

Correspondence

Sir,
IQS/RICS Unification

Having written on the merger before as a 'spectator' and deliberately not then expressing an opinion, now the time draws near I feel I must express a definite view.

Being on the educational side of the profession, I see young people of both sexes mainly from the grammar school or 'A' stream comprehensive system, entering the profession as young trainees in the P.Q.S., Contracting and Consultant sides. Strangely enough they are all equal in ability and not a little confused as to why there should be two highly respectable bodies with good and equal academic standards in competition with each other.

If we reflect, the only reason for the existence of the IQS is that the RICS (in the dim and distant past) would not recognise quantity surveyors working in the contracting industry. Anyone influenced by this criteria should recall that circumstances have changed. We are now a respected body of high repute with the same ethics, attitudes and educational standards as the RICS. Many members belong to both bodies and the RICS now allow their members to work with contractors.

Like the railwaymen we must be prepared to review the circumstances as they are today, not as they were, and does it really matter what letters we write after our names? It is the job that counts.

I shall vote for the merger.

Yours faithfully,
 D L Eacott, AIQS, MCSI
 Erith College of Technology,
 Kent.

Sir,
 I do so profoundly agree with the letter from Mr L R Shaw in your July edition. One feels like the helpless victim in the track of a road roller. I have been a member of the IQS for forty years and took part in the establishment of the East Anglian Branch with Mr C E Smart. We had stern opposition from the local branch of the RICS with no holds barred. It is impossible to contemplate giving up the place we fought for over many years. I am a Retired Member now so that the 'Chartered' status is of no practical use to me, but can it be of sufficient importance to the present membership to throw

aside the loyal work of so many people during the last forty-one years?

Yours faithfully,
 R O Charter
 Weeping Cross, Stafford.

Sir,
 As an overseas member of the IQS my opportunities for discussion and consideration of unification are limited, and indeed, almost entirely restricted to the content of the Journal and a certain weekly Q.S. newspaper which shall remain nameless.

In 1975 I was against joining the RICS. I could not see sufficient benefit for either the Institute or, on a more selfish basis, myself. I am first and foremost a Quantity Surveyor and always will be. That was the reason for joining the Institute of QUANTITY SURVEYORS. Had I wanted to be a Chartered Surveyor, a title synonymous with Estate Agents in the eyes of the public, I would have joined the RICS.

I do not now wish to be forced to join the RICS just because the hierarchy in both Institute and Institution are in favour of unification (something that was not in evidence at the time of the last vote).

In light of the fact that many members will have disposed of the details of the 1975 unification proposals, would it be asking too much to request that a list of the differences between the 1975 and 1982 documents be printed in the Journal, so that we can all see quite clearly the improvements that have been made to the terms of unification in the more recent discussions?

I realise that a full document setting out all the details of unification is to be published, however, I have a suspicion that some cosmetic changes have been made, but that really all we are doing is having a third vote on the same set of proposals.

We are all used to seeing additions and omissions. Is this not a suitable instance for a Bill of Variations to be produced, as is usual before the Final Account is signed?

Yours faithfully,
 D R Lee, AIQS
 Limassol, Cyprus.

Sir,
 I have been a member of the Institute for thirty of its forty years.

Having started my career as an RE Field Survey Officer in charge of international boundary and

trigonometric desert surveys I came to be a contractor's quantity surveyor for most of my working life and as such could not become a Chartered Surveyor.

Now I am working for a firm of Chartered Surveyors and therefore wish to become one myself. During my working life I have also been engaged in management and building surveying, insurance valuation surveying, as well as quantity surveying, as indeed I am sure others must. I therefore regard myself as a 'surveyor' - pure and simple.

If at the third attempt this unification is not achieved because of opposition from our Institute, then, those of us who wish to become Chartered Surveyors should be welcomed, without further examination, in our present grades by the RICS, for if they will accept us as a whole then surely there is no good reason for not accepting us individually?

If we were to wait for a few years, as one of your correspondents suggested last month, until this Institute obtains its own Charter we ourselves shall never be 'Chartered' anything - merely members of a Chartered Institute.

Yours Faithfully,
 John Burrows, FCIQB, FCIARB,
 FIQS
 Pulborough, West Sussex.

Sir,
 I write to express my opposition to this latest attempt to 'take over' the IQS.

The Unification Working Party appears to have given scant consideration to the needs of the QS profession but concentrated on the needs of the RICS. I found it interesting that the Working Party indicated a certain lack of identity within the profession. Surely it is extraordinary that a profession of the size and standing of quantity surveying is not united yet under the auspices of its own independent Society with a clear identity.

In the early 1920s the Association of Quantity Surveyors was absorbed by the then Surveyors institution and quantity surveyors disappeared from sight, it was said to be a 'back room' occupation. After the 1939-1945 war the advent of the IQS brought quantity surveying into the light of day and undoubtedly continual pressure by the IQS over the years has caused changes within the profession and also within the QS

Division of the RICS. I do not believe that the IQS can be faulted for the slow progress or lack of identity within the profession; reference to the figures given in the 1976 and current amalgamation papers indicates that the IQS training grades of membership now exceed those of the Quantity Surveyors Division of the RICS.

Those quantity surveyors within the RICS form but a minority group whose interests must be constrained by and be subordinated to the demands of the larger group and Society as a whole; being first a Chartered Surveyor and secondly a Chartered Quantity Surveyor cannot help ones identity. The absorption of the IQS is extremely unlikely to improve the profession for without external pressures history suggests decline.

The RICS, in my opinion, is far too large a Society of which the QS Division forms a small part, big never was beautiful nor economic, size leads to unwieldiness, complicated and very costly administration, undoubtedly such an organisation will acquire an ever increasing and insatiable appetite for its members' money.

On the other hand the IQS is an autonomous body, financially sound with its own freehold headquarters which stands as a tribute to those dedicated members whose determination has given the profession an opportunity to possess an independent representative Society. It is a matter of record that one of the aims of the IQS is to fully represent the profession. I urge all members to think carefully before giving up the only opportunity the profession will ever have of an independent Society of its own.

I have written and spoken many times on the necessity of unifying the profession by that of course I mean far more than just joining the RICS QS membership with the IQS membership. Now is the time for the quantity surveyor to show that he wishes to be master of his own destiny; may I suggest that the first logical step would be for the RICS QS membership to join the IQS. Once that fusion took place, undoubtedly Chartered status for all would soon follow.

However the first thing is to vote 'No' to the present proposal.

Yours faithfully,
 R E Biscoe-Taylor, PPIQS,
 FRSH, FCIARB
 Harrow, Middlesex.