

they go after it in the right way. With hundreds of educated, bright and capable men in its ranks, with men of vision and capacity among its members, with a record for fine service in the past and an outlook for greater usefulness in the future, no government will refuse to grant to engineers what it has already granted to physicians, lawyers and dentists. Chartered accountants have acquired a measure of legal status where a few years previously they had none, simply by concerted, articulate transactions. Dentists, whose occupation is manual and mechanical to a very large degree, have obtained the professional status because they presented their case to a public that was open to reason and was prepared to act soon it was convinced. As engineers are we willing to become a trade union where we might be a profession? Are we willing to sacrifice our birthright for a mess of pottage? Are we going to grasp the shadow when we might have the substance?

A policy of coercion will fail where enlightened publicity and judicious propaganda will succeed. There is a story of a man who was night after night disturbed by a howling dog in front of his house. One night, no longer being able to endure the racket, he ran out in his nightshirt to silence the dog, in spite of the fact that it was bitterly cold. When he failed to return in an hour, his wife went out to look for him. She found him full length upon the snow, stiff and cold, holding on to the dog's tail. "What in the world are you trying to do," she asked. In a weak voice he answered: "I am freezing the damned thing to death." Had he been as resourceful as he was patient, he might have found a better way out of his trouble.

Summary

I am opposed to the unionizing of engineers: (1) Because I believe it would be impossible to get more than half the available membership to support unionization.

2. That being the case, in order that the advantages of unionization may accrue to the unionized membership, it will be necessary to enforce the closed shop.

3. The strike and sympathetic strike are means of coercion which we as engineers cannot entertain. It is entirely possible that because of dissatisfaction in one section of the country, all engineers, regardless of classification or locality, would be called out, although they might have no grievance of their own. And just here let it be stated that nothing has alienated public sympathy from labor unions in the past quite as much as the sympathetic strike.

4. Another sequel to this will be that unionized engineers must refuse to recommend or instal any appliance upon which non-union engineers have been employed.

5. The engineers of Canada now have in the Engineering Institute and other allied associations everything that they might hope to secure by unionization except whatever might accrue through the strike as a weapon.

6. By unionizing, engineers would prostitute an ancient, honorable and respected calling to the level of a trade. By endorsing the coercive method, we would accept the creed that between those who perform expert service and those who profit thereby, there is inevitable warfare, and that an appreciative public opinion does not exist. This, in my opinion, is not borne out by the facts.

7. We would be ignoring the principle that interests of the general public are greater than those of either employer or employee.

8. I believe that legal protection for engineers in Ontario is attainable, for I refuse to believe that from a government that grants protection to dentists and veterinary surgeons, that taxes the consumer in order to bonus a desirable industry, that refuses to tolerate the unqualified teacher in the humblest of our rural schools, the protection of professional engineers cannot be obtained. Further, that if it be not obtained, the fault will be ours, not that of the public or the public's accredited representatives.

9. I believe that the use of a crude weapon is usually an acknowledgment that the user cannot command a finer one. I believe that to unionize engineers would be to declare to the world that we as a class possess nothing that is

distinctive or worthy in education, training, attainments, traditions or capacity for altruistic endeavor.

10. While neither the unionizing nor the professionalizing of engineers will ensure work where work is not to be had, nor fees where consulting services are not required, I believe that the latter will secure everything that the former will obtain, and with infinitely greater credit to engineers as a class, and with their almost unanimous approval.

"YES," DECLARES WILLIAM SNAITH

(Continued from page 281)

eration and the like, and in the second place because in union there is strength.

It is practical because it has already produced results among engineers and because it has produced results among other callings.

Unionization, in the third place, is necessary for six reasons: (1) Salaries are too low and can be raised; (2) because the world needs engineers and is not likely to get them unless salaries are raised; (3) it is necessary, very necessary, because other agencies have failed; (4) unionization has never failed in the long run; (5) unionization is necessary because, as was said in the old "tea-party" days, if we do not hang together we shall hang separately; and (6) it is necessary because it is founded on correct principles.

Unionization is Advisable

As to the advisability of unionization, the statement that it binds by strong ties, and that in union there is strength, call for little in the way of proof, and it would be necessary to place before you a concrete proposal for the formation of a union, let us say affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, before it would be worth while to amplify this phase of the subject. We shall probably reap more benefit by proceeding to our other points.

Unionization is Practical

I have said that unionization has produced results among engineers, and as proof I would submit that in the International Federation of Technical Engineers and Draughtsmen, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, there are over 4,000 civil, electrical and mechanical engineers, besides some 3,000 naval architects and a few thousand draughtsmen, all highly trained, technical men, graduated from almost every university in America. There are 39 unions, scattered over America from coast to coast. In the National Federation of Federal Employees, which is also affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, there are more than 5,000 civil, mechanical and mining engineers, besides some 6,000 school teachers and 55,000 others, among whom are many professional men and women. The Chicago union has grown to such a point that the architectural men in the union expect this year to have the union label used on all plans and specifications, and they further expect to be backed up in this by the Building Trades Council, so that no union men will work from any but union label plans.

Some will almost instinctively oppose such an action, but the proposed legislation which the Engineering Institute is apparently anxious to secure, is based on the same fundamental principle.

Unionization is practical because it has produced results among other callings. A classic example of this is the pay of bricklayers; but the locomotive engineers and firemen, together with the other great "brotherhoods," are a still better example on account of the high tone which they have managed to give their organizations. I need not go into details in this connection. It is not pleasant for engineers to read a statement of salaries paid to the operating department of the railways and contrast it with that paid to engineers.

Unionization is Necessary

1. Unionization is necessary because salaries are not only lower among engineers than among a number of trades, but they are actually and positively too low, regardless of