

result, the brains of the man who designs the big bridge have less market value than the instinct of the salesman who supplies the bolts for the structure. And as long as the engineer accepts this as a satisfactory condition, just so long it will exist. Of course, it is going to be a terribly uphill fight, for the engineer, in general, has no great thirst for money. Even now it is his pride as much as anything that spurs him to demand better monetary recognition. How far is he prepared to go in his demands?

The engineering profession have two very definite precedents before them in the medical and legal professions. Time was when both of these were looked upon in much the same light as the general public now regards the engineer. Two factors have brought about the change. A standard was first established, and after that a proper value was set upon that standard. For, we believe, it must be in our own profession. An "engineer" must mean something more than the "expert" who receives his title from the newspaper reporter and, after that, there must be a mutual understanding and recognition among engineers themselves of the value of their services.

Another phase of the engineer's future which Mr. Keith touched upon, and which we have repeatedly advocated, is that he must interest himself in the government of his country. Mr. Keith says: "The lawyer and the politician have admittedly failed to solve the industrial relations of man to man and the relation between capital and labor." How could it be otherwise? The actions of lawyers and doctors are regulated by precedent. Their education consists largely in a study of past experiences. The education of an engineer, on the contrary, consists in an examination of general principles—his after success consists in their application. Every problem in engineering is, in the main, a new one, and so there is developed that attitude of mind, that aptitude and quality of mind, that makes the engineer the logical choice for the solution of most of those problems for

which there is no precedent. Such a one is the relation of labor and capital. Now that our governments are showing signs of recognizing the principle of regulation and control "for the good of the state," no better men could be chosen for the councils of the state than men trained in engineering experience. *Editorial, Electrical News, Dec. 1st.*

"THE ENGINEER IS FAST BECOMING AN ECONOMIST"

Fraser S. Keith, general secretary of the Canadian Society, said in a recent address (see our issue of Dec. 26, p. 540):

"The gradual evolution of the status of the engineer . . . he is fast becoming an economist and an arbiter in industrial problems."

For 12 years this journal has editorially urged engineers not only to study economics, but to reach out for economic leadership, politically and industrially. The idea that the engineer should primarily be an economist was slow in gaining adoption, but now it may be regarded as having received general acceptance by many engineers. The next task is to educate the public to regard the engineer as an industrial and political economist. Mr. Keith says:

"The government and railway official . . . In the meantime it is we who are culpable, not they."

"The newspaper in this country are . . . would prompt them to act and give their hearty support."

"To those of you who have become discouraged . . . and the group of men who wrought the former change will also be responsible for the greater change that is to come."—*Editorial, Engineering and Contracting, Chicago.*