

the chief inspector and the inspectors in carrying out their duties under this act in reference to the approval of designs, the manufacture, installation, inspection, testing and operations of boilers, pressure vessels and plants.

The thing I cannot understand is, why was not the simple procedure used under the situation of writing a letter to A.S.M.E. which have, I understand, two or three committees that are experienced in reactors, and get their opinion? That is the usual procedure.

Dr. MACKENZIE: But we are not dealing with a usual case. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to refer to a group of Canadian who are highly expert in this field to an American committee that is not as competent as we are and have not nearly as much experience as we have.

Mr. DRYSDALE: You find that this is nonsensical in the Ontario legislation?

Dr. MACKENZIE: I refuse to answer this question because this is a trick question.

Mr. DRYSDALE: There is a specific reference to this organization. Why do you object to A.S.M.E. looking into this factor?

Dr. MACKENZIE: I do not object to it; we use it all the time. We did not use it in this particular case because it is not a normal type of case. When I say "we", I mean the engineers. You are talking about procedures of C.G.E. engineers, and I am talking about my responsibility as a member of the atomic energy control board. If there is anything dangerous about this reactor, and if we are not competent, then we should be removed.

Mr. DRYSDALE: I cannot tell one way or the other, but the thing I am trying to ascertain is why the normal procedure was not followed.

Dr. MACKENZIE: The normal procedure was followed.

Mr. DRYSDALE: I suggest it was not, because it was a special ruling given under this act—not the usual ruling.

Dr. MACKENZIE: The act provides for this type of thing, which is normal.

Mr. NUGENT: I thought all this had been gone into at the previous meeting, where we had a perfectly good explanation. I thought this matter was explained clearly and completely. I cannot see the point now of going into the technicalities of whether or not there might have been another approach to this.

Mr. DRYSDALE: If I can clarify it for Mr. Nugent's edification, the point is that I understand there is a reduction in the safety factor from a factor of four to a factor of three. Following through the procedure, I understand there was an application made to the inspector under the Ontario Boiler and Pressure Vessels Act. As a result of that reference, the inspector, who, as I understand is an expert on the usual boiler and pressure vessels, made a special ruling which was filed with the committee. I was trying to ascertain as to why there was no reference made, as provided under this act, to A.S.M.E. who have a subcommittee on atomic reactors and who are a group which could either back up or disagree with this particular ruling. In other words, I was seeking to have some objective group other than the interested parties make some ruling on the safety factor. I understand that this was the first time that there has ever been a special ruling regarding a reduction in the safety factor in this type of boiler.

Mr. NUGENT: I thought the witness before us, or the safety advisory committee, were a check on that and were backing up the ruling of that department. Your suggestion is that there should have been a third safety committee check on that.

Mr. DRYSDALE: The impression I got from Dr. Laurence was that there was nobody other than those vitally concerned in the A.E.C.L. projet. In other words, the same group that were doing the basic design work were the ones