

NOT USED IN
THIS FORM

D R A F T

REMARKS BY P. A. LAPP, P. ENG.,

PRESIDENT

ASSOCIATION OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS OF ONTARIO

TO

THE ENGINEERING INSTITUTE OF CANADA

TORONTO BRANCH

ENGINEERING WEEK '83

INN ON THE PARK, TORONTO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1983

Thank you for the invitation to be your guest speaker at the official opening of Engineering Week '83. Thank you also for your generous introduction, both for what you were kind enough to say about me and for what you were discreet enough to omit. I have always regarded it as a great honour and privilege to be an honorary member of the Engineering Institute of Canada, though on this occasion it entails singing for my supper.

Today is Valentine's Day, which is not exactly the day in the year when, even for an engineer, the most pressing thing on his mind is high technology. It is not a subject you associate with hearts and flowers and Cupid's arrows. I assume, therefore, I am not being asked to take part in a hi-tech love-in.

However, on behalf of APEO, I would like to express my appreciation to the Engineering Institute of Canada for once again sponsoring Engineering Week in this community. In doing so, you are helping to make the public more aware of the role and contribution of our profession to society. And, of course, to have the proclamation of the week itself made by an engineer, Metro Chairman Paul Godfrey, is to add the icing to the cake.

The annual slogan of Engineering Week is, appropriately, "Engineering is for people." APEO was granted self-governing powers by the Ontario government 60 years ago in order that, as the act regulating our profession says, "the public interest might be served and protected." Our Code of Ethics specifically states, "A professional engineer shall regard his duty to public welfare as paramount."

We like to feel we have responded to this commitment and challenge.

The epitaph to Sir Christopher Wren, the architect of St. Paul's Cathedral and other magnificent London buildings reads: "If you seek his monument, look around you." These words could equally be applied to the works of engineers which are so visible a part of communities such as this.

Engineers, traditionally, have been community and nation builders. In opening up Canada to settlement and development, we have left our stamp everywhere. We are what Mrs. Malaprop would have called an iniquitous breed. Engineering in all its forms has played a central role in the growth of our nation and province. It is interesting to note that 21,000 of our 50,000 members live and work in an area somewhat larger than Metro Toronto. On their behalf, I thank you for the recognition you have extended them in Engineering Week.

The modern world is becoming increasingly dependent on technological systems of growing complexity, and engineers, of course, are part and parcel of it -- in fact, at the heart of it. Yet even engineers can be shocked by the rapid rate of change. Technological innovation keeps expanding the volume of knowledge to which engineers are exposed, further enlarging the diversity of disciplines in which we are engaged.

The profession has advanced a long way from Dr. Samuel Johnson's 1775 dictionary definition of an engineer as "one who manages engines or directs the artillery of an army."

It is a basic tenet of economic theory today that technical progress is an essential ingredient of economic progress.

Secretary of State Don Johnston told the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers last November that "technology-based industry is the spearhead of economic renewal." We look to technology to bring about economic recovery and to maintain our position as an industrial trading nation.

Given then that the new technologies are powerful and essential instruments for economic advancement, as a profession we would be less than honest if we ignored their social impact. If engineers working with the new technologies are hard pressed at times to assimilate change, how can we expect the public not to be uneasy about some of the effects?

Confronted with developments with which many of them have not the knowledge or ability to accept and work with, people being displaced in jobs which they thought were life-time occupations find themselves in a serious quandary.

Their dilemma brings to mind the story of the two men who met at the door of their psychiatrist's office.

"Hello," said one of them, "are you coming or going?"

"If I knew that," replied the other, "I wouldn't be here."

In inviting me to speak to you about high technology, you are asking me to cover a wide waterfront in a very short space of time. For your sanity and mine, I must limit my terms of reference. Moreover, the all-embracing speech suffers from longitude and platitude. It seemed best, therefore, to confine myself to the new technologies, the microelectronic revolution that is becoming so far-reaching and all-pervasive as to be the dominating force in society today.

This knowledge explosion has the potential to affect essentially all the major sectors into which our economy can be divided. In the wake of these developments, technology is not divisible. Is there any such thing any more as low technology? Whatever technology is used in the future it is going to have a high-tech component. This is particularly true of our resource-based industries, traditionally our strength. For example, my own experience in remote sensing bears out the importance of hi-tech in developing our basic resources.

In the extraction and manufacturing processes, our primary industries-forestry, steel, mining and minerals, energy--are being profoundly affected by the new technologies. The same holds true for our financial, transportation and distribution systems, our secondary manufacturing and, particularly, the service industries.

And what of the individual? The new technologies are transforming the lives of Canadians. Computerized systems keep tabs on us all from our income tax forms to our motor vehicle licences.

In this respect, A Science Council of Canada study of the information society notes; "Cradle-to-grave social safety nets would not be possible beyond a rudimentary level without the new technologies."

The microprocessor chip has invaded our lives. Video games are just one manifestation. The chip can be found everywhere--in every room of your house. Soon home computers will be as commonplace as television sets and dishwashers.

At an APEO seminar just 10 days ago, a survey of 10

members of a panel discussion group showed that five had personal home computers. Computing to work rather than commuting to work may be closer than we think.

The application of solid state technology has dramatically reduced the size and cost of computer goods. One effect is clear, as the Science Council noted: "Our expectations increase; we hunger for more.

As Marshall McLuhan noted: "The new electronic independence creates the world in the image of a global village."

Not surprisingly, Time Magazine saw fit to substitute its traditional Man of the Year with a Machine of the Year on its cover since in its view no human candidate symbolized the past year as significantly as the computer.

A Time inside story notes that a New York real estate executive uses his Apple in business deals, to catalogue his 4,000 books and to write fund-raising letters to his Yale classmates. But he also uses it to wake him in the morning with soft music, turn on the TV, adjust the lights and make the coffee.

A further story outlines the role the computer plays in medicine. One model, CADUCAEUS, knows some 4,000 symptoms of more than 500 diseases. It sees patterns in what patients report and can then suggest a diagnosis.

Comments the Time article; "The process may sound dehumanized, but in one hospital where the computer specializes in peptic ulcers, a survey of patients showed that they found the machine 'more friendly, polite, relaxing and comprehensible' than the average physician." So much for bedside manner.

What are the implications of this chip revolutions for the individual and the engineer? Microelectronics are creating structural changes to our employment patterns leading to the new in-term "technologically unemployed." A recent series of Globe and Mail articles on the chip refers to these displaced persons as "techno-peasants."

It has been said the toughest decision a purchasing agent may face is when he is about to buy the machine designed to replace him. Computers can solve all kinds of problems except the unemployment problems they create.

One of the human consequences of the current economic slump is that companies are laying off workers whose jobs will not reappear when recovery takes place.

Hitherto we have looked to the service industries to provide employment for those displaced in primary and secondary manufacturing. But service industries in the future are going to be profoundly affected as word processors, electric filing and other information systems take over in the workplace, some jobs are going to become redundant. The automated office and the automated factory are facts of life.

However, there is the other side of the coin. The chip can and will contribute to our productivity as an industrial and exporting nation. Thus, while the chip is creating unemployment principally in the service sector, it should be contributing to our overall output sufficiently to re-absorb appropriately trained workers in all segments of the economy.

Moreover, all the evidence is not in about worker displacement. There is a shortage of reliable information. There are those who hold that if we had growth in the economy, unemployment from technology would dissipate as in the past. Technological change is

unfortunately, taking place at a time of recession and its job-creating potential cannot be properly assessed.

There is a message too for engineers. The chip is invading all walks of engineering--and on an international scale. It will have an impact on virtually all new products of the 1980s, and even on the design process itself. The development of sophisticated software has made possible the automation of the draftsman's task as well as the engineer's.

Through CAD/CAM technology we are entering the era of the fully automated factory. So rapid is the pace of technological change, obsolescence can quickly overtake us. The half-life of an engineering curriculum today has been estimated as about five years, that is to say, half the course material will be obsolete in five years.

In my opinion, the profession needs to recognize this revolution, embrace microelectronics to the fullest extent, using the systems approach, and inculcate the necessary knowledge and awareness among our budding engineers during the information process.

What about the older engineers? During the APEO seminar to which I referred to earlier, we heard reference to "burn-out" among engineers before their normal careers had ended. The lesson of the computer age is that though in our work we may at times be mutilated and spindled, we must not fold. As a profession we must be receptive to the new technologies and harness them to mankind's benefit.

As former U.S. Secretary of Defence Robert S. MacNamara once put it: "A computer does not substitute for judgment any more than a pencil substitutes for literacy. But writing without

a pencil is no particular advantage."

As people who work with the new technologies and who in many cases are the catalysts from which new technologies emerge, engineers must bear concern for the social impact they create. If we truly believe that engineering is for people we have to consider the human dimension of what we do.

This problem has been well summed up by William Boggs in the EIC Ontario Region bulletin for February/March. Writing about Managing in Turbulent Times, he says;

"What is critical in this revolution (the new technological revolution) is the people dimension.

"How we adapt this new technology to the deeply rooted needs of human beings.

"How we organize our offices and factories to take advantage of the changes.

"How we train people in the skills required.

"How we motivate people and overcome their inevitable fears."

Overcoming fear of the unknown, to my mind, is a major problem. If even engineers can be shocked by the rapid rate of change, how much more difficult it is for others to assimilate change and overcome their natural resistance to it. We need innovation, not just in technology itself but also in dealing with human factors involved in technological change.

The real danger is not that computers will begin to think like men, but men will begin to think like computers.

We cannot ignore the human dimension.

As someone has observed, "In addition to hardware, which is the computer, and software, which is the program, computer scientists have lately been talking about wetware, which is the human brain."

If technology-based industry is the spearhead of economic renewal, then we must make the fullest and most effective use of the new technologies. Canada has the opportunity to be a world leader in the new technologies, as we now are in communications satellite technology.

The silicon chip and software will dominate our future industrial development and we must strive for leadership in these two technologies. In doing so, we must, as engineers, accept social responsibility for their impact on society and play a full part in lessening any adverse effects.

The Science Council report from which I quoted earlier is subtitled, "Tomorrow is too late." In fact, the future is already here, and we have a lot of catching up to do.