

*Adjournment Debate*

Several aspects of Doctor Davies' study also warrant further comment. First, the study was intended to identify the major routes of human exposure to certain chemical contaminants, including dioxins. The results are in general agreement with the Health Protection Branch's findings that food is a major route of exposure. The actual levels of dioxins reported in the various foods analysed in this study must, however, be interpreted cautiously. Officials have advised that the number of samples analysed was extremely small, and in the case of fruits and vegetables, samples were not washed prior to analysis as would normally be done in the home.

In conclusion, these factors taken together with other available information, support the view that the reported results for dioxins in produce may be too high and not representative of actual levels in such foods as consumed.

*[Translation]*

NATIONAL DEFENCE—REQUEST FOR PUBLICATION OF STUDY ON IMPACT OF SHOOTING RANGE PROPOSED FOR LAC SAINT-JEAN REGION

**Mr. Svend J. Robinson (Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Nielsen) is taking steps to expropriate some 130 kilometres of land in the Saguenay-Lac Saint-Jean region in order to provide for a shooting range for the F-18 bomber. In spite of massive local opposition to that militaristic move, the Conservative Government will not reconsider its decision. The Coalition against the Shooting Range includes more than 85 organizations, of which 14 municipalities, 7 regional school boards and the Quebec wing of the New Democratic Party.

The development of that training area was the subject of a campaign by the Minister of National Defence, the Secretary of State (Mr. Bouchard) and the local Conservative MPs. Far from defending the interests of their constituents and their communities, those Members actively supported the interests of the military establishment. In 1984, for instance, the Secretary of State said he saw no reason to proceed with the plans if citizens in the area opposed it. But that same Secretary of State has now flip-flopped. He is warning citizens that if they oppose the development of that shooting range, they will jeopardize the whole base and the many jobs that depend on it. That kind of political blackmail is totally unacceptable and is a terrible insult to the population of the Saguenay-Lac Saint-Jean region.

The Coalition against the Shooting Range is fighting that proposal for two basic reasons: (1) An important question of principle—peace. This probably would be the first time in Canadian history that a shooting range would be developed in peacetime. Citizens in the area feel that this is a disheartening precedent. The funds allotted for the project should rather be used for civilian purposes—education, health care, child care and social services. They should be invested in the community to enhance its social and economic development. (2) The democratic, popular will. Surveys show that two citizens out of three oppose the shooting range.

• (2210)

I, for one, have tabled in the House of Commons petitions with over 3,000 signatures against this project, not to mention that the Government never consulted the citizens of the area but presented his proposal as a "*fait accompli*".

For months the Government had been asked by the Coalition to make the impact study public. Now, after much dillydallying and foot-dragging, it has finally made it public. Unfortunately, we find that it raises quite serious questions.

The study covers only an area of 80 kilometers, while the F-18s need for training an area of 200 kilometers. Over half these missions will have longer ranges which puts in question the study's basic assumption. The bombers' flights would take place over a fairly extended area, something untouched by the impact study.

People wonder also whether these F-18s will be armed with nuclear missiles such as the Bomarc. By the way, two F-18s crashed recently in Alberta and one in Prince Edward Island. The Coalition feels that these operations are carried out over an area too close to the human habitat.

The Federal Government's impact study has not even convinced the Quebec Government, which is seeking further information on the reasons which have convinced the Federal Government that it would save \$8 million by choosing the Bagotville site.

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, NDP supporters in Ottawa and Quebec, together with the Saguenay-Lac Saint-Jean people, demand that the Conservatives abandon this project. They will be able to build this shooting range only by disregarding the wishes of the people in the area. On the other hand, this project will have repercussions on the local fishing and hunting tourist industry and could put at risk the lives of thousands of area residents.

The Secretary of State's political blackmail is unacceptable in this Parliament: Let us not take hostages the residents of that area. The Secretary of State's threats should not force them to renounce their principles. NPD supporters insist that the Government abandon its militaristic option and listen to the Saguenay-Lac Saint-Jean residents. Their message is loud and clear: No shooting range either here or elsewhere!

• (2215)

*[English]*

**Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, just at the very outset, I might call upon the Hon. Member not to be quite so alarmist. There is no suggestion that any use of this or any other range existing in Canada would involve the use of nuclear weapons and, to suggest so, is quite irresponsible. Indeed, it is alarmist. I think the Hon. Member has been around here long enough to know that that is just a little bit irresponsible of him.