

Regulator's future directions enliven AGM

By MICHAEL MASTROMATTEO

Subtle differences of opinion about PEO's future direction characterized much of the discourse at the regulator's annual general meeting April 29 in Toronto.

In many ways, the discussion was shaped by the respective priorities of outgoing President Bob Goodings, P.Eng., and new President Pat Quinn, P.Eng.

Goodings, for example, stuck to his belief in PEO's strategic plan as a means to address most of the concerns now before the engineering regulator. He described the plan as being "central to my interests as President," and expressed hope that the plan's ultimate aims of increasing and promoting the value of the P.Eng. licence will overcome problems of government incursion on the self-regulatory landscape and the limited participation of licensed engineers in PEO affairs.

Quinn, meanwhile, suggested in his comments that the strategic plan might not be a cure-all for PEO's ills. "There's a very deep and abiding feeling at PEO at the moment that the strategic plan is the answer to everything, and while parts of it [are impressive], the plan is almost like examining the entrails to find out what's happening in the brain," Quinn said. "It actually isn't the best way to deal with the problems and so, every time I hear someone say that we're taking care of things in the strategic plan, my advice is to ask, how is it being taken care of?"

"There's a very deep and abiding feeling at PEO at the moment that the strategic plan is the answer to everything."

—PRESIDENT PAT QUINN, P.ENG.

Despite these differences, however, both Goodings and Quinn emphasized the need for engineers to remain vigilant

in the face of the threats against self-regulation of the profession.

continued on p. 12

Date set for OBC judicial review

By MICHAEL MASTROMATTEO

PEO is gaining support from other regulators for its legal challenge of changes to the *Ontario Building Code* (OBC).

Other regulators are concerned about the interference of the government with self-regulation. At least two other associations/regulatory colleges, including the Ontario Association of Architects, have indicated that they intend to ask the court for permission to participate at the hearing of the PEO legal challenge. Other regulators are considering the matter as well.

Richard Steinecke, PEO's legal representative in these proceedings, says, "I am not surprised that other self-regulating professional bodies are following this proceeding with great interest. It seems that all such regulators are facing increasing challenges in trying to maintain the principle of self-regulation."

PEO is asking Divisional Court to clarify the application of OBC amendments that took effect on January 1, 2006. These amendments purport to require licensed professional engineers to qualify and register under a housing ministry regime to engage in building-related design and review of construction activities. PEO believes the amendments duplicate, contradict and otherwise interfere with PEO's statutory role to license, discipline and regulate its members and that the amendments are not authorized by the *Ontario Building Code Act, 1992*.

The judicial review in Divisional Court has been set for October 26 and 27, 2006.

Meanwhile, at the June 9 annual meeting of Consulting Engineers of Ontario, Housing Minister John Gerretsen acknowledged the controversy surrounding his ministry's OBC reforms. "When you're involved in the public policy process, you cannot always please everyone and there

are times when there are differences of opinion with respect to how you go about things," he said. "But let me just tell you that from our perspective, what we think is extremely important is the issue that we ensure that everyone is certified or is certified along some sort of parallel system, in bringing building applications forward..."

"The way I understand it, [when Bill 124/02] was first promoted by the previous government, the quid pro quo basically was, get everybody certified who is involved in the building permit process and, on the other hand, we're going to get the permits in effect issued in a faster, more expedient fashion. And I can tell you we are working on that to make sure that end of the bargain is lived up to by us."

Gerretsen also said the housing ministry remains committed to working with Ontario's engineers in reforming the building code and the building permit application process. In response to questions from *Engineering Dimensions*, Gerretsen affirmed the contributions engineers can make in reforming Ontario's building code and its building permit application system for the sake of improved public safety. He added, however, that proper certification of all parties remains the key. "I'm a lawyer and I know there are some lawyers who haven't been inside a courtroom in years," he said, suggesting that some professionals require ongoing demonstrations of competence or certification in certain practice areas.

While PEO supports the housing ministry's efforts to improve the building permit application process, it questions the application of the OBC amendments to licensed professionals, who are already fully accountable under their regulatory bodies' enabling statutes.

continued from p. 11

In his outgoing remarks, Goodings referred to such initiatives as the Government Liaison Program (GLP) and PEO's recent initiative of seeking legal clarification of the application of recent amendments to the *Ontario Building Code* as evidence of engineers actively defending the privilege of self-regulation.

"We've tried almost everything to off-set provisions of the *Ontario Building Code* amendments," Goodings said. "There's a notion that we let the ball slip, but that's not true. The record shows that we've been resisting this for the last four or five years. That doesn't mean we win, but we haven't let our guard down."

"There's a notion that we let the ball slip, but that's not true. The record shows that we've been resisting this for the last four or five years. That doesn't mean we win, but we haven't let our guard down."

—OUTGOING PRESIDENT BOB GOODINGS, P.ENG.

Similarly, new President Quinn stressed the regulatory incursion issue as a watershed event for the engineering community. "Bill 124 [the enabling legislation for the building code amendments] is like the canary in the mine," Quinn stated. "There is something happening that we consider unhealthy for the profession and we may be right or we may be wrong [but] our first act is to try and get it clarified, so that's why we've taken the legal action—to clarify the jurisdictional issue. Are we truly the regulators of our profession, or are there other people who believe it's their obligation as well?"

Lost to the profession?

Quinn also voiced concern over PEO's ability to "capture" new engineering graduates, many of whom express little interest in becoming professional engineers.

"There's a great concern that people coming out of engineering [schools]

don't see themselves as part of PEO," Quinn warned. "Our capture rate is less than 20 per cent, which means that 80 per cent—most of the people coming out of engineering—don't see us as being very relevant. Should we be concerned about this? I believe that yes we should, because it has to do with this whole issue of engineering."

As part of his President's Report, Goodings outlined some of the accomplishments of the past year. In addition to the strategic plan and the government liaison activity, he cited progress with such initiatives as the Engineering Internship Training (EIT) program, the Licensed Engineering Technologist

(LET) designation, and PEO's Accommodation Task Force, which is studying the regulator's possible purchase of a new headquarters.

One significant change at this year's annual meeting concerned the way member issues are brought to and treated at the meeting. What were once "member resolutions" to be voted on at the meeting, this year became submissions for the future consideration of the Executive Committee and Council. The change recognized that the votes previously conducted on resolutions cannot be binding on Council and were not a good use of precious annual meeting time, especially when there is a commitment to consider all the submissions anyway.

The lone 2006 submission was brought forward by Peter Broad, P.Eng., and Peter DeVita, P.Eng. It proposed that Council be required by an amendment to By-Law No. 1 to hold six full business

meetings a year. The by-law currently requires that Council hold at least four meetings a year.

The Ontario government was represented at the 2006 meeting by MPP Greg Sorbara, former finance minister (since reinstated). Sorbara, who represents the Vaughan-King-Aurora riding northwest of Toronto, tainted an otherwise positive message by making use of off-colour comments and language. It was an especially egregious gaffe before an audience concerned with overcoming the image of engineers as a sexist boys' club.

Nonetheless, Sorbara echoed sentiments previously expressed by Ontario Attorney General Michael Bryant that the provincial government fully supports self-regulation of the professions in the public interest.

He also referred to PEO's government liaison work, and its recent submission of a policy paper to then Energy Minister Donna Cansfield, as key steps in keeping policymakers attuned to the engineering profession's concerns.

Sorbara later suggested that PEO emphasize its work in helping internationally educated engineers integrate into the Ontario workforce as an important way to showcase engineering self-regulation.

Getting the message out

"What is less known is how much great work is being done right now by PEO," Sorbara said. "It's less known because it's a political football, and I encourage you, through your political action groups, and through the work that you are doing, to get that other message out. I think it's trite for a politician to get to a podium like this and offer anecdotes about engineers driving taxicabs. That's a reality, but the other part of the reality is that our professional bodies in Ontario have seized this issue as well, and on that score I simply encourage you to do two things: to continue with that mandate, and secondly, something that perhaps you do less of, to get that story in front of the Ontario public—to tell the story of the

continued on p. 14

continued from p. 12

work you've done [and] to put the numbers before Ontarians as to the successes you've had in this area."

(In the week following the meeting, Sorbara formally apologized to President Quinn for the portions of his remarks that detracted from his main message.)

In a change from previous annual business meetings, the 2006 gathering featured the tabling of reports from other Canadian engineering regulators, the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers (CCPE) and the Ontario Society of Professional Engineers (OSPE) (see News, p. 15). Representing these organizations at the annual meeting were: Robert Ito, PhD, P.Eng., president, Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of British Columbia (APEGBC); David Chalcraft, P.Eng.,

president, and Neil Willard, P.Eng., registrar, Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta (APEGGA); Jon Gillies, P.Eng., president, Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan (APEGGS); Robyn Taylor, P.Eng., president-elect, and Grant Koropatnick, registrar, Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Manitoba (APEGM); Gaétan Samson, ing., president, Ordre des ingénieurs du Québec (OIQ); Steve McLean, P.Eng., executive director, Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Newfoundland and Labrador (PEGNL); Colin Smith, P.Eng., president, and Marie Lemay, P.Eng., CEO, Canadian Council of Professional Engineers (CCPE); and Chris Cragg, P.Eng., then president and chair, and Sharon Glover,

CEO, Ontario Society of Professional Engineers (OSPE).

The annual meeting also included a send-off to Council members completing their terms of office, and a welcome to newly elected or appointed Council members.

After his installation, President Quinn reiterated his priorities of having PEO take a more active role in encouraging engineers to engage policymakers, and to instill a greater respect for professional licensing within recent engineering graduates.

"If we want to be real participants in society, we have to be sitting there at the decision-making tables," Quinn said. "And that starts at the municipal level. It's not just the federal level or the provincial level. We have to participate and we have to be there when the decisions are being made that affect us and society."



Regulators looking to future directions

BY MICHAEL MASTROMATTEO

Engineering regulators across the country are considering strategic planning activities and governance changes in efforts to better serve licence holders and help promote the value of the P.Eng. title.

In reports to PEO's annual general meeting April 29 in Toronto, several of them outlined new strategic plans aimed at bringing about an improved regulatory landscape. The efforts are in line with PEO's recent implementation of a five-year strategic plan aimed at demonstrating the value of engineering self-regulation in the public interest.

Representatives from British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Quebec provided updates on activities in their provinces. In addition, Colin Smith, P.Eng., then president, Canadian Council of Professional Engineers (CCPE), offered a national perspective on engineering advocacy work, while Chris Cragg, P.Eng., then president and chair, Ontario Society of Professional Engineers (OSPE), outlined some of the provincial advocacy organization's 2005 highlights.

At least two of the five regulators providing updates at the PEO meeting indicated that an engineering boom and increase in the number of major construction and development projects on the horizon spell new opportunities for engineering practitioners.

Several of the provinces also emphasized the need for the profession to continue responding to the challenge of accommodating international engineering graduates to the local labour force.

David Chalcroft, P.Eng., president, Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta (APEGGA), said a key issue for his organization is the possible development of a partnership with the province's engineering technologists in jointly regulating aspects of professional practice.

"This vision represents a positive path forward, a path that is conceptually congruent with leading-edge regulatory acts passed in recent years in Alberta," Chal-

croft said in his report. "Under the umbrella of the *Engineering, Geological and Geophysical Professions Act*, ASET (Alberta Society of Engineering Technologists) would take on regulatory responsibilities for categories of technologists who practise within teams."

Another key development for APEGGA is the development of a Provisional Licence, designed to assist applicants who meet all requirements for licensure except the one year of Canadian experience.

Robert Ito, P.Eng., president, Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of British Columbia

(APEGBC), listed professional reliance, globalization, emerging disciplines and professional liability as the top issues facing west coast engineers. Meanwhile, Jon Gillies, P.Eng., president, Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Saskatchewan (APEGGS), highlighted mobility, continuing education, and outreach to other professional regulatory bodies as among their top concerns.

Robyn Taylor, P.Eng., president-elect, Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Manitoba (APEGM), said a legal settlement with the province's architects over scopes of practice in building design and construction has brought

Several of the provinces also emphasized the need for the profession to continue responding to the challenge of accommodating international engineering graduates to the local labour force.

Wolfe and Smith awards presented at AGM



Tony Hamilton, P.Eng., (left) and Bill Andrews, P.Eng., were honoured at PEO's 2006 annual general meeting for high achievement in the PEO examination program. Hamilton claimed the S.E. Wolfe Thesis Award for his engineering report *Gas Turbine Cylinder Assembly Cycle Time Reduction*, while Andrews took the V.G. Smith Award for proficiency in a series of technical examinations. The V.G. Smith Award is given to the professional engineer licensed in the previous year through PEO's technical examination program who attains the highest mark in any three technical examination papers. The S.E. Wolfe Thesis Award is given to engineers completing at least one technical exam, who submit an engineering report judged to have been the best of all reports received during the year.

some relief to the local engineering community. Taylor also pointed to APEGM's support of a program allowing Aboriginal students to study engineering as an important initiative for 2005.

"Another issue that APEGM is facing is the significant increase in foreign-trained professionals," Taylor said in her report. "The increase will challenge and tax the screening and guidance programs currently in place at APEGM."

For Quebec's engineers, the main issues involve governance modernization, improved administrative services to membership, and stepped-up efforts to assist the provincial government in policymaking. The Ordre des ingénieurs du Québec (OIQ) recently presented the Quebec engineers' position paper on the energy sector to the parliamentary commission, which advocates wider accountability in consideration of climate change and greenhouse gas reduction plans.

OIQ President Gaétan Samson, ing., also encouraged PEO in its efforts to defend self-regulation against perceived regulatory incursions. "Like PEO, the OIQ is very much concerned about the application of the *Ontario Building Code* amendments," Samson said in his report. "We are following the situation with interest, and are especially concerned about the challenge to the exclusivity of PEO's role with respect to the supervision of the profession, but also about the potential impact of this legislation on the mobility of engineers in Canada."

OIQ President Gaétan Samson, ing., also encouraged PEO in its efforts to defend self-regulation against perceived regulatory incursions.

Nikola Tesla still relevant for today's P.Engs

By MICHAEL MASTROMATTEO

A leading authority on the life and work of Nikola Tesla (1856-1943) says the late 19th to early 20th century innovator continues to be a source of inspiration for today's engineers.

Marc Seifer, PhD, a professor at Roger Williams University in Bristol, Rhode Island, discussed Tesla's far-reaching achievements April 29 as keynote luncheon speaker at PEO's annual general meeting in Toronto. Seifer is author of a profile of Tesla in the January/February 2006 issue of *Engineering Dimensions* and of the book *Wizard: The life and times of Nikola Tesla*.

To mark the 150th anniversary of Tesla's birth in Smiljan, Croatia, and the innovative spirit in all engineers, PEO has designated 2006 as the "Year of Nikola Tesla."

The creator of the rotating magnetic field and the alternating current (AC)/polyphase electricity system, Tesla's name and reputation appear to have declined over the last 70 years in comparison to such other inventors as Thomas Edison (1847-1931) and Guglielmo Marconi (1874-1937).

"Tesla did not see himself as an inventor; rather, he saw himself as a discoverer of new principles," Seifer said in his presentation. "The implication is clear—Mother Nature is smarter than man. [Tesla's] invention of wireless communication, really the radio tube, was based on his study of the human eye. Just as a human eye can receive impulses stemming from hundreds, even millions of miles away, so, too, could his receiving tubes pick up signals from distant places."

Seifer believes Tesla deserves more credit for his efforts to harness natural forces for technological progress, and as an electrical engineer whose discoveries and innovations opened the door to the modern industrial age.

Although Tesla had become world famous by the late 1890s, one notable



Nikola Tesla researcher Marc Seifer, PhD, speaking at the PEO annual general meeting.

failure appears to have relegated him to a second-class inventor category. "Once he failed in his attempts to create a world-wide wireless system to distribute light, voice, pictures and power—known as Wardenclyffe—at the turn of the century, his name began to disappear from the mainstream," Seifer told *Engineering Dimensions*. "Another main reason was Marconi's success in sending the first wireless transmission across the Atlantic in 1901, and Marconi receiving the Nobel Prize in 1909. But after the Wardenclyffe fiasco, [Tesla] disappeared from the popular imagination."

Seifer said Tesla realized his creations would dramatically alter the way the world would evolve, but he remained optimistic that an engineering-entrepre-

"Tesla did not see himself as an inventor; rather, he saw himself as a discoverer of new principles."

—MARC SEIFER, PHD

neurial spirit would help usher in an era of peace, stability and careful use of natural resources.

The Tesla authority suggested Tesla's work in the early decades of the 20th century can be seen as prototypes for the later development of wireless communications, the cell phone, and even the Internet. Seifer added that Tesla's development of the induction motor, the fluorescent light bulb, remote-controlled machines, steam-powered automobile engines and his designs of innovative aircraft, all point to

Tesla's belief in a future made safer and more secure by technological discovery.

As for Tesla's ongoing significance to the engineering profession, Seifer had several observations. "If he were alive today, he would be very concerned with creating alternative ways to create energy," Seifer said. "He would be studying—and did study—solar energy, solar panels, how to harness wind, how to create more efficient ways to fertilize. He would be active in increasing the efficiency in the wireless transmission of power, trying to find ways to transmit electrical power to the moon and Mars [and] how to make air travel more effective."

As well, Seifer suggested, his subject would likely have remained involved in the development of wireless transmission stations and in the search for more efficient and less polluting modes of transportation. Nanotechnology, he added, would almost certainly have appealed to Tesla's fascination for discovering new secrets and technological applications from nature itself.

"[Tesla] would suggest that engineers study a broad range of topics to expand their understanding," Seifer said. "For instance, the study of biophysics may have great applications to civil and other [forms of] engineering. The thread of a spider, for example, is very strong. How can we make cables to capture this kind of strength? Learn from nature."

Diverse issues discussed at latest CLC

By JENNIFER COOMBES

A productive day was spent by senior members of PEO's chapters, who explored key issues facing chapters in particular, and PEO in general, at the latest Chapter Leaders' Conference (CLC). Held April 28, the day before PEO's annual general meeting, the theme of the conference was "Chapters: the tie that binds members to PEO." It was a chance for chapter volunteers to get together, discuss the outcome and progress of work started at the last conference, and to move on to new challenges.

President Bob Goodings, P.Eng., opened the conference by praising the work of chapter leaders, adding: "PEO would be a dull place without people in chapters...they are the heartbeat of engineers outside head office."

Following the President's remarks, Nick Colucci, P.Eng., chair of the conference organizing committee and a PEO Councillor, welcomed attendees, provided a recap of last year's conference, and updated attendees on what had happened as a result of the meeting. Colucci rhymed off the many positive and encouraging outcomes of last year's CLC, including creating a healthy and collaborative relationship with government, looking at where additional regional offices might be located, updating chapter by-laws (by 2007, all chapters should have updated by-laws), creating a speakers' bureau, and strengthening the chapter executives.

PEO Councillor Diane Freeman, P.Eng., brought attendees up to speed on what has been happening with the Government Liaison Program and the role of chapters in the the program. In particular, she discussed the program's history, the rollouts that are planned (see News, p. 20), and why the program is necessary. "In the past, no demand-side legislation had encroached on the PEA [*Professional Engineers Act*], and in the past engineers felt they didn't need to communicate with the government," Freeman said. "We thought the message was loud and clear.

However, clearly we need to work on our key messages. In fact, if we had relationships with MPs already, this incursion [recent amendments to the *Ontario Building Code*] could have been prevented."

The rest of the morning was spent hearing success stories of chapters in PEO's five regions, including the Brampton Chapter's education outreach to students in grades 9 and 10, Hamilton Chapter's community outreach program to assist prospective engineers by making the licensing process less intimidating for them, and Kingston Chapter's student papers night, which helps engineering students improve their presentation skills, and exposes them to PEO.

In the afternoon, concurrent breakout sessions were held on several topics. Attendees learned how the features of website software application PRISM can help them communicate more effectively with chapter members. Questions such as how chapters can help international engineering graduates were pondered. Attendees also brainstormed on how chapters can encourage a pool of volunteers to help support the regulatory function of PEO's Engineering Internship Training program. With 3500 experience reports waiting to be reviewed, there is a desperate need for volunteers to get through the backlog.

An interactive Chapter Boundary Task Force (CBTF) session was held late in the day. The task force is seeking to address the issue of chapter boundary definition and member identification, to better match the interests of members to chapter activities, to improve the low participation rate in chapter functions, and to increase the number of volunteers to carry on the objectives of the chapters. The task force was given its mandate and authority at the August 28, 2005 Regional Councillors Committee (RCC) meeting, which passed a motion "that measures be made to properly define, in today's terms, the chapter boundaries." Attendees at the CLC were asked whether there should be flexibility to allow members to be associated with a specific chapter. Other items of interest discussed were how far chapter members are traveling to attend chapter events and whether the chapter centres are properly identified. Recommendations from the CBTF, based on previous work and feedback from this meeting, were presented to Regional Congress meetings in June for input from the chapters, and will be considered by the RCC at its next meeting.

The next Chapter Leaders' Conference will be held November 18 at the Marriott Courtyard hotel in Toronto.



(Left to right) Dave Robinson, P.Eng., Nick Colucci, P.Eng., and Diane Freeman, P.Eng., listen to President Bob Goodings' opening remarks at the April 28 Chapter Leaders' Conference.

Minister welcomes PEO input in energy plan

By MICHAEL MASTROMATTEO

Ontario's former energy minister said she would welcome PEO input in drafting a policy aimed at helping the province meet a rising demand for electricity over the next 20 years.

Speaking May 10 at an event hosted by PEO's Etobicoke, Toronto-Dufferin, Toronto-Humber and Kingsway chapters, Donna Cansfield, since shuffled to transportation minister, saluted PEO's offer to join forces with the province in undertaking a "value analysis" of Ontario's conservation and energy supply challenges.

"I want to thank PEO for its recent offer to partner with the province to jointly sponsor a value analysis of Ontario's energy conservation challenge," Cansfield said. "I know that [PEO Registrar] Kim Allen [P.Eng.] and my staff have had a very good meeting and we've asked our officials to look at how your suggestions can fit in with our current plan. And I will tell you that I will do everything that I can to make it happen, because I think your proposal is value added."

Value analysis, a key part of a recent PEO paper, *Sorting Through the Noise: A Unique Decision-Making Approach for a Secure Energy Future*, is a process by which a wide array of competing interests, stakeholder positions and other factors are taken into account to reach broad and socially acceptable solutions to public policy issues.

PEO presented its energy paper to Minister Cansfield on May 5. At the time of the presentation, PEO President Pat Quinn, P.Eng., said value analysis can be an ideal mechanism to help governments draft more effective policy in the energy sector. "There is a lot of pressure on the government to find the optimal solution for meeting our future energy requirements," Quinn said. "We're proposing a trusted mechanism to make effective energy decisions. Value analysis will account for all of the competing interests."

Cansfield later said the PEO energy paper represents a way for the engineering regulator and the energy ministry to work together in promoting a conservation culture in the province. "At the same time," she

said, "[the joint effort] can reinforce our commitment to maintaining the necessary high standards to protect public safety."

Cansfield later outlined some of the provincial government's latest efforts to increase electricity generating capacity while encouraging business, industry and individual consumers to look for ways to reduce energy use.

The province stands firm in its commitment to phase out use of coal-powered electricity generation, while considering its options to arrive at an optimal energy supply/generation mix.

The people of Ontario face some tough choices to ensure a reliable supply of energy to meet the province's rapidly expanding population, Cansfield said. She said the energy ministry's main objectives over the next 20 years include reliability of supply, a competitive/true cost pricing system, the maximization of existing generation and transmission capacity, and the construction of new and cleaner generation sources.

"Our success in building a new energy future requires participation and the support of all Ontarians, and so obviously I appreciate [PEO's] interest and, in particular, your willingness to support the government in its ongoing conservation effort," she added.



Former Energy Minister Donna Cansfield speaking May 10 at a PEO chapter event.

The minister's emphasis on conservation as a key component in the provincial energy policy supports PEO's proposal to partner with the province in sponsoring a value analysis project on the energy conservation challenge. "This exercise," the PEO energy paper says, "could be a springboard for technical innovation and investment in energy conservation. In this way, PEO and the province could make a tangible contribution to the building of an energy conservation culture."

Since the provincial cabinet shuffle on May 23, PEO has reiterated its offer to new Energy Minister Dwight Duncan and continued discussions with ministry staff, but to date there is no indication the government wishes to proceed with the value analysis project.

PEO to present “campaign college,” media tour

By MICHAEL MASTROMATTEO

PEO is extending the scope of its Government Liaison Program (GLP) as the program enters its second year of operation.

Leading off the expanded program are plans to stage a one-day seminar to provide professional engineers, GLP spokespeople and any new volunteers with insights into the political process. Scheduled for early September, the seminar, dubbed “campaign college,” is designed to demystify political decision making and to encourage engineers to consider running for political office.

Ottawa-area MPP Phil McNeely, P.Eng., and federal MP Omar Alghabra, P.Eng. (Mississauga-Erindale), are among the politicians invited to serve as keynote speakers. Recruiters from each of the major political parties are also scheduled to attend.

In an interview with *Engineering Dimensions*, MPP McNeely, one of the few engineers elected to the Ontario legislature, emphasized the importance of engineers considering the political route. “Engineers are involved in so many aspects of society, so it’s a shame if we don’t get more of them into politics,” he said. “The

tion in the public interest. Said President Quinn: “It’s time for engineers to become more visible to the provincial government and general public. Hopefully, my colleagues will give me their full support and be inspired to get more involved.”

The tour will stop in Toronto in late October for the second Engineering for Ontarians Day at Queen’s Park. The first Queen’s Park event in June 2005 brought MPPs, including Ontario Attorney General Michael Bryant, and engineers together to discuss the value of engineering self-regulation.

PEO is supporting the higher-profile elements of the program with new information and a GLP toolkit for chapter GLP subcommittees and spokespeople. Supporting material will include a regular GLP column in *Engineering Dimensions* and enhancements to the GLP pages of the chapters section of the PEO website.

Councillor Diane Freeman, P.Eng., gave members a full briefing on the GLP-chapter link during the Chapter Leaders’ Conference at PEO’s annual general meeting in late April. The GLP information

ers, and the protocols for engaging MPPs, are also included in the manual.

PEO established a pilot Government Communications Program (now the GLP) in 2005 with the aim of informing provincial decision makers about PEO’s legislative mandate under the *Professional Engineers Act* to regulate the practice of professional engineering in the public interest. The program first focused primarily on encouraging PEO members to engage government leaders at both the Queen’s Park and constituency levels. And while maintaining such links with elected officials remains a priority, in this next phase, the GLP will include helping engineers get involved in election campaigns as volunteers, canvassers, donors, or even candidates.

This phase of the program will also emphasize the ways P.Engs can work with government to help create more effective public policy. In this vein, PEO recently submitted an energy supply paper to the energy ministry to remind government leaders that the province’s professional engineers can lend their experience, expertise and enthusiasm to policy making in the public interest.

The expanded GLP will continue to rely heavily on volunteers, including those members who had already volunteered to be PEO spokespeople.

To date, it is generally agreed the first 12 months of the GLP succeeded in bringing about a heightened awareness of the benefits of engineering self-regulation among Ontario MPPs.

John Grefford, P.Eng., one of the first wave of PEO government spokespeople, told *Engineering Dimensions* elected officials across Ontario seem more attuned to engineers’ concerns. “I believe the main objectives of [the] GLP have been achieved.” Grefford said. He added that PEO’s recent move to seek legal clarification of a purported overlap between engineering self-regulation and the housing ministry’s *Ontario Building Code* reforms underscores the need for active engagement with policymakers. “It is unfortunate that

“Engineers are involved in so many aspects of society, so it’s a shame if we don’t get more of them into politics.”

—MPP PHIL MCNEELY, P.ENG.

only way this is going to happen is if P.Engs start to get out there, meet their MPPs, get to know those involved in the riding, and lend a hand. Getting heard is all about being proactive.”

A second key component of the next phase of the GLP is a tour of various Ontario cities by PEO President Pat Quinn, P.Eng. Each stop will include meetings with key media, local government officials and PEO chapter leaders to increase PEO’s visibility and to reiterate the value and importance of self-regula-

tion manual is in the process of being circulated to all PEO chapters for comments and will be published to the GLP website pages.

At present, each chapter is establishing a Government Liaison Program Chapter Subcommittee to oversee the integration of the program into its operations. The GLP manual outlines the role and responsibilities of these subcommittees and provides guidance on how each chapter should organize government outreach activities. Details about PEO’s messaging and positioning, significant political lead-

the legal route needed to be undertaken by PEO to ensure that our concerns are fully addressed. The GLP should yield benefit in preventing similar intrusive legislation from being introduced in the future.”

Fellow practitioner Joe Adams, P.Eng., who met with London-area MPPs throughout 2005, says that whatever success the GLP has had to date will likely be enhanced with the addition of new materials and resources.

“The concept is good, but the program needs some better organization to help support the local presence,” Adams said. “An issue paper, published every two to three months for the spokespeople, would be helpful to ensure a consistent message and an opening topic with the MPPs.”

Adams says the GLP appears to be making more significant inroads at the local, rather than Queen’s Park, level of government. “I can’t say [if all MPPs] are really more sensitive yet [to PEO concerns], as they have a number of groups working for their attention,” Adams said. “But I can say they are at least now aware of us. It will take an ongoing effort to ensure they are aware of our concerns and issues, but the seeds have been sown.”

Mississauga-area engineer Tap Das, P.Eng., says the success of the GLP might lie in convincing MPPs their political fortunes would benefit from increased sensitivity to the needs of engineers and other self-regulated professions. “MPPs are mainly responsive to something that impacts their political future,” Das said. “MPPs will involve with something that improves their public image and hence get them re-elected.”

Wafik El Sunbaty, P.Eng., of PEO’s Mississauga Chapter, has been especially active with the GLP, organizing meetings between engineers and municipal and provincial politicians. El Sunbaty has also organized meetings with provincial Conservative leader John Tory and other members of the provincial opposition.

“I believe it’s important for engineers to convince policymakers that P.Eng. values are in sync with public interest values, and that engagement of government leaders is important, not to force them into decisions but to keep them mindful of our existence, our experience and our willingness to help out,” El Sunbaty said.

MPPs contacted by *Engineering Dimensions* agreed the GLP appears to be making some impact.

Liberal MPP Ernie Parsons, P.Eng. (Prince Edward-Hastings), who has hosted meetings with engineers at Queen’s Park, says the campaign should

establish priorities amid the hundreds of competing interests and special requests all vying for attention.

Liberal MPP Tim Peterson (Mississauga South) echoes the view the campaign can be effective by targeting both back bench MPPs and cabinet members.

“It is unfortunate that the legal route needed to be undertaken by PEO to ensure that our concerns are fully addressed.”

—JOHN GREFFORD, P.ENG.

gain strength as it continues. “I believe the campaign has been very effective from the viewpoint of educating provincial politicians, but I strongly suggest that it not be viewed as a one-time effort, but rather the beginning of a regular occurrence,” he said.

Parsons says regular followup by engineers is needed to help policymakers

“I met PEO and was very impressed with both their enthusiasm to be self-regulating and the thoroughness of their approach, not just with me, but to the other MPPs and cabinet ministers as well.”

For details about campaign college, the President’s provincial tour, and ongoing development of the GLP, watch the PEO website at www.peo.on.ca.

Engineers seek input into foreign credentials agency

By MICHAEL MASTROMATTEO

Engineer regulators are keeping close watch on plans by the federal government to establish a new agency to assess the credentials of internationally trained professionals.

In his May 2 budget speech, federal Finance Minister Jim Flaherty announced the government is allocating \$18 million for the creation of a Canadian Agency for Assessment and Recognition of Foreign Credentials.

Although it is too early to predict how the new agency will affect provincial licensing bodies, there is some concern that its work could overlap with that of regulators in terms of assessing professional credentials.

In a May 8 memo to the presidents of Canada's engineering regulators, Colin Smith, P.Eng., then president, Canadian Council of Professional Engineers (CCPE), said that while the engineering community supports efforts to integrate international engineering graduates (IEGs), regulators must be consistent in their response to the government initiative.

"The federal government's stated objective in establishing a foreign credential recognition agency is to improve settlement outcomes for immigrants by offering assistance and referral services that allow immigrants to successfully navigate through different government and regulatory channels," Smith said. "This approach can be consistent with our own goals, provided that the new agency respects the regulatory bodies' legislated obligation to assess licensure applicants' qualifications and avoids duplication of credentialing processes already in place."

Smith also said regulators should stress the need for the engineering profession to have some stake in the immigration selection process, especially in terms of assessing credentials of prospective immigrants who identify engineering as their career objective.

CCPE also emphasized that the engineering profession has already taken a leading role in helping steer IEGs on the path to licensure. CCPE's From Consideration to Integration (FC2I) project, a three-phase, nationally focused effort, has

been working since 2003 to provide a clear road map for IEGs to follow from the time they consider resettling in Canada until they are licensed as professional engineers.

Although the Canadian Agency for Assessment and Recognition of Foreign Credentials appeared to be a high-profile item in the new federal budget, it may be a while before it actually begins operations. At this point, the government is committing only to consulting with regulators, immigrant advocacy groups and other stakeholders. "As we engage the different orders of governments in discussions on the new credentialing agency, it will be important that they are kept up to date on our profession's leadership role in addressing the challenges faced by international engineering graduates," said Colin Smith of the CCPE.

In an effort to promote consistency of message, Smith also suggested any regulators consulting with government about the governance and structure of the new credential recognition agency keep four main themes in mind:

- The engineering profession supports efforts to integrate IEGs into the workforce;
- Educational qualifications for IEGs should be assessed for Canadian equivalency by the profession at the earliest possible stage in the immigration process;
- The engineering community as a whole welcomes the opportunity to work with government in giving shape to the new agency; and
- In its assessment of credentials, the new agency should avoid any duplication of effort and process already provided by engineering regulators.

Provincial developments

The creation of a new foreign credential and assessment agency coincides with a recent move by the Quebec government to create one-year work permits, which will allow professionals who have obtained their education and training outside the country

a restricted form of practice. The Quebec government's Bill 14 is designed to alleviate labour shortages in some professions, while speeding up the time required to recognize foreign credentials.

Meanwhile, in early June, the Ontario government tabled the *Fair Access to Regulated Professions Act*, which puts the province's 34 regulated professions under greater scrutiny to show their admission processes are fair and equitable.

In a media release issued the day the legislation was announced, PEO expressed support for the proposed legislation.

"PEO has always fully supported fair and inclusive registration practices that permit the association to regulate the practice of professional engineering and govern licence and certificate holders to protect and serve the public interest," said President Pat Quinn, P.Eng. "This legislation provides the public an open and transparent means to validate these practices and demonstrates a commitment by the government to self-governance of professions."

The Ontario Institute of Chartered Accountants also publicly expressed support for the goals of the new Bill 124/04, with other Ontario regulators taking a wait-and-see approach.

On June 19, however, President Quinn also wrote to the *Toronto Star* in response to an editorial in its June 18 issue. The letter was published on June 20. In it, he reiterated PEO's support for the legislation, but noted licensing and registration requirements might not be the cause of the difficulties some IEGs have in integrating into the Ontario workforce.

"There is no demonstrated 'looming labour shortages' in engineering in Ontario," he said, "no 'confusing and unwieldy' assessment processes in PEO, and no need for forcing fairness and transparency on a profession lauded for its generosity in assisting foreign trained engineers to become registered.

"There is much good in Minister Colle's bill, but painting it as an answer to the real problems of absorbing engi-

neers into Ontario's market place is disingenuous, and casting the engineer's regulatory body as responsible for finding jobs for engineers is nonsense.

"...Before asserting that we all lose when skilled immigrants cannot use their expertise, you could consider the morality of inviting skilled people to

marketplaces where they cannot immediately be absorbed, and whether all this ado about credentialing is masking the real dilemma."

APEGGA offers to partner with Alberta technologists

By ANNE GARRETT, P.ENG.

In 2005, the Alberta Society of Engineering Technologists (ASET) submitted a change of name to the Corporate Registry of the Government of Alberta, the agency responsible for the *Societies Act*. Despite the objections of the Association of Professional Engineers, Geologists and Geophysicists of Alberta (APEGGA) and other professional associations, approval was given to change the society's name to the Association of Science and Engineering Technology Professionals of Alberta. APEGGA's primary concern was the use of the words engineering and professional together in this name, which has significant potential for confusion in the minds of the public as they might think that members of ASET are licensed to provide services independently.

On January 30, 2006, ASET appeared before the Alberta government's Standing Policy Committee on Education and Employment. This body receives information and advice from Albertans and uses it to formulate policy that is reflected in the government's legislative agenda. ASET requested a new act for all applied science, information, and engineering technologists that would make ASET a regulator of technologists with the right to practise independently and accept responsibility for their work.

On March 21, the Pro 10 group (APEGGA plus nine other professional groups in Alberta) and APEGGA made separate presentations to the Standing Policy Committee addressing these issues. The 10 associations jointly addressed concerns about the name change as well as about the proposal to make ASET a regulator of a wide range of technologists, many of whom are already provided for under existing legislation regulating these professional groups. APEGGA, in addressing specific concerns

for the proposed legislation, rejected the concept of independent legislation and instead suggested partnering with ASET under a one-act, two-association model.

APEGGA's proposal is three-part:

1. government to reject separate legislation for technologists (ASET is currently constituted under the *Societies Act* and does not have separate legislation).
2. the *Engineering, Geology and Geophysics Professions Act*, which governs APEGGA, be amended to also include ASET, i.e. two associations under one act. ASET will have right

to title and a regulatory role in relation to technologists practising under supervision. APEGGA and ASET would jointly regulate technologists who may be qualified to practise independently.

3. a government-appointed mediator be requested to work with APEGGA and ASET to develop a mutually acceptable solution within a specific timeframe.

Details of the proposal can be found on the APEGGA website at www.apegga.com/ASET/default.html.

Expanded Public Information Model set to launch in early 2007

By PAT QUINN, P.ENG.

At its September 2004 meeting, Council adopted the concept of an Expanded Public Information Model (EPIM), part of the Privacy Policy approved at the same meeting, following analysis that indicated a public interest need for more information about practitioners than is currently available. Removing as many barriers to information about P.Eng.s as possible allows PEO to better fulfill its regulatory mandate as it fosters informed choice by and greater protection for the public, and promotes professional accountability in practitioners. We have to see privacy in the light of technology today, and in terms of the public's interest and rights to knowledge about the professionals whose work impacts their lives.

Engineering Dimensions, January/February 2005, pp. 54-57).

What the EPIM means for licence holders is that certain information about practitioners will be made publicly available starting in early 2007. At first, the information available on the EPIM online directory will be basic. In fact, most of this core information is already available on the current online directory of professional engineers and engineers-in-training on the PEO website (which will be phased out in early 2007).

Information contained in the first EPIM member profiles will include licence number, name, employer name and contact information, gender, immigration status (EITs only), type of licence, and licence status. It will also include the Cer-

as home address, will only ever be available to the public or another member via a written request that will be personally reviewed by the Chief Privacy Officer. Each written request for information (a form will be provided on the website) will require the requestor to identify himself or herself, and state an acceptable public interest need for the information.

For an overview of the types of information that will be made available over the course of the implementation of the EPIM project, and by which mechanism the information will be made available (either online or by written request), see In Council, *Engineering Dimensions*, March/April, p. 30.

There is a great deal of work to be done before the searchable EPIM online directory goes live in early 2007. In par-

Certain sensitive information will only ever be available to the public or another member via a written request that will be personally reviewed by the Chief Privacy Officer.



PEO is a not-for-profit organization and, as such, is exempted from the *Personal Information Protection and Electronic Documents Act* (PIPEDA). However, taking the public's best interests into account, PEO has adopted voluntary privacy policies that follow the act's principles of accountability, and that safeguard personal information and identify the purposes for which it is collected, used and disclosed. Council's approval of the PEO Privacy Policy underscores the regulator's commitment to protecting members' personal information, and using and disclosing it responsibly (see "Privacy protection is good business,"

tificate of Authorization number of a member's employer, designation, date registered, date of first licensure with PEO, position/title, C of A, consulting designation, and education information (degrees, disciplines the degrees were granted in, the institution granting degree, year of graduation).

Over time, more information will gradually be made available to the public as it is collected from members through such activities as the Strategic Plan Voluntary Annual Reporting project (see *Engineering Dimensions*, March/April 2006, p. 20). This process will occur in phases. Certain sensitive information, such

particular, on August 1, the member profile will be made available to each member (but not yet publicly) via the members' area on the PEO website. During this time, members can update their profiles using the online address change function on the website.

In certain special circumstances, determined by PEO's privacy officer (primarily for safety reasons) a member's information may be excluded from the online directory. Members may request that their information not be included in the EPIM online directory by filing a *Request to Withhold Information from the Public Form*, which will be available on PEO's website.

Consulting P.Engs vying with cost, client satisfaction issues

By MICHAEL MASTROMATTEO

Ontario's consulting engineers continue to press the provincial and municipal governments to adopt quality-based selection (QBS) as the main criteria in choosing engineering services, especially in light of the need for massive infrastructure renewal projects across the country.

The merits of QBS as opposed to cost-based selection, formed a significant part of the discussion at the Consulting Engineers of Ontario (CEO) annual general meeting June 7 to 9 in Kingston. CEO is an association advocating for the commercial and business interests of its more than 250 member engineering firms.

Guest speaker at this year's CEO event was MPP John Gerretsen, Ontario minister of municipal affairs and housing. Ontario's engineering community has long been engaged with the housing ministry in regard to amendments to the *Ontario Building Code* (OBC) that it regards as infringements on engineering self-regulation.

Other speakers included Randy Lewis of XL Design Professionals Insurance, who discussed meeting client expectations, and Peter de Jager of Technomobility, who discussed effective change management.

CEO and its national counterpart, the Association of Consulting Engineers of Canada (ACEC), have endorsed QBS as the preferred method of selecting engineering consultants. QBS is said to emphasize the experience, qualifications and overall value provided by engineering firms over the lowest price-based bidding often sought by municipal and provincial government procurement departments.

In addition to the QBS discussion, CEO members debated plans to better satisfy client concerns about overall quality. CEO believes that while satisfaction with the consulting engineering sector remains at a high level, some clients have suggested that the quality of service provided by consulting engineering firms is on the decline.

A third priority item for consulting engineers is the value and understanding of the PEO "consulting engineer" designation. At its 2005 annual meeting, CEO established a task force to consider ways of promoting better understanding of the consulting engineer designation, both within the industry and to the general public. CEO's recommendations in this area were forwarded to PEO, and the regulator is considering a plan to combine revisions to the consulting engineer designation with its strategic plan aims to increase the reach and effectiveness of PEO's regulatory function under the *Professional Engineers Act*.

The annual meeting was also the venue to announce election result of CEO's officers and directors. Ian Williams, P.Eng., of McCormick Rankin Corporation, takes over as CEO chair from Anne Poschmann, P.Eng., who remains on the board as past chair. Other officers and directors for 2006-2007

include Bob Fleeton, P.Eng., vice-chair; Joe Heynick, P.Eng., treasurer; and Garry Leveck, P.Eng., secretary. Newly elected directors include David Amm, P.Eng., Bill De Angelis, P.Eng., Shawn Gibbons, P.Eng., Greg Turchyn, P.Eng., and returning directors, Ron Mazza, P.Eng., Chris Redmond, P.Eng., Anita Smith, P.Eng., and Dave Tipler, P.Eng.

In his address to members, Williams cited the importance of consulting engineers to improving the quality of life and public safety in Ontario. He also referred to the wealth of engineering opportunities stemming from infrastructure renewal across the country, calling it "a watershed moment" in the history of CEO.

CEO also presented its achievement awards at the AGM (See Awards, p. 32).

In his remarks towards the end of the meeting, John Gerretsen said that despite the controversy surrounding his ministry's involvement with the OBC amendments, consulting engineers are poised to make significant contributions to the ongoing development of the province.

Although he appreciates engineers' concerns about the building permit application process and the development of a "parallel system" of registration, Gerretsen said he looks forward to working with engineers under a design, planning and building code regime.

"And as all of you know, the next edition of our building code will use a much more flexible objective-based format," he said. "It's going to make the work of your profession even more important, I believe, because under that [objective-based] format, the designers will all have a clear framework for proposing new building materials, new systems and new designs as alternatives to the acceptable solutions set out in the code, and this will promote innovation in the construction sector, while maintaining public safety, so that your work, in a sense, becomes even more important than it is right now."

Ontario's consulting engineers continue to press the provincial and municipal governments to adopt quality-based selection (QBS) as the main criteria in choosing engineering services.

OSPE executive takes shape for 2006-2007

By MICHAEL MASTROMATTEO

The Ontario Society of Professional Engineers (OSPE) has looked to the recent past in coming up with a new leader.

Danny Young, P.Eng., of London, Ontario, who led the engineering advocacy organization in 2003-2004, has been re-elected as president and chair for 2006-2007. Members of OSPE's 2006-2007 executive were announced May 6 during OSPE's annual general meeting in Toronto.

Joining Young on OSPE's volunteer executive are Past Chair Chris Cragg, P.Eng., Vice Chair Michael Monette, P.Eng., Treasurer Cindy Akyuz, P.Eng., and Secretary M. Clare Morris, P.Eng.

The 2006 annual meeting featured brief reports from PEO Past President Bob Goodings, P.Eng., John Gamble, P.Eng., president, Consulting Engineers of Ontario, Giuseppe Indelicato, ing., of Quebec's engineering advocacy organization (SERVIQ), and David Thompson, executive director, Ontario Association of Certified Engineering Technicians and Technologists (OACETT).

In a report to members, outgoing Chair Cragg said the previous year had been marked by OSPE progress in advocacy, professional development and political action.

In taking on the OSPE chair for a second time, Danny Young cited advocacy, mem-

bership growth, services, and professional development as among the top priorities.

"In the coming year we will continue to build on our advocacy successes, seek out new programs and services to meet the needs of our members, and grow our membership base," Young said.

Other directors for 2006-2007 are Annette Bergeron, P.Eng., John Clayton, P.Eng., Peter DeVita, P.Eng., Steven Rose, P.Eng., Michael Santaluce, P.Eng., John Schindler, P.Eng., David Steeves, P.Eng., and Alourdes Sully, P.Eng. Outgoing directors are Catherine Karakatsanis, P.Eng., Paul Martin, P.Eng., and Anne Sado, P.Eng. Sharon Glover remains as OSPE's chief executive officer.



2007 Council Elections—Call for Candidates

All nominating committees invite PEO members to become candidates for the positions of **President-elect**, **Vice President**, **Councillor-at-Large** and **Regional Councillor** (one for each of PEO's five regions) on PEO Council.

The position of **President-elect** is for a one-year term (2007-2008), after which the incumbent will serve a one-year term (2008-2009) as President and a one-year term as Past President (2009-2010). Candidates for the position of President-elect must have served on Council previously for a total of at least two full Council years as of PEO's Annual General Meeting 2007, and must not have served as President for at least five years before they would take office (i.e. not since 2002).

The position of **Vice President** is for a one-year term (2007-2008). Candidates for the position of Vice President must have served on Council previously for at least one full Council year as of PEO's Annual General Meeting 2007, and must not have served as President for at least five years before they would take office (i.e. not since 2002).

The position of **Councillor-at-Large** is for a two-year term (2007-2009).

To become a candidate for the positions of **President-elect**, **Vice President**, or **Councillor-at-Large**, please submit your name and a letter accepting the nomination by **September 5, 2006** to George R. Comrie, P.Eng., chair, Nominating Committee, c/o Brenda Caplan, PEO, 25 Sheppard Avenue West, Suite 1000, Toronto, ON, M2N 6S9. Fax: 416-224-8168; 800-268-0496.

The position of **Regional Councillor** is for a two-year term (2007-2009). Candidates for Regional Councillor must reside within the region through which they are nominated.

To become a candidate for **Regional Councillor**, please submit your name and a letter accepting the nomination by **September 5, 2006** to the chair of the appropriate Regional Nominating Committee, c/o Michael Chan, P.Eng., PEO, 25 Sheppard Avenue West, Suite 1000, Toronto, ON, M2N 6S9. Fax: 416-224-8168; 800-268-0496. Chairs of the Regional Nominating Committees are: Cliff Knox, P.Eng. (Eastern Region), Thomas Chong, P.Eng. (East Central Region), David Euler, P.Eng. (Northern Region), John Vieth, P.Eng. (Western Region), and Colin Moore, P.Eng. (West Central Region).

If you choose to become nominated for these positions by submitting your name to the nominating committees, you will not require nominators' signatures. The nominating committees will put forward as nominations all the names they receive. The nominating committees will seek candidates only where there are no submissions or to avoid an acclamation.

If you choose to become nominated by members at large, you will require nominators' signatures as outlined in Regulation 941/90, section 14. Deadline for nominations from members at large is 4:00 p.m. on December 13, 2006.

Complete election procedures appear beginning on the facing page. For further information on becoming a candidate through the nominating committees, please contact: Brenda Caplan, 416-840-1104, or 800-339-3716, ext. 1104; email: bcaplan@peo.on.ca.