



Minutes of the 83rd Annual Business Meeting

SATURDAY, APRIL 16, 2005—CHAIR: G.R. COMRIE, P.ENG.

The 83rd Annual Business Meeting, Professional Engineers Ontario, was held in the Grand Ballroom East of the Hilton Hotel, London, Ontario, on Saturday, April 16, 2005. The meeting was called to order by President G.R. Comrie, P.Eng.

Before declaring the business meeting open, the President thanked the Regional Councillors Committee for its work in organizing and hosting Friday's conference.

He said that in 2004, Council had officially recognized the role of chapters as a vehicle to help PEO deliver its strategic objectives and the additional objects prescribed in the *Professional Engineers Act*. Yesterday's conference was one mechanism used by chapters to fulfill this role.

The President reminded the members that, following the business meeting, there would be a luncheon with Dr. Nils Petersen, a nanotechnology expert, as the keynote speaker. The 428th meeting of Council would take place in the afternoon, followed in the evening by the 2005 Order of Honour gala, at which 12 exceptional individuals would be recognized for their significant lifetime contributions to the engineering profession in Ontario.

Introduction of Council

As the first order of business, the President introduced the members of the 2004-2005 Council.

The Executive Committee: George Comrie, P.Eng., President; Robert Goodings, P.Eng., President-elect; Kenneth Lopez, P.Eng., Vice President (elected); Allen Lucas, P.Eng., Vice President (appointed); Kenneth McMartin, P.Eng., Past President; Bruce Clarida, P.Eng., Councillor-at-Large; and Nancy Hill, P.Eng., Lieutenant-Governor Appointee.

The remaining members of Council: Councillors-at-Large Bruce Clarida, Denis Dixon, P.Eng., (absent), and Roydon Fraser, P.Eng.; Regional Councillors Seimer Tsang, P.Eng., and David Robinson, P.Eng., (Northern Region); Allen Lucas and Cliff Knox, P.Eng., (Eastern Region); Daniela

Iliescu, P.Eng., and Santosh Gupta, P.Eng., (East Central Region); Diane Freeman, P.Eng., and John Vieth, P.Eng., (Western Region); and Colin Moore, P.Eng., and Phil Maka, P.Eng., (Western Region). Lieutenant Governor-in-Council Appointees James Dunsmuir, P.Eng., Peter Frise, P.Eng., (absent), Ravi Gupta, P.Eng., Nancy Hill, Nicholas Monsour, P.Eng., Gul Nawaz, FCA, Laurier Proulx, C.E.T., David Sims, QC, (absent), and Derek Wilson, P.Eng., (absent).

PEO's Directors to the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers (CCPE) for 2004-2005 are: Past President Kenneth McMartin, and former PEO Presidents Richard Braddock, P.Eng., and Gordon Sterling, P.Eng.

The President said it had been a pleasure working with the members of Council over the past year, who had become not just professional colleagues or co-workers, but also friends.

Order of business

President Comrie said there was a full business agenda. He then referred to the order of business for the meeting as outlined in section 22 of By-law No. 1 and in the agenda distributed at the meeting.

In Memoriam

The President asked all present to stand for a minute of silence to honour the members of the association who had passed away during the past year.

Adoption of the Minutes

President Comrie referred to the Minutes of the 2004 meeting, which had been published in the January/February 2005 issue of *Engineering Dimensions* and distributed at the meeting.

It was moved by D. Robinson and seconded by K. Lopez that the Minutes of the 2004 meeting, published in the January/February 2005 issue of *Engineering Dimensions* and distributed at this meeting, be adopted.

Motion Carried

Greetings from Premier and Guests
President Comrie read the following message received from the Honourable Dalton McGuinty, Premier of Ontario:

"On behalf of the Government of Ontario, I am delighted to extend warm greetings to everyone attending the 83rd Annual General Meeting of Professional Engineers Ontario.

"Professional engineers are key to our province's prosperity. Engineering is an integral part of our everyday lives, from the roads we drive on to the buildings we work in, to the technology used on assembly lines and in telecommunications. Advances in technology have greatly enhanced efficiency and productivity—resulting in improved growth rates.

"Engineers are at the heart of the information age and, as such, they are a major force in driving the economy. Ontarians owe a debt of gratitude to the engineering profession for the outstanding quality of life we enjoy in our province. Since it came into existence more than eight decades ago, PEO has never veered from its mission of mandating public confidence in the profession. This fine association is largely responsible for the reputation for excellence, integrity and professionalism that engineers in Ontario enjoy.

"As you gather to exchange ideas and experiences, celebrate the achievements of the past year and to assess the challenges of the future, I offer my sincere best wishes for an enjoyable and highly productive meeting."

Throughout the meeting, President Comrie called upon the following guests from provincial and national associations across the country to provide a brief update on important matters in their jurisdictions:

- Dennis McJunkin, P.Eng., President, Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of British Columbia;
- Linda Van Gastel, P.Eng., President, Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta;
- Digvar Jayas, P.Eng., President-elect, Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Manitoba;
- Gaétan Lefebvre, ing., President, Order of Engineers of Quebec;
- Annette Bergeron, P.Eng., President, Ontario Society of Professional Engineers;

- Clarence Reid, P.Eng., President, Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan; and
- Darrel Danyluk, P.Eng., President, CCPE.

Business arising from the Minutes

The President outlined actions taken by Council in response to the resolutions presented by members.

Resolution No. 1

The resolution read: “That from now on, the motions and resolutions passed at AGMs should be binding on the Council for response and/or implementation no later than one year from their passage; and

“That for those motions and resolutions that have not been responded to or implemented within one year of their passage, the full reason should be given for a failure to do so at least two months before the election of the new Council, so that members-at-large may be able to take it into consideration before voting.”

Before commenting on the action of Council, the President stated that motions from the floor of the Annual Meeting are not binding on Council, whose obligation is to consider them.

Action/Progress: Resolutions from the AGM are found on PEO’s website, and updates on actions are added regularly. Minutes of Council meetings and the Registrar’s Reports on current PEO issues and activities also appear on the website or in articles in *Engineering Dimensions*. These initiatives should provide members with the information they need to make informed decisions, so members should make a habit of reading them.

Resolution No. 2

The resolution read: “Resolved that PEO create one or more task forces to review and identify critical technical or engineering-based issues, policies, or practices that are, or may, affect the health, safety or well-being of the public; and

“Prepare a formal briefing on such identified issues to form a basis to educate, promote and develop within the various levels of government, regulatory agencies and the public, a feasible and timely policy or practice to address a situation that may adversely affect the health, safety or well-being of the Ontario public.”

Action/Progress: At the 423rd meeting of Council, on June 17 and 18, 2004, Council passed the following motion:

“That Council:

- receive the Policy Development Process presentation as given to the Executive Committee on May 18, supported by the Draft Policy Development Reference Manual, for its information and comment; and
- defer final consideration of the Policy Development Process to the September 2004 meeting of Council, and that the main motion be amended by adding a new paragraph (c) which was:
- to direct staff to determine the best estimated costs on the implementation of the process for the September 2004 meeting of Council, when the process is placed before Council for approval.”

The new process will require generating and evaluating different policy options to address identified problems, and proposing solutions that produce measurable results for future evaluation and feedback.

Such an approach to developing regulatory policy should ensure that work is directed only to the critical issues that fit within pre-established PEO priorities, and should also ensure a formalized and broad approach to stakeholder consultation, increased accountability for policy development, and informed Council decision-making, based on solid strategic and policy analysis.

Resolution No. 3

The resolution read: “Moved that PEO prepare a guideline that provides examples of activities that must be performed by a professional engineer registered in Ontario, including a list of work covered by existing acts and regulations (referred to as demand-side legislation) and where a P.Eng. seal is required for work affecting the safety of the public.”

Action/Progress: President Comrie commented that the previous *Professional Engineers Act*, replaced in 1984 by the current Act, had included a definition of the practice of professional engineering that incorporated specific activities that fell within the practice (only Quebec has a similar definition at present). In 1998, a Task Group on the Definition of Professional Engineering presented a revised definition and an interpretive guideline, but these were not implemented.

In response to a 2002 CCPE resolution, CCPE’s Canadian Engineering Qualifications Board (CEQB) developed a discussion paper on the application of engineering principles. In June 2004, a draft discussion paper was submitted to the national meeting of discipline and enforcement officials. The ultimate goal is to agree on a written interpretation of the term “application of engineering principles,” which forms a critical component of the definition of professional engineering and which, in part, will address the AGM resolution.

In addition, one of the objectives of PEO’s 2005-2009 Strategic Plan is to clarify the definition of the practice of professional engineering in the Act, with initiatives to prepare an interpretive guideline and introduce performance standards to reinforce the definition. Although this objective was not prioritized as an initial focus, it is next on the list should resources be available. Also it may actually be better left until after the CEQB finalizes its work.

In summary, the intent of the AGM motion is taken seriously, but it cannot be implemented quickly. It will continue to be discussed and future progress will be available through our website.

Resolution No. 4

The resolution read: “That Bill 124 regarding changes to the *Ontario Building Code* be vehemently opposed by PEO, and that PEO and all members should do everything in their power to stop its implementation and that PEO seek amendments to Bill 124 (referring to the *Ontario Building Code*) to allow professional engineers a better opportunity to serve the interests of the public.”

Action/Progress: At the 423rd meeting of Council, on June 17 and 18, 2004, Council passed the following motion:

“That Council:

- direct the CEO/Registrar to inform the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing that PEO withdraws its proposal to administer the Qualification Registration process relating to Bill 124 [correspondence between PEO and the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing is available on the website at www.peo.on.ca];

- (b) stand down the existing Bill 124 Task Group, effective immediately;
- (c) create a new Bill 124 Task Force to be composed of the President, the President-elect, and Chris Roney, P.Eng., effective immediately, with the power to appoint additional members if needed;
- (d) direct the Bill 124 Task Force to work closely with PEO's Policy Development Unit to develop a policy position that supports the exemption of professional engineers from the requirements of Bill 124;
- (e) direct the CEO/Registrar to direct the Communications Department to implement a plan to communicate PEO's policy position on Bill 124 to its members and the public; and
- (f) to direct the CEO/Registrar to provide the resources necessary to carry out items (d) and (e) above, on a priority basis."

Action/Progress: Through *Engineering Dimensions*, members have been advised that Council's motion was acted on immediately, and a number of other things have happened.

PEO's position document on the issue of the *Building Code Statute Law Amendment Act* has been included in delegate packages. Late in 2004, with the assistance of communications and public affairs consultants Brown & Cohen, PEO embarked on a grassroots government communications campaign to inform Ontario legislators of PEO's regulatory mandate and of the power of our Act and Regulation as instruments of public policy in engineering-related matters. This program will urge legislators to refrain from regulatory incursions into PEO's regulation of the engineering profession.

Over 70 members have volunteered to date to participate in the program. Two training sessions for spokespersons have been held and a number of government meetings have taken place.

Originally, PEO opposed the implications contained in the regulation, the main issue of contention being the requirement that all designers, including professional engineers, pass Building Code knowledge tests. It was felt that, as far as professional engineers are concerned, this kind of testing is not appropriate or useful for the accomplishment of the original objectives set out

by the task force. However, Council decided that the legislation was going to pass and that the best option for retaining some involvement in the regulation was to go along with it and actually implement our own testing, using the Ministry's test and our own register.

After revisiting the matter last year, Council determined that there is no justification for PEO to get into the business of administering the Ministry's test to our members. The Ministry had said this had nothing to do with the practice of engineering or with any failures of engineers to perform their responsibilities. It was simply an administrative requirement related to the permitting process.

In reply to our letter advising that PEO would not participate, the Ministry responded that some "parallel process" could be implemented in which PEO could evaluate its own members' Building Code knowledge. While the Ontario Association of Architects has taken that approach, PEO decided that it was not an appropriate thing to do, particularly since there was no evidence that a professional practice issue is involved.

While the Ministry appears to be back-pedaling on this, it has been very firm in stating that they are going to go ahead with this no matter what. Numerous problems have emerged such as how to handle specific types of practice, what kinds of exams have to be passed to get the permit, and so on. It is an evolving scenario, but any member who submits building plans for approval for a living should assume that it is going to go ahead.

There may still be some opportunity for PEO. Meetings have been scheduled with the Minister and how things will unfold has yet to be determined. At the very least, the government probably now realizes that there is no simple clean solution and that a lot more thought and a lot more consultation with PEO and other organizations should have taken place. It is an issue of great concern to many members, and it is hoped that a repeat of this kind of thing will not occur quickly.

Financial Report

The President referred to the booklet *Questions and Answers on PEO Operations* included in the registration package.

While not directly related to the financial statement, it does address questions raised by members on various aspects of PEO's operations, he said. He also referred to the Auditors' Report and the audited financial statements, which appeared in the March/April 2005 issue of *Engineering Dimensions*, and a summary version of which is included in the 2005 Annual Report distributed at the meeting.

It was moved by D. Adams, P.Eng., seconded by J. Vieth, that the financial statements, as presented, be received.

The President then opened the meeting to questions.

Some items included in the discussion were:

- **Budget**—Comment was made that the annual membership fee should be reduced by the same amount that PEO no longer pays to OSPE. Because there appears to be no intention to reduce the fees by this amount, PEO's budget should be questioned. However, the agenda does not include time for discussing the budget. In response, the President stated that the Financial Statements are what must be approved at the AGM, so that it is on these statements that the discussion should be focused.
- **Cash**—The \$700,000 in cash shown on the statements is invested at an interest rate of approximately 2.5 per cent.
- **Portfolio investments**—PEO recently changed banks. The banking tender that went out included all associated investments. Therefore, the Scotia family acts as PEO's financial advisor and takes care of the portfolio investments.
- **Salaries**—Since "salaries" include associated benefits cost, which are in the order of 20 per cent of the figure, the amount shown in the statements is not a pure salary number. The executive management group, which includes approximately seven or eight staff members, receives over \$100,000 per year.
- **Capital assets** (Note 5)—There is a printing error in Note 5. The columns should be headed "Cost," "Cumulative Amortization" and "Net Book Value for 2003 and 2004."
- **Rent**—In response to the question as to whether there were any plans for PEO to own its own building, the President advised that the current lease expires in

2008. The Accommodation Task Force is looking at options for future accommodation, including the possibility of PEO acquiring its own building.

- *Chapter costs*—With reference to the difference in chapter costs in Note 10 of the Financial Statements and the pie chart in the *Questions and Answers* booklet, the pie chart includes all support costs associated with operating and supporting chapters.

In conclusion, President Comrie said comments about the Financial Statements (such as a suggestion to include a column showing percentage changes from the previous year; and showing costs on a program basis) would be taken into consideration in preparing next year's statements and booklet.

The President then called for the vote on the motion to receive the financial statements.

Motion Carried

Appointment of Auditors

It was moved by Gul Nawaz, seconded by Len King, P.Eng., that the firm of Deloitte and Touche be appointed as auditors of the association for the 2005 financial year.

In response to a question, members were advised that a request for tender had been sent out about two years ago. Deloitte and Touche had been selected from those firms submitting proposals, because PEO already had a relationship with the firm and its bid was the lowest price. The proposal was for five years; 2005 would be year three.

Motion Carried

Resolutions and open discussion

The President referred to the resolutions at each place, which had been submitted in writing in advance of the meeting by the deadline of 4:00 p.m., Friday, April 8, 2005.

Before the first motion was presented, President Comrie read the following statement:

As noted in section 17, of By-law No. 1, which relates to the association's administrative affairs, PEO's Annual Meeting is held for the following purposes:

1. *To lay before members reports of the association's Council and committees;*
2. *To inform members of matters relating to the affairs of the association; and*

3. *To ascertain the views of the members present at the meeting on matters relating to the affairs of the association.*

"Resolutions presented to the Annual General Meeting serve as a vehicle for members in attendance to express their views on matters related to the affairs of the association.

"Members submitting resolutions to the AGM have been requested to describe clearly the issues being addressed, and to indicate how the motion advances the objects of the Ontario Professional Engineers Act.

"The Annual General Meeting provides a forum to assess whether the views in the motions are shared by those members present at the meeting.

"All of the resolutions presented for discussion at this AGM, and the outcome of the voting, will be published in the July/August 2005 issue of Engineering Dimensions, and will be available on the PEO website within the next two weeks.

"Members' resolutions passed at the AGM will be referred to PEO Council for consideration at a future meeting of Council.

"The mover and seconder of a member resolution that is passed may, at the discretion of Council, be invited by Council to address their resolution in detail at a future Council meeting.

"The secretary to Council will contact these individuals to make the appropriate arrangements, if necessary.

"Council considers the issues raised at the Annual Meeting to be important, and will address resolutions passed in an expeditious manner.

"In dealing with the resolutions at this AGM, I will give the mover and seconder of each resolution an opportunity to speak to their resolution. During the discussion, I'll ask that all speakers use one of the floor microphones and identify themselves prior to making their remarks.

"When I feel that the viewpoints on a resolution have been given a fair airing, and taking into consideration the limited amount of time we have, I will call for a vote on the resolution.

"Again, I would remind you that, according to our rubric, these resolutions are not binding on Council but they do serve as an expression of the interests and perhaps the consensus of the members who are present in the meeting."

The President stated that resolutions No. 1 and 3 would be discussed together because they essentially relate to the same subject of how chapters receive their allotments.

He said this subject has been debated for a number of years by the Regional Councillors Committee (RCC). Council's position has been to support the recommendations and decisions of the RCC concerning chapter allotments. The President assumed that the outcome of Resolutions No. 1 and 3 would be referred to the RCC for further discussion and that, subsequently, the RCC would report back to Council.

Resolution No. 1

Whereas any expenditure of public funds has to be accounted for by those who incurred them; and

Whereas money given by PEO to the chapters for their activities are public funds, since they are derived from the membership's fees;

Therefore be it resolved:

That in order to receive an allotment for the next year, a chapter must provide the RCC with a business plan for the current year and a detailed account of the chapter activities for the previous year, i.e. list of events showing the total number of dollars spent for each event, together with the number of people who participated in each event.

(Moved by Nick Gurevich, P.Eng. seconded by John Glover, P.Eng.)

Before opening the meeting for discussion, the President then read Resolution No. 3 as background.

Resolution No. 3

Whereas the chapter system is recognized by the *Professional Engineers Act*, R.R.O. 1990, Reg. 941 and the by-laws of PEO, and is fundamental to the self-regulatory nature of the association as recognized on numerous occasions by Council, committees and task forces of PEO and most noticeably in the initiatives of START I and START II; and

Whereas these initiatives have recognized the importance of supporting volunteerism, in particular the efforts of those members who take time to participate in the running of chapters and who serve as a Chapter Executive; and

Whereas the most recently implemented approach to determining funding of chapters has had the reverse effect of increasing the frustration level of chapter executives and volunteers, created an environment dominated by analysis and justification of individual chapter events and activities, and raised fears of a forthcoming reduction in the funding commitment to chapters;

Therefore be it resolved:

- (a) To maintain adequate financial support of chapters, funding to chapters should remain at the level established over the past decade;
- (b) To simplify the allocation of funding and reduce the frustration of volunteers, chapters should receive a "primary" funding allocation based solely on the number of members in each chapter, and a "secondary" additional funding allocation when sufficient justification can be presented for this; and
- (c) To encourage chapter funds to be spent rather than accumulated, an individual chapter's request for funding should be reduced by the amount that its reserves at the end of the preceding year exceed the amount calculated for its primary funding allocation.

*(Moved by Jeremy Cook, P.Eng.
seconded by Desmond Gomes, P.Eng.)*

During discussion of Resolution No. 1, some points raised included:

- The resolution is self-evident. Unanimous approval will prove that the engineering profession is dedicated to accountability and transparency.
- Budget submissions from the chapters should tie in with the budget-setting process of PEO; and financial statement recording should also tie in with PEO's financial reporting process prior to the AGM.
- The financial statements should show the actual amount paid to chapters and, separately, the amount of the expenses allocated to chapters, i.e. staff salaries, RCC meeting expenses, special project funding, etc.
- Sufficient funding should be allocated to support a chapter.
- The allotment, the business plan, and the term of office of the person developing the business plan should all be tied together for the same year.
- The intent of the motion is positive. However, it can be interpreted to suggest

that additional analysis and justification of activities should be introduced into the chapter funding process, when actually the intent is to simplify the process.

- This issue has come before the RCC in the past and there has always been a conflict. Bigger chapters that have many activities feel they deserve the money of smaller chapters that don't have as many activities.
- There is no incentive to keep costs down. What will happen is continual pressure on the amount of money that chapters want. The simplest thing would be to just give out an allocation; money left over at the end of the year should be returned to PEO and PEO could issue it to chapters that need funding for special events approved on an individual basis.
- Since other aspects of PEO (committees, task forces, etc.) must be fully accountable and transparent, chapters should also be accountable. Chapters asking for money do not automatically get it. They get it in accordance with the guidelines that are in place. If necessary, the guidelines might be changed to fully support the chapters in an equitable manner across the province. However, there must be some sort of accountability in place.
- In response to the START II Report, the RCC has tried to develop a fair, transparent process that accounts for regional differences. Chapters submit their proposed activities for the coming year so that their business planning cycles can be meshed with PEO's business planning cycle, which starts in May.
- With respect to reporting requirements, the RCC has tried to accept a wide variety of reporting, and has tried to simplify and improve it. This is not additional work; chapter by-laws require that a report be sent to the President. The RCC is just requesting that the report be sent to it first.

Upon a vote being called, Resolution No. 1 was carried.

Resolution No. 3

President Comrie referred the meeting to Resolution No. 3, which had already been read.

During discussion of the resolution, some points raised included:

- Members do not want funding to chapters cut back, and they would

like to simplify the process by which chapter funding is determined.

- Monies given to a chapter should be spent by the chapter members. Chapters require a certain amount of money to properly do what they're being asked to do. However, once reserves exceed that amount, chapters should not receive more money.
- The intent of the motion is not to oppose accountability. Chapter funding needs should be included in the PEO budget process.
- It is not possible to fund every chapter based only on membership. Small chapters sometimes do more than big chapters and, if they're farther away, they cannot always rely on PEO staff.
- Allotment levels established in the past decade were based on membership, and should be based on activities.
- All funding should be subjected to a business plan.
- With respect to reserves, Council should determine a way to properly reduce the reserves. Perhaps, if reserves are more than twice a chapter's allocation, they should be clawed back. This would allow smaller chapters to build up a significant reserve to take on a large project in the next year.
- Chapter funding should not be solely on a per-member basis. There are base costs for operating every chapter, and that should go out to each chapter.
- Funding should not be reduced if it is not spent. This might encourage frivolous spending if chapters feel they might not get money the following year. Rather than leaving the money with the chapter, perhaps PEO could hold the money in trust for later use by the chapter for a specific event.
- Northern chapters have a lot of additional costs for relatively small chapter membership sizes. Some sort of funding mechanism is needed to accommodate their special needs, and this resolution does not reflect this.

Upon a vote being called, Resolution No. 3 was defeated.

Resolution No. 2

Be it resolved:

That PEO designate the year 2006 to be the year of Nikola Tesla.

*(Moved by Vasilj Petrovic, P.Eng.
seconded by Brian Fenoulhet, P.Eng.)*

Mr. Petrovic spoke about Nikola Tesla, explaining that many new technologies in the world today were based on Tesla's ideas. His polyphase AC generators and motors allowed Sir Adam Beck to found Ontario Hydro, ensuring that every Ontarian would have equal access to affordable electricity. By honouring great engineers who invent something and contribute to the engineering profession, such as Nikola Tesla, PEO will recognize the great profession called engineering and will encourage the younger generation to become engineers.

Mr. Petrovic suggested that PEO might recognize Tesla in several ways: by having its AGM in Niagara Falls next year; organizing an international symposium on his work; initiating presentations in schools, colleges and universities to encourage the younger generation to study engineering; publishing articles about Tesla's work in *Engineering Dimensions*; and initiating other similar educational activities for the public.

President Comrie noted that, historically, PEO has not identified key engineers who have made contributions. Acceptance of the resolution could set a precedent, and this sort of thing could come up again in the future.

Some points raised included:

- How do we define in the future who is worthy and who is not worthy of having a year named after them?
- Tesla was one of the greatest engineers the world has seen, but is virtually unknown. Although he is not actually associated directly with Canada, this would be an opportunity to bring his name forward to the public.
- The principle of honouring engineers who have made magnificent contributions should be examined. Interest in the profession would be generated by the stories of individual people.
- Any opportunity to recognize outstanding contributors to the profession of engineering is worthwhile.
- The matter of celebrating Tesla is under consideration by OSPE, so perhaps it could be a joint event.
- The principle of doing something like this as an association should be looked at. However, designating a full year to somebody seems too long.

Upon a vote being called, Resolution No. 2 was carried.

Resolution No. 4

Be it resolved:

That Council acknowledge that there is more than a suspicion that apathy, indifference and hostility to PEO exist to an unhealthy degree, and that this be addressed in a series of town hall meetings, exploring the issues and potential responses.

(Moved by Patrick Quinn, P.Eng. seconded by Peter DeVita, P.Eng.)

Asking for the meeting's indulgence, Mr. Quinn spoke at length, expressing concern about several matters, including:

- his impression that the profession appears to be under attack from within and without;
- the staggering number of members who do not vote, and are not being urged to vote by PEO;
- that young people do not want to be engineers; engineering enrolment is dropping. Many graduates can't get engineering jobs, do not want to have anything to do with PEO and are actually hostile toward PEO;
- immigrant engineers' belief that PEO is responsible when they have problems settling in, because of the inadequate job market;
- while Council has put in a huge effort to fight Bill 124, there is a certain apathetic nature in accepting that this is a doomed cause. This is the lid of the coffin on self-regulation and much of our energy is being spent discussing governance, strategic planning, and chapters; and
- the negative language of the strategic plan. PEO is not doing such a bad job; it regulates the profession properly, does the things it is mandated to do, and protects the public.

During discussion, some points raised included:

- The resolution is not really a resolution. It is a statement of reflection and is encouraging a change.
- Chapter people work hard and there are some really exciting things going on. Chapter allocations have increased over time, and PEO and the chapters are trying to do more.
- Through consultation with chapters and members, a governance model has been created. PEO must now move forward with excitement and

seek out opportunities. Town hall meetings are held every month in every chapter; Council and members are encouraged to attend these meetings.

- Regional congresses discuss matters such as the strategic plan, the budget, and how money is being spent. The framework that exists provides so much opportunity that members should be excited about the future of engineering.
- There is a great reserve of energy in the chapters that is not being tapped, and the chapters are looking for guidance.
- There is not a shortage of volunteers to conduct the business of PEO, which is regulation of the profession.

An amendment to the motion was suggested; the Chair ruled that it was a substantial change to the original motion and it was withdrawn.

Upon a vote being called, Resolution No. 4 was defeated.

The President advised the meeting that the discussion of resolutions had exceeded the allotted time, so that the meeting would be unable to discuss all of the remaining resolutions. He asked Patrick Quinn, the mover of the resolutions, to pick one of them to conclude this portion of the meeting.

Resolution No. 5

Be it resolved that:

The committee studying the Certificate of Authorization (C of A) give priority to establishing the modifications necessary to make the C of A fairer and more accessible to sole proprietors, sole practitioners and small practices with less than three employees, that this committee report within six weeks on this matter, and that Council treat the committee's recommendations as urgent and implement regulation changes as may be required.

(Moved by Patrick Quinn, P.Eng. seconded by Denis Dixon, P.Eng.)

President Comrie noted that the matter of the Certificate of Authorization is part of the strategic plan projects. He suggested that the purpose of the motion is to accelerate the pace of this project.

During discussion, some points raised included:

- This matter has been going on for years, so we are not actually talking about accelerating it.
- The C of A and the way it is administered right now is unfair, and something has to be done about it.
- The problem is that the C of A is strictly a register, but should in fact be a certificate of competence. Then, whether the competent person is in a large or small company, PEO would be assured that the work is being done properly.

It was moved by Joanne Moore, P.Eng., seconded by John Clayton, P.Eng., that the motion be tabled.

Upon a vote being called, the motion to table was defeated.

Upon a vote being called, the main motion was defeated.

President's Report

President Comrie stated that the meeting was now almost at the adjournment point, so he closed the Members Resolutions portion of the meeting without dealing with the remainder of the resolutions. He noted, however, that they would be considered by Council in any event, including the ones that were rejected. Progress on them would be published on PEO's website.

In the interest of time, the President did not present his formal report, but referred members to the written report in the Annual Report, which covers many of the things he was going to report on.

He then concluded with a couple of brief remarks.

He reminded members of the vision he had when he took office the previous year to have the engineering profession well recognized, both in terms of its role as a regulator and its value to society. The characteristics of that vision included getting proper respect, being consulted on matters where the profession has expertise and a contribution to make, and being properly compensated.

He then asked two questions: Is the vision legitimate? Is the vision realistic?

The association and its members have been given a mandate to do something on behalf of the public, he said. For 80 years or more, engineers have

been working quietly, out of the public eye a lot of the time, to make sure that technology does in fact serve the public. Therefore, it should be respected and should be looked at to provide direction on public safety.

While there appeared to be some concern that the vision is not realistic, the President said he believes that it is realistic. While a lot had been done to move the agenda forward, there is still a lot to do, he said.

President Comrie then asked what needs to be done to capitalize on some great opportunities. One of the highlights during the past year was the attempt made to strengthen the association's relationships with other groups that it works with. A lot of effort was put into improving the relationship with the Ontario Society of Professional Engineers, and with the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers. Attention would now be turned to improving the relationship with the government of Ontario and with the Ontario Association of Certified Engineering Technicians and Technologists.

The President said these relationships are critical to the association's success. As long as its house is divided and there is squabbling amongst its members, the association is not going to achieve this vision that he felt everyone wanted.

In conclusion, President Comrie asked members to look outward, not inward, and to focus their energies not on the minutia, such as allocation of funds to chapters, but on what can be done to fulfill the association's mandate as a regulator and to put engineering in its proper place in society.

Presentation to outgoing Councillors

President Comrie said it had been a privilege to serve as President and to work with Council, and thanked Councillors for their service to the profession during the year.

In recognition of their service, he presented certificates and desk plaques to retiring members of Council Kenneth McMartin, Kenneth Lopez, Roydon Fraser, Santosh Gupta, James Dunsmuir, and Nicholas Monsour. Peter Frise and David Sims were also retiring but were absent.

Introduction of the 2005-2006 Council

Members continuing on the 2005-2006 Council are:

President Robert Goodings, Vice President Allen Lucas, and Past President George Comrie; Appointed Councillors Ravi Gupta, Nancy Hill, Gul Nawaz, Laurier Proulx, and Derek Wilson; Councillors-at-Large Denis Dixon and Bruce Clarida; Regional Councillors Cliff Knox (Eastern Region), Daniela Iliescu (East Central Region), Phil Maka and Colin Moore (West Central Region), John Vieth and Diane Freeman (Western Region), and David Robinson and Seimer Tsang (Northern Region).

The new members of the 2005-2006 Council were introduced: President-elect Patrick Quinn, Councillor-at-Large Richard Weldon, P.Eng., Eastern Region Councillor Nick Colucci, P.Eng., and East Central Region Councillor Jeff Mark, P.Eng.

Installation of the new President

His duties completed, George Comrie swore in Robert Goodings as President for the 2005-2006 term, and presented the gavel of office to him. The new President then presented Mr. Comrie with a ceremonial gavel of office, a certificate of lifetime membership, a sculpture, and a Past President name badge.

Closing remarks

President Goodings thanked Past President Comrie, on behalf of the association, for his service during the past year and for a brilliant job well done. He said he had really appreciated working with George and the experience had given him a better insight into understanding PEO. The collective results of what he had learned so far and the guidance of Mr. Comrie in the coming year would be very beneficial for the association, he said.

The President also thanked the London Chapter for arranging an absolutely beautiful and unique event.

He then shared a quotation with the meeting: "That one person can be a crucial ingredient on a team, but one person cannot make the team." He said it was his belief that the President of

PEO should not determine the direction of PEO by himself or herself and be its only face. The President must lead Council, but also work together with it, and should listen to and depend on all the people working with him or her.

Council members have acquitted themselves very well in the past, and Mr. Goodings said he had great confidence in them. Councillors share the same concerns for the profession as all members of the association. Whether made in positive or negative statements, everyone has the same understanding of the problem, and the association and Council will work in a positive way to make a change.

During the next 12 months, Council has an aggressive timetable. It has approved a strategic plan covering the next five years. There are a number of initiatives that are to begin in 2005 and it is Council's intention to complete three of them during the year. Also, all the issues brought forward during the AGM would be discussed and deliberated by Council, including the resolutions that had not been debated.

The President said that licence holders are the true backbone of the association. Many make outstanding and often unreported contributions, including chapter members, Councillors, members of task forces and committees. The life of PEO Council would be unproductive without their selfless dedication to the profession.

He concluded by reminding the meeting that the Order of Honour dinner would be held that evening. The members being recognized are only a few of the very strong people who exist in the profession, he said. Engineering is an honourable profession, long considered as one of the senior professions. It has much to offer and it needs to be heard at the highest levels of government. Many years ago, the association's letterhead said "Silent service is not enough," and it is still being said today.

President Goodings said it is time to do something about it. Although it will be no easy task, he challenged his friends and his colleagues in the profession to join him in making a difference.

Adjournment

The 83rd Annual Business Meeting then adjourned at 1:01 p.m.

*Kim Allen, P.Eng.
CEO and Registrar*