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INTRODUCTION

In June, 1975, the fledgling Canadian Coalition for Nuclear Responsibility began a crusade for a national inquiry into nuclear energy. Since then, with respect to the various aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle, there have been no fewer than a dozen public participation commissions, committees and inquiries conducting investigations in Canada. Four of these have not completed their deliberations but will shortly.

A national inquiry is very close to becoming a reality.

In light of such extensive investigation, the question is, will the day ever come when it can be said that the basic nuclear principles, practices and issues have been examined fully and sufficiently? Or is nuclear energy so politicized and imbued with moral issues that, like crime perhaps, it must be subject to continuous public examination and trial?

In other words, can a definitive inquiry on nuclear energy ever be completed?

THE INQUIRY RECORD

In rough chronological order of formation, beginning with one which was already under way in 1975, the formal public investigations into nuclear energy issues in Canada since the CCNR's founding are as follows:

The Royal Commission on the Health and Safety of Workers in Mines - Ontario's "Ham Commission";

The Royal Commission on Electric Power Planning - Ontario's "Porter Commission";

The Select Committee on Ontario Hydro Affairs;

The Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry - Saskatchewan's "Bayda Inquiry";

The Ontario Environmental Assessment Board hearing into the expansion of uranium mining at Elliot Lake;

The Committee on Nuclear Issues in the Community (CONIC) - (Science Council and Royal Society);

Four hearings under Environment Canada's Environmental Assessment and Review Process (EARP) regarding a proposed uranium refinery:

- Port Granby
- Blind River
- Dill Township
- Hope Township
The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Uranium Mining in B.C. - the "Bates Commission"; and

The Energy Committee of the New Brunswick Legislature.

The above-mentioned dozen inquiries are highlighted here because they all involved a good deal of public input, involvement and interest, more or less according to the impact of their subject matter. Two others might be added, but since both had a very low public profile, they might be considered exceptions for the purpose of this discussion. They are: the 1977 Quebec government commission on energy (Commission Parlementaire sur l'énergie) or "Jonon Commission", which focused on a green paper and major energy policy issues; and the federal Standing Committee on National Resources and Public Works, which over the years has made various probes into nuclear topics, the most intensive being a half-dozen sessions in the Spring of 1977, and a couple on the waste disposal issue in February, 1978.

Other than the fact that they deal with some aspect of the nuclear industry, (and a few have tried to deal with all aspects), the common denominator of each of the efforts mentioned is that they have been publicly funded. A full accounting is not yet available, but a conservative rough estimate tallies at over $5 million and climbing.

Where are we now after years of debate, miles of transcripts, shelf upon shelf of exhibits and extensive media coverage? Is there much more to be examined, or is it now necessary to concentrate on a compilation and overall assessment? What about the general public, in whose interests all this time and money is being spent - is the public any wiser or safer? Do these investigations tend to scare or to reassure, to confuse or to inform? Is it possible that inquiries serve the interests of critics more than those of the electorate?

One could question the value and impact of the inquiries themselves for hours, but I doubt that any meaningful answers would arise without a comprehensive opinion poll being taken. And of course that has its limitations.
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But as we head for a national inquiry, perhaps it would be useful to examine past goings-on to see what they might reveal. Time will not allow a detailed examination of each one I have mentioned, but an overview and a few comments on some of the most important might be instructive. I have arbitrarily chosen five.

The Ham Commission

The Royal Commission on the Health and Safety of Workers in Mines, chaired by Professor James Ham, issued its 350-page report on June 30, 1976, after 21 months' work including eight weeks of public hearings in Ottawa, Toronto and northern Ontario mining communities. Described as "the Ham blueprint", the $500,000 study produced 117 recommendations touching all aspects of the Commission's mandate; one-sixth of this monumental work was specifically devoted to the problems associated with the front end of the nuclear fuel cycle, and provided an excellent review of the hazards from ionizing radiation in the mine environment. It was an eminently actionable document.

Professor Ham strongly criticized the federal and provincial governments and industry for failing to protect the province's 30,000 mine workers from hazardous conditions. Yet the report itself met with a singular lack of criticism, the only exception being one from the unions regarding the Commission's failure to endorse the principle of refusal to work in hazardous conditions, which of course has now been resolved through provisions of the Canada Labour Code and provincial legislation.

Perhaps the best comment on the acceptability of the Ham Commission's work came from the Globe and Mail's Norman Webster who remarked that "The Ham proposals are so firmly based on simple justice and good sense that they could hardly be resisted."

In a post-report interview, Professor Ham expressed the view that health standards for miners were a fundamental public policy question. "How many deaths is Ontario society willing to accept as a consequence of having uranium mining?" he asked, followed by the statement that "If the government is to set standards, there has to be some public debate."
Apart from the important recommendations of the report itself, which provide a framework for action, the comment regarding the need for public participation may be one of the most telling legacies of the business-like Ham Commission.

The Porter Commission

On September 27, 1978, after two years and $3 million, the Royal Commission on Electric Power Planning, chaired by Dr. Arthur Porter, brought forth its 227-page interim report on nuclear energy in Ontario, "A Race Against Time". Based on 335 hours of public hearings, including funded cross-examinations, the report gave cautious and conditional approval to a continuing role for nuclear energy in Ontario, adding a post-1985 new construction moratorium warning unless there is a "credible and broadly accepted" nuclear waste management program.

Issue papers, "outreach" programs, exhibits, information centres, symposia, seminars, panels, workshops, open letters to the public, debates, and hearings held on a very informal basis have constituted the Porter Commission's efforts at maintaining communications with the people of Ontario. One commentator has remarked that since the Commission's formation, Dr. Porter "has been in show business" conducting a repertoire "that threatens to outrun 'Hello Dolly!' as perpetual entertainment."

The Commission certainly has been labouring for some time. Formation of the Porter Commission was announced on March 13, 1975, in a speech to the legislature by then Provincial Secretary Allan Grossman. As outlined by Mr. Grossman, the Commission's mandate was rather prosaic, being to "focus on the broad conceptual consequences of alternative ways of supplying sufficient electrical power during the period 1983 to 1993."

However, the nuclear topic soon dominated the Commission's attention, possibly surprising the Commission itself which had originally scheduled only 12 days for the nuclear power issue. The aforementioned commentator saw this as a natural result of public and media titillation, saying "You don't give them Shakespeare when the crowd wants a skin show."
The Porter Commission's interim report has been applauded as being eminently reasonable, but it has also been attacked by both nuclear industry spokesmen and nuclear critics. This is likely due to its middle-of-the-road nature: it did not give the industry a shot in the arm, (and in certain respects "pulled the rug out"), but neither did it come down heavily in support of the critics' views.

The findings of the Porter Commission, both interim and final, will form important building blocks for any future inquiries, as well as providing guidelines for action to meet public concerns. However, the major legacy may well be the impetus the Commission procedures have given to Canadian nuclear critics. I think it is fair to say that the deliberations of the Porter Commission have seen the coming of age of interventionists on the nuclear scene in this country.

Through receipt of funding, patient encouragement, and ample opportunity for practice in a forum conducted under lenient rules by an indulgent chairman, the critics at the Porter Commission sharpened their skills for use elsewhere.

To the extent that these critics will use their skills in the public interest and not on their own behalf, I feel the experience has certainly been worthwhile. There are grounds for concern, however, that future interventionist funding and support should be carefully channeled in the public interest. For example, it would seem questionable to fund individuals or organizations which are on record with the Porter Commission as admitting their brief was straight propaganda, or who have stated that regardless of the Commission's findings, even if all opposing "facts" were proven wrong, they would continue to oppose nuclear energy.

In the public interest, the future of nuclear energy in Canada cannot be left to the determination of narrow-minded zealots, whether of the "pro" or "anti" persuasion. Nor should such persons live off the public purse which has only been opened to foster meaningful debate.
The Ontario Select Committee

If the Ham Commission can be characterized as "business-like", and the Porter Commission as "easy-going informal", one would have to describe the Select Committee on Ontario Hydro Affairs as "very political". As it is composed entirely of politicians, one might expect this, but those who have attended the hearings of both the Ontario Committee and the New Brunswick legislature's Energy Committee will attest to the relatively extreme political nature of the Select Committee.

If its subject matter were not so serious, the Select Committee might also be described as "entertaining" - the Committee transcripts make fascinating reading. One group of energy critics with whom the AEOC has been conducting discussions suggests extracts would make a riotous book.

The Select Committee was announced in November, 1976, amid protestations of concern that it would duplicate the work of the Porter Commission. In fact, the Committee did not begin looking at nuclear power in depth until the fall of 1977, and maintained a fairly low profile until this past summer when nuclear safety and the brouhaha over NPD catapulted it into prime time and onto the front page.

The Select Committee is now into a second session on nuclear power, and is not expected to report for about a month or so. It is supposed to carry on into 1980 on some nuclear subject, perhaps that of waste management, but the national inquiry may affect its plans.

With 14 members and a $405,000 budget, the Select Committee's major achievement to date has been a significant contribution to public access to information. Through its efforts, Ontario Hydro has released some 800,000 pages of correspondence and internal documents embodying 392 volumes and taking up a purported 80 feet of shelf space.

Such a precedent has important ramifications for future inquiries as well as on the basic way in which the nuclear industry operates, and the controls upon it are exercised.
Despite its political orientation, the Committee has also demonstrated a fundamental principle of inquiry effectiveness which is of note for future investigations. This is the question of whether or not expert cross-examination is required to winkle out all the tidbits necessary for informed decision-making. After considerable debate, Committee members opted to do their own questioning, supported as necessary by outside advice and a Committee counsel primed and coached by an independent expert. Committee chairman Donald MacDonald justified the avoidance of day-to-day cross-examination by saying, "Our job is not to have a full understanding of the technical details, but to grasp the essence of them in terms of their impact on social and economic policy."

The matters laid bare by the Committee in the resulting non-adversarial forum are vivid testimony to the ability of technically uninformed persons to come to grips with the nuclear issues without elaborate legal techniques. This is important because there has been a tendency for politicians, who do, after all, represent the man on the street, to leave the complicated nuclear debate to others. The technocrats and professional critics have had to fill the void, and the human aspects have sometimes been forgotten in the rush to counter opinion with fact and vice versa.

The Select Committee has demonstrated that by proxy, members of the general public can indeed ask the questions which are important to them, and in most cases can elicit meaningful answers.

The Bayda Inquiry

The Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry, under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice E. D. Bayda, was established by Saskatchewan Order-in-Council of February 1, 1977. Within 18 months, after 65 days of formal hearings, 12,000 pages of transcript, 240 exhibits and 140 witnesses, the report of the Inquiry was filed in June, 1978.

The Bayda Inquiry drew 122 conclusions and made 51 recommendations, all having to do with the considered opinion that uranium could be extracted without damage to the environment or danger to the health of workers, provided strict rules were enforced.
The style of the inquiry was informal yet business-like, with Mr. Justice Bayda brooking no delays. This earned a good deal of criticism, manifested in threats of boycott and newspaper headlines like "Firm inquiry date irks nuclear debaters".

The Board of Inquiry interpreted its mandate very liberally, and heard testimony on nuclear issues well beyond the uranium mining health and safety questions. The final report even contained a 23-page chapter on moral and ethical issues, including a series of ethical judgements.

Despite its thoroughness from the point of view of hearing all sides, the Bayda inquiry was criticized virulently both during its deliberations and on issuing its report. Like the Porter Commission, it acted as a whetstone for the nuclear critics' blades. Nuclear protestors tore up or returned their four-figure intervenor funding cheques. Anti-nuclear puppet theatres, parades, demonstrations, advertisements and even a comic book featuring nuclear dragons met the Inquiry's public contact efforts, which included the establishment of 18 information centres.

The United Church attacked the Inquiry report for having the temerity to address ethical issues without the benefit of clerical counsel.

Indeed, Bayda's final report met with mixed reviews locally, and reverberations are still being felt. It is difficult to rationalize or find a consensus in the comments, which range from charges that the report was a "government snow job" to an editorial endorsement in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix which said, "The general tone of the Bayda report represents the people".

Then there was the National Farmers' Union which, doubtless reflecting its interests in matters of breeding and husbandry, issued the opinion that the Bayda Inquiry had "laboured and brought forth a mouse".

Though it was very receptive to widely different points of view, the Cluff Lake Board of Inquiry did not find in favour of any of the major objections of critics. Mr. Justice Bayda and his Board members apparently did not try to curry favour where they found no merit, pragmatically following the 1860 dictum of George Denison Prentice:
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"It is in vain to hope to please all alike. Let a man stand with his face in what direction he will, he must necessarily turn his back on one half of the world."

The Bates Commission

The Royal Commission of Inquiry into Uranium Mining in British Columbia is the most recently established public investigation of the nuclear fuel cycle. Set up on January 18 this year under the B.C. Public Inquiries Act, the Commission is chaired by Dr. David Bates, a professor on the UBC medical faculty.

The first thing noticeable about the Bates Commission was its fairly liberal interpretation of its mandate. Simply stated, this was to inquire into the adequacy of existing federal and provincial measures to provide protection for the public, workers and the environment in all aspects of uranium mining in the province.

However, like the Bayda inquiry, B.C.'s commission has included a number of peripheral issues for consideration. For example, a list of 10 technical hearings which began last month includes one titled "Social Impact" and another labelled "Ethical Questions".

Following a previous series of 10 community hearings and the receipt of over 160 briefs, the Commission released an interim report on September 17. This deals essentially with uranium exploration and contains nine recommendations. It does not call for a moratorium on exploration, which has been a persistent demand from certain interest groups, communities and individuals in the province.

The interim report has been described as not as controversial as expected, but it is difficult to suppress a grin when considering the ramifications of one of the recommendations, especially if you visualize what the famous Vancouver Sun cartoonist Len Norris could do with the subject - I am referring to the recommendation requiring warning signs to be placed where outcrops of rock are specially radioactive. Though
undoubtedly this was put forward with the best of intentions, I am not sure what environmentalists in beautiful B.C. would say about that kind of visual pollution!

The Bates Commission has, of course, come in for its share of criticism. The Greenpeace Foundation has called it "a whitewash", and the Inquiry received a unanimous vote of no confidence from the Spring '79 conference of the B.C. Energy Coalition. There have been threats of withdrawal from the proceedings by some of the intervenors sharing $225,000 provided in the form of 29 grants; and MLA Charles Barber has expressed the opinion that allowing continued exploration is a serious mistake which will inevitably lead to nuclear power coming to B.C. However, the Commissioners seem to feel confident that despite the vocal protestations of their critics, they have a finger on the public pulse. At a news conference following release of the interim report, Dr. Bates said, "We now have a concept of what people view as to the problems of uranium mining in B.C."

The Bates Commission hopes to have its final report ready for August, 1980. Should this document be comparable to the one produced by the Bayda Inquiry, some very definitive positions may be drawn from any matching conclusions.

The National Inquiry

It is not yet clear what precise form and thrust the national inquiry will take. I am aware that there are opposing views as to what would be best regarding both the subject matter and the methodology. For example, nuclear critics have volubly demanded a legalistic commission of inquiry to focus specifically on the nuclear fuel cycle; one cannot help but get the impression that nothing short of an inquisition leading to a death sentence will suffice.

The Government, on the other hand, definitely favours a Parliamentary Committee of as yet unspecifed make-up but fairly broad terms of reference.

There are those in the nuclear industry who, having weathered quite a number to date, are more or less indifferent to the style of the inquiry, but would like it to consider nuclear power in the context of all sources of energy, not in isolation.
The AECB is really not in a position to express a viewpoint, but in view of the fairly narrow focus of most previous inquiries, a broad-based national inquiry would seem to be in the best interests of the politicians, policy makers and the public. It is likely that the general public simply wants sufficient information to be able to feel reassured by and confident in the findings of the inquiry no matter how it goes about its business.

I would like to dwell a moment on this important subject of information - not documentary information that will be made available to the national inquiry itself, since I think it is a foregone conclusion that based on the precedent of the Ontario Select Committee this will be extensive - but rather the question of how the public will be informed of what is transpiring at the inquiry, and what its final results are.

Undoubtedly a national inquiry will require some sort of cross-country information meeting system, if only to accumulate some of the questions which people in different parts of the nation would like answered. This might be compared to the political process of "pressing the flesh" on the hustings, a way to both listen and be seen, and be seen to be listening.

However, given the limitations of school gyms, church basements and even concert halls, it is doubtful that face to face information get-togethers on what has been labelled the "Swedish" model could reach more than a few thousand people. The chain reaction or domino effect would result in information spreading further, but a tremendous amount of time and resources would need to be expended for limited results, and the cost-effectiveness might be questionable. Furthermore, dependence on an out-spreading of information by word of mouth could be counterproductive - I am sure many of you are aware of the youthful game of "whisper 'round the ring" where a message is imparted from person to person and great guffaws greet the last listener's recital of what he heard compared to the original.

Then too, there is the sobering experience of the defunct CONIC group, whose ostensible purpose was to act as an independent, dispassionate and cooperative nuclear information agent. I know no one who has a ready
solution to the public perception problems of that kind of exercise, and suggest that it may be impossible to conduct a completely acceptable information dissemination program on a public meeting basis.

During and after the inquiry, the printed transcripts and conclusions of the investigation can be spread throughout the length and breadth of the land via such vehicles as public and institutional libraries, regional offices of government, and other means. The B.C. Bates Commission has added an interesting twist to this process by making edited videotapes of its hearings available for viewing on loan at libraries throughout the province.

These methods of making informational material available are essential, but of necessity they require a conscious act of inquisitive research and are therefore limited in the numbers of plain folk they will reach.

Because of the shortcomings of what might be called engineered direct contact vehicles, it is my belief that in a country the size of Canada, there can be no substitute for the mass media as the communications tool to reach people, and lots of them, at all levels right down to the so-called "grass roots".

However, to fulfil their potential as objective public educators and their responsibility as mirrors of society and its times, the Canadian news media are going to have to radically alter their methods and approaches in covering such a critical national inquiry.

If possible, the splashy headline and the grabby quote are going to have to be foregone for the duration of the inquiry, or else the reading, listening and viewing public will be put in a similar position to jurors prejudiced by seeing sensational mid-trial publicity - the mental sets will be established and reinforced before the final results are in.

Reporters assigned to cover the hearings will have to be the best available from the science beat - the subject is not one which rookies handle well, and is too vital from the public's standpoint to be entrusted
to amateurs. Even the top flight correspondents must be well briefed with background material before typing or taping one word.

The following suggestion is likely to be received by hoots of derision from newspaper editors - after all, who am I to be telling them how things should be done? However, in view of the importance in today's and tomorrow's context of energy in general, and nuclear energy in particular, it does not seem unreasonable to me that in each daily newspaper a full page, or at least a half, be dedicated to the national inquiry for each of its sessions. A headline such as "Today at the national nuclear inquiry" would be a utilitarian one devoid of any bias either intended or accidental, and every newspaper in the country, including those very important weeklies, could carry comprehensive Canadian Press wire summaries of each session's activities, prepared specially for that purpose.

On the broadcast side, the state-owned CBC radio and TV network should be required to devote at least one half hour of prime or near-prime time to the inquiry on a weekly if not a regular post-session basis. Private syndicated networks could be encouraged to do likewise.

I cannot stress too strongly the role the news media are going to have to play in imparting the full story of the inquiry, and not just selected tidbits which happen to tickle the editor's fancy. While my proposals may be impractical for one reason or another, ways must be found to obviate the need for the media to tweak its own nose, as for example occurred in the September 1 Financial Post article which began: "A summer-long probe of nuclear safety by the Legislature's Select Committee on Hydro Affairs has failed to uncover any significant risks in Ontario Hydro's nuclear operations - despite the impression to the contrary given by the media."

In the interests of information dissemination and maximum public awareness of one of the most controversial issues ever, the fullest possible coverage, tempered with the strictest possible objectivity, will be expected of the news media. If that is not forthcoming, the general public will be poorly served by the national inquiry, which will appear through the magnifying lens of the media as a circus of rhetoric rather than a conference of reason.
At this juncture, I can think of no better way to get a feel for what one might expect of a national inquiry than to look at what Energy Minister Ray Hnatyshyn has said recently on the subject.

In his notes for an address at the Conference on Resource Development, in Saskatoon, on August 30, 1979, Mr. Hnatyshyn said: "As many of you know, we at the federal level are in the process of setting up a nuclear inquiry by a Parliamentary Committee. This committee will have broad terms of reference and it will make recommendations to ensure that the development of nuclear power in Canada will proceed in a safe and environmentally acceptable manner."

The Canadian Press reported that in an audience question period at the conference, the Energy Minister referred to the importance of the federal inquiry going beyond provincial ones, particularly in the areas of international aspects of nuclear development and the question of federal jurisdiction over the industry. Mr. Hnatyshyn is also reported to have indicated that one of the essential purposes of the parliamentary inquiry will be to ensure that no one can legitimately complain of a lack of a full and frank discussion of nuclear issues.

On September 10 this year, at the provincial mines ministers' conference in Winnipeg, Mr. Hnatyshyn's speech text contained the following: "One area where the provinces have been out in front of the federal government is in the holding of public inquiries into uranium mining and the whole nuclear field..... The Government of Canada is planning a parliamentary inquiry into the whole field of nuclear energy. This inquiry will openly review the many aspects of this field of energy that are causing concerns in this country, and will be examining, in particular, the role the Government of Canada should have in the future development, regulation and use of nuclear electric power. It is intended that the Committee, when appointed by Parliament, will have a broad mandate and will call on many sources of information."
The Energy Minister continued with: "I would like to emphasize to you that this inquiry will not be made by a Royal Commission or any other independent body but by a Committee of Parliament where the representatives of the people of this country will address this serious question in a public forum. I would also emphasize that it is the Government's view that there will be no moratorium on any part of Canada's nuclear industry during the course of this inquiry."

Finally, on September 17, in an address to the Canadian Club, Mr. Hnatyshyn said the nuclear inquiry will be set up "to lay down the guidelines for safe and acceptable development."

It should not be long before we learn how these statements of intent and viewpoints translate into committee make-up, terms of reference and timetable.

From the point of view of costs and resource commitment, I am sure there are many who fervently hope that the national inquiry will embrace and build on the information, discoveries and conclusions of past inquiries, rather than duplicate the work. Though critics seem to thrive on the repetition, it must be frustrating from the industry's point of view, as I know it is from the regulator's, to have to go over old ground again and again. I understand this has led to at least one expression of outright opposition to public inquiries from the industry: Mr. Bernard Michel is a vice-president of the mining firm Amok Ltd., the only company in Canada ever to be subjected to a provincial government board of inquiry before being permitted to proceed with plans for a uranium mine under what has been labelled "the most stringent lease in North America". To Mr. Michel has been attributed the notion that inquiries are used by some interest groups to put society on trial, and that they often mean only that some arguments are repeated without any new information coming forward.

There may be people here who would agree or at least sympathize with Mr. Michel. They would probably also go along with Dr. Leo Yaffe, Vice-President of Administration at McGill, who expressed the view at an August session of the New Brunswick Energy Committee that there is no such thing as an independent national inquiry.
Well, I would strongly urge anyone to put aside sentiments of this nature. In the current climate they are pointless and unproductive, and smack of the self-righteous indignation which so often creeps into the attitude of someone who feels both unfairly attacked and powerless to defend himself.

No, the national inquiry will have to be seized and used, not disparaged; that is the challenge.

As for concerns about duplication in the national inquiry, some assurance may be drawn from the Energy Minister's reference in his Winnipeg address that the inquiry "certainly.....will draw on the results of the related provincial inquiries and in addition will likely seek views from provincial governments."

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the track record of nuclear-related public inquiries to date, it would be easy to be pessimistic about another, no matter how well intended and carefully set up it is; and I use the word pessimism in its broadest sense, i.e. that neither the industry, its critics, its regulator nor the public are served by the inquiry's results. However, as I mentioned moments ago, I believe it is incumbent on the industry and its regulatory body to enter the inquiry with a determination to make it a success.

Now, whether or not success can be equated with definitiveness is a moot point. Yet it might be possible to infer a way to measure the success of the inquiry from something Mark Witten wrote in an article "The Politics of Power ", in the summer '79 issue of ABCL's journal "Ascent". Having set down the important observation that the grounds of the nuclear debate have been shifting from questions of fact to values, Mr. Witten writes, "The politics of nuclear energy.....are totally dependent upon the factor of public acceptability."
Public acceptability is the key - not that every living soul must be convinced that nuclear energy is safe, but that through the national inquiry, a majority of Canadians become confident that their elected representatives have taken care of four matters:

1) the subject of nuclear energy in the Canadian context has been given a full and sufficient airing;

2) that quite clearly there are established, effective mechanisms to look after the public interests in the nuclear field;

3) that any shortcomings identified by the inquiry will be rectified; and

4) that there has been established a climate of access to information and constructive public participation for the post-inquiry period.

To the extent that this is achieved, the national inquiry will have been definitive.