

piggyback terminal being located so close to the residential area.

There are now two additional reasons why the terminal should not be located on Wilkes Avenue. Last week the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) announced a \$436,000 loan for the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation for the purchase of land for housing west of the proposed piggyback terminal. A housing development and a piggyback terminal adjacent to one another are in no way compatible. There will be heavy truck traffic in the area as well as diesel engines shunting box cars, and no doubt the terminal will have to expand in the future, thus compounding the problem. Second, the city of Winnipeg agreed last Thursday to send a telegram to the federal government to register the city's position and to ask that an order in council permitting the construction of the terminal be rescinded.

I feel that the federal government is setting a bad example in this case, as apparently there has not been proper consultation between CNR, the Ministry of Transport, the Department of Urban Affairs, and the Department of the Environment.

The Department of the Environment does environment impact studies on any new federal government developments, and I believe this piggyback terminal was its first project under a new order in council calling for an environmental study on new developments. I would say that the Department of the Environment is off to a bad start on its first project. In their report its officials state:

The currently underdeveloped area west of Kenaston may be affected by sound emission from the proposed terminal.

We now find that a 220 acre housing development by the federal government is to be built. No doubt hundreds of children will reside in the development, and there will be danger to them from the heavy traffic generated by the terminal. The Department of the Environment should now review its study. Also, the area north of the proposed site contains \$1.25 million of installed services for housing. Further services at a cost of \$1.50 million will shortly be installed. Present plans call for housing developments to extend right up to the CNR mainline which is adjacent to the piggyback terminal.

I am sure the parliamentary secretary can see by now that this is no place for a piggyback freight terminal, and I hope he will impress this upon the minister and have him instruct CNR to look for a more suitable location. CPR was allowed to construct a freight terminal adjacent to a residential area in north Winnipeg some years ago and has since expanded, and the traffic and noise are unbearable.

Another reason why the terminal should not be located on Wilkes Avenue is that the main artery to the terminal at Kenaston Boulevard has already 80 per cent to 90 per cent of the traffic it can bear during peak periods, and the addition of tractor-trailors going to and from the piggyback terminal would make the traffic flow situation impossible.

Also, a number of residential subdivisions are to be built off Kenaston Boulevard, and a neighbourhood shopping centre is to be built to accommodate these housing de-

#### *Adjournment Debate*

velopments. It is becoming more and more apparent that a piggyback freight terminal will not blend into the area for very obvious reasons.

The total number of residential units to be built in the immediate area is approximately 2,198, bringing the total population of the area of 73.3 acres to between 5,000 and 6,000 people. So you can see that CNR and the Department of the Environment have done no long range planning.

In addition, the Fort Garry-Saint Vital Bridge has just been approved and will be extended to Lagimodiere Boulevard and Kenaston Boulevard, making it possible for the trans-Canada highway to be routed up Kenaston on completion of the bridge.

In a city of Winnipeg traffic study dated 1973 it is stated that Kenaston and Grant regional streets will be incapable of absorbing future growth due to Kenaston Estates housing development being completed in 1983. This report did not take into consideration the piggyback or the Fort Garry-Saint Vital bridge traffic on Kenaston. Also, a small herd of white tailed deer is known to inhabit Assiniboia Forrest Park and areas adjacent to the terminal. Housing developments will be less harmful to them than engines shunting freight cars.

Any way we look at it the CNR proposed site was a short sighted choice. Within a few years the surrounding area will be developed residentially, and pressure will mount to have the terminal moved out. It would be better not to put it there in the first place. Locating the piggyback near the west perimeter highway would be much more acceptable to the local residents, and much more desirable for truckers who would then not have to fight bumper to bumper traffic.

I strongly suggest the four ministers involved, the Minister of Transport (Mr. Lang), the Minister of the Environment (Mr. LeBlanc), the Minister of State for Urban Affairs, and the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Sharp), who should have received the telegram from the city of Winnipeg requesting that the terminal be relocated, should instruct CNR to act accordingly in the name of sensible, long range planning to protect the citizens of the area.

I also understand there has been similar poor planning in the Edmonton area where rail terminals have been allowed to locate in residential areas. Hon. members will be hearing more of this in the near future.

In closing I should like to say that the local residents advisory group chairman, Mrs. Donna Mae Yeo, said at the most recent hearing that CNR officials presented half facts which were beneficial to them, leaving out those which were detrimental.

**Mr. Ralph E. Goodale (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the hon. member for Winnipeg South Centre (Mr. McKenzie), and I are becoming regular partners at this particular point in the proceedings of the House, and I welcome the opportunity of responding to one of his concerns again this evening. As I begin, I draw to his attention the answer which the minister gave to him on this point in this House just a very few days ago when he first raised it, and that was that the minister would be happy to engage in consul-