

Adjournment Debate

parts of it because I think it is important that these questions be answered.

Do the proposed changes, particularly the removal of the \$350,000 limit on real estate, and the amalgamation allow the Salvation Army to transfer property held by registered charities?

Each of its facilities is a registered charity in its own right. Can that be transferred to the corporation such as Grace Hospital, House of Concord, Mainwood Home, child welfare facilities?

Could profits from the sale of these properties legally then be used by the corporation for other purposes? In other words, for non-child welfare or non-medical purposes?

Could the properties be transferred and sold in spite of provincial government wishes and the fact that the provincial government may have advanced funds on those properties or held liens such as under the Community Facilities Funding Act.

Could the assets or value of properties be transferred from one province to another province in spite of provincial government source of funding?

Has the Salvation Army communicated with provincial governments its request and obtained their concurrence?

• (1730)

As the Salvation Army is not a registered charity, can it hold properties that are used for charitable purposes? Does the Salvation Army now hold real estate in excess of the \$350,000? I believe it does because since I wrote the letter, I found out that section was—

Mr. Milliken: They are a registered charity.

Mr. Karpoff: They are not a registered charity. The Salvation Army Corporation is not a registered charity. They have a number of registered charities held at provincial levels.

As I stated previously, I want to indicate to the Salvation Army that we would like this matter referred to a legislative committee so that these matters can be dealt with. We feel strongly that it would be a disservice to the Salvation Army if this House simply rushed through the legislation in a manner that would at some time in the future lead to the embarrassment of the Salvation Army.

The Salvation Army is known for its good works. It is known for its dedication to humanity and we feel that it deserves that this legislation be examined in detail by a committee, and we support approval at this stage and referral to a committee of this House.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Motion agreed to, bill read the second time and referred to a legislative committee.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

VIA RAIL

Mr. Iain Angus (Thunder Bay—Atikokan): Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to further continue the debate on VIA Rail. A question was put by me in this House back on December 6, with an unsatisfactory answer, I think it is safe to say.

It has been an interesting experience, working with the transport committee, railway unions, Rural Dignity, Transport 2000, Greenpeace, and the city of Thunder Bay, all in the aid of promoting a modern, efficient rail passenger service.

What we got from this government was not a step into the future, but a leap into the past. The Government of Canada cut the funding to VIA Rail which forced VIA to slash its system by approximately 51 per cent. Whole areas of the country lost their rail service. Northwestern Ontario in particular lost The Canadian. Atlantic Canada saw its service reduced to the point where it is almost impossible to go from Atlantic Canada to central Canada. The international and regional transportation networks were decimated.

This government argues that the fiscal necessities of our time forced it to do that. It also argued that the