

the editor makes the following statement: "The best solution of the difficulty would probably be to lease the road to private capital on a percentage basis, with a guarantee as to the maintenance in good order of equipment, road bed, etc. Failing satisfactory arrangement of this kind, the road should be put under control of a competent and independent commission, if such an one could be obtained. The trouble is that as things are being run now it would be almost impossible to obtain such a commission. We might get honest commissioners, but would they know how to handle the railroad if they were not practical railway men. *On the other hand, if they were practical railway men, what assurance is there that they would not be bound to the party wheels, and thus consciously or unconsciously run things, much in fact as they are now being run, with an eye more or less upon the politics of the day?* Recent disclosures of graft and dishonesty in high places certainly do not hold out much hope of relief, through Government by commission, because of the not altogether unwarranted assumption that the commission might be influenced politically." The reflection here made on the sheep is not sufficient to cast a dark shadow over the whole flock. There are men with low standards in other professions, but the number is so small that no man would be warranted in casting such a reflection on the profession as a whole, as the one referred to. In referring to *other* professions the assumption is made that engineering is also a profession. While this is not strictly true, it is nevertheless customary to refer to engineers as professional men. This custom can do no harm, but on the other hand it should encourage us to so maintain our relations with the public that the reference will be merited. The relation between the clergyman and his parishioner, the physician and his patient, the lawyer and his client, are regarded by law as sacred and inviolable. If engineering is to merit the status of a profession, those men who profess to be engineers must assume the same obligations with respect to their clients. The public regards engineering in its various branches as a special subject, not easily within the grasp of the layman. It therefore places itself in trust in the hands of the engineer in the same way as the patient places himself in the hands of the doctor. He is thus placed under the utmost moral obligation to respect that trust. It follows that if a man professes to be an engineer, he must necessarily profess at the same time to maintain a high ethical standard in his relations with the public. It is because men think they can profess the former without the latter, that we have such public reflections as the one referred to.

The moral duties of the engineer are threefold: First, his duty to his client; second, his duty to the public; and third, his duty to the profession.

His Duty to His Client.—This, of course, is the most important obligation to be considered, and the one which must have preference to all others if there is a conflict. It is hardly necessary to say that the client is entitled to the very best thought and service of which the engineer is capable. The essential principles involved in the relations between the two are the same as those existing in the older professions, although there are many circumstances which call for the employment of special means to properly maintain these principles. It is well known, for instance, that many engineers have affiliations with engineering or manufac-