opportunity to reply to some of the things that I shall say this afternoon.

There is no doubt that the question of unemployment has become critical. It is not just the transitory, seasonal unemployment that bothers Canada because of our severe winter weather. It is chronic longterm unemployment that has reached into the level of skilled and professional people. It has been a long, long time since we had young Canadians qualifying with Ph.D. degrees unable to find suitable employment. It is a long, long time since we have had people with technical skills unemployed, after a lifetime spent in the work for which they were specially trained, and it has been a long, long time since the young have been so severely affected by the chronic state of unemployment that besets the Canadian economy at present. Admittedly, there is always some unemployment and it is the chronic poor who suffer most in this regard. Now, because of the growing severity of the problem, they are feeling the pressure all the more because of the lack of policy and misdirection on the part of the federal government.

I am not going to engage in a battle of statistics because statistics are cold comfort. We do know that the situation is severe. Whether it be the number on unemployment insurance, the number who are registered for employment in the manpower centres, the number who are statistically calculated on the seasonally adjusted basis, it is a very black and serious day for a young country like Canada. I suggest that the situation has developed because of what has been designated the Benson iceberg theory by a gentleman in Manitoba, who applied this term to the minister's white paper on taxation. If one reads that book by the tax expert in Manitoba, who is also the leader of the Liberal party in Manitoba, Mr. Izzie Asper, I think one must come to the conclusion that he reached, that when the Minister of Finance (Mr. Benson) brought down his white paper on taxation he obviously had not read the document himself because since that time he has been backing away from his own thesis.

That white paper has been discussed in season and out of season across the country. I do not think any of the important proposals in it had the approval of the people of Canada. There has been much newspaper comment on the White paper. I read one from the Deloraine *Times* published in my constituency. The item is headed, "An Angry Canada", and reads:

> Across the country, more and more people from all walks of life are asking: "What is Ottawa trying to do?"

That is a good question, but unfortunately the members who sit on the treasury benches in Ottawa are not able to answer it because they do not know the answer. In all the letters which are reaching my office there is evident a spirit of growing protest, economic protest and political protest. The other day one of my correspondents waxed eloquent with poetry, and I would like to read this for the benefit of hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a poetic summary of the attitude of people in western Canada to the current disarray in government programs and policies. I know there is to be a ministerial safari to Saskatchewan this week-end. The ministers will get the message in person. I merely wish to give them a preliminary foretaste of what they may expect:

• (4:20 p.m.)

> Of Trudeau and Sharp you have heard,
> Edgar Benson is a big third.
> Recession, depression,
> In deadly procession
> Is the aim of this ravenous bird.

That was sent to me in a letter, and I think it is a good summary of the situation which faces the country at present. So far, the only minister who has spoken in the continuation of the debate has been the minister responsible for housing. His solution is, build more houses. He also gave us some words of wisdom when he tried to rebut some of the comments which opposition spokesmen have been making. He quoted that old aphorism, "The optimist sees the doughnut and the pessimist sees the hole." There are 700,000 unemployed people in Canada at present, as I am sure hon. members opposite realize. I almost said, "Hon. members absent", which would be a more appropriate term, and I include hon. ministers opposite when I say "hon. members opposite". It is very difficult for those people who are unemployed to see anything except a very dismal hole. There is not much dough in the doughnut that faces them in this dismal prospect. The government seems to be replying that unemployment is a rumour or, to use a phrase that the Prime Minister frequently likes to use, that it is, "a foul canard perpetrated by a bunch of people who are out of work." That is as close as they come to realizing the problems that accrue to those who find themselves among the 700,000 unemployed, a situation that has come about as a result of government bungling.

The Parliament of Canada set up within recent years the Economic Council of Canada. That Economic Council of Canada every year presents a report. Each year it reports the desirable goals towards which the government of Canada ought to aim. These are not the half-baked proposals of any private Member of Parliament. These are the carefully researched, analytical goals set out by the members of the Economic Council of Canada. We must have, first, full unemployment. I am referring to the points outlined by the Economic Council.

**Mr. Francis:** Full unemployment or employment?

**Mr. Dinsdale:** If the whip of the government party will read the report of the Economic Council of Canada he will see that full unemployment in Canada as a result of seasonal adjustments—I beg your pardon. I ought to say "full employment". Full employment, on that basis, is reached when our unemployment rate is 3.8 per cent.

**Mr. Francis:** Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question. He has twice referred to full unemployment.

**Mr. Dinsdale:** I have corrected myself and said "full employment". The figure there is 3.8 per cent. There must be, second, a high rate of growth, an annual increase in the gross national product of 4.75 per cent. Third, there must be reasonable price stability, which would be a 2 per cent rate of increase in prices annually.