

the great principles of efficient and viable federalism. Our success—for, we will succeed—will serve equitably the interests of the provinces, the central government, the whole Canadian people; it will not fail either to give the divided world a great example and cause for hope.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

[English]

**Mr. W. B. Nesbitt (Oxford):** Mr. Speaker, there are many subjects on which one could comment during this debate on the Speech from the Throne. I wish to confine myself briefly to three. One concerns the Unemployment Insurance Commission, another has to do with transport and, last, there is the question of the cost of living.

Turning to the unemployment insurance matter, for years we have been promised amendments to the relevant Act and improvements in the administration and in the commission. I notice that this year a brief reference is made to this subject in the Speech from the Throne. I can only hope that adequate and proper changes will be made in the Act, in the regulations and in the way in which the commission administers its responsibility. Unfortunately, the record of administration is a very bad one in the opinion of most people. The commission appears to be much more concerned to make administration easier for those within its own organization than it is about properly serving the working people of Canada, as it is supposed to do.

There is one recent example I could cite. The commission withdrew all its offices from the heavily industrialized area of southwestern Ontario—presumably the situation is the same in the comparable part of Quebec—and concentrated them in one place, namely, London, Ontario. When there are complaints from workers—and there are a good many, as all hon. members know—working people are obliged to take a day off work, if they have work, so as to run up to London and explain their problems. All this means a good deal of inconvenience and expenditure. It is only one example of what has been happening. I propose to deal with others when the subject comes before the House.

The latest thing we hear is that the commission intends to move its office to Belleville—not even to Toronto. People who work between Oshawa and Windsor will have to

*The Address—Mr. Nesbitt*

traipse to Belleville every time they encounter difficulties in connection with their claims. I have heard of stupid administration, Mr. Speaker, but this seems to be one of the stupidest things I have heard yet.

In addition, the attitude of the commission itself needs to be changed. It has a long record of inflexibility, bordering sometimes on arrogance. In a recent case with which I have been concerned the Umpire made certain recommendations and suggestions to the commission. The commission decided to disregard them. When things get to the point at which a government commission pays scant attention to the recommendations and suggestions resulting from its own appeal procedures, things have reached a pretty pass and re-organization is needed. When the subject is brought before the House I intend, along with some of my colleagues, to bring these matters to your attention, Mr. Speaker, in greater detail.

I turn now to the subject of transport. When the Minister of Transport (Mr. Jamieson) spoke in the debate yesterday his eloquence flowed like the Hamilton River in his province. His transplanted blarney was equally effective. In the course of his speech he suggested that the opposition never had anything constructive to propose. Well, I shall make a little suggestion now. Incidentally, the government never pays any attention to suggestions coming from this side of the House anyway. Certainly, this has been our experience as members of the Standing Committee on Transport. Even when unanimous recommendations were made, not only did the government disregard them but it did not even have the common politeness to wait until we had completed our recommendations before it went ahead to do something else. As hon. members know, last session the committee paid a visit to the Atlantic provinces to study the transport situation there and make recommendations. The government reached a decision concerning the Prince Edward Island causeway while we were still in the process of drawing up our report. So much for the minister's statement about suggestions from the opposition side, even when they are made by a standing committee of this House upon which, of course, even government members are represented. No attention is paid to them, anyway.

Nevertheless, I should like to bring one matter to the attention of the minister. It concerns highway policy. Since the earliest days of Canada's development the federal