

justment of differences with employees, preserving the rights of both parties. By injunctions they have fought the boycott and through representations to legislatures they have opposed vigorously its legalizing. They have sought, generally by lawful means, to aid the regularly constituted officials and machinery of the state in the enforcement of existing laws and the punishment of law-breakers.

#### Strikes Undignified and Unethical

Thirdly and finally, there are the so-called professions, a profession being generally understood to be an occupation involving a liberal education or its equivalent, and mental rather than manual labor. The professions, too, have their associations for professional advancement and for individual and collective protection. One function is the dissemination of professional knowledge; another is the control of the educational qualifications of their members and the admission to their ranks. They discipline their members for breaches of professional ethics and etiquette and for unprofessional or immoral conduct. They have a code of ethics and keep a tariff of fees for professional services which can usually be collected in courts of law. They are recognized by statute in that there are certain services which by law must be performed by members of these professions, and by them alone. They seldom or never resort to the strike. To the professional man the strike is undignified, unethical and unnecessary.

Men engaged in the so-called learned professions have always been held in high esteem individually and collectively in civilized communities, for several reasons. They are usually men of attainment and culture; as a class they identify themselves with the life of the community in which they dwell. They are usually men of exemplary character and conduct and while in many cases their fees are large, there are many instances in which members of the professions have rendered valuable professional services for individuals and communities for which no remuneration was received and none was expected.

#### Unionism's Autocratic Disposition

Between the trade union and the profession there are, then, resemblances and differences. Each endeavors to promote the social and material interests of its members. Each controls or endeavors to control the admission to its ranks and to fix in some degree the rewards which the services of its members can command. The trade union has no code of ethics. Because of the large number of its members, it must command support by more or less autocratic measures. When disputes arise regarding hours of labor, working conditions or wages which do not seem capable of settlement by negotiation, the union has recourse to the strike to force the concession it demands. But strikes cannot be made effective if other men are permitted to take up the tools laid down by the strikers, and a strike involves picketing, persuasion, intimidation and often violence. To force the "unfair" employer to see the error of his way, the boycott is adopted, whereby his shop and its product are declared to the world to be unfair and shunned by all friends of labor. In certain cases the strikers resort to sabotage, or that species of direct action where expense and trouble are made for the employer in order to force his hand.

Engineering is an occupation requiring on the part of those who practice it, more than an ordinary amount of intelligence. It is an occupation in which the empirical gives place to the analytical to a much greater extent than in many lines of human endeavor. On the products of its work, the lives and fortunes of humanity depend. It boasts great traditions. It has tunneled the mountains, bored beneath the sea, conquered the air, made the desert to blossom as the rose. With the work of Watt, Stephenson, Smeaton, Roebing and Baker constituting the background of its history, the engineering profession has a record for achievement surpassed by no other. And with the increasing number of new applications of technology to the carrying out of the world's work, no profession has a future of greater usefulness.

It is a truism that engineers have not been accorded the recognition to which their work entitles them, nor have their emoluments in general been commensurate with the service they render. Like Kipling's immortals, their reward too often is the joy of working, and with Berton Braley, they can say:—

"Though we like our share of treasure and the pleasure that it brings,

It is something else that drives us to our goal;  
It's the triumph of our labor over elemental things,  
And the vision which gives splendor to the whole.  
We are members of an order that is guided on by dreams,  
By the voices of the prophets and the seers,  
And unless you care for service more than money-getting schemes,

You had better never join the engineers."

Being human, engineers naturally aspire to a few of the better things of life. To attain them some have proposed unionization; others, that they seek incorporation so as to acquire the legal status of other professions. The results of unionizing would probably be these: There would be a minimum scale of pay; a day's work in hours and in output would be defined, and the closed shop would follow.

#### "Closed Shops" Among Engineers

The unionized engineer must support his union otherwise his union ceases to function, for who among engineers would support a union that could not conserve for its members the work and the pay that are available? He must therefore refuse to work with non-union men; indeed he must either coerce them into joining his union or he must eliminate them altogether. All engineering offices must therefore be closed to the non-union man.

The unionized engineer further must boycott all equipment, structures or plant tainted by non-unionism. The chief engineer of the Hydro-Electric Power Commission, for example, could not recommend to his commissioners the acceptance of tenders for turbines, motors, transformers or transmission towers upon which non-union engineers had been employed. The chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals would refuse to consider tenders for bridges unless the designs were by unionized engineers. If this seems fanciful, just reflect that any union that does not embrace the great body of the craft workers must fail of its purpose. The necessary means to this end are the closed shop and the boycott. And to these a very large number of engineers who object to unionizing on principle, and most of the employers, are opposed. It would be intolerable to free men everywhere. Government departments and government commissions, both large employers of engineers, would have both the power and desire to fight it, and they would. It would be bound to fail.

#### Coerciveness vs. Fine Sentiments

Finally, how would one reconcile the coercive methods of the union with that fine sentiment appearing monthly on the front page of the institute's journal which asserts that the function of the institute is "to develop and maintain higher standards in the engineering profession and to enhance the usefulness of the profession to the public?" Or, how could one square it with the definition of the illustrious Tredgold that engineering is the adaptation of the great forces in nature to the use and convenience of man?

Let us consider what the effect on the average citizen would be if he learned that the physicians or the clergymen or the editors of his community had become unionized and had adopted the tactics of unions. Would he feel that they had exalted their callings? Could he bring himself to believe that such a step would be consistent with the professions of men who shape to some extent the intellectual well-being of a community? I am afraid he could not. And similarly for engineers, unionization would be a fatal blunder.

But another, and a better way lies before. Engineering may become a profession, since it is unwise to become a trade. Engineers might have had legal protection ere this had they been less silent, and I believe that they can get it to-day if