

Veterans Affairs

very clear yesterday. All he was able to say is this: The matter is being studied.

There was no suggestion that any legislation is being drafted. We have been given no assurance by the Minister of State for Urban Affairs (Mr. Danson) that his department is dealing with the matter. So, we are being asked to let the Veterans' Land Act, a piece of legislation that deals with housing for veterans, die on March 31, 1975, with no assurance that there will be anything to take its place on April 1, 1975—indeed, there is no real assurance that there will ever be anything to take its place.

How my friends opposite could have fallen for that argument is, to me, a mystery. Some of them are new members and they do not know that the government can make promises but not come through with them. Member after member on the other side has said, "We are going to vote against the motion, against the proposal to continue the Veterans' Land Act, because we are in favour of something better." But where is that "something better"?

I join with those who have expressed belief in the minister's complete sincerity and concern for veterans. I say to them, and I say to the minister, that if it is true that there is to be veterans housing legislation, that is all the more reason to let this legislation stay on the books until that time comes. That would show that the government means business. We fear that if this legislation is allowed to drop, then in the weeks and months ahead, when the hon. member for Humber-St. George's-St. Barbe and I, as well as others, stand up and ask where is that veterans housing legislation, the answer at first will be that it is being considered, it is under study; then, after a while, the Minister of State for Urban Affairs will stand up and say, "Well, the veterans have available to them the government's general housing legislation."

I predict that this could well happen, and the idea in the mind of the Minister of Veterans Affairs might never come to pass. Therefore I say, Mr. Speaker, that without any guarantee that we are to see such veterans housing legislation soon, or ever, it would be utterly irresponsible for this House to let the Veterans' Land Act die.

I must sit down, Sir, before you call it six o'clock. The clock is going faster than I thought. I know that the government has stated its position, and I know that Liberal after Liberal has said he will vote against the motion. But, Sir, in that 15 minutes between the putting of the motion and the vote, during that time when the bells are ringing for 15 minutes, or however long they may ring, there will be time for the government to rethink its position.

What will the position be if the government decides to let this motion pass? It will not actually extend the Veterans' Land Act. The motion calls on the minister to come back to the House within 15 sitting days and tell us of the result of another review. In effect, that is all. This motion, if passed, will simply guarantee another review, another statement by the minister within 15 sitting days. The issue will remain open. But a defeat of this motion is, in effect, a statement that the Veterans' Land Act is going to die on March 31, 1975. I do not think the House of Commons should say this at this time, just a few days before Remembrance Day.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

[Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre).]

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): I thank all those who have participated in this debate. Each has expressed his views. I hope that we will now, by our vote, show where we stand with respect to the rights of our veterans.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order, please. Debate on the motion being terminated at this time, it is my duty to put forthwith the question necessary to dispose of the motion, pursuant to the special order adopted previously. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

All those in favour of the motion will please say yea.

Some hon. Members: Yea.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: All those opposed will please say nay.

Some hon. Members: Nay.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the yeas have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion (Mr. Knowles, Winnipeg North Centre), which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 5)

YEAS

Messrs.

Alexander	Hamilton	McKenzie
Allard	(Swift Current-	McKinley
Baker	Maple Creek)	McKinnon
(Grenville-Carleton)	Hargrave	Muir
Baldwin	Hogan	Munro
Balfour	Holmes	(Esquimalt-Saanich)
Bawden	Horner	Murta
Beatty	Huntington	Neil
Benjamin	Hurlburt	Nielsen
Blackburn	Jelinek	Nowlan
Brisco	Jones	Nystrom
Cadieue	Kempling	Oberle
Caouette	Knowles	Orlikow
(Villeneuve)	(Winnipeg	O'Sullivan
Clarke	North Centre)	Paproski
(Vancouver Quadra)	Knowles	Patterson
Crouse	(Norfolk-Halifax)	Peters
Darling	Lambert	Reynolds
Dick	(Bellechasse)	Ritchie
Dinsdale	Lambert	Roche
Dionne	(Edmonton West)	Rondeau
(Kamouraska)	Laprise	Saltsman
Douglas	Lawrence	Schellenberger
(Nanaimo-Cowichan-	Leggatt	Schumacher
The Islands)	MacDonald	Scott
Elzinga	(Egmont)	Skoreyko
Fairweather	MacDonald (Miss)	Smith
Firth	(Kingston and the	(Churchill)
Forrestall	Islands)	Stanfield
Fortin	MacKay	Stevens
Fraser	MacLean	Stewart
Friesen	Macquarrie	(Marquette)
Gilbert	Malone	Symes
Halliday	Marshall	Towers
Hamilton	Masniuk	Wagner
(Qu'Appelle Moose	Matte	Wenman
Mountain)	Mazankowski	Whiteway
	McCleave	Wooliams
	McGrath	Yewchuk—94