

It is volume XI of the oral proceedings, and I was quoting from page 660, the first part I cited being at line 11 and the second part at line 20.

The case was argued, and it was very disappointing both to the dominion government and to the government of Quebec that their lordships should make the decision—which under the contract they were requested by the two parties to make—in the form in which they did make it. They did decide, and I am now reading from the *Times Law Reports*, volume XLIII, 1926-27, at page 299:

For the above reasons their lordships are of opinion that, according to the true construction of the statutes, orders in council and proclamations referred to in the order of reference, the boundary between Canada and Newfoundland in the Labrador peninsula is a line drawn due north from the eastern boundary of the bay or harbour of Anse Sablon as far as the fifty-second degree of north latitude, and from thence westward along that parallel until it reaches the Romaine river, and then northward along the left or east bank of that river and its head waters to their source, and from thence due north to the crest of the watershed or height of land there, and from thence westward and northward along the crest of the watershed of the rivers flowing into the Atlantic ocean until it reaches cape Chidley.

The government of Canada felt that it had submitted a reference to the judicial committee of the privy council for a decision and that though, unfortunately, that decision had not been the one hoped for, it was bound by its contract to treat it as a decision, and is treating it as such, and that is all that was stated in the terms which were suggested as being terms believed to constitute a fair and equitable basis for union of Newfoundland with Canada.

Mr. G. R. PEARKES (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker, when the leader of the Progressive Conservative party (Mr. Bracken) was speaking on the address in reply to the speech from the throne he cited, as one of the reasons why confidence was being lost in the present government, the plight of the veterans in Canada. I do not suggest that that plight is unique so far as the veterans are concerned or that they can be separated from the general conditions of the country as a whole, but there are certain trends which have emphasized the difficult situation in which veterans find themselves today.

One of those trends is the tendency of industry and of government and of crown corporations to place the emphasis upon youth and to employ in their organizations younger men. There are many reasons for that. One might cite, as a habit which has sprung up in recent years, that of appointing personnel agents. These are young college

men and naturally they place great emphasis on the importance of youth. Then there are such agencies as retirement schemes, group insurance and so forth. The sum total of all this is that a man who is now over forty is having great difficulty in finding employment. Some officials in this country have been doing excellent work in trying to stimulate public opinion to realize this situation, and I would refer to Mr. MacNamara, deputy minister of labour, and Colonel Philpott of the Department of Veterans Affairs, both of whom have done excellent work in drawing this situation to the attention of the nation as a whole. But it does emphasize the fact that the elderly man, the veteran of world war I, or the veteran of world war II who is a little bit up in years, is having to rely more and more on his pension, if he draws a pension, or upon his allowance if he draws an allowance under the War Veterans' Allowances Act.

We heard just before Christmas the statement by the Prime Minister (Mr. Mackenzie King) announcing an increase of \$10 a month as far as the 100 per cent pensioner was concerned. When that announcement was made I was shocked by the meagreness of the increase and spoke out of turn, and for that I apologize to you, sir, for having spoken when I was out of order. I spoke in haste, stung by disappointment. I have had eight weeks in which to think over the remarks that I then made, in which I said that the increase in the pensions was inadequate. I repeat now, after careful consideration, that the increase in the pensions are totally inadequate, and there is no doubt today that that announcement came as a cruel and tragic let-down to the veterans of this country.

If in the middle of December I claimed that the pension increase was inadequate, inadequate because I believe all pension and pension increases have been based on the general cost of living, and it has been many years since an adjustment was made, it is certainly more inadequate today when we find that the cost of living has even increased since that statement of mine was made. Only this week have the official figures been published, showing that since the first of December the index has jumped from 146 to 148.3 on January 2, 1948, and that there has been a rise of 21.3 in the last twelve months from January 2, 1947, to January 2, 1948. The same figures as published indicate that the food rating has gone up nearly 40 points in the last twelve months, having risen to 182.2 from 145.5. Those upward trends are continuing, because those figures have not taken into consideration the effect of the new food contracts which have been made with Great Britain, and we all