now it is perfectly obvious that there would be no difficulties whatsoever if certain companies did all the private surveys in certain districts, and new businesses could not be launched. But they can be started and it is not going to do the profession any good if they are forced to do surveys with inadequate information. It is equally obvious that the older firms have their notes as their most valuable asset, which should not be exposed to a camera, or any other copying method, in exchange for a smile.

I am a member of a very small firm with practically no store of notes (I hereby pay tribute to my wife, who answers the telephone). For a long time we must get far more information than we give. We have no objection whatsoever to a "reasonable charge". In fact, I should rather pay it, just as I would rather pay for my dinner than be a free-loader. It is clear that with our small overhead we would be in an unduly advantageous position to do surveys if survey information were freely available to us from all private sources. In effect, we would have an enormous file of information, maintained and produced at no cost to us. I feel sure that the ill-will about this subject has been generated, not by the imposition of a charge for the use of notes, but by the fact that such a charge is levied, or not levied, for often irrelevant reasons. A surveyor in a certain district may charge rival firms, but not those who operate further away. A firm which does not approve of the survey practices of another may express its displeasure by a stiff charge for notes. A personal acquaintance may charge me nothing, but will charge other surveyors. And so on.

Let us formulate two principles with which we can all agree. The first:

is that survey notes are a valuable possession, and, like other valuable possessions, are worth a fee to those who use them. The second, but most important, is that nothing should impede the free flow of survey information between private surveyors - this can only result in bad surveys, which is the last thing we can afford.

I submit that a fee should be charged in all cases in which a private surveyor wishes to use the notes of another, and that the Regional Groups should agree on a fee, or scale of fees, for use in such cases, and should produce a form to be used by the district members to record the interchange of notes. In this way the fees paid for the use of notes will be exactly proportional to the amount of use, and those firms which are, so to speak, note-rich, will get a return on their investment. At the same time, this, and other small firms will feel free to get needed information, without being overcharged, undercharged, or cold-shouldered.

Surely this is an impartial solution, suitable for a judicious and honourable profession.

STAG NIGHT

For fun-filled conviviality amidst friends and congenial surroundings, Stag Night is being revived as a social function for this years' Annual Meeting in Windsor. Our jovial Emcee Mr. E. C. "Bill" Brisco of Chatham, is most anxious to contact all surveyors who can contribute to this evening of self-made entertainment. If you can sing, dance, play any musical instrument, ventriloquize, take off Ed Sullivan or do a Wayne and Shuster, Bill Brisco wants to hear from you immediately.

It's More Fun When YOU Participate



"Of course I remember you! Your name is..."

—from *Think*, ed. by Charles Preston.
A Gold Medal book, Fawcett Publications, Inc., 25¢.