



THE MANITOBA PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER

June, 1967

Bulletin of the Association of Professional Engineers of the
Province of Manitoba

Results of Questionnaire on Collective Bargaining

Although unsolicited, the comments and criticisms received with many of the returned forms are interesting, enlightening, and in some cases, constructive. Some of these comments were obviously written out of a sincere concern for the association and the profession as a whole. Others, however, obviously indicated that self interest was the only motivating force inspiring their presentation.

Criticism is admittedly often healthy and this is particularly so when supported by well reasoned suggestions for improving the condition or situation inspiring such criticism. Like most organizations of a democratic nature, the opportunity for presenting suggestions, the submitting of complaints, and the putting forward of criticism is provided to the membership. The main forum in our Association for those who feel so inspired is, of course, the annual meeting, but another even more available platform is through the medium of this Bulletin. The Bulletin Committee is always ready to accept dissertations from any member who feels he has an axe to grind, a drum to beat, a poem to write (traditional or modern), or a theory to expound upon. From the notations added to the questionnaire by many members, it would appear that there should be no shortage of contributions.

One of the comments submitted which evinced some interest and concern goes as follows:

"The A.P.E.M. is nothing but a pawn in the hands of managerial staff. It does nothing

to protect the engineer. Organizations such as the medical and legal bodies are so far ahead of us in this respect that we are the laugh of the professions. Even the C.L.C. receives more respect than the A.P.E.'s. It is becoming more apparent every day that there is no pride in admitting to being an Engineer. Therefore, these questions are irrelevant."

After reading this comment, I looked over the list of Council members and endeavoured to draw up in my mind a mental picture of each, trying desperately to find one or more who would qualify for the term "pawn in the hands of management," one who would seem to fill the role of the boss's lackey. I was alas, unable to do so.

In any society there are those who would lead and those who would follow. Those who would lead are generally those members of any society or group who have the capabilities for the leadership, those who are prepared to accept the inherent responsibility, those who are inspired to service of their fellow man and their colleagues, those who are willing to carry the load that others are often not willing to bear. The followers fall into two classes: the willing follower and the reluctant follower. The latter being that member of the group who aspires to leadership but who often has not the capabilities necessary for the position. It is usually he who, instead of being content to follow at whatever level his natural abilities allow to him, finds solace for his own shortcomings by directing the barb of cynicism at those who have achieved the leadership.

**Engineers Wish to Stay Professional
See Results of Questionnaire Page 1**

From my observation the members of Council either in their positions within the Association or in their private vocations do not fall into the class of the reluctant follower. The contributor of this comment should check his classification.

It would appear that the person making this criticism of the Association is unaware of the purpose of the Association of Professional Engineers. He seems to feel that it is in some way responsible to provide him with that aura of prestige to which he aspires and to defend him from that ogre he calls 'management'. The prime purpose of the Association is not to provide for the protection of us, as engineers, but rather to protect the public against the incompetent and the false practitioner and to ensure the maintenance of standards.

In general, most of the comments were not directed at a criticism of manager - employee relations, or at the administration of the Association. Some showed a concern that the condoning of collective bargaining on the part of engineers would further erode the status of the professional. As will be shown subsequently in this article this feeling is indicated in general through the answers provided to the questions on the questionnaire. However, one further criticism which would bear some comment is

that implying that, the Association should enforce its own existing policies. The inference here, of course, is that the Association is not doing its job in enforcing regulations. In this regard it might be pointed out that the degree of enforcement that the Association is capable of is in direct relationship to the amount of support supplied by the membership. Further, to enable the Association to take legal action where necessary requires money. To enable the Association to carry out information and educational programmes requires money. To govern the use of engineers and to effect fully the terms of the Engineering Act requires a stewardship on the part of all members and necessitates that actions entered into in respect of infringement of regulations have the backing of those reporting of such infringements. To correct any failings the Association may have in respect of the foregoing and to place the Association in a position of real strength would mean an initial increase in fees. Engineers in the past have not always been willing to support such increases and, until such times as we are prepared to pay fees starting at least at \$50.00 per annum, we cannot be too profound in our criticisms in this regard.

A summary of the replies to the questionnaire is as follows.

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|---------------|----------------------|--|
| Questionnaires mailed to members | | | | 1445 | |
| Questionnaires returned | | | | 669 | |
| Percentage returned | | | | 46.3% | |
| | Yes | No | Total Replies | Percentage in favour | |
| 1. Should the A.P.E.M. actively oppose collective bargaining for professional engineers? | 483 | 172 | 655 | 73.7% | |
| 2. Should the A.P.E.M. actively oppose group negotiations for professional engineers? | 147 | 510 | 657 | 22.4% | |
| 3. Should professional engineers form negotiation groups? | 374 | 222 | 596 | 62.8% | |
| 4. Should the A.P.E.M. avoid any participation whatsoever in employee-employer relations? | 216 | 439 | 655 | 33.0% | |
| 5. Should the A.P.E.M. limit participation to the provision of information? | 331 | 299 | 630 | 52.5% | |
| 6. Should the A.P.E.M. support negotiation groups? | 350 | 279 | 629 | 55.6% | |
| 7. Should the A.P.E.M. assist members of negotiation groups and/or individual members to correct obvious inequities? | 411 | 216 | 627 | 65.5% | |
| 8. Should professional engineers join other groups (professional or non-professional) in collective bargaining? | 46 | 602 | 648 | 7.1% | |
| 9. Should the A.P.E.M. tolerate collective bargaining? | 213 | 420 | 633 | 33.7% | |
| 10. Should the A.P.E.M. support collective bargaining? | 102 | 553 | 655 | 15.6% | |

It will be noted that 73.7% of those reporting are in favour of an active opposition by the Association to Collective Bargaining as applied

to professional engineers. 22.4% indicate that the Association, however, should not oppose group negotiations by professional engineers.

This is understandable when, in the first instance, the bargaining has all these attributes generally associated with the union movement whereas the second situation would indicate only that the Engineers within any organization form an entity to provide a forum to discuss wages and working conditions with members of management. In all instances in the foregoing summary, it would appear then that all reference to Collective Bargaining with all its legal implications and inferences towards the militant was opposed by those reporting. This would indicate then that the questionnaires returned suggest that feelings of a good number of the members of the Association are strongly professional and there is a strong aversion to applying the trade union principles in relationship to the professional engineer.

Some reference was made by those returning questionnaires with comment to the fact that doctors and lawyers all get together and set their fees. The question is asked why not Professional Engineers? I think if the whole question is looked at in the proper light, it will be realized that a doctor in private practice is actually operating as a consultant. The same is true of a lawyer operating a private practice, in which case they are selling their services on a consultative basis and the setting of fees not only provides a uniform return for these services, but also ensures a standard in quality of the service provided by reducing the ill effects that might be transpired through open competition. In any event when doctors, lawyers, architects, etc., operate in an 'employee' capacity, they do not band together in the manner suggested to set their fees. The remuneration in these cases is governed by the pay scale of the organization by which they may be employed.

Here I would challenge those who cast the green eye of envy in the direction of the lawyer to look at the pay scales under which many young lawyers or lawyers of the intermediate status operate. The eye might then lose some of its shade of green.

In conclusion then it might be said that the results of the questionnaire as well as the apparent feeling of those attending the recent Smoker would indicate that for a majority of those within the Association, (slim though this majority may seem to some), there is still a strong desire to sheer away from the protective shelter of the trade union and to respect the independence and individuality inherent in a professional status. The matter of membership in collective bargaining units as such should then *not* be condoned by the Association, although the matter of some form of support to the employee-engineer should be considered. The degree of this support should remain within the realm of professionalism and

act as a stimulus to employee-employer understanding, and not be degraded to the level of militant action of any kind. No matter how good original intentions may be the end result of a Collective Bargaining Agreement when negotiations fail is militant action despite whether it is called a study session or a strike.

It would seem that rather than relegating our art to that of a trade by turning towards the medium of Collective Bargaining in our endeavours to provide the standard that some members feel they lack, we should expend our efforts towards enhancing the image of the Engineer. Let us direct our attention towards making our Association strong and effective and giving it the support necessary to do its job. Let us demand and ensure that membership is mandatory and let us not tolerate the use of the term engineer other than by those who are registered. Let us by our own actions and by directing our thinking outward rather than inward, consider the whole profession and its place in society and thereby ensure that the term engineer even without the prefix "professional" be one that envisions respect and confidence in the mind of the public and thereby establish its value. Finally, let us establish our individual worth rather than demanding that all engineers be brought to the same common denominator despite individual ambition, drive and personal merit.

—W.R.N.



NOMINATIONS FOR COUNCIL

The Nominating Committee has submitted the following slate of nominees for Council for the year 1967 - 68:

J. D. Adam
S. Barkwell
H. Dashevsky
R. Hood
B. Whitfield



USE OF SEAL

Section 19 of The Engineering Profession Act reads as follows:

Every person registered under this Act shall have a seal, the impression of which shall contain the name of the engineer and the words "Registered Engineer, Province of Manitoba," with which all estimates, specifications, reports, working drawings, plans and other documents issued from his hand shall be sealed.

Published by the Association of Professional Engineers of the Province of Manitoba
418 — 265 Portage Avenue, Winnipeg 2, Manitoba

President — R. C. Sommerville, P. Eng.

Vice-President — F. M. Fowler, P. Eng.

Secretary and Registrar — T. W. ALGEO, P. Eng.

The Manitoba Professional Engineer is published under the direction of the Bulletin Committee

Editor: W. R. McQuade, P. Eng.

Committee Members: T. G. H. McKibbin, R. M. Stokes, E. A. Speers, B. R. Hryhorczuk, J. N. Warren, R. Hood, K. A. Millions, M. N. Collison, W. R. Newton, J. G. Iliffe, J. W. J. Lewis, V. L. Dutton.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, JUNE, 1967

President's Message

By R. C. SOMMERVILLE, P. Eng.

Since I last had the opportunity of reporting to you, your Council has had four more meetings and has made definite progress toward achieving the four prime goals set for this year.

These goals, not in order of precedence were first, to review registration and appeal procedures to see if they could be made more satisfactory and straightforward. A Committee, chaired by Larry Blackman, has been formed and is now actively considering this.

The matter of collective bargaining, raised in a report by the Employee-Engineers Committee, has required long and careful discussion, and a policy has now been established which is spelled out elsewhere in this Bulletin.

The third goal was to acquire new and better office space, to be shared with the Manitoba Association of Architects, as authorized at the last annual meeting. A definite commitment has now been made in this regard and it is planned to move into new premises in the Chamber of Commerce Building during the month of July.

A fourth goal is to establish better contact with members of the Association resident outside of the Metropolitan Winnipeg area. Now that better weather has arrived, it is hoped to do something about this. In addition, the Advisory Committee is continuing its study of revisions to the Code of Ethics which will probably be completed prior to the end of this year.

There are obviously many other things to be done. For example, at a recent meeting to discuss group negotiations there was evidence of a shocking lack of knowledge of the

purpose of this Association and of a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the status of the profession. One vague comment was to the effect that "something is wrong with the profession and the Association should do something about it." One member clearly thought that the purpose of the Association was to serve only consulting engineers. Another said that the Association "should get us more money." Several said that having set a schedule of fees for consulting engineering practice the Association is required also to set a salary schedule for employee engineers. Someone deplored that "less than half" of the engineers practising in Manitoba are registered and the Association should do something about it.

The purpose of the Association, as defined by Council and published in this Bulletin last year is:

"The protection of the public by ensuring that the practice of professional engineering in Manitoba is carried on only by competent and ethical practitioners. All activities of the Association must be judged on their contribution to, or interference with this purpose."

In my personal view, we have gone beyond the point of simple administration of the Act, as have the medical and the legal professions. In my mind, the purpose of protecting the public is served by any action which enhances the status of the engineer. Only by continuing to attract the best into the profession can this Association hope to serve its purpose. Ensuring that engineers have the recognition and respect of their employers and, incidentally, protecting the salaries of engineers, falls, I believe, within this scope.

On the other hand, the Association is cer-

tainly not intended solely to protect engineers' salaries. Otherwise this becomes a trade union and engineers become only technologists.

Also within the scope of protecting the public, in my view, are such diverse things as enforcing professional conduct, stimulating engineering education, setting fee schedules, controlling professional advertising and high school counselling.

Many of us are dissatisfied with the status of the profession and that is a good sign, provided we are willing to work to improve or to change these conditions. Criticism of the Association is welcomed but it must be realized that the Association is not just Council, not just the staff, nor is it just the 100 or so members serving on committees. The Association is all of us together.

We should not lose sight of the significant progress which has been made by this Association in the past, but we still have a great deal to do. Your Registrar and his staff, together with our active committees are doing much to improve the standing of the profession and the understanding of the role of the Association. We cannot succeed on their efforts alone. Achievement of our purpose requires the active interest and support of each member of this Association.



YE CANNOT SERVE GOD AND MAMMON

"No man can serve two masters for either he will hate the one and love the other or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."

(Matt. 6:24).

At the Kipling Ritual held on April 8th, the same faces that have been seen there for a number of years were again present, with very few unfamiliar ones among them. Conspicuous by their absence were the majority of the proponents of collective bargaining; that banding together of employees to blackmail their employer with threats of dire consequences, such as strike action or work slow down, if he disregards their demands. The few that were in attendance obviously have forgotten the ceremony and the obligation or do not wish to give them serious consideration. The impression is given that some of the Sons of Martha have renounced their mother and now wish to become the Sons of Mary.

One who participates in this solemn ceremony commits himself to the service of his fellow man and the profession, with monetary gain a second consideration, and since participation is voluntary the decision must be made by an

individual without collective reasoning with others. It would appear that some go through the ceremony only with the thought that it is necessary in order to receive their iron ring, and the obligation that they make as individuals means less than nothing to them. If they want an iron ring without the responsibility that they must accept with it at the Ritual, it would be better for them to go out and buy or make it.

Possibly if they turned out to the Ritual more often, they would realize that this talk of collective bargaining is incompatible with the concept of the Professional Engineer, who succeeds or fails as an individual and does not ask others to hold his hand when the going gets rough.

There are those who define a Professional Engineer as: "a man with a seal." They are to be pitied, as they are missing a great deal of that which their profession offers in the way of service, personal satisfaction, and pride both in the profession and in themselves.

—W.R.M.



SMOKER '67

The subject of Collective Employee-Employer negotiations prompted a good turn-out to the Annual Smoker held at the Montcalm Motor Hotel on April 5th.

Chairman Pat Feschuk admonished the speakers in advance in anticipation of their exceeding the allowed time limit and George Russell kicked-off proceedings in his own inimitable fashion. As might be expected from statements made prior to the meeting, his views could be expressed as "CON." Nick Diakiw, Chairman of the Employee Engineers Committee, took the "PRO" side of the argument in line with the recommendations of his committee to Council. Mr. J. McCartney, a management consultant, struck a nice balance pointing out some of the disadvantages inherent in the collective bargaining scheme from the point of view of the employee.

By the time group discussions got underway, vocal chords had become well lubricated by frequent trips to the bar. Through the rather loud hum of deep philosophical discussion it was evident that at certain tables tempers were approaching critical mass and when the chairman cut off discussion to hear the Group Secretaries' reports, some tables had not got past the first question of what distinguishes the Professional Engineer.

When the group secretaries presented their summaries a Professional Engineer was defined between the limits of a demigod and a

man who owns a seal. The possible areas for collective employee-employer negotiation ranged between none and all, and the question of whether Professional Engineers should engage in collective employee-employer negotiations elicited answers from definitely yes to definitely not.

Some indication of the mood of the meeting can be gleaned from the attendance statistics. Of the 93 Engineers in attendance, 65 were employed by some form of government or governmental agency, 10 were consulting engineers, and 18 were in industry.

As could be expected, no one was persuaded to change his views, but possibly some members modified their thinking somewhat as the meeting certainly pointed up the magnitude of the problem. Unfortunately, (or fortunately) the chairman cut off debate after receiving comments from each table and one member of the bulletin committee with much more to say was left with notes in hand and mouth open.

Comments from those present indicated that the evening was well enjoyed and most productive. The topics, depth of discussion, and time for discussion are not available or suitable at other social functions which have other distractions. The most frequent comment heard during the evening was "Let's do this more often."

Pat Feschuk and his membership committee are to be commended on a fine job of organizing and running the Smoker.

"SO LET'S DO THIS MORE OFTEN."
—W.R.M.



Letters to the Editor

TOO MANY WORDS

Dear Sir:

For some time I have been on the mailing list of the Community Planning Association of Canada. Last month I wrote them and asked that my name be taken off their mailing list. Why? Well, the plain truth is that their Newsletter did not contain sufficient material that was interesting or important to me. I am trying to get out from under the mass of paper and words that threatens to drown me!

Finding myself on the Bulletin Committee, I have been doing considerable thinking about our own Newsletter — the Bulletin. Searching my memory, I could recall very few items that I had read in the Bulletin. A survey of several other Engineers (admittedly a very small

sample) seemed to confirm that the articles in the Bulletin make no impact.

At this point, I re-read some back issues of the Bulletin. One thing I learned was that the Bulletin is costing us some \$2,000.00 annually. A second point that came through strongly was concern over the so-called image of the professional engineer. Thirdly, the Bulletin carries information about the actions of Council. Finally, the social activities of engineers and their wives receive a certain amount of publicity.

After much thought on the subject, I am convinced our memberships are receiving poor value in the Bulletin. This being my opinion, how can the situation be improved?

PROPOSAL No. 1

The activities of Council should be reported by means of a less-expensive format (Gestetner or photo-offset processes). Semi-annual reports would likely be sufficient for this purpose. This "Newsletter" could contain reports on the social activities of the Association although, personally, I find this type of article both uninteresting and unnecessary.

PROPOSAL No. 2

Many of the articles in the Bulletin, with a slight change in emphasis, could be made of interest to the general public. This being so, why not take out a full-page (or half-page?) advertisement in the local papers several times each year and use these articles to "improve our image?" The pattern has been set by the advertisements of Motor Coach Industries. This proposal would not save us any money but it could give the public a better idea of our profession providing, of course, that the material in the advertisements is well thought out and well presented.

V. L. Dutton, P. Eng.

MEMORY FEAT

Dear Sir:

Re Council Meetings by T. G. H. McKibbin in March, 1967, issue.

This writer, and no doubt many others, takes exception to the remarks that "the easy way into the Association is through a recognized university."

In an article in 1958 by W. A. Corbett entitled "THE HARD WAY," it would seem that entrance into the Association via university examination was not the "easy way."

As the Engineering Act stands now, formal education is not mandatory for entrance into the Association nor are Association exams. Thus a person whose formal education would not admit them to a recognized engineering course

can gain admission on the basis of experience only. What could be easier!

As finances are no longer a problem in gaining formal education one need only have the ability and desire. The candidate lacking either or both of these qualities will look for some other means of obtaining professional status, such a means is obviously less rigorous and can be quite inferior.

It is to be hoped that Council will endeavour to upgrade the Profession by effecting the removal of those clauses which tend to weaken the Act and the addition of new ones that will strengthen it.

—D. T. HOLLOWAY.

(Ed. Note: Elephants are not the only ones with exceptional memories).



ENGINEERING EDUCATION

As the licensing body for all engineers and the instrument for ensuring a preservation of standards in the Province of Manitoba, the Association has an obligation to concern itself with the curriculum of the University of Manitoba Faculty of Engineering, and all other matters pertaining to the training given student engineers within the province. Yet at the present time there is very little co-ordination between the University and the Association. Indeed, many engineering professors are not even members of the Association.

Engineering is an applied science, and those who have applied that science over a number of years are most competent at passing their knowledge on to others. A professor who has a number of years of practical experience is usually better able to generate enthusiasm in the student body, because he is able to teach specific engineering principles by illustrating their practical application. It is our opinion that the best professors are those who have applied the knowledge they acquired in University, and have sufficient experience to recognize both the strengths and limitations of the thousands of theories they have learned.

On the staff of the Faculty of Engineering there are a number of lecturers who were top students, and were hired as soon as they graduated. Their technical knowledge is unquestioned, but their ability to teach the practical application of that knowledge must be hampered by their limited experience as

practising engineers. It is also our feeling that these men would have a tendency to regard engineering as a pure science rather than an applied science. To correct this situation we would like to suggest that all engineering professors be required by law to be registered engineers, and that teaching or a masters degree not be considered a sufficient substitute for the two years practical experience required before registration.

We would also like to comment on the apparent reluctance on the part of the Faculty of Engineering to employ more than a token number of part-time lecturers, although there are surely a large number of practising professional engineers in the Winnipeg area who have specialized in particular fields of engineering and who would be eminently qualified to teach in those fields.

Both the faculties of Law and Medicine make very extensive use of part-time demonstrators and lecturers. In Medicine, especially, there are very few full-time professors, with most of the teaching being done by practising doctors who have specialized in one field.

Since the objective of both the Association and the Engineering Faculty is to provide the highest standard of engineering possible, we feel that qualified engineers in the Province should recognize their obligation to pass on the knowledge they have accumulated through training and research, and the Engineering Faculty should be prepared to see that those most qualified have an opportunity of imparting this knowledge to the student body.

—R.M.S.



COUNCIL MEETING APRIL 19, 1967

The Registrar and eight Councillors met for nearly three hours on April 19, 1967.

The first hour was spent reviewing qualifications of an applicant for admission to the Association. This appeared to be a repeat of January 31st discussion reported in the March Bulletin. Conclusion was to refer the application back to the Board of Examiners to make sure that all avenues had been explored, no bridges left uncrossed, and no stones unturned. In watching the democratic process you must admire the painstaking care of Council to be fair.

An hour was spent reflecting on the Associ-

ation's responsibility to take an interest in public safety. This topic arose from a letter sent by Mr. W. N. Isberg and related particularly to the investigation of fatal accidents around engineered products. Professor Russell submitted a motion that in the event of a fatal accident the interested engineer meet for discussion with his peers. A less august journal would report that this set the cat amongst the pigeons. Protection of the public is clearly within the Association's terms of reference. The matter will be discussed further in a month. In the meantime, the Registrar was instructed to investigate and find out what happens in the event of an accident, who reports what to whom and what conclusions are drawn.

In the short time remaining, it was moved and carried that in special cases Association exams could be written other than at the regular April sittings.

Representatives were selected for a career guidance night. H. N. Gawley was appointed to the Board of Examiners. The questionnaire on employee relations will be discussed at Council meeting May 3. The Canadian Congress meeting in Montreal will be discussed May 7.

Mr. R. C. Sommerville reported on a visit to the Alberta Association annual meeting. It sounds like a really exciting two-day affair. Friday they have technical sessions. Friday evening is a stag and reception. The Association meeting is on Saturday. At noon there is a lunch with guests, at night is a banquet and dance. The whole show has good press coverage, some of it paid for. How about that for live action. —J.W.J.L.

MOVING?

PLEASE let us have your change of address.

Please fill this out and mail it to the Association office, 418 — 265 Portage Avenue, Winnipeg 2.

Name.....

Old Address.....

New Address.....

Collective Bargaining Council Policy

Statement on Employer-Employee Relations
Issued by Direction of the Council of the
Association of Professional Engineers
of the Province of Manitoba
May, 1967

Council recognizes that over the past several years there have been several developments related to collective bargaining for professional engineers. These developments include the formation of collective bargaining groups of engineers in Quebec, legislation at the Federal level providing for the formation of negotiating groups in the Federal Civil Service, which will affect many professional engineers, and recent policy statements by other provincial associations of professional engineers. At the 1966 annual meeting of the Manitoba Association, a Committee presented a report recommending that Council accept the principle of group negotiation, and this report was tabled for further study by Council. Council believes that it is desirable to evolve a national policy on employee-employer relationships through the offices of the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers.

In Manitoba, so far, only one formal group, representing a very small percentage of the total registration, has been formed. Nevertheless, these developments can have considerable significance to the profession and they have therefore been studied and discussed to the greatest extent by the Council of this Association.

After considering this matter fully, Council believes it desirable, at this time, to issue the following statement of policy on relationships between professional engineers and their employers.

Policy Statement

Council is opposed to any form of compulsory collective bargaining for professional engineers and will continue to oppose the inclu-

sion of professional engineers in any group formed for the purpose of collective bargaining as it believes this to be contrary to the best interests of the public and of the Association.

Council believes that each member of this Association should, to the greatest extent possible, deal as an individual with his employer in matters of employment conditions.

However, Council recognizes that the individual approach may be impractical in some cases and that some form of group discussion may be necessary. Council therefore accepts the principle of group negotiations by professional engineers, provided that the group is formed on a strictly voluntary basis, is restricted to members of the engineering profession, is not affiliated with any trade union and is designed to establish and maintain the employment relationship with a particular employer on a voluntary, ethical and professional basis.

An information service is now available and it is proposed to provide a more comprehensive advisory service to members and to employers. The Association will not participate directly in discussions between member groups and their respective employers nor will it become a bargaining agent for individual members or for groups of members.



CLASS OF '27 REUNION

Charles Rigby, 1927, B.Sc.C.E. was a recent visitor to Winnipeg, enroute on a round the world trip from Johannesburg, South Africa. Mr. and Mrs. Rigby had travelled from South Africa eastward to Australia where they have a daughter in Melbourne. Continuing eastward they stopped at Sydney, Hawaii, Vancouver and Winnipeg. They continued to Montreal, Madrid, Rome and arrived back in Johannesburg, April 24th.

Chuck Rigby is a Consulting Engineer in the firm of C. A. Rigby & Partners. They are engaged in many civil engineering projects, such as large head frames in concrete for the Gold Mining Industry, towers for a complete micro wave system for the Republic of South

Africa and a large newspaper office building and printing plant which has several levels below grade over a full city block. The deepest level is 95'0" below street grade.

Chuck Rigby was employed after graduation with Dominion Bridge and later with the City of Winnipeg and he designed the foot bridge to Assiniboine Park.

He left to teach at the University of Durban, South Africa, in 1937, later spending several years at Pretoria with the National Research Building Division for the Government of South Africa.

About 12 years ago he joined a large Architectural firm as structural designer and later set up his own practice in this field.

A reunion of all local members of class '27 and their ladies and friends was held on April 10th at the Winnipeg Winter Club. Put Johannesburg on your itinerary when you make that long trip.



FREEDOM OF SPEECH AND EXPRESSION

In his message to congress on January 6, 1941, Franklin Delano Roosevelt set forth his famous Four Freedoms, commencing with "The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world." A century earlier Lord Macaulay wrote "Men are never so likely to settle a question rightly as when they discuss it freely."

Freedom of expression is a legacy we have inherited from ancestors, many of whom gave their lives for this cause. Time has dimmed the memory of their sufferings and sacrifices and the freedom they handed down to us is now taken for granted.

It is time for a reassessment of the privilege of freedom of expression as it applies to professional engineers. "Freedom" is not synonymous with "Abuse." Free expression by professional engineers should also be responsible expression. In his report in this issue President Sommerville "quotes" some comments made at the Smoker on collective bargaining, which, as he points out, evince "a shocking lack of knowledge of the purpose of this Association." One comment, that "less than half of the engineers practising in Manitoba are registered" is very far from accurate.

Constructive criticism makes a healthy contribution and is always welcomed in the Association. Spirited debate, conducted in a

responsible manner, is beneficial to the Association. This publication has, from time to time, offered what it believed to be constructive suggestions to Council. However, any constructive criticism contained in these pages should not be construed to mean that the members of the Bulletin Committee do not have complete confidence in the members of Council. Those members of this Committee who have covered the Council meetings are in an excellent position to appreciate how very hard the members of Council must work on behalf of the Association, how many hours of homework is required of them, how many difficult decisions they must reach and even sometimes how much abuse and how many annoyances they must put up with, how much time and patience they must devote to cranks and to those without minimum requirements for admission who try to "talk" their way into the Association by lobbying. As long as this Association is served by men with the integrity, wisdom and courage constantly displayed by members of Council there is much to be grateful for. Members serving on committees are also going the second mile for the Association and the profession.

Members who are dissatisfied with some aspects of the Association, or who feel the Association should do something for them, should leave their names at the Association office as being available for committee work. This would give them an opportunity to learn much more about the operations and functions of the Association, to meet fellow engineers and share their views and it would help them toward a more responsible contribution to the profession, to the Association and to their own development.

It has been noted that those who work on committees, who attend the Kipling Ritual, who turn out to the annual meetings, are not those who make invalid, destructive criticisms, and they do not expect anything personally in return for their contributions, other than the satisfaction of knowing that they are doing their duty.

While the members of Council and the members of the committees are carrying more than their share of professional responsibilities, each individual member can make his own contribution to the profession in many ways, one of which is by refusing to participate in irresponsible discussions. He can be sure he has all the facts before he draws any conclusions.

This Association may not be perfect but every one of its members can do something constructive to bring it closer to that state.

Freedom of speech and expression should be a cherished responsibility and treated among

all professional engineers with honour and integrity. "This above all to thine ownself be true, and it must follow, as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man." This applies not only to individuals but to groups of individuals. Let us be true to ourselves and, sequitur, to the profession.—S.J.A.

♦ ♦ ♦

FLIN FLON NEWS

By M. N. Collison, P. Eng.

The news is very brief this time. Several P. Eng. were tied up with the Flin Flon Glee Club production of "South Pacific," on April 4th to 7th.

R. L. Price (P. Eng.) was associate producer, a chore he has handled many times and can't seem to get away from. Mrs. S. F. Liss (P. Eng. wife) was a co-producer and I think Stan must have been home doing the housework nearly every night the last week or two before curtain time. Certainly Dot was not at home because every practice I went to she was there. Yes — believe it or not — I was in it too — Capt. Brackett, no less. The producers will let me act (?) but not sing. Anyhow the show was a success and we all had lots of fun.

The Hudson Bay Mining & Smelting Co., Limited announced the following appointments following the Company's Annual meeting on April 28th.

- Mr. W. A. Morrice, P. Eng.—
Senior Vice-President
- Mr. H. A. McKenzie, P. Eng.—
Vice-President, Development
- Mr. L. W. Ogryzlo, P. Eng.—
Vice-President, Exploration
- Mr. C. O. Buchanan—
Vice-President, Sales.

Mr. Buchanan will be leaving Winnipeg for Toronto and Mr. McKenzie will be leaving Flin Flon for Winnipeg, both in the near future.

(Ed. Note: In order to meet the deadline for this issue, our faithful Flin Flon correspondent wrote his contribution in a hotel room while he was on vacation. This is real devotion to duty).

♦ ♦ ♦

PRACTISING OUTSIDE MANITOBA WHERE DO WE STAND?

Final Report

As reported in the November, 1966, issue of the Bulletin, a circular letter was circulated to Professional Engineering Associations in

Canada and the United States in 1966. The letter was as follows:

Dear Sirs:

I have been asked by the Bulletin Committee of the Association of Professional Engineers of Manitoba to conduct a survey which we feel would be of general interest to our members. The questions which have prompted the survey were:

1. As a registered Professional Engineer in Manitoba, living in the Province of Manitoba, can I obtain—
 - a) Non - resident registration as a Professional Engineer in the other nine provinces and fifty American states, or
 - b) Non - resident Licence - to - Practise in a particular Province or State for a specific time period, or
 - c) Non - resident Licence - to - Practise in a particular Province or State for a specific project?
2. What would be the fee for the non-resident registration or licence-to-practise for which I am eligible?
3. What examinations must I write or further training must I receive before being eligible for non-resident registration or before I may receive a licence-to-practise?

In order that the questions are not simply hypothetical ones, I am attaching a resume of my own background and educational and professional qualifications as an example for your consideration.

Your co-operation in this survey will be greatly appreciated.

Yours truly,

The writer's background included both B.Sc. and M.Sc. from the University of Alberta and his engineering experience since graduation in 1951.

The variety of replies and mass of documents received have provided me with my Centennial project. However the information has finally been digested, evaluated and tabulated, and is given in Table I below.

Some comments on the information may be made.

CANADIAN REPLIES

1. An *annual* Licence-to-Practise could not be obtained only in Ontario and Quebec.
2. Quebec only indicated that Canadian citizenship was required for registration of its residents.

REPLIES FROM THE UNITED STATES

1. Only New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania require United States citizenship for registration.
2. Ten of forty-five replies received indicated that I could likely obtain full registration:

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| Yes | 1 |
| Qualified Yes | 3 |
| Probable | 2 |
| Possible | 4 |
3. The balance of 33 replies received indicated that, as I had not received my registration in Manitoba by examination, I would have to take examinations in the respective state to obtain registration. Some states would grant a temporary permit for 30 to 90 days, but most would not on the basis that my registration was not by examination.
4. Many states required the full 16 hours of examination, 8 hours of examinations on engineering fundamentals in addition to 8 hours of examinations in the specialized field, because the University of Alberta is not accredited. The examination on **Engineering fundamentals** may have been waived if the University of Alberta had had full accreditation.

While there is a certain amount of inconvenience in obtaining Licences-to-Practise for many small projects in one year for Ontario and Quebec, a registered Manitoba engineer, living in Manitoba should have little trouble practicing engineering in other parts of Canada.

However, if Manitoba engineers wish to practise engineering in the United States, changes from our present system are necessary if we wish to take advantage of any reciprocal agreements which can be arranged:

- (1) Full accreditation would have to be obtained for qualified Canadian engineering schools.
- (2) Registration would have to be after examinations on engineering fundamentals and in the particular branch of engineering, in addition to the present education and experience requirements.

With an expanding demand for engineering services throughout the world, both American and Canadian engineers will soon want reasonable freedom to undertake projects wherever their talents may take them. In the future, Manitoba engineers need not be handicapped in offering services in the United States if our requirements for registration are equivalent to the requirements of the various States.

All documents received as a result of this assignment are on file at the Association offices. Of necessity, many details could not be included in Table I. Those interested in further detailed information are invited to inspect these documents.

TABLE 1

| REPLIES TO QUESTIONS AS NUMBERED IN LETTER | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------------|------------|---|--|--|
| Province or State | 1 (a) | 1 (b) | 1 (c) | 2 | 3 | Remarks |
| Alberta | Not Stated | Yes—1 year | Not Stated | \$10 for 1 (b). | None for 1 (b). | |
| British Columbia | No | Yes—1 year | N/A | \$27 for 1 (b). | None for 1 (b). | |
| New Brunswick | No | Yes—1 year | N/A | \$50 annual plus initial \$10 for 1 (b). | None for 1 (b). | |
| Newfoundland | Yes | Yes—1 year | N/A | \$10 registration, \$15 annual. | None for 1 (a). | |
| Nova Scotia | No | Yes—1 year | N/A | \$5 registration, \$17 annual. | None for 1 (b). | |
| Ontario | No | No | Yes | \$10 per project per year. | None for 1 (c). | |
| Prince Edward Island | No | Yes—1 year | N/A | \$5 registration, \$25 annual. | None for 1 (b). | |
| Quebec | No | No | Yes* | \$15 for 1 (c) plus \$5 for stamp. | None for 1 (c). *Licence for each project up to 1 year. Provision for renewal. | |
| Saskatchewan | No | Yes—1 year | N/A | \$10 for 1 (b). | None for 1 (b). | |
| Yukon Territory | Yes | N/A | N/A | \$10 for 1 (a). | None for 1 (a). | |
| Alabama | Yes* | N/A | N/A | \$25 registration, \$10 annual. | *Examination if education and/or experience ruled against. | *Would require ruling on education and experience. |
| Alaska | No | No | No | \$20 registration, \$10 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | Require written exam. | |

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS AS NUMBERED IN LETTER

| Province or State | 1 (a) | 1 (b) | 1 (c) | 2 | 3 | Remarks |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---|---|--|
| Arizona | No | *Yes— 90 days. | N/A | \$50 for 1 (b). \$25 registration, \$10 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | Require 16 hour written exam. | *If application for registration made. |
| Arkansas | Yes | No | No | \$25 registration, \$5 annual, for 1 (a). | None. | |
| California | No | No | No | \$25 to \$40 registra- tion fee, \$8 to \$16 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | Require written exam, length not stated. | Provision is made for temporary licences but seldom granted. |
| Colorado | No | No | No | \$30 registration, \$5 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | Require 8 hour written exam. | |
| Connecticut | No | No | No | \$50 registration, \$5 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | Require 16 hour written exam. | |
| Delaware | Yes* | N/A | N/A | \$30 registration, \$6 annual, for 1 (a). | N/A | *Would require ruling on education and experience. |
| District of Columbia | NO REPLY RECEIVED | | | | | |
| Florida | No* | No | Yes**— 90 days | \$25 for 1 (c). | *Require written exams for full registration. | **Provided Manitoba Association would reciprocate. |
| Georgia | Possible* | N/A | N/A | \$15 registration, \$5 annual, for 1 (a). | Require oral and/or written exams if experience ruled against. | *Would require ruling on 12 years experi- ence, applicable to candidates over 35 years of age. |
| Hawaii | No | No | No | \$15 registration for 1 (a) after exams. | Require examina- tions for full registration. | |

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS AS NUMBERED IN LETTER

| Province or State | 1 (a) | 1 (b) | 1 (c) | 2 | 3 | Remarks |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------|-------|--|--|--|
| Idaho | No | No | No | \$50 registration, \$3 to \$10 annual, for 1 (a) after exams. | Require 12 hour written exam, (16 hours if graduation had been after 1961), for full registration. | |
| Illinois | No | No | No | \$30 registration, \$10 annual, for 1 (a) after exams. | Require 16 hour written exam for full registration. | |
| Indiana | No | No | No | Fee not stated for 1 (a) after exams. | Require 16 hour written exam for full registration. | |
| Iowa | No | No | No | \$25 application, \$10 registration, \$5 annual, after exams. | 16 hour written exam, required for full registration. | |
| Kansas | Possible* | N/A | N/A | \$25 registration, \$10 annual, for 1 (a). | N/A | *No written exams in Kansas prior to 1961. Applicant was a reg- istered professional engineer prior to this date. |
| Kentucky | NO REPLY RECEIVED | | | | | |
| Louisiana | No | No | No | \$25 registration, \$7.50 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | 16 hour written exam, required for full registration. | |
| Maine | No | No | No | \$25 registration, \$3 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | 16 hour written exam (possibly re- duced to 8 hours) for full registration. | |
| Maryland | Possible* | N/A | N/A | \$25 registration, \$5 annual, for 1 (a). | N/A | *On the basis of length of practice and age of applicant. |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Massachusetts | No | No | Yes — 30 days. | No fee for 1 (c). \$25 registration, \$4 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | Written exam re- quired for full registration. | |
| Minnesota | No | Yes* | N/A | Fee not stated for 1 (b). \$15 application, \$15 registration, \$8 annual for 1 (a) after exam. | 16 hour written exam required for full registration. | *After successful oral exam. |
| Mississippi | | | NO REPLY RECEIVED. | | | |
| Missouri | No | Undetermined* | N/A | \$25 registration, \$5 annual, for 1 (a) after exams. | 16 hour written exam for full registration.** | *The Statutes pro- vide for fees for a permit and the annual renewal of a permit, but does not spell out who is eligible. **Can be registered after exams if Mani- toba reciprocates in registering Missouri Professional Engineers. |
| Montana | Possible* | N/A | N/A | \$10 registration, \$5 annual, for 1 (a). | 16 hour written exam, if required. | *The fact that regis- tration can be ob- tained in Manitoba without examination is taken into con- sideration. |
| Nebraska | No | No | No | \$25 registration, \$4 to \$10 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | 16 hour written exam for full registration. | |
| Nevada | No | No | No | \$35 application and registration, \$10 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | 16 hour written exam for full registration. | |

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS AS NUMBERED IN LETTER

| Province or State | 1 (a) | 1 (b) | 1 (c) | 2 | 3 | Remarks |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------|---|--|--|
| New Hampshire | Probable* | N/A | N/A | \$15 application, \$15 registration, \$2 to \$5 annual, for 1 (a). | 16 hour written exam may be necessary for full registration. | *At discretion of board. |
| New Jersey | No* | No* | No** | | | *Must be U.S. citizen. **If Manitoba regis- tration had been by exam, an exemption for 30 days for a specific project could be obtained. |
| New Mexico | No | No | No | \$25 application, and registration, \$16 Biennial, for 1 (a) after exam. | 16 hour written exam required for full registration. | |
| New York | No* | No | Yes** | \$40 for 1 (c) plus \$25 for seal if it is to be used. | | **30 day limit. *U.S. Citizenship required for registration. |
| North Carolina | | | NO REPLY RECEIVED | | | |
| North Dakota | No | Not Stated | Not Stated | \$15 registration, \$5 annual, for 1 (a) after exams. | 16 hour written plus oral exams required for full registration. | |
| Ohio | No | No | No | \$15 registration, \$3 annual, for 1 (a) after exams. | 16 hour written exam required for full registration. | |
| Oklahoma | No | No | No | \$25 registration, \$5 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | 8 hour written exam required for full registration. | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|------|-----|-------|---|--|--|
| Oregon | No | No | Yes* | Fee not stated for 1 (c). \$15 examination, \$10 registration, \$7.50 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | Examinations required for full registration. | *30 day limit. |
| Pennsylvania | No* | No* | No* | | | *U.S. Citizenship required. |
| Rhode Island | No | No | Yes* | \$25 for 1 (c). \$30 registration, \$10 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | 16 hour written exam required for full registration. | *30 day limit. |
| South Carolina | No | No | No | \$25 registration. \$10 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | 16 hour written exam required for full registration. | |
| South Dakota | No | No | Yes* | | 16 hour written exam required for full registration**. | *Time Limit and fees not stated. **Registration and annual fees not stated. |
| Tennessee | No | No | No | \$25 registration, \$5 annual, for 1 (a) after exams. | 16 hour written exam required for full registration. | |
| Texas | No | No | No | \$25 registration, \$10 annual, for 1 (a) after exams. | 16 hour written exam required for full registration. | |
| Utah | * | No | Yes** | No fees stated for 1 (c). \$25 registration for 1 (a). | Written exam required for full registration. | *Question misinterpreted. **30 day limit. |
| Vermont | Yes* | No | Yes** | \$15 registration, \$4 annual, for 1 (a). Fee not stated for 1 (c). | | *If accreditation for Univ. of Alta. can be obtained. **30 day limit. |

 REPLIES TO QUESTIONS AS NUMBERED IN LETTER

| Province or State | 1 (a) | 1 (b) | 1 (c) | 2 | 3 | Remarks |
|-------------------|-----------|-------|-------|--|--|--|
| Virginia | | | | NO REPLY RECEIVED | | |
| Washington | No | No | No | \$15 Registration for 1 (a). | 4 hour exam for professional engineers registered elsewhere to obtain full registration. | |
| West Virginia | No | No | Yes* | Fee not stated for 1 (c). \$25 registration, \$7.50 annual, for 1 (a) after exam. | Written exam required for full registration. | *60 day limit. |
| Wisconsin | Probable* | No** | No | \$10 application, \$10 biennial for registration, and \$20 biennial renewal for 1 (a). | *Written exam may be required. | *Based on length of practice and age (over 35). **Only if application for registration is before board. |
| Wyoming | No | No | No | \$15 registration, \$8 biennial, for 1 (a) after exam. | 16 hour written exam required for full registration. | |

COUNCIL MEETING

March 15, 1967

Some members of Council seemed to feel that they should follow the wishes of the majority of the members of the Association and others felt that the role of Council was to provide leadership and guidance to the untutored masses. Such was the situation which shaped up during the discussion as to whether to send out questionnaires to the membership at large, or not, requesting their views on collective bargaining for engineers. During the discussion, which became quite heated at times, a motion was introduced which indicated Council would be flatly opposed to collective bargaining; this motion was defeated and a later motion resolving that questionnaires be sent out was passed. President Sommerville seemed somewhat perplexed by all the confusion, since it seems that a decision to send out questionnaires had been made at the February 23 meeting, reported in our last issue. Finally it was decided to get the questionnaires out as soon as possible, hopefully to provide food for thought and discussion at the Smoker to be held on April 5.

During the meeting Councillor McBain gave notice of his impending move to Calgary necessitating his resignation from Council. The Association will be losing the services of an active and popular Association member and Councillor. The boys on the Bulletin Committee will long remember him as one of the mainsprings during the years he worked on the Committee. Not the least of Clyde's accomplishments of that era was the production of a potted Shakespeare spectacular produced at a Fall Frolic a couple of years back in response to a challenge from the Social Committee. Council will no doubt remember him affectionately for the salubrious way in which he launched the first meeting he attended as a Councillor.

By the time it came for Transfers, Registrations, Licences and so forth, Council felt time was a-wasting and got through these bits of business with astonishing rapidity.

Council will, as usual, be supporting the Kipling Ritual with a motion that the Association assist in defraying the cost of refreshments. Funny how that word refreshments can mean different things! In the morning it's usually coffee and doughnuts — but in the evening, well your guess is as good as mine. Talking of the Ritual it is a pity that a good many more of the engineering profession don't turn out to welcome the "new boys."

—T.G.H.M.

COUNCIL MEETING

May 3, 1967

The main event, as they say in boxing circles, was discussion of the results of the questionnaire on collective bargaining, although Council took a little time warming up before getting to it.

Preceding the main topic, we learned that the new space in the Chamber of Commerce building would be ready for A.P.E.M. office staff to move into sometime in July. Such a location will be handy for many A.P.E.M. members who also frequent the C. of C. Space will be shared between the A.P.E.M. and our brethren in the architectural field, although we understand their staff is small, almost to the vanishing point.

As the Fall Frolic has turned out to be somewhat less than that this last year or two, some thought is to be given to combining the annual general meeting with a dance, preferably on a Friday in November. Our country cousins would be able to attend the A.G.M., let their wives whoop it up in the big stores, have a ball and rest up in a comfortable city hotel for the balance of the weekend. Sounds so good that your scribe wouldn't mind being posted out-of-town!

On the main theme of the day, collective bargaining, the only thing to emerge clearly was that the results of the questionnaire on collective bargaining should be published in the Bulletin. It was hoped that a firm statement of Council policy on the subject could be hammered out — and I do mean hammered — at the meeting. Many points of view, some with surprisingly little differences from their next-door neighbours, were presented. Finally it was decided that Council would like to do a little more individual thinking on a draft statement, which was introduced at the meeting, before committing Council firmly on this ticklish subject. It was hoped to have something for the faithful who read the Bulletin for this issue.

Looking around the assembled members of Council, it was noted that all come from the "managerial" class. It was interesting to conjecture what course the meeting might have taken had there been any engineers of the "labour" class on Council. As it was, the repartee was quite spirited from time to time.

A note of irrelevance, or is it? Of the eight members of Council present, three are pipe smokers, two smoke cigarettes, while the other three appear to have no visible vices.

—T.G.H.M.

COUNCIL MEETING MAY 17

Collective Bargaining and Potted Palms

The labour pains were excruciating but Council persisted and brought forth a policy statement on the explosive subject of Collective Bargaining, or as this rose is sometimes called, Group Negotiation. The decision to approve the statement, which is published elsewhere in this issue, was not unanimous, as the feeling existed that a professional organization should not get involved in this subject.

Progress is being made toward the move to new quarters and mid-summer should see the Association offices located in the Chamber of Commerce building, replete with oriental rugs, potted palms, diaphanous drapes, M.A.A. pulchritude and the A.P.E.M. filing cabinets.

Council considered the Second Quarter Budget statements and pondered over expenses which have increased 18% over the same period last year.

Council wisely appointed A. G. Moffatt as the A.P.E.M. representative to the Manitoba Division of the Community Planning Association of Canada.

A letter from the President of the Engineers' Plaza Fund was discussed, asking the A.P.E.M. to advance the funds necessary to meet the Manitoba quota of \$6000.00. Members of the Association have already had several opportunities to indicate what funds they wish to see spent on this project. It might be suggested to the fund promoters that they reduce the Manitoba quota to a more realistic figure in order to balance the books. After all there are slightly more than 1000 registered professional engineers living in Manitoba. The rest of our membership resides elsewhere and many of them are registered in other provinces and have probably made their contributions where they live.

It was suggested that another Smoker be held at the end of September. Let's have a professional topic this time. Councillor Finnbogason could be asked for a few suggestions.

—S.J.A.

K. H. Williamson to Africa

Ken Williamson has left Manitoba for a two-year stint as senior electrical engineer with the Niger Dams Authority who are building a hydro-electric generating station on the Niger River, complete with an 800 mile 330 kilovolt transmission system. He will also take over duties as Nigerian correspondent for this publication and we will look forward to his communiques.

