
CORRESPONDENCE

Letters and comments should be addressed to 'The Editor, The Institute of Quantity Surveyors, 98 Gloucester Place, London W1H 4AT'.

Sir,

Editorial Comment in April Journal

As an active member of an Institute Branch, I cannot let the editorial article in the April Journal pass without comment.

Recently my Branch, in common with many others, has criticised the leadership and the administration of the Institute as unsatisfactory in many respects. Your editorial assumes that because such criticism comes only from the few actively engaged in Institute affairs at Branch level the remainder (and vast majority) of the membership are satisfied with the service provided by Headquarters.

I would venture to suggest that it is only active members who are in a position to be aware of the state of the Institute. Even so the committee of my Branch has been increasingly approached by local members frustrated in their contacts with Gloucester Place and turning to us for solutions. One particular problem has been the implementation of the new education policies by Headquarters staff.

There would certainly appear to be ample basis for the concern about Gloucester Place.

There can be no doubt that those who have led the Institute since its formation have achieved outstanding success. My concern is that this should continue. Today, merely to stand still is to regress in the light of others progress. So what for the future?

Firstly, I believe that Council should canvas the views of the corporate membership to discover their opinions and expectations of the Institute. Secondly, I would like Council to develop a long term plan for the Institute, perhaps on a five year basis with positive steps to the ultimate goal clearly defined, well publicised and rigorously adhered to. This should be based on careful consideration of members' views: for example should we aim for a Royal Charter, seek unification with the RICS or merely remain as we are?

Finally, whatever the decision of Council, collective responsibility must be the rule and a united front presented. The active campaigning by some prominent Council members against the Council decision concerning the last RICS/IQS amalgamation recommendation is to be deplored and must never happen again. All this could only be achieved with the support of an efficient administration and close liaison with the membership.

Let us therefore urge all those who lead the Institute to face up to the challenge of the future and not adopt the complacent attitude of this editorial.

Yours faithfully,
S. M. Rogers, FIQS

Redditch, Worcs.

Sir,

How proud I felt to read John Hardy's letter in the April edition of this publication regarding unfair treatment of day release diploma students still struggling to qualify.

His letter voices the opinion of all the diploma students who having placed their faith in the IQS and turned their backs on the RICS, find those unprotected backs assailed from behind by their own Institute and any escape blocked by the Institute's insatiable ambition to enhance the IQS to a far higher level than the RICS, at the expense of those loyal students.

We part time students believed that exemption granted by the IQS from the external exams, by passing the diploma in quantity surveying would be kept as promised and not removed by a political whim whenever the IQS no longer wished to stand by its agreement.

As Mr Hardy stated we students have now been told to complete an additional two years upon passing the diploma inclusive of the T.P.C. To some people, a six year diploma course may seem quite long enough but to the students an additional two years, after being promised otherwise, is a foul blow.

My own college life, including the additional two years will mean twelve years of day-release study to attain the AIQS and this is without failing a single exam but having sat the City and Guilds, ONC and HNC, each of two years duration and finally bridging to the diploma for another four years of study, only to find that the IQS has added an extra two years, is so very unfair and unjust.

How can the IQS expect loyalty from its members at all grades if those members cannot depend solidly on their acknowledged Institute.

We all agree that the quest for knowledge is a fine ambition but agreements between the IQS and its students should be a matter of honour.

We believe that the IQS is the only Institute for quantity surveyors and feel very strongly that the decision to affect our course in this way is an unfortunate mistake which can be rectified once the facts are known.

Participation after qualification of the IQS exams would increase greatly if only the students and members could feel secure that the IQS is working for them and not against them.

As Mr Hardy said in his letter, visit the college and its students and decide what is best for the educational advancement of the IQS and its members as a professional body.

Yours faithfully,

S. D. Madden

and students of Chelmer, Essex.
Institute of Higher Education

BOOK REVIEWS

Specifications and Quantities (2nd Edition)

By D. Burchess

The general introduction to this book states that the series was originally designed as an aid to students studying for technical examinations and it was subsequently found that engineers in mid-career were also finding the books useful. With this in mind the original books in the series have

been enlarged to cater for this need.

The book deals with the Civil Engineering side of Contract Procedure and Administration, Conditions of Contract (5th Edition), drafting Specifications, the 1976 Standard Method of Measurement and the preparation of Bills of Quantities. It covers each of these elements in a clear and concise manner using various worked examples and although no great depth of subject is obtained it does cover the basic principles.

Published by George Godwin Ltd., in the Godwin Study Guides Series, price £4.50.

Building Cost Control Techniques and Economics (2nd Edition)

By Peter E. Bathurst and David A. Butler

The authors, in their introduction to this second edition, point out that their objectives have not altered from those intended for the first edition but they have introduced variations in presentation and content to meet the changing needs of the building industry. Inflation, rates of interest and fuel costs have all changed dramatically since the first edition was prepared and it was necessary to incorporate revisions to take account of these changes.

The book is loosely structured into sections ranging from the background to the building industry through preliminary estimates, statistics, design consequences and cost limits to the theory and practice of cost planning and cost in use. There are numerous tables, diagrams and examples, including some to illustrate the application of cost planning techniques.

As our review of the first edition indicated, this book is useful and informative whilst still remaining "readable"; it is an invaluable work for the student and practitioner alike.

Building Cost Control Techniques and Economics is published by Heinemann, price £8.50.

CONFERENCES AND COURSES

NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE POLYTECHNIC

Symposium on the Preparation and Giving of Expert Evidence in Court, Tribunal or Arbitration Proceedings

The School of Surveying at Newcastle Polytechnic have organised the above Symposium on Expert Evidence, intended for members of the Architectural, Surveying, Civil Engineering professions and others who may be at some time in the position of an Expert Witness, required to give evidence relating to their speciality.

The Symposium is to be held on Thursday, 11th June 1981, starting at 2.00 pm in Room A102 in Ellison Building. This room is just off the main corridor leading from the Entrance to Ellison Place.

The main speaker is Mr Alan Hutchinson, LLB (Hons), LLM, Barrister of Grays Inn, Lecturer in Law, University of Newcastle upon Tyne.

Other speakers will deal with specific areas of