

Adjournment Debate

easy, if not impossible, for one solution to commend itself to all men and women.

What Government seeks then is a compromise which satisfies the most, with offence and inconvenience to the fewest. There has been no lack of conferences and publications on this issue, and the various seminars and publications have, by and large, made a vital contribution to society by the dissemination of specialized and general information, and the education of the general public. Unfortunately, there have been many who have jumped on to the rhetorical bandwagon and have succeeded in contributing no more than further confusion to the issue. It is regrettable that a great body of poorly researched and overly subjective material exists in the whole area. It contributes nothing to an understanding of the problem, much less to a solution.

• (2210)

ATOMIC ENERGY CONTROL BOARD—APPOINTMENT INQUIRY.
(B) REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Mr. Ian Waddell (Vancouver—Kingsway): Mr. Speaker, as we are only too well aware, since the nuclear reactor accident at Chernobyl in the Soviet Union, Canadians and all citizens of the world live in a nuclear age. In Canada, the Atomic Energy Control Board regulates the nuclear industry, so who is on that Control Board is important.

On April 15, 1985, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Miss Carney) sent a letter to Dr. Ursula Franklin, a distinguished Canadian, appointing her to the Atomic Energy Control Board. I have a copy of her letter which states:

May I say how pleased I am that you have agreed to serve in this capacity.

She also states:

I am delighted to confirm your appointment as a member of the Atomic Energy Control Board.

On April 22, 1985, Dr. Franklin received the Minister's letter that was sent on April 15.

On April 22, 1985, Dr. Franklin posted her letter of response, stating that she would like a clarification of the secrecy provisions of the Atomic Energy Control Board and of the relationship of the Board to the public. She did not refuse to accept an appointment. She says in her letter, of which I have a copy:

May I stress that I am not looking for private dispensation from the secrecy provisions but for a clarification of the relationship of the Board to the public.

On April 23, 1985, Dr. Franklin was informed by telephone from the Minister's office that the appointment was a mistake. Note that she is informed of this before the Minister's office actually received her letter, inquiring into the secrecy provisions.

On May 29, 1985, a letter was sent by the Minister to Dr. Franklin, informing her that her appointment to the Board by letter was sent in error. Clearly, between April 15, 1985, and April 23, 1985, the Cabinet vetoed the Minister's appointment while she was away in China.

In answering a question put in the House by my leader, the Hon. Member for Oshawa (Mr. Broadbent), the Prime Minister (Mr. Mulroney) tried to claim that the reason for the rescission of the appointment was that Dr. Franklin did not want the job because of the oath of secrecy. This is wrong, however, and actually a falsehood on the part of the Prime Minister because obviously the Cabinet had already refused to give the okay to the Minister's appointment.

Why did the Cabinet veto that appointment of a very distinguished Canadian? Did the Atomic Energy Control Board and members of the atomic industry lobby the Cabinet members when it became known to the nuclear industry that Dr. Franklin had been chosen by the Minister?

No replacement has been chosen and this position has been vacant for a year. Furthermore, Hugh Spence, an official of the Atomic Energy Control Board, stated publicly that he agrees with Dr. Franklin that the secrecy oath is badly worded, vague and needs to be changed. Why has the Government been so shabby in its treatment of Dr. Ursula Franklin of the University of Toronto? I believe that it was the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) who stopped this appointment because he did not like the credentials of Dr. Franklin and that she is an outspoken person. I think the industry obviously stopped the appointment of this person and I would like the ministry to tell us why the Prime Minister had his facts wrong about the appointment of Dr. Franklin. Why did the Government treat Dr. Franklin so shabbily?

I want to draw the Government's attention to *The Canadian Encyclopedia* to see the tremendous qualifications of Dr. Ursula Franklin. The Encyclopedia states:

She is a tireless advocate for Science for Peace. Her work has received worldwide recognition.

The Government shabbily withdrew her appointment.

Mr. Jim Edwards (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that dates back to more than a year ago. I would invite the Hon. Member to resort not to *The Canadian Encyclopedia* but rather to the dictionary and look up "innuendo", and "omittendo". The Hon. Member, persisting in his quest for something momentous in all this, was assured at that time by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Miss Carney) that there was nothing more or less notable in this other than the fact of an unfortunate administrative error.

• (2215)

The facts in the matter are these: Dr. Ursula Franklin, in April of 1985, was being considered for appointment to the AECB. During the course of that consideration, it became apparent that Dr. Franklin held reservations about the provisions of the secrecy oath required for all board members. Specifically, she wanted to know to whom she could or could not impart AECB information. The administrative error referred to earlier happened at this point and a letter was sent informing Dr. Franklin of her appointment to the board, even