

*Weather Modification Identification Act*

atmosphere knows no international boundaries. In recent years additional emphasis has been placed on cleaning up our environment, which includes the earth, the water on and surrounding the continents and the air we breathe. We are aware, for example, of the vibrations that were created around the world before the tests were undertaken on Amchitka Island. Hopefully, these vibrations will result in postponing indefinitely all these tests. In like manner, we are made aware of the effects of fall out from nuclear tests made many years ago, for traces of radioactivity and radioactive substances have been found in our far northern areas. These substances could only have been carried by the winds which blow from the four corners of the globe. It is very important, therefore, that we have control of all activities which may pollute the air we breathe. We, on this side of the House, therefore, support the principle of this bill.

As I said a moment ago, our earth's atmosphere knows no boundaries. I would therefore ask the minister or the parliamentary secretary, what steps were taken and what representations were made to the Russians or to the United States, our two giant neighbours, to ascertain, prior to the drafting of this legislation, whether they are considering something comparable to Bill S-11, since any action taken by either of these two great countries which would pollute their air could have a very damaging effect on Canada. I believe that a topic of this importance should be debated at the United Nations. It might be something that could be undertaken by a special international committee, for unless everyone is alerted to the necessity of cleaning up the atmosphere, of cleaning up all our air, we could all be in trouble.

I understand that the Russians have been carrying out a hail suppression program in some areas of their country. There are reports that they have fired silver iodine artillery shells into hail clouds and, as well, that they have shot rockets into hail clouds, with some degree of success. Since we, in Canada, up to now have only been studying hail storms, has the government given any thought to date to exchanging scientific data with the Russians on this matter in order that destructive hail storms could in future be either broken up or curtailed before valuable crops are destroyed? It would also be interesting to learn if the Americans have perfected hail control programs since they, too, suffer from this atmospheric phenomenon in certain parts of the United States.

One part of the bill, clause 7 dealing with offences and punishments, I believe is worthy of comment. That clause provides that anyone guilty of an offence is liable, on conviction, to a fine not exceeding \$1,000, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or to both. In my view, anyone charged with interfering with the forces of nature, or anyone who is subsequently charged with this offence, should pay a much larger fine than that stipulated in this bill. It seems to me that a \$1,000 fine is not a sufficient deterrent with regard to such crime.

**Mr. Speaker:** Order, please. I hesitate, most sincerely, to interrupt the hon. member for South Shore (Mr. Crouse). I am wondering whether we are proceeding in an orderly fashion, since we are now considering, at the report stage, the amendment proposed by the parliamentary secretary. I am wondering whether we should not at this stage limit

[Mr. Crouse.]

debate to what is before the House and, on third reading, make the type of speech which is being made by the hon. member for South Shore. It seems to me that it might more appropriately be made on third reading, after we have considered the amendment. I appreciate what the hon. member is saying; yet I think that we should be orderly in our consideration of the bill and follow regular procedure. It seems to me that the proper procedure would be for the House to consider the amendment before us and then later this afternoon when we reach the third reading stage of the bill, we might at that point give consideration to other matters which are not at this time before the House.

**Mr. Crouse:** Mr. Speaker, I shall heed your admonition. As a matter of fact, my next comments were related to the amendments proposed by the Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of the Environment. I do not have a copy of the amendment. As I understand the suggestion, he was dealing with clause 5 which reads as follows:

• (3:30 p.m.)

Any information obtained by the Administrator or his authorized representative pursuant to this Act may be made public or made available on request to any member of the public,—

The amendment, as I understand it, is to change the word "shall" to read "may". We on this side of the House are concerned about any attempts to curtail information or limit the knowledge which may be available to the general public. We believe that such important information as this obtained by the administrator should definitely be made public on the request of any member of the public. We have always followed the course of endorsing the word "shall" in preference to the word "may". In our view, this removes any possibility of the administrator at any time refusing to give information to any member of the public who may be interested in seeing it. Without any further comment, I wish to place on the record that as far as we in the official opposition are concerned, we prefer to see the bill passed as it is now written, using the word "shall".

**Mr. Stanley Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre):** Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon the government House leader indicated that there had been an objection to proceeding with this bill today, but that he had learned from across the floor that the objection had been withdrawn. It was I who had objected, but only because I was hoping the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) could be here because of his keen interest in this piece of legislation. When I learned that it would be impossible for him to be here this afternoon and that he had nominated me to speak in his stead, there was nothing for me to do but withdraw my opposition. It is interesting to note the number of subjects about which one has to learn something when he occupies a role such as I happen to have in this party.

I am very grateful to the parliamentary secretary for his reference to the hon. member for Timiskaming and to the keen interest that he has shown in this whole question of weather modification equipment. This is germane to the report stage amendment now before us, Mr. Speaker, because what the parliamentary secretary is seeking to do is make a change in an amendment that the hon. member