

[LETTERS]



AN EASIER SOLUTION?

I read your article on “Efforts continue to seek common ground on *Building Code Act*” (p. 8) in the March/April 2015 issue of *Engineering Dimensions* magazine. Can you take an “end run” around this impasse by requiring that all chief building officials be professional engineers? In other words, instead of trying to get agreement on the interpretation of the act, why not try to change the qualifications of the chief building officials to be licensed as P.Engs? Problem solved?

Harry Nagata, P.Eng., North York, ON

Letters to the editor are welcomed, but must be kept to no more than 500 words, and are subject to editing for length, clarity and style. Publication is at the editor’s discretion; unsigned letters will not be published. The ideas expressed do not necessarily reflect the opinions and policies of the association, nor does the association assume responsibility for the opinions expressed. Emailed letters should be sent with “Letter to the editor” in the subject line. All letters pertaining to a current PEO issue are also forwarded to the appropriate committee for information. Address letters to jcoombes@peo.on.ca.

AD INDEX

Carleton University carleton.ca/engineering-design	p. 19
IESO saveonenergy.ca	p. 11
Manulife Financial www.manulife.ca	p. 79
TD Meloche Monnex www.melochemonnex.com	p. 80
Tensor www.tensorcorp.com	p. 17
The University of British Columbia mel.ubc.ca	p. 15
University of Waterloo uwaterloo.ca	p. 2

SIZE MATTERS

I could not agree more that the present composition of council is totally unwieldy (ref. the axiom “...the effectiveness of a decision-making body is inversely proportional to its size...”) (*Engineering Dimensions*, President’s Message, March/April 2015, p. 3). At the moment there are, I believe, a total of 27 seats (as per the staff listing), with 10 LGAs. Of the latter, currently five are also P.Engs, who, primarily, are supposed to protect the public interest. The non-P.Eng. members, if carefully selected, can bring a lot of outside expertise to council, such as valuable legal input.

As a former LGA P.Eng., my own modest proposal is for a council of 19: four executives, expanding the number of councillors-at-large to five, five regional councillors, and five LGAs (all non-engineers). The rationale is we aim for a more reasonable size, expand on more general viewpoints vs. possibly parochial regional ones (chapters being well-represented in other symposia) and remove LGA P.Engs, as they appear redundant. I recommend, in addition, that we could do away with the elected vice president position altogether, as being of such a short-term nature. I know all of this would require a major upheaval (council, government approval, act change, etc.), but I do not believe we can continue to kick the can down the road as politicians do. Could council strike a task group to investigate alternatives to the present council makeup and recommend alternatives? In parallel with this reset, council has to tackle the surely worrying challenge of appallingly low electorate returns of members (currently about 11 per cent). Why does the vast majority seem to feel voting for council is irrelevant?

James Dunsmuir, P.Eng., Brampton, ON

CORRECTION

The President’s Message in the print edition of the March/April 2015 issue incorrectly mentions Engineers Canada as having been designated to perform preliminary credential assessments of applicants for engineering work under the federal government’s Express Entry Program. In fact, Engineers Canada is still in the process of applying to be designated by Citizenship and Immigration Canada to perform educational credential assessments for international engineering graduates under the Federal Skilled Worker Program.