



**Association of the  
Chemical Profession  
of Alberta**

**Minutes of the Annual General Meeting  
Saturday, June 25, 2005  
Best Western Regency Inn, Airdrie, Alberta**

A light lunch was provided for all those attending. An attendance sheet was circulated, and 35 voting members of ACPA were present (10 voting members were required for a quorum).

**1. Call to order of the 2005 AGM**

The meeting was called to order by the Chair of the Board of Directors, Robert Taylor, at 1:00 PM.

**2. Approval of Minutes of the 2004 AGM**

The minutes of the 2004 AGM should be amended to indicate that 15 members attended, and that more than the minimum required for a quorum was present.

Motion: Approval of the minutes of 2004 AGM as amended.  
Moved: Bob Taylor                      Seconded: Trent Parks                      Carried

**3. President's Report (Bob Taylor)**

Bob Taylor introduced the following people:

- The guest speakers: Adrian Pritchard (Alberta Human Resources and Employment) and Dave Schwass (Vice-President of the CSC and ACPA member #001);
- The ACPA Board of Directors for 2005–06: Bob Taylor (President), Tim Blackmore (Vice-President; Specialist Sign-off Committee) [absent], Roger Cowles (Treasurer; Board Rep. on Discipline Committee; Specialist Sign-off Committee), Neil Warrender (Secretary; chair of Member Value Committee) [absent], Brent Cook (Public Member), Ken Schmidt (Special Events and Promotion; Technical Seminar Committee; Member Value Committee), Stan Backs (Special Events and Promotion; Technical Seminar Committee; Member Value Committee), Mark Rice (Webmaster), Doug Crighton (Board Rep. on Practice Review Committee), Pat Kalita (Board Rep. on Registration Committee; board nominee), and Chris Swyngedouw (board nominee);
- The members who will be standing for re-election to the ACPA Board of Directors in September: John Banks (Specialist Sign-off Committee; ACPA Rep. on the P6 Environmental Joint Practice Standards Subcommittee) and Elena Weisman; and

- Other ACPA officials and the members of the ACPA committees for 2005–06: Trent Parks (Registrar), the Registration Committee (Trent Parks, Pat Kalita, Joe Schulz, Dave Schwass and Frank Bachelor), the Specialist Sign-Off Committee (Roger Cowles, John Banks, Tim Blackmore, Mary Mayes and Bob Swingle), the Discipline Committee (Roger Cowles), the Practice Review Committee (Doug Crighton), the Member Value Committee (Neil Warrender, Stan Backs and Ken Schmidt), Technical Seminar (Ken Schmidt and Stan Backs), P6 Environmental Joint Practice Standards Subcommittee (John Banks) and the APEGGA Inclusivity Task Force (Kevin Dunn).

Bob then delivered the President's Report:

- After a few initial adjustments, ManageWise Inc. is functioning very well as the ACPA's administrative office. This arrangement has been good value for the association and the Board, and ACPA will continue with them for the foreseeable future.
- The ACPA website continues to grow and improve with Mark Rice as webmaster.
- An "Inclusivity Initiative" (with Kevin Dunn as ACPA representative) was proposed by the Board of APEGGA but was subsequently killed by opposition from APEGGA's own membership. The current revised form of this proposal is so different from the original proposal that it no longer has any effect on chemists.
- The list of ACPA awards and sponsorships is growing. The ACPA sponsors the annual \$500 Arthur Bollo-Kamara Scholarship, various National Chemistry Week activities in Edmonton and Calgary (annually \$300 each), the U. of A. Chemistry Students Career Night (\$200 to \$250 annually), and annual regional Science Fair awards in Calgary, Edmonton and Medicine Hat (various amounts depending on the needs of each event). This year, the Board also approved a special grant of \$412.50 to support chemistry students at the 2005 Western Canadian University Chemistry Student Conference in Victoria. These awards and sponsorships are excellent means to improve the awareness and goodwill towards ACPA for students as well as the public. The Board is proceeding with plans to expand the number of ACPA Science Fair awards to include all Alberta regional science fairs (another four or five remain to be added).
- The ACPA participated in science and engineering career fairs at the U. of C., thanks to the generosity of Halliburton (in 2004 and 2005) and Sanjel Corporation (in 2005) who provided ACPA with free space in their display areas. Bob Taylor noted that Halliburton now hires science graduates (particularly chemists) as well as engineers to fill their engineering and technology positions, and that extensive in-house training and experience helps them to succeed. For Halliburton, it is often easier to teach a chemist the necessary engineering skills than to teach an engineer the necessary chemistry.
- Bob expressed his thanks to the Board and the members for the assistance and support provided during his term as President.

#### 4. Treasurer's Report (Roger Cowles)

The Treasurer's report distributed at the meeting included letters from the auditors, a profit-and-loss statement for 2004, a balance sheet as of Dec. 31, 2004, and a budget for 2005.

Total assets as of December 31, 2004:	\$ 58,211.97
Total liabilities as of December 31, 2004:	-\$ 48.63
Total equity as of December 31, 2004:	\$ 58,260.60
Total income for 2004:	\$ 33,483.20
Total expenses for 2004:	\$ 21,276.48
Net income for 2004:	\$ 12,206.72

##### *Notes regarding the Treasurer's report*

The net income of \$12,206.72 was in part due to a surplus from the conference. The "Uncategorized" income of -\$41.30 was a GST rebate. On the advice of the Treasurer, the ACPA de-registered this year with respect to GST (since most of its income is not eligible for GST). The GIC of \$54,000 (split into several portions with different due dates) is the ACPA reserve fund, which is earmarked for operational expenses in lean years or for future litigation expenses. The \$500 Bollo-Kamara Scholarship was changed from an endowment to an annual expense due to insufficient endowment funds being available. A correction was noted in the "Budget for 2005": the 2004 item of \$40.00 for Science Fair Edmonton should be moved to the line for Science Fair Calgary (Science Fair Edmonton received no ACPA support in 2004). The administrative fee shown in the budget for 2005 is based on the old contract with ManageWise; a new contract for 2005 to cover the administration of a larger membership base will likely increase this figure. The telephone bill is quite large due to the monthly teleconference meetings of the Board of Directors (a new telephone contract is being researched and should reduce these rates).

It has been suggested by ManageWise that in the future a designated board member (other than the President, who already has many responsibilities) should organize the AGM. These duties would include keeping track of deadlines, arranging the notice of the meeting, proposing the nomination committee, organizing the voting, contacting the hotel and so on.

Sincere thanks were expressed to the volunteer auditors for 2004, Andrew Swoboda, P.Chem. and Wendy Lam, P.Chem. The auditors found no irregularities in the 2004 financial statements.

Jim Hyne asked if ACPA members were personally liable if ACPA was sued, and if ACPA had liability insurance to cover this. It was noted that ACPA had only "Director and Officer" liability coverage: it was not known if more extensive coverage was available or advisable.

Motion: Approval of Treasurer's report.  
Moved: Roger Cowles      Seconded: Frank Bachelor      Carried.

Motion: Appointment of Andrew Swoboda, P.Chem. and Wendy Lam, P.Chem. as auditors for the 2005 financial reports, subject to their acceptance.  
Moved: Roger Cowles      Seconded: Bob Taylor      Carried.

## 5. Registrar's Report (Trent Parks)

Current membership as of June 20, 2005:	175
Full Members (M)	165
Provisional (P)	2
CIT Members (T)	3
Retired Members (R)	4
Associate Members (A)	1

Members in good standing as of the 2004 AGM:	167
Members in good standing as of December 31, 2003:	140
Members in good standing as of December 31, 2002:	122

It was noted that there were 11 members who had been in good standing as of 2004 but who had not yet renewed their membership for 2005.

## 6. Service to the Profession Award (Bob Taylor)

Kevin Dunn, P.Chem. was presented with the *Frank W. Bachelor Service to the Profession Award*. This award recognizes an individual's outstanding contribution to the Chemical Profession in Alberta. The recipient of the award receives a plaque and complimentary membership for life (subject to the recipient's continued qualification for Professional Chemist status). Kevin is a former Chair of the ACPA Board and has served the ACPA tirelessly in many capacities. Photos of the presentation were taken by Mark Rice.

## 7. ACPA Joint Professions Committee Report (Roger Cowles)

Thanks were expressed to Adrian Pritchard (AGM guest speaker) and to the Alberta Department of Human Resources and Employment for their support of the Joint Professions Committee. This committee was formed in early 2004 and included representatives from six regulated professional organizations (PROs) in Alberta, also known as the "P6":

- Alberta Institute of Agrologists
- Alberta Society of Professional Biologists
- Association of the Chemical Profession of Alberta
- Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta

- College of Alberta Professional Foresters
- College of Alberta Professional Forest Technologists

The task of this committee was to recommend to the Alberta Minister of the Environment as to who should be allowed to sign off for reclamation and remediation work at upstream oil and gas sites in Alberta. The Minister accepted their recommendation that only qualified members of the PROs should be allowed to sign off for such work, but also requested an investigation into the establishment of an interim certification board for environmental practitioners who were not eligible to become members of the PROs (i.e., many technologists). This approach was deferred because of the considerable resources required for an interim certification board and in view of the proposed Agrology Profession Act (which would allow membership of many more technologists in a PRO).

In April 2005, a subcommittee was formed to develop a joint practice standard for environmental work. John Banks is the ACPA representative on this subcommittee.

A further initiative of the joint committee of the PROs was to discuss the possibility of negotiating a group rate (for all PROs except APEGGA) for errors and omissions insurance. Ken Schmidt commented that due to higher costs for environmental work, some members of ACPA may be in a separate risk group for this kind of insurance.

## **8. First Guest Speaker**

### ***The Outlook for the Professions in Alberta from a Government and Regulatory Perspective***

#### **Adrian Pritchard**

*Manager*

*Professions and Occupations and Land Agents Licensing  
Alberta Human Resources and Employment*

It is the long-term intent of the current government in Alberta to use the new Agrology Profession Act (which passed third reading in the Legislature on May 12, 2005) as a template for all those Alberta professional organizations that are not health related. This includes APEGGA, whose current legislation is NOT cast in stone. The Professional and Occupational Associations Registration Act (POARA) provides only “exclusive right to title” and was intended as a starting point for professional self-regulation for many groups. Conversely, the “P7” (i.e., APEGGA and the doctors, lawyers, dentists, veterinarians, architects and chartered accountants) have long had both “exclusive right to title” and “exclusive scope of practice” in their legislation. Alberta would like to move the POARA groups towards the middle of this range, similar to the position of agrologists and the foresters who have “mandatory registration”. If things go well, Alberta may subsequently consider awarding POARA groups exclusive scope of practice. The government would like the associations governed by the (POARA) to help sell this idea to their memberships and to those legislators who oppose it. The time required for these legislative changes may be anywhere from three to ten years.

The Agrology Profession Act is to receive Royal Assent this summer (2005) and the associated regulations are due out in the fall. Spring of 2008 is the current deadline for upcoming changes to all POARA legislation, so the Alberta government will be soon be negotiating with all 12 POARA associations and receiving input for the new legislation. After making the changes in POARA, the relevant regulations must be revised and refined by about 2010. However, this all assumes that the direction of the government does not change due to possible intervening changes in their priorities, policies, Ministers, Premiers, or even governing parties. The deadlines for any new legislation may also be set back due to intervening elections.

Alberta Environment and other ministries would like to see greater movement towards exclusive scope of practice to enable better control of signoffs in various areas of expertise. All of the PROs in the "P6" (APEGGA, ACPA, the agrologists, the biologists, the foresters, and the forest technologists) are regarded as equals by Alberta Human Resources and Employment and will be pushed towards more "symmetrical" legislation. APEGGA is the largest of the PROs, but it is still regarded as only one member of the group.

The APEGGA inclusivity initiative dovetailed with these intentions. It promoted "laddering" of people within a "silo" (i.e., arranging categories in a vertical hierarchy according to skill sets), with professionals at the top, a category of registered practitioners (with proficiencies in restricted areas) in the middle, and technologists lower down. However, the APEGGA membership has not supported this initiative and the proposal has not gone forward in its original form. In spite of the strongly held opinions of some of its membership, however, the traditional APEGGA view that engineering is all-encompassing has not stood up in court and conflicts with the current direction of the Alberta government. It was noted that while there are currently 42,000 professional members of APEGGA and approximately 50,000 technologists in related fields in Alberta, only 152 of the latter have so far become Registered Engineering Technologists within APEGGA.

Conversely, lobbying of the agrology technologists to be a meaningful part of the new Agrology Profession Act was successful. This Act should be regarded as a template for new legislation governing all PROs. The biologists are currently looking at this possibility.

Adding a new category of technologists would put pressure on the resources of individual associations, and higher membership levels will be needed to provide the budget for this. Mandatory registration will help. The agrologists have 1500 members now and are hoping to have 3000 next year under the new legislation, which includes mandatory registration. If all goes as planned, they may subsequently be given exclusive scope of practice. It is expected that the foresters will be the next to follow this path, followed eventually by the other PROs.

It may sound onerous and daunting to enforce exclusive scope of practice, but the number of disciplinary actions necessary is actually quite low. Nonetheless, a war chest to cover the costs of legal proceedings for enforcement will be necessary. A complaints resolution (or perhaps mediation) process will also need to be included in the legislation. To mitigate liability and to provide more of a person-on-the-street view, the proportion of public membership on the Board of Directors should be increased to 25% and there should be a public member on each committee.

The introduction of exclusive scope of practice will require methods to resolve areas of overlap between the various professions. However, we are already on the way to resolving this problem with the reclamation and remediation task force. Perhaps a joint review board will be established to deal with overlap issues. Fuzzy areas will persist, but the PROs will need to build a mutual trust and an acceptance of the new rules. Regular meetings will be necessary on issues of jurisdiction and discipline to resolve disputes and to prevent problems from building up.

A reasonable (but not excessive) level of detail will be needed in the scope-of-practice sections of any new legislation governing PROs in Alberta. The old Act governing veterinary medicine had a very general scope of practice section that was struck down by the Supreme Court of Canada. For examples of the appropriate level of detail and flexibility, see the new Acts governing agrologists, foresters and veterinarians.

Each profession may have an expanded scope of practice under the new rules so that they will be permitted to do everything for which they are qualified. If this infringes on another group's scope of practice, the other profession may ask your association if your work is being performed properly. For example, APEGGA has accepted the much broader scope of practice provided to agrologists under their new Act, but they still want to be sure that the regulatory body for the agrologists has the power to enforce sanctions. APEGGA is currently satisfied that every professional in these areas will be a member of a regulatory organization and will be governed responsibly. They realize that will not get everyone within their fold and they are living with that.

In the health-related professions, another route has been tried in Alberta: the Health Professions Act of 1996. The deadline for full implementation was 1999, but unfortunately progress has been slow: only 6 out of 30 associations are on board so far. An umbrella regulatory organization for the 50 or 60 professional and technical groups in Alberta that are not health related (an "Alberta Academy of Science and Technology") would likely suffer the same fate: there is too much turf protection, professional bias, and inconsistent existing legislation for such an initiative to work.

Dave Schwass noted that the Chemistry Institute of Canada is very happy with the direction being taken in Alberta. Elsewhere in Canada, the situation for chemists is quite variable. For example, Quebec legislated scope-of-practice privileges for professional chemists long ago, but Ontario still respects only the old original professional organizations.

Alberta likes to be a leader in government practices: the Professions and Occupations and Land Agents Licensing office is unique in Canada (except for Quebec). Alberta also tries to anticipate upcoming issues, such as the need to assist skilled recent immigrants to become members of the appropriate professional organizations. Alberta is also working with BC to help that government develop new PRO legislation. Other provinces (New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Saskatchewan) are watching closely, but Ontario is resisting any change. Chemists in BC need to get organized along the lines of ACPA to become self-regulated. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, chemists and legislators need to be made aware of the Alberta legislation (already done by Dave Schwass of the CIC) so that they could use it as a model where appropriate.

In some sectors of the economy, chemists are still not paid at a professional level or regarded as professionals. However, this is changing as a direct result of ACPA and the P.Chem. title. Some employers now recognize ACPA membership as equivalent to APEGGA membership in their pay scales, and others actively recruit professional chemists for jobs traditionally held by engineers. As long as these workers are doing their jobs properly, as long as they are accountable for the quality of their work, and as long as they belong to a regulatory association that holds them accountable, then the Alberta government has no problem with that. The Alberta legislation (as it is now envisioned) should ensure that all chemists will have the option to be accountable professionals in their chosen areas of expertise.

## 9. Second Guest Speaker

### *The CSC and the Status of the Chemist as a Professional in Canada*

**Dave Schwass**

*Vice-President*

*Canadian Society for Chemistry*

The 4000-strong Canadian Society for Chemistry (CSC) is the national organization for chemists in Canada. It is part of the Chemical Institute of Canada (CIC), along with the Canadian Society for Chemical Engineering (CSChE: 1600 members) and the Canadian Society for Chemical Technology (CSCT: 200 members). It has formal ties with international chemistry organizations (such as IUPAC and Pacifichem) and great relations with the American Chemical Society (ASC). It administers dozens of awards, conducts salary surveys and publishes a periodical magazine for members. It offers members group insurance plans and reciprocal fee discounts with the ASC. The CSC also administers a chemistry degree accreditation program used by universities and colleges across Canada and around the world; this accreditation is used by the ACPA, the ACPO and the OCQ as a standard for membership in their professional categories. The CSC has a network of Local Sections (strong in Edmonton but struggling in Calgary) as well as a number of Divisions based on fields of interest. In the past, the primary emphasis of the CSC was on Division activities and on organizing conferences, but it was found that these activities involve only about 50% of the membership—primarily academics. The

emphasis is shifting since it is now recognized that many members are not academics or traditional chemists.

The new Board of the CSC is stronger, smaller and more focussed. It recently passed a motion stating that *“The CSC will raise the status of the chemist as a professional in Canada”*. The CSC is committed to moving this issue forward in cooperation with the ACPA, the ACPO (Ontario), the OCQ (Quebec) and fledgling organizations in Nova Scotia and British Columbia. Through a coordinated and leveraged approach, the CSC believes that it can increase the awareness and credibility of the profession of chemistry with communities, regulators and other professional colleagues. It has developed a strategy that will connect with all chemists regardless of their occupation, branch of chemistry, or level of education.

The status of chemists as professionals is good in Alberta but is still a challenge in most other provinces of Canada. In particular, there are problems with predatory behaviours of some engineering associations that put the employability of chemists at risk (but the CSC was happy to note the progressive attitude shown by APEGGA). Unhelpful attitudes are also a problem, such as the view espoused recently in BC that “if you want a future in science, you had better be an engineer”.

Professional chemists need to be ethical, competent, credible, dedicated, professionally responsible, and accountable (i.e., liable). To provide protection for the public, chemists need to be governed by an appropriate disciplinary mechanism. Most especially, chemists need to be recognized as professionals by peers, employers and governments. Such recognition is sometimes hard to get from those (often academics) who still regard terminal B.Sc. degrees as limiting: this notion is no longer true. In addition, it is more difficult to obtain for chemists who are working outside the most visible or stereotypical chemistry areas.

The CSC needs to recognize the activities of all its members. The former Industrial Division—the most relevant to many of the chemists interested in the professionalism issue—died some time ago because of insufficient volunteer help. The CSC hopes to re-establish the dormant Business and Economics Division, but may need some help from provincial chemistry groups.

To gain recognition from the public, the regulators and other professionals, chemists need to organize into credible groups. Such groups must have the necessary “critical mass” of members, and also need to cooperate and to coordinate their efforts across Canada. The existing groups—ACPA, the ACPO, the OCQ, and the fledgling organizations in BC and Nova Scotia—currently do not communicate much with each other. Neither do they talk much with the CSC, the CSChE (which is fully supportive of the CSC initiative) or the CSCT (which is unsure of their position). We need to raise our collective profile, and none of us can do it alone.

The risk of inaction is that new legislation introduced anywhere in Canada sets precedents and then is hard to remove if it is harmful to our cause. For example, it has

been advocated in some jurisdictions that an academic chemist should have to get a limited license to practice engineering in order to work as a consultant. We need to be aware of any such upcoming legislation across Canada and help our colleagues to combat it whenever necessary.

The CSC has already been helping to fight a political battle on a provincial issue for chemists in BC, and is committed to continue providing such assistance across Canada. Help from the CSC may be in the form of official letters or other communications to governments or other organizations (in protest or praise), administrative assistance, website hosting, and even access to the CSC member database for mass e-mails.

Appropriate marketing should also be carried out: this will present a consistent image and increase awareness of chemists as professionals. Upcoming articles in *ACCN* (the CIC magazine for its members) will help with these marketing efforts by outlining the issue of professionalism and listing ways to raise awareness. All our organizations should be lobbying for help and advice from chemist allies in high places, such as heads of major corporations (some of whom have chemistry degrees), high government officials such as chemist Arthur Carty (National Science Advisor and former head of the National Research Council), and officials within major science and technology funding organizations.

A title such as “P.Chem.” could be trademarked (but not otherwise protected except in Alberta) and used across Canada by qualified chemists as a tool to promote professional recognition. The CSC could perhaps administer some sort of national professional practice exam that must be passed to qualify for the national “P.Chem.” title (the OCQ already administers such an exam).

Kevin Dunn noted that several years ago the ACPA offered to trademark this title and make it available for use across Canada, but no organization was willing to take up the administrative burden at that time. [*Ed. Note.* Alberta residency is not a requirement for joining ACPA; any qualified chemist in the world may apply for membership and officially gain the right to use the P.Chem. title as well as a personal “Professional Chemist” stamp.]

Ken Schmidt noted that the Edmonton Section of the CSC and the ACPA have already established a relationship, and that as a member common to both boards he is acting as a liaison. The two organizations have pooled their resources to support chemistry-related events for the last several years and they intend to increase their level of cooperation. The Edmonton Section of the CSC has a large pool of volunteers to draw upon, partly because it has been willing to provide its mailing-list and newsletter services to chemists who are not officially members of the CSC. This maintains contact with former members (and prospective new members) and builds up goodwill that can be tapped later.

Some audience members commented that they felt the CIC was no longer relevant to them now that the ACPA was established, but others said that there was both strength and unity to be found in diversity. All chemists (including biochemists, geochemists and even

chemical engineers) still need to defend their right to work and their right to fair remuneration. However, we also need to reinforce the perception that our organizations are definitely not trade unions: they must be correctly seen as either learned societies (the CSC) or regulated professional associations (the ACPA) like the similar organizations of doctors, lawyers or engineers.

Dave Schwass made a final request that the ACPA support the initiative of the CSC Board and designate a liaison with the national office of the CSC. This liaison would facilitate communication and would allow the ACPA to vet and validate CSC strategies in areas of mutual interest. The CSC has money and resources available and would like to move forward with their initiative to raise the status of the chemist as a professional in Canada.

#### **10. Elections of ACPA Board Members for Three-Year Terms**

All four open positions are for three-year terms.

Pat Kalita and Chris Swyngedouw were acclaimed to two of the open positions on the Board.

The two remaining open positions on the Board will be filled by election or acclamation at a special meeting to be held in September of 2005. Former Board members Elena Vaisman and John Banks have put forward their names as candidates for these positions.

#### **11. Chemist's Ring (Eugene Dakin)**

A proposal for a Chemist's Ring was submitted to the Board by Eugene Dakin and was circulated through the ACPA newsletter. A copy of the proposal is posted on the website at <http://www.pchem.ca/Newsletters/Attachments2005June/ChemistsRing.pdf>.

A Chemist's Ring has been proposed as a symbol to show that we are professionals, not to mimic the engineers in any deliberate way. It would be made available as an option, and would not be compulsory. It could possibly be imprinted with a symbol or some text.

A member who could not be present (James LeBlanc) contributed by e-mail that he liked the idea and would be interested if cost permitted. He would prefer that a unique ring design be coordinated across Canada as a unifying symbol for all professional chemists. A model to consider might be the ring of Canada's Registered Professional Foresters: they have a simple silver band engraved with their coniferous tree logo.

David Gibson noted that he had already instituted a chemist's ring for his 1996 graduating class at the U. of Waterloo. His mother is a jeweller so he had ready access to the necessary equipment and expertise. He designed a six-sided ring (with rounded points) modelled on the benzene ring. It also had a motto engraved on the interior of the band. He made a series of moulds that were used to cast silver or gold versions in various sizes, and still had these moulds in his possession. He found his own ring comfortable

and has worn it frequently over the past nine years. He provided photos of this ring to the Board prior to the AGM, and brought the ring to the meeting for viewing. He estimated that it would cost about \$50 for a silver ring and \$125 for a gold one in this design, but the cost might vary somewhat depending on the size required.

An iridium ring (with a rainbow sheen) was suggested as an alternative to gold or silver.

The Board received a variety of other e-mail responses, both positive and negative. Some of the more aggressively negative responses centred on anti-engineering feeling and a strong desire not to imitate that group. In response, it was noted that other professions such as foresters and agrologists also have rings. Police forces have a ring as well: the “blue line ring” is silver or gold with a thin blue line of enamel fired into the surface.

The discussion also considered an ACPA lapel pin (or possibly a Canada-wide chemist’s lapel pin) as an alternative to a ring. It was noted that the ACPO already had a pin, but one owner (John Banks) had found that it did not generate much curiosity. Others noted that lapel pins are considered good for branding and communication purposes, but a pin is not usually worn as often and does not have the same recognition value as a ring.

Dave Schwass noted that if a ring is chosen, it should be created with a clear purpose and as a reminder of something important. A ring needs some substance, and thus there should be a clear understanding of its meaning.

It was noted that engineers traditionally do not receive their rings until they have completed a short course of instruction on ethics, participated in a ceremony and taken an oath (essentially vowing to be ethical, honest and competent). Engineers each receive a certificate with the text of this oath, which must be signed by the engineer and is numbered, signed and dated by an official of the organization that distributes the rings. The ACPA Board did not support investing quite this level of effort into a Chemist’s Ring.

A straw vote of those attending was taken: 60% were fully in favour of a Chemist’s Ring, 10% were in favour of something else instead (such as a lapel pin), 30% were undecided, and one person was opposed to the idea.

The Board will consider the matter further.

## **12. Adjournment**

Moved: Bob Taylor

The meeting was declared adjourned at approximately 4:00 PM.