

PROPOSED CITY PREMISES.

REPORT

SUBMITTED TO THE MEMBERS

BY

The City Premises Committee for consideration with a view
to the adoption of a site offered near Tower Hill

Minutes of Proceedings

AT THE

Extraordinary General Meeting,

HELD AT THE LIVERPOOL STREET HOTEL, E.C.,

June 13, 1912,

TO SANCTION THE ACQUISITION OF A SITE FOR PROPOSED NEW
CITY PREMISES.

CHAIRMAN: SUMMERS HUNTER, Esq. (President).

THE HON. SECRETARY read the notice convening the meeting.

THE CHAIRMAN said that, as this was the first occasion on
which he had had the privilege of attending a General Meeting

of the Institute, he took the opportunity of thanking the members for the honour they had conferred upon him in electing him their President. He sympathized in every possible way with the very important work the Institute had done in the past, and he could quite enter into their very laudable ambitions as to what the Institute would be in the future. During his tenure of office he would do his best to assist them in carrying out those endeavours. To him it was of very great interest that his first appearance amongst them should be on so important an occasion. He had followed the various developments of the scheme, and he knew the whole matter had had the careful attention of the Committee. He hoped their recommendations would ultimately meet with the success he was sure they all desired. In a scheme of this kind it was only natural they should look a few years ahead. Personally, he could see a very great future for the Institute; the importance of the work of the marine engineer was increasing every day. When one saw the advances being made in engineering, one wondered how the sea-going engineer was going to adapt himself to the new methods, requiring, as they did, almost a new education and a new training. He did not know how far shipowners recognized the work of the Institute; but he did know that some of the largest shipowners looked upon the position of the chief engineer from a very serious point of view; they found it increasingly difficult to obtain first-class experienced men. In this respect he felt the Institute had a great work to do. He thought the members should take heart and hope from the fact of the gradually increasing membership, and he thought, with more suitable premises, they might reasonably expect the membership to increase still further.

The Chairman then called upon Mr. J. Hallett, Hon. Treasurer of the City Premises Committee, to state the financial position of the Fund, and also of the proposed scheme.

MR. HALLETT stated that the total amount received and promised was £4,944 18s. 6d., the interest upon deposit account amounted to £37 16s. 8d., making a total of £4,982 15s. 2d.

With regard to the proposed site on Tower Hill, and on the assumption that the whole cost of the buildings, namely, £8,700, was subscribed, the site, so far as the ground leases were concerned, had only to be dealt with. A lease for ninety-

nine years at a total ground-rent of £305 per annum could be obtained ; this would include all the land shown on the plan which was coloured both pink and green. The parts shown coloured pink were already leased on a perpetual lease to the Neil Trustees by the City of London Corporation. The remaining portion, coloured green, was still the property of the Corporation and could be obtained with the other portion on equal terms.

An alternative to the lease of ninety-nine years would be to purchase the perpetual lease from the Neil Trustees ; they held this lease on a yearly payment of a ground-rent of £39 7s. 9d. Every fourteen years a fine of £275 14s. 3d. was levied, on payment of which the lease was renewed for a further sixty-one years. For the part coloured pink, which belonged to the Neil Trustees, they required £280 per year as ground-rent under a ninety-nine years' lease ; this sum less a yearly payment of £39 7s. 9d. now paid by them to the Corporation with the yearly proportion of the fine levied for fourteen years. The last two together amounted to £60 11s. 9d. ; this, deducted from the £280, left a balance of £219 8s. 3d., which at twenty-seven-and-a-half years' purchase, amounted to £6,033 16s. 9d. Assuming the same rate of purchase for that portion which was coloured green, this would amount to £675, making a total for the whole site of £6,700.

The estimated annual charges under the first scheme would be as follows :—

	£
Ground Rent.	305
Rates and Taxes	150
Upkeep	100
	—
	555
Estimated amount derived from letting offices	250
	—
Balance	£305

In the alternative scheme the figures would be as follows :—

	£	s.	d.
Interest on £6,700, borrowed at 4 per cent.	268	0	0
Rates and Taxes	180	0	0
(which, of course, would be of a larger amount than the previous scheme)			
Upkeep	100	0	0
Annual Ground Rent (now paid by Neil Trustees)	39	7	9
Yearly proportion of fine levied every fourteen years	19	14	0
	<hr/>		
	£607	1	9
Estimated amount derived from letting offices	250	0	0
	<hr/>		
Balance.	£357	1	9

It must be borne in mind that under the first scheme it would be necessary to provide a Sinking Fund which would redeem the cost of the buildings on the termination of the ninety-nine years' lease. From enquiries he had made, this would cost, roughly, about £40 per annum, so that, comparing the two schemes, the amount of annual charges would be almost identical. The Institute would, of course, be relieved of the rates and upkeep of the present premises, also the cost and charges in connexion with the use of rooms taken in the City for the purpose of our meetings. The second scheme gave the members the advantage of being in more secure possession of their premises. It must be understood that the figures given in both schemes were, excepting so far as the ground-rent, etc., were concerned, approximate, as, until the building plans had been submitted to the Assessment Committee, he was not in a position to say what the amount of assessment would be.

In reply to a question by Mr. P. S. DOHERTY, Mr. HALLETT said the lease could only be obtained in perpetuity subject to the fine being paid. In reply to Mr. G. A. PULLEN, he said the ground-rent on the ordinary lease was £305 per annum; in the other case, where the nett annual charge was given as £357, £20 (approx.) was allowed for payment of the fine.

Mr. J. SHANKS said he thought the members were all agreed that City premises were a necessity for the progress of the Institute. He had found no enthusiasm among the members, however, for the site now proposed. They all knew the character of the locality, and he thought an expression of opinion of the members should be taken on the subject.

On the suggestion of Mr. W. E. FARENDEN, the Architect sketched a rough plan showing the position of the proposed new premises, which was handed round to the members present.

Mr. J. T. MILTON pointed out that it was an "island" site, the longest side facing the Tower Bridge, and on the direct route from the Tower Bridge to the City. It was exceedingly difficult to find a site in the City of London which would satisfy the requirements of size. This site was neither too large nor too small. It was very close to Mark Lane and Fenchurch Street stations. It was near the position chosen by the Port of London Authority for their new offices, and there was no doubt the site would be much more valuable within the next few years, when the few existing old buildings in its proximity were pulled down. If they went further into the City it would mean a question of facing an expense, not of £300 a year, but of £3,000 a year.

Mr. TIMPSON asked if the amount estimated for rates and taxes included water rates.

Mr. HALLETT said he was informed the £150 estimated included all water rates. It was based upon an office in the City at about the same rateable value. Amplifying his remarks on the total amount payable for purchasing the perpetual lease, he said the ground-rent now paid by the Trustees who held the perpetual lease was £39 7s. 9d. Adding this to the £20 per year fine payable to the City Corporation, and the £268 interest on the £6,700 borrowed, it would make the total annual charge, after purchase of the lease, to be £357 1s. 9d.

Mr. GEO. ADAMS said he understood this meant the lease was purchased for £6,700, subject to further payments of £60 per annum. He asked what would happen if the fine was not paid.

Mr. HALLETT said the lease would last for sixty-one years only.

Mr. ADAMS said he had viewed the proposed site along with other members of the Institute. He agreed with Mr. Milton that any site proposed should not be too large or too small ; but he would like to see the proposed Institute in a better situation. He thought they should have some definite information, or some guarantee, that the old buildings near the proposed site would in time be demolished. He thought it possible that the scarcity of sites in the City was responsible for the present suggestion, and asked if it was necessary that the present meeting should settle the matter.

On the invitation of Mr. MILTON to give particulars of available sites and relative costs, Mr. V. WILKINS, Architect, said the only other site they could find in the whole City was one lying between Liverpool Street and Fenchurch Street stations. It was a very narrow place, the site was of a peculiar shape, and the building would have to be very low on account of "ancient lights." The cost was £900 per annum, three times the cost of the present site. These two were the only pieces of available freehold land at present in the market. The value of the land was three times as much as they approached Fenchurch Street, and thirty to forty times as much as they approached the Bank of England. Any site in Fenchurch Street was out of the question, as the price was enormous.

Mr. P. S. DOHERTY said he did not like the site. In his opinion it would not be attractive to present or future members, and the upkeep would be costly. In addition to having to pay interest on the amount borrowed there would still be the annual charge of £60.

Mr. E. W. ROSS said the estimated annual cost was £580, while the balance on the Institute's accounts last year was £159. If it was suggested to sell the investments it would mean a deduction of £52. The rates and taxes and other expenses on the present premises was £87. This deducted would reduce the estimated annual cost to £500. How was this money to be raised ?

Mr. G. A. PULLEN thought the matter should receive further consideration, especially as to the effect of the site upon the social side of the Institute.

THE CHAIRMAN said the points raised were important and the financial ones in particular. He thought they ought to raise the money to buy the site. They would all like to see the Institute nearer the City, but that would mean much more money to be expended.

Mr. DOHERTY asked what support the members had given to the scheme.

Mr. HALLETT said he had not the exact figures, but he believed about eighty-eight or eighty-nine members had subscribed.

Mr. MILTON said the City Premises Committee had taken a great deal of trouble in making appeals and had been successful in raising about £5,000. Although part of this was promised, there was no doubt the promises would be fulfilled. The Committee, however, felt that the members themselves ought to make more personal effort in obtaining the money. The matter did not originate with a few, or with the Council; it was pressed forward by the members themselves, and the Committee were rather disappointed that more support was not received from the members. On the other hand, they were convinced that as soon as a *bona fide* scheme was commenced, there would be considerably more support. It might be desirable, from some points of view, to have a better situation, but the financial objections would then have much more force. This site was to be had for £300; nearer Fenchurch Street it would cost £800 or £900 a year. With regard to the question of desirability, the site was within two minutes' walk of a railway station, and if there was an objectionable area it was confined to a very small part of that distance. If the scheme was adopted they might reasonably expect to see a large increase in the membership.

Mr. DOHERTY said he was sorry more members had not contributed. Personally, he had doubled his subscription last year and this year; and he thought if the majority of the members increased their subscription for a year or two, the financial difficulties would be largely solved.

Mr. E. PULL said he would like to point out to those who wanted a better site that in other Institutions there was a much larger annual subscription; in the Institution of Civil Engineers it was five guineas and the Institution of Mechanical Engineers

three guineas. In Westminster, also, the same objections obtained as were urged against the Tower Hill site.

Mr. WILKINS stated that the Port of London Authority had taken two-and-a-half acres on which to build new offices quite close to the suggested site. This would entirely change the character of the district, and would very largely increase the value of the site.

Mr. R. LESLIE considered the site to be much better than that on which the Institution of Engineers and Shipbuilders in Scotland had erected a building at a cost of £60,000. Personally, he had not experienced the objections that were alleged against the site, and he did not think they had much force. As to the expense, he had ascertained the cost of three rooms of ordinary size in Fenchurch Street, for which £480 per annum was charged. The Committee were very much indebted to Mr. Rosenthal, who had brought the matter before them. As Chairman of the Committee, he could say they had spent a great deal of valuable time on the subject, and he would be very sorry if their efforts proved to be wasted.

Mr. ADAMS put forward as a second consideration the question of endeavouring to obtain premises in Devonshire Square, close to Liverpool Street Station. With regard to annual subscriptions, he said the Institute was primarily for sea-going engineers, many of whom would not be in a position to increase the amount.

Mr. R. BALFOUR suggested that an objection to the site might be the noise caused by the heavy traffic.

Mr. F. M. TIMPSON agreed with Mr. Milton that much more support would be obtained if a definite scheme were put before the members. He did not think much objection could be urged to the district, as it was now very different to what it was a few years ago.

Mr. K. C. BALES said he knew the district fairly well and he did not attach any importance to the objections raised as to the suitability of the site. The fact of the Port of London Authority putting up their large new offices near at hand would improve it in value.

Mr. D. HULME proposed that the meeting should be adjourned

for the members to have more opportunity of viewing the site.

It was pointed out that it would be difficult to obtain the site if the matter were further delayed.

THE PRESIDENT pointed out that the Resolution to be proposed that evening would not commit them definitely, if passed. For such a Special Resolution to be carried into effect it would require to be confirmed at another General Meeting, of which due notice would be given. This would leave time for them to view the site and consider the matter further. They had had a good indication of the cost of sites elsewhere, and even to carry this through would require more money. He knew of many who would subscribe as soon as a definite scheme was proposed. He considered it desirable that they should carry the resolution and leave it to the next meeting to decide finally.

Mr. Hulme's proposal for adjournment was not seconded.

Mr. LESLIE then proposed the following Special Resolution :—

The City Premises General Committee having advised the acquisition of a Site in Tower Hill, London, E.C., for the erection of City Premises, the Council of the Institute are hereby authorized to take the necessary steps for securing that Site for the purposes of the Institute; the Site to be obtained on conditions giving the right in perpetuity, if possible; but if not, upon a lease for ninety-nine years.

In seconding the motion, Mr. MILTON pointed out that, if carried, it would have to be submitted for confirmation at a further meeting before it could be acted upon. The last sentence had been added to the resolution as printed in the notice sent to the members, as the possibility of obtaining the lease in perpetuity was not known when the notice was sent out.

Mr. SHANKS thought it would be very reasonable to pass the resolution on this understanding, as it would give the members an opportunity of considering the matter further before the next meeting.

The motion was then put and declared carried, with one dissentient. Mr. Ross afterwards stated that he would have been pleased to have made the vote unanimous, but he was not quite clear on the financial aspect.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that at present about £8,000 was available in money and promises. If £6,000 or £7,000 more were raised, the only annual charge upon the property would be about £60.

Mr. LESLIE pointed out that in the figures quoted by Mr. Hallett the rates upon the present building had not been taken into account, and there were other items of expenditure for upkeep which were being sustained at present. The cost of having meetings in the City would not be incurred, and the Lecture Hall was also a possible source of revenue.

On the Chairman declaring the meeting closed, a hearty vote of thanks was accorded to him on the proposal of Mr. SHANKS, seconded by Mr. BALFOUR.

Minutes of Proceedings

AT AN

Extraordinary General Meeting

HELD AT THE LIVERPOOL STREET HOTEL, E.C.,

on Friday, June 28, 1912,

TO CONFIRM A RESOLUTION AUTHORISING THE ACQUISITION
OF A SITE FOR PROPOSED CITY PREMISES.

CHAIRMAN: MR. R. LESLIE, R.N.R. (Vice-President).

THE HON. SECRETARY of the City Premises Committee read the notice convening the meeting; also the Minutes of the Extraordinary General Meeting held on June 13.

A statement from the Architect was then read, as follows :

I have marked on the Ordnance Sheet in light pink the Street Widening which has taken place immediately surrounding the proposed site. Within the last few years numbers of houses have been demolished to give place for wider roads, and in those remaining the leases have run out and they are now let on short tenancies, pending a convenient opportunity of placing them in the market for building leases.

I think it will be found that as soon as building operations are commenced the property adjoining would come into the market for rebuilding. Negotiations for this have already been commenced.

The neighbourhood is increasing in value and the character is changing rapidly.

Within a few weeks from now, within 300 yards of the Site, the Port of London Authority are starting on a re-building scheme covering 2½ acres. A competition has been held among some of the leading architects for a complete scheme of fine buildings, which cannot but rapidly enhance the value of the surrounding property.

It was suggested at the last meeting that I should inquire as to any available sites in Fenchurch Street or close by. I have ascertained that there is a large site which has not yet been put in the market, and the owners would consider disposing of say, about 4,000 square feet of this, but the price they ask freehold is £20 per square foot. Taking the same area as the Tower Hill site, this land would cost £54,000 freehold.

The CHAIRMAN said the members had now had an opportunity of viewing the proposed site and it was very desirable that the question of acquiring it or not should be determined that evening. In his view it was a site very suitable to marine engineers, and one such as could seldom be obtained in London. Although only a small percentage of the members had subscribed to the Fund, he thought many were waiting until a definite scheme was brought forward. He hoped members would discuss the matter thoroughly, with the best interests of the Institute at heart.

Mr. P. SMITH considered the site an ideal one for the requirements of the Institute, although, unfortunately, the locality was not very good. They were assured by the Architect, however, that if they went further West the cost would be three times as great, and he did not think the finances of the Institute would bear any greater expense than the present scheme involved. He did not think it would be a bad investment, and personally, he would be prepared to support the scheme.

In reply to a question by Mr. E. PULL, Mr. MATHER stated that the amount subscribed, as per the printed list, was £5,000; the amount of £8,000 mentioned at the previous meeting included the amount of the Institute investments which could be realized.

Mr. R. H. DALTON said he did not see anything mentioned with regard the furnishings, which would amount to £500 or £600.

Mr. TIMPSON said that, personally, he had no objection to the

proposed site, but he considered that there should be a better representation of the opinion of the members on the subject.

Mr. W. McLAREN considered the efforts of the Committee to be worthy of support, and he thought there was no doubt that the members would contribute as soon as there was a scheme in view. The situation was very suitable, as it was near the docks and the river. Another consideration was that it was open on all sides.

Mr. J. E. ELMSLIE said that he quite approved of the site ; but the expenses would come to about £600 per year, whereas the balance on last year's account was £160. He asked how this expense was to be met.

Mr. RUCK-KEENE said it was a question of meeting an expense of £300, not £600. The proposed site was not the best they would like ; but it was a question of £300 against £900 in a more favourable position. There was no doubt the neighbourhood had undergone a great change in the last few years, and it would undergo a still greater change when the Port of London Authority erected their new offices. He instanced the change in character and value of the surrounding property through the erection of the present offices of Lloyd's Register. With regard to obtaining a more representative gathering, each member had received an invitation to attend both meetings, and it was very doubtful if anything would be gained by putting the matter off.

Mr. A. ROBERTSON spoke in favour of the proposal to purchase the lease in perpetuity. If the amount of £6,700 was subscribed for this purpose, instead of an annual charge of £357, it would be one of £50 to £100 only. From the point of view of an investment, it seemed to be a perfectly sound proposal.

Mr. J. H. ROSENTHAL said that, at the last Annual Dinner, the President expressed the view that the present premises were hardly worthy of the Institute and that something should be done to lift it on to a more prominent plane. Their Past-President, Mr. James Denny, had asked him if he would help on the scheme, and he had said he would be very pleased to be associated with the Committee in bringing the matter to a business-like issue. The matter had been before the members

for some time and they had arrived at a point where, unless they told people who were likely to subscribe that they were on the point of putting up a building, it would not be easy to obtain any more money. As to the financial aspect, it was perfectly certain that many Institutes had started schemes under far less flourishing conditions. He had approached a good many people and had got subscriptions from a few ; but he had not approached one-hundredth of the number he could approach if a building scheme were in view. To hesitate to proceed with the matter on account of lack of financial support would be tantamount to saying they were not the people to go on with it and that it would be better to hand back those subscriptions already received. So far as the site was concerned, marine engineers had their calling in the docks or round that district, and would be more inclined to go to some place of convenient access than to the West End. It was quite near to the stations, and it was astonishing to him that the site could be obtained so cheaply. He did not see much advantage in acquiring the perpetual lease ; but in any case the 99 years' lease could be obtained with a proviso that the perpetual lease could be acquired at any future time if considered desirable. Full particulars of the scheme, with illustrations of the proposed building, had been sent to each member, and if they did not attend the meeting it must be assumed that they were either in favour of it or at any rate lukewarm on the matter. The criticisms on the locality might be justified, but one could not expect West End conditions for a small sum of money.

Mr. J. BLACKETT said he fully endorsed what Mr. Rosenthal had said.

Mr. R. BALFOUR agreed with Mr. Ruck-Keene as to the effect of erecting good property in a poor district, and he could understand that the acquisition of the proposed site would be a good financial investment. From the financial point of view he did not think there was anything to fear.

Mr. P. SMITH raised the question as to whether it was proposed to make the new premises a club for engineers.

Mr. JAS. SHANKS said he was willing to go with the majority, but he had not altered his views as expressed at last meeting,

and thought with Mr. Timpson that the matter should be considered by all the members before a decision was arrived at.

Mr. G. ADAMS said that after listening to the various speakers, and particularly to Mr. Rosenthal, his opinions on the subject had been modified. It appeared that it was not possible to get another position suitable to their needs and therefore they would have to do the best with the material they had at hand. They had now a membership of 1,200 and he thought they would require at least 500 more members to ensure the necessary income that would be required. He was convinced that the site was a cheap one as compared with others in the vicinity. He did not think the members wanted a club element with a licence; but suggested that the basement, instead of being used for offices, might be let to a firm of caterers. He thought the best they could do under the circumstances was to accept the scheme, and he expressed their thanks to Mr. Rosenthal for his efforts in getting, in so short a time, a practical expression of the Institute before them.

Mr. J. G. HAWTHORN said that from the earliest years of the Institute it had been their ambition to have a domicile in the City of London. The meetings at Stratford were not attended as they should be, and he thought the scheme proposed would be very suitable to the sea-going members. He did not see how a better scheme could be arranged from a financial standpoint. He did not think that the Stratford premises should be given up entirely; but thought rooms might be rented at a small charge.

Mr. G. W. NEWALL said he had come determined to dislike the whole matter, but after listening to the arguments put forward he thought it was a matter they would be quite safe in adopting. To his mind, the Institute seemed to be undergoing a change, and there was a conflict the two phases represented, the scientific and the social. He thought the scheme as offered to them was a very good one and he would support it.

Mr. MATHER, referring to the question of the club element, said the matter had been considered at a meeting of the Committee, when it had been decided that, for the present, the facilities in this respect should only be such as were at present obtainable at the present premises.

Mr. W. E. FAREN DEN said that, in view of the small attendances at the meetings at Stratford, he was convinced that premises in the City were necessary. He had not been favourably impressed with the position of the site, but after hearing of the developments likely to take place, he did not think they could do better than adopt the recommendation of the Committee. He considered Mr. Adams' suggestion to let the basement to refreshment caterers would be a very good method of reducing the expenses of upkeep.

Mr. ADAMS pointed out that the question of taking the perpetual lease for 99 years' lease had not been discussed. He suggested that if the 99 years' lease were taken, part of the responsibility would be left to their successors.

The CHAIRMAN said he quite agreed that part of the responsibility should be left to future members; but the matter was of secondary importance and could be settled later. With regard to the number present, 967 notices had been sent to members, and they must take it that silence gave consent.

Mr. A. ROBERTSON stated that by purchasing the perpetual lease it would prevent a further increase in the ground rent, which would probably be imposed at the end of the 99 years. The important point, however, was that there would be an annual charge of £305 per annum and the Institute funds at present would not meet that charge. Therefore he thought they should adopt the bolder scheme and endeavour to obtain the £5,000 or £6,000 required, to obtain, as far as possible, what was equivalent to the freehold.

Mr. J. T. MILTON then proposed the Resolution, as follows:—

The City Premises General Committee having advised the acquisition of a Site in Tower Hill, London, E.C., for the erection of City Premises, the Council of the Institute are hereby authorized to take the necessary steps for securing that Site for the purposes of the Institute; the Site to be obtained on conditions giving the right in perpetuity if possible, but, if not, upon a lease for 99 years.

Mr. Milton stated that the Resolution should be carried exactly as it stood. There would be very little difference in the cost of the two schemes, as, in the event of the 99 years' lease being obtained, provision would have to be made for a Sinking

Fund for the redemption of the lease. With regard to the second scheme, as mentioned by Mr. Robertson, if a considerable sum of money was still received, the expenses would not be £305 more than the present expenses. He felt certain there would be a good deal of support given when once the scheme was started. The City Premises scheme was impressed upon them by the general membership and not by a few, and the interest in the scheme was not to be judged by the attendance at that meeting.

Mr. HAWTHORN suggested that the question of a 99 years' lease or a perpetual lease should be the subject of a resolution as to which should take precedence ; but it was pointed out that, to comply with the statutory requirements, the motion should be passed as resolved upon at the preceding meeting.

The Resolution was then seconded by Mr. ROSENTHAL.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Mr. MATHER to read a letter from the President, Mr. SUMMERS HUNTER, as follows :

June 25, 1912.

DEAR MR. ADAMSON,—

Thanks for yours of the 21st. I have to be in London to-day (Tuesday) and to-morrow (Wednesday) and may have to return North again on Thursday, in which case I shall not be able to attend the Meeting on Friday evening, and if I am not at the Meeting I will be glad if the Secretary will kindly read this letter as expressing my views upon the position with regard to the new premises, etc.

At the Meeting which I attended on Thursday evening, 13th inst., I felt it my duty to emphasize the good works done by the Institute in the past, and also to point out how this work might be increased in the future, provided adequate financial support was forthcoming. After much consideration, I feel that we should be more certain of this financial support, before committing ourselves to an expenditure, whatever form that expenditure may take, whether as an annual cost or by payment of a lump sum.

It has been said that the membership of the Institute could be increased, and personally I have held that view myself, but I must say that it was modified when I realized what had taken place at Cardiff, and, I believe, at Liverpool, as a result of which I do not think we can expect an increase of membership in these ports ; and although we might get a few members from the North-East Coast and the Clyde, still, it would not be sufficient to meet the increased annual expenditure necessary for the new buildings.

It further appears to me that, in the past, reasonable efforts have been made to increase the membership in London, but possibly more members might be got there. Yet this can only be to a limited extent, and we

ought to have some knowledge as to the number of new members before counting upon their subscriptions.

With regard to raising a lump sum of money to purchase a site and erect buildings, this to me seems the most likely scheme to succeed, but here again I cannot help feeling that we ought to have a large proportion of the money in hand, either by definite promises or actual cash, before committing ourselves to purchase within a definite time.

With reference to making the new buildings into a sort of Club, I do not see how this is going to improve our financial position; in fact, it might lead to a further increased annual expenditure.

If, on further consideration, new buildings are decided upon, then my personal feeling is that we should get a substantial proportion of the money together, or, at any rate, as much of it as would leave the annual cost something that the Institute could meet in a reasonable way.

I am not losing sight of the fact that the Institute was primarily started for the benefit of sea-going engineers, and we cannot but realize that the Institute has been well supported by those in charge of the engineers—both Owners and Superintendents and Consulting Marine Engineers as well. Further, I believe that the same sources will continue to support the Institute, and, I should say, to an increased extent. Also, I believe that Marine Engine-builders, and probably Shipbuilders, who at present do not actively support the Institute will do so in the future, when they realize that the Institute has done such excellent work in the past, and that possibly more important work lies before it in the future.

With regard to the site, opinions appear to be divided as to the suitability of it, and it seemed to me as if the Owners were rather pressing for our acceptance. I imagine that, before coming to a definite decision, a report of what took place at the Meeting, together with a statement of the financial proposals, should be in the hands of the members for a few days; in fact, it may be desirable that, as sea-going engineers form the bulk of the membership, they should have an opportunity of considering the position: however, the Special Committee will know more about this than I do.

As mentioned to Mr. Leslie, and also to yourself, it seems to me desirable that we should have the opinions of the surviving Past-Presidents on the position, and if this suggestion is agreed to I will be glad to write them, and, if possible, see them personally; but before doing this, I would like to have a statement of the position to send with my letter.

I am sure every one will agree that the Committee have carried out a difficult task admirably, but before committing ourselves to the scheme, we should be sure of the finances.

This rather seems to indicate that a further postponement may be necessary.

I am,

Yours faithfully,

SUMMERS HUNTER.

Mr. MILTON said he was rather surprised to see Mr. Hunter's letter, as, to some extent, it threw cold water on the scheme;

but, as they would observe, he said he did not see that the scheme should be proceeded with unless they had the money. They had sufficient money to carry out the scheme ; although the annual charge was a question to be considered. It was true that they had not as many members on the Bristol Channel as they ought to have, but he understood there were many in Cardiff who were disposed to join, and it only required some influential member there to discuss the matter. Sir John Gunn, who was a Cardiff gentleman and a Past-President, had subscribed 100 guineas to the Fund, and had assured him that considerable support could be obtained from Cardiff ship-owners. He did not understand why they had not more members in Liverpool, but probably it was due to the presence of a local Engineering Society. He considered, however, that Liverpool was a good recruiting ground.

Mr. SHANKS said he had started the criticism of the scheme and he thought it had raised a very interesting discussion, which had enlightened them a great deal as to what the Committee had done. It was quite clear to every one now that this scheme must be accepted or the whole thing dropped, which would be most deplorable. It had been the aim of the Institute to have City Premises, and he was satisfied that this was the only scheme possible. He would like to see the voting unanimous in its favour.

Mr. P. S. DOHERTY said that as one who also spoke against the scheme at the last meeting, although he did not like the site any better, he had come to the conclusion that it was the only one possible. He agreed with Mr. Shanks that it was to be either this scheme or the whole thing must drop, and if it went through he would give it his hearty support.

The motion was then put to the meeting and carried nem. con., three-quarters of the members voting for the motion and none against.

Mr. MATHER stated that he had seen Mr. James Denny in London a week or two ago, and he had expressed himself very strongly in favour of the proposed scheme.

A vote of thanks was accorded to Mr. Rosenthal for his valuable services in bringing the matter before the Institute.

The meeting closed with a vote of thanks to the Chairman, on the proposal of Mr. HAWTHORN, seconded by Mr. TIMPSON.