

I believe that an engineer in a union can be as impressive of manner or character as the best engineer outside of a union, and I think the unionized engineer would be equally excellent, worthy or honorable.

I believe that the profession of engineering after unionization would still involve a liberal education or its equivalent, and mental rather than manual labor, and that it would still call for special mental and other attainments, or special discipline. In other words, I do not believe that the dignity of the profession would be harmed in any way.

I would like to go further and state that the dignity of the profession would be materially enhanced if engineers could be placed in the position that they could afford to devote some of their time and energies to matters outside of their calling, and in this I am not thinking so much of being able to go in for politics, but of such homely matters as educating their families. We are facing a condition at the present time where mechanics are better able to give their children college educations than are professional men.

I might have proposed a solution of what is undeniably a difficulty, and that is the grading of the various members of a union. In this connection I should like to say that there is more than enough material for discussion in this subject alone to take up an entire paper. If the principle is right

the details can without any doubt be worked out. The first attempt may be a partial or complete failure, but the principle will eventually triumph.

I would not like anyone to get the idea that the principle of unionization can be adopted without a struggle and without individual loss and suffering. The first trades unionists faced prison sentences in fighting for their convictions. Later on, they drew down on themselves the ill-will of their employers. It was sufficient that a man belonged to a union for him to lose his job as soon as it was discovered. Some of these men must undoubtedly have had families who depended on them, and it must have been just as much a hardship for the carpenter or machinist who got on a black-list in a particular section and had to leave the town where he lived, as it would be for the engineer to pull up stakes under similar circumstances. Do I think that this would happen if engineers unionized? I have no doubt whatever that it would happen in some cases. I am satisfied that it would not happen to anything like the extent that it happened in the earlier days of the labor movement and still happens in certain sections where labor is struggling for a foothold.

Unionization does not offer engineers something which is easy, and perhaps for that reason, as well as for other reasons, it will attract them.

Toronto Engineers Demand Action on Salaries

Discussion on Unionization Debate Results in Adoption of Motion Urging Engineering Institute to Study Members' Economic Welfare

AT a meeting of the Toronto branch of the Engineering Institute of Canada held last Thursday evening, there was a debate on the question, "Should Engineers Unionize." William Snaith supported the affirmative, delivering an address which appears in full on page 281 of this issue. Prof. Peter Gillespie then spoke on the negative side. Prof. Gillespie's address also appears on page 281. The question was then open for general discussion, following which Prof. Gillespie summed up and Mr. Snaith replied, concluding one of the most interesting meetings ever held by the branch. Following is a condensed report of the general discussion:—

A. W. Connor declared that legislation is needed to prevent unqualified engineers from practicing. Engineering, in his opinion, is different from other professions in that each job is a separate undertaking, and when it is finished the engineer has to look for another.

H. P. Heywood agreed with the principle of unionization, but disliked the idea of using the name "union." He suggested that a society should be formed within the Engineering Institute of Canada to further the financial interests of the members.

William Storrie said that legislation would do practically everything that unionization could be expected to do.

J. R. W. Ambrose stated that he was in sympathy with the idea of unionization. He said that engineers are too much in the habit of wishing for an increase in salaries, but taking no concerted action in this connection. His recent experience with unions had been that he merely received letters from the leaders saying that after a certain date the pay for labor of such a class would be a certain sum, and from time to time further letters advising of additional increases. He said that all that he could do was to instruct the cashier to make the necessary changes in the books. He regretted that this is not the situation with engineers. The average employer, he declared, treats an engineer as a necessary evil.

Legislation the Solution

William Harland agreed with Mr. Storrie that by legislation practically everything could be accomplished that the formation of a union would give to the profession.

Walter P. Merrick urged that engineers should stand aloof from labor. He made an interesting comparison be-

tween the results which might be expected from legislation in the province of Quebec and the lack of such legislation in Ontario.

Willis Chipman said that both of the principal speakers of the evening had presented points with which he agreed. He spoke strongly in favor of legislation and said that the bill now before various legislatures will put the engineering profession in possession of the same rights as are now possessed by lawyers and physicians.

G. W. Winckler related some experiences in the matter of low salaries on railroad work near Winnipeg, and said that until engineers are more fully represented in parliament, they can expect little in the way of legislation on their behalf. He doubted whether there is a single engineer in parliament.

John F. Cassidy said that in Ontario there is one engineer in the provincial parliament, namely, Hon. Manning W. Doherty, minister of agriculture, who is an associate of the Engineering Institute of Canada.

T. T. Black remarked that there is one engineer in the legislature in British Columbia, and that the engineering profession has one representative in the Dominion parliament.

Engineers as Leaven

Frank Barber said that he can see little objection to engineers forming a union, and that if they are allied with labor, the engineers would probably act as leaven to the advantage of labor and the engineers. To show that engineers do not have to be completely organized, he instanced the experience of the Mississippi pilots. He said that he was amazed at Prof. Gillespie's statement that labor unions have no code of ethics, and he gave an instance of lack of ethical conduct on the part of civil engineers. He claimed that the same thing could not have happened among union men.

Prof. H. E. T. Haultain said that legislation is good, but that in order to benefit the profession, it will have to be followed by unionization. He alleged that the school teachers of Ontario have legislation establishing a closed profession, but are probably the poorest paid of all the professions. He said that one of the troubles of the engineer is that he is almost invariably a poor salesman; many other professions do not undertake to market their own services; authors, even