

Mr. Nowlan: That is worthy of Kreskin. Show some humility.

Mr. Benjamin: I say this with a reasonable degree of safety because I am a most cautious fellow.

An hon. Member: We don't want you at any price.

Mr. Benjamin: But I would find the bed about equally uncomfortable if I had to get into bed with either one of those two parties. If the official opposition would, first of all, drop the word "wage" from the phrase "price and wage policy" and substitute therefore the word "incomes", and, second, if they would undertake that the profits of financial institutions and corporations, and the incomes of professional people, including members of parliament—

Mr. Hurlburt: Lawyers and undertakers.

Mr. Andre: Preachers, too.

Mr. Benjamin:—and if they will specify that the people who are the first victims of inflation—and as far as I am concerned they are persons earning less than \$10,000 a year—will not be subject to compulsion, I might be prepared to get rid of "them" in favour of "those".

Mr. Saltsman: This is degenerating into a debate.

Mr. Benjamin: I feel reasonably sure that no Tory will offer any such thing, because the difference between the two parties when it comes down to the crunch is nil.

Mr. Paproski: You simply don't understand us, Ben.

Mr. Benjamin: The hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) talked about lowering interest rates and removing the tax on building materials. I have heard Tories talk *ad nauseam* for the last five years—in fact, I have heard members of my own party talk *ad nauseam* about the removal of sales tax from building materials. I have yet to hear a single member of the official opposition say that the sales tax on building materials should be removed only if and when the advantage was passed on to the consumer. That is the essential difference.

I recall the years when the CCF and, later, the NDP were clamouring, together with the Tories, for the removal of the sales tax from drugs. Finally, the Liberal government did remove it. But no reduction in the price of drugs to the consumer followed: the benefit of the removal of that 11 per cent tax went to increase the profits of the drug manufacturing companies. And there was not a word of complaint from the Tories. So, again, if the official opposition would take the stand that the removal of the sales tax from building materials should not serve to profit the manufacturers and builders of houses, I will believe what they say.

The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Whelan) spoke today. I hoped he would give us some idea of what the policy being followed by the minister in charge of the Wheat Board really meant. Instead, he gave us a lecture about not wasting food. He was critical of professors, and I agree with that. I hope he agrees that the number one professor in this House is the Minister in charge of the Wheat Board. Then, we might add the hon. member for Don Valley (Mr.

Cost of Living

Gillies) and the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby (Mr. Broadbent).

• (2350)

An hon. Member: You must be kidding.

Mr. Benjamin: I am only two-thirds kidding. I did not mean that about the hon. member for Oshawa-Whitby because he is a half-decent fellow.

The Minister of Agriculture talked about his expert friends who are professors and economists putting half the farmers on welfare. As the hon. member for Vegreville (Mr. Mazankowski) quite rightly pointed out, it was five experts, economists with the task force on agriculture, none of whom had grown a bushel of wheat in his life, who recommended that at least one-third of the farmers of this country had to go.

I wish the Minister of Agriculture had told us more about his feed grains policy, particularly since he comes from Ontario. I would have appreciated his explanation of how the western feed grain producers would be happy to help out eastern livestock feeders to the tune of a buck a bushel. These are people who talk of national unity yet continue to impose policies that divide the people of this country. The Minister of Agriculture should not have risen this afternoon. If he had to rise, then all he should have said was: "Mr. Kierans, where are you now that we need you?" I hope that as this session progresses all parties in this House will agree that we must strengthen the Prices Review Board to include all commodities, and that we will give the board power to investigate and to roll back unjustified price increases.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member's time has expired.

Mr. J. H. Horner (Crowfoot): Mr. Speaker, much has been said and many good speeches have been made. There appears to be an agreement on the part of the Liberal party and New Democratic Party to attack us in this debate since they are fearful of the approach of the Conservative party which may have the answer, or part of the answer, to the inflation that has been confronting Canada.

People have been wondering how long this supposed marriage is going to continue. They should read about federalism in Canada as written by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), before he was Prime Minister and when he was a socialist, as he is today. He is quite happy with the marriage and has no trouble with the NDP as bed partners. As someone said in this House earlier, there are no cabinet ministers in the House. Certainly, there are; the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles) is here.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Horner (Crowfoot): He is head of treasury board and deputy House leader—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Waterloo-Cambridge is rising on a point of order.

Mr. Saltsman: Mr. Speaker, I must rise to protest. If the hon. member for Crowfoot is determined to have his say,