

*Adjournment Debate*

A condition of the federal government's approval for the Pacific Salmonid Enhancement Program was the government's investment in this program could be subject to cost recovery.

In March, 1979, an agreement on the SEP was signed with the province of British Columbia in which both parties agreed on the principle of cost recovery by the federal government through licence fees from marine fisheries and landings charges on commercial fish landings.

Following the signing of this agreement the Department of Fisheries and Oceans began an analysis of how and when such a program could be implemented. The subject of landings charges has been discussed with all interested groups participating in Pacific coast fisheries as well as with the government of British Columbia.

On October 28, 1980, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. LeBlanc) announced in Vancouver, B.C. that, and I quote:

Due to the poor fishing year in 1980, and the absence of necessary legislation, a plan to introduce landings charges on commercially-caught salmon will be delayed. A scheme will be reached for implementation in 1982 in the hope that 1981 will bring higher salmon catches and better prices than this year.

● (2220)

The rate of landings charges has not yet been determined.

The legislative authority for such a program is being examined; however, currently there are no plans as to when such legislation will be introduced.

NATIONAL DEFENCE—U.S. FIGHTER AIRCRAFT CRASHING ON  
CANADIAN SOIL

**Mr. Doug Anguish (The Battlefords-Meadow Lake):** Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself to a question which I put quite some time ago. In fact I raised this question in the House in the summer during the heavy fire season in western Canada and in Ontario. Until the end of the year Saskatchewan had sustained losses in excess of 3.3 million acres of forestry land, a good portion of which is what is called the commercial zone where the province lost 815,892 acres, and the balance in the secondary zone where it lost 2,497,128 acres of forestry land in the fires. The province of Saskatchewan spent a total of \$15 million to maintain a crew to fight the forest fires throughout the year.

In my question in the House I addressed myself in particular to the problem which arose close to my constituency. During the early part of the year and in the summer manoeuvres had taken place at the Canadian forces base Cold Lake. They were utilizing areas such as the Primrose Lake bombing range, part of which lies within the The Battlefords-Meadow Lake constituency. During the manoeuvres in this part of Canada, two U.S. fighter aircraft crashed. One crashed within the bounds of the Primrose Lake bombing range and it has been positively identified as the cause of an extensive forest fire which burned much of the Primrose Lake bombing range and spread into the Battlefords-Meadow Lake constituency.

Since the U.S. fighter aircraft has been identified as the cause of the forest fire in Saskatchewan, either the Department of National Defence or else the U.S. government have the responsibility to pay damages. I think that someone should reimburse those who have had losses as a result of the forest fire, thus setting a precedent following forest fires which are caused in this manner in years to come. I think there should be a cost recovery for extinguishing the fire to the provincial government and I think that lost revenues should be reimbursed to those who have sustained losses, such as the loggers, people involved in mining activities, in commercial fishing and in trapping, people who have lost much revenue in the inhabited areas which were burned. Thirdly, the province should be reimbursed for the revenue which it lost from taxing the beneficiaries in the areas which have been burned out.

I admit there is an agreement in existence between the province of Saskatchewan and the federal government with regard to the range. I am not particularly happy with that agreement but I have heard it stated that if there are losses within the range, the provincial government recovers some money for extinguishing the fire and it also receives some money for lost revenue, but nothing is provided either by the provincial government or the federal government to reimburse those people who have lost some benefits from logging, fishing or trapping. Outside the range nothing is provided by the federal government to benefit people who have suffered lost revenue from which the province of Saskatchewan would also benefit.

This evening I am asking the minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, to consider the provision of some money to those people who have suffered losses as a result of the forest fire.

I think that payments to these people and to the provincial government for damages sustained outside the area to which I referred should be made either by the Department of National Defence or the U.S. government which should be held responsible for a fire which was caused by one of their fighter aircraft while on manoeuvres over Canada.

● (2225)

Before closing let me indicate that I would like to see the federal government—and I would like to hear its comments on this issue—develop a user plan for the Primrose Lake bombing range in the Saskatchewan sector whereby people can go into that area to conduct logging operations for part of the year or to harvest some of the fish or furs within the bombing range, so that the federal government, the provincial government and the people who actually wish to use the range can begin to co-operate. I am referring to places such as Canoe Narrows, Dillon, Buffalo Narrows, Pierceland, Goodsoil and many other communities. It would utilize some of the resources within the Primrose Lake bombing range which are of no benefit to anyone right now other than those involved in the military manoeuvres which take place there.

With those comments I would like to leave this matter. Although the parliamentary secretary might not be prepared to answer some of the points I have raised, I would like her to