I have had the pleasure of working as a Professional Engineer (P.E.) in local government for the past 40 years, from far north Queensland to Tasmania.

Over the past 20 years or so I have observed, with concern, the decline in the size of the pool of P.E.s (and associates/technicians) that rural councils can access.

The result is that it is almost impossible for these councils to obtain in-house technical expertise; they either 'ignore' the problem or outsource it, at considerable cost and inconvenience.

By ignoring the problem, infrastructure 'whole-of-life' costs are substantially increased. Small councils are particularly likely to fall into this category. \*\*\*
By 'outsourcing' the technical advice, the same 'level of service' is rarely obtained and the cost is almost always considerably more. \*\*\*

\*\*\* Hence economic development is not nearly as cost-effective and safety is potentially jeopardised.

## **Medium/Long-term Solution**

If the Federal Government financially encourages the training of a sufficient number of P.E.s and associates at Universities and TAFEs, the benefit/cost ratio will be very positive as 'whole-of-life'

costs of development and existing infrastructure will be substantially reduced. The objective should be a slight surplus of P.E.s and technicians; this is far more cost-effective overall than the

current practice of aiming for short-term lower costs without considering the long-term effects of the lack of expertise (Economic Rationalism).

## **Short-term Band-aid**

Attract more experienced P.E.s from overseas.

## Conclusion

If we do not take immediate steps to increase the numbers of P.E.s and technicians to be available for all levels of government, we are not being smart; and the overall cost to the nation will be astronomic!

## **Harry Seccombe**