## editoria

Tis not whether it is better to unionize but ...

## One union? Two unions? Three unions?


alter this situation to the detriment of the students. Having reiterated some of the points against faculty unionization we now have to take the realistic view and admit, that cespite student feelings on the
matter, a union is inevitable
It seems that if there has to be a union, let there only be one. Consider the following possibility What would happen if there were three unions and the Association of Engineers and Foresters decided to strike. Several
engineers are taking three or so electives in arts. Do they or do they not go to classes? And what or how will this affect their degree? Do other profs cross picket lines?
Another important point to consider is that a "leapfrogging" effect could become a distinct possibility with three unions on campus. This could come about as a result of one union going to
the bargaining tables for a pay increase of, shall we say 8 per cent. Then, once having achieved their goal and gone away satisfied, another of the unions sees what has been done and decides to ask for a 9 per cent increase. Meanwhile the third union, seeing the other two getting their pay increases, also decides to ask for an increase of shall we say 10 per cent. The next thing you know is that the original union wants to go back to bargaining for an extra 2 per cent. Not only will this mean that the administration will be tied up with unions all year, which could mean more personnel to deal with the increased workload, but where are the students going to be when everyone is tied up trying to get more money?
While the case may be somewhat overstated, we do see the above Brunswickan dos not brunswin more than one union that any more than one union sensible.

