

of the highest calibre, frequently use the services of an agent in selling their product.

George Powell enquired whether, in case of unionization, employing engineers would occupy the same position as foremen in the organization of a union; that is, whether they would cease to be active in the union as soon as they became employers of other engineers.

G. A. McCarthy related an instance of the effectiveness of unionization. The locomotive engineers in New Brunswick organized a union in 1875, and were immediately dismissed, but two months later they were reinstated by the government and paid for all the time they had lost.

#### "For Board and Car-Fare"

E. M. Proctor drew a comparison between engineers and physicians and lawyers. He said that engineers are at a disadvantage because their profession is not closed, but he claimed that the young engineer is more prosperous than the young physician or lawyer, who has to work at the outset of his career for practically no salary at all. He also stated that he had been approached by several engineers who expect to graduate at the University of Toronto this year, who are willing to work for little more than their board and car-fare.

Prof. C. R. Young claimed that unionization would involve a levelling process that would be incompatible with the ideals of the engineering profession. He declared that an engineer's best work is frequently done outside of office hours. He feared that unionization would result in restriction of hours of labor and output. He strongly advocated legislation closing the profession, but at the same time expressed the opinion that some more effective measures would have to be adopted to improve the status of engineers. While unfavorable to the formation of a trade union, Prof. Young stated a belief that some organized effort can be made that will be entirely within the bounds of professional ethics. In order to find a solution for the problem, he introduced the following motion:—

"Whereas, by reason of inadequate compensation, salaried engineers are now working under exceptionally trying economic conditions, which in some cases amount to hardship;

"And whereas many engineers in the Toronto district are convinced that these conditions can be ameliorated only by direct, organized effort, and that immediate remedial measures are imperative;

"And whereas the Engineering Institute must either promptly face the issue and grapple with it or stand aside and permit newer and perhaps foreign associations to press the claims of the engineers in this country for economic consideration;

"Therefore, be it resolved, that this branch urge headquarters of the institute to forthwith request all branches to appoint committees of not less than five members, with power to add to their number, to thoroughly investigate and report through the various branches to headquarters upon the structure and constitution of an organization designed to bring into operation direct and concerted efforts toward the improvement of the economic status of engineers; and that, if practicable, headquarters defray all expenses of these committees in the matter of holding hearings and obtaining stenographic reports of evidence."

Thomas Taylor seconded this motion, which was subsequently adopted.

#### Disappointed in Institute's Achievements

H. A. Goldman opposed the statement that the Engineering Institute is doing all that engineers could desire in connection with increased salaries, and claimed that he and others who, a year or two ago, contemplated the formation of a society with the object of increasing salaries, are disappointed in the results so far achieved in this direction by the institute.

George Clark advocated legislation rather than unionization.

Prof. Gillespie then summed up for the negative, very briefly, on account of the lateness of the hour. Mr. Snaith

replied, that the essence of Mr. Gillespie's remarks was that by joining a union, engineers would be giving up freedom of action. Mr. Snaith declared that the only way that a man can be perfectly free is to go to a desert island and become a hermit. It is a question of giving up a certain amount of freedom in exchange for money. He opposed Mr. Gillespie's claim that engineers would have to adopt all the tactics of labor unions, and said that he had no doubt that if engineers form a union, they will continue to act as professional men. "Although unions have made mistakes, they have no monopoly in this respect," declared Mr. Snaith. "Little can be gained by pointing out the mistakes that have been made by specific unions, because this can be readily balanced by the fact that men of greater ability and education have made even worse mistakes."

#### ONTARIO'S ROAD-BUILDING PROGRAM\*

BY HON. F. C. BIGGS

*Ontario's Minister of Public Works and Highways*

**T**O-DAY Ontario is faced with a different situation regarding roads than ever before. There are three or four outstanding features. First, there is an acute shortage of labor, which necessitates quick and short lines of transportation. Time is very important, and also it is very important that production—if it is possible to increase it in this province—should be carefully watched. I do not think there is any one thing to-day that will tend more to relieve the unrest which is so prevalent in the rural districts, than good roads to the door of every farmer, so far as possible.

We have a great deal of good roads legislation on our statute books, but the traffic has changed; it is becoming much heavier, and many of the old acts and laws are inadequate to meet our changed conditions. We must wake up and get a twentieth century policy that will meet circumstances as they stand to-day. We must also have a policy that will bear evenly on all the people of this province. When I say evenly, I mean money that is used in the development of this policy must be derived from uniform sources as near as possible, and the distributing of this money for road purposes must be carried out in such a manner that all those who contribute will receive their fair share of that expenditure.

So far as provincial roads are concerned, there are two sources of revenue: First, the source that has been made possible by the Dominion parliament's setting aside \$20,000,000 to be spent over a period of five years, of which Ontario receives approximately \$6,000,000. Last year there was spent on provincial highways in Ontario about \$1,250,000, but I see no possible way of getting the Dominion government to take care of 40% of that expenditure.

We must keep our road system balanced in mileage, expenditure and benefit. The late provincial government designated 422 miles of provincial highways in Ontario up to the time they gave up office. This road is largely a trunk road, serving, on a large portion of the route, a one-sided population; that is to say, the road practically from Toronto to Quebec serves only the people to the north of that road. The road from Hamilton to London serves both sides, but a system of that kind would never derive the benefit for the people of this province, the taxpayers, that we are looking for, and to have this system evenly balanced I have made up my mind that it will take 1,824.7 miles to do it at the present time.

The class of construction that will be followed by the government is largely a business undertaking, the same as taking the roads over. A limited system of provincial roads will never be popular. A comprehensive system of trunk or provincial roads has been clearly demonstrated in the United States as the only system that will become popular with

\*Address at the 18th annual meeting of the Ontario Good Roads Association, March 3rd, 1920.