really I am only endangering the whole resource structure for the ten provinces across Canada." So, Mr. Broadbent threw in the hat. When he threw in the hat he threw in Mr. Nystrom with it. He went with the hat.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: It is not a ten-gallon hat now, it is a ten-pint hat because Mr. Nystrom is not going to be in that hat and he has already lost another member from the hat. So that was a mad hatter's tea party that the Leader of the NDP had with the Prime Minister. Now his credentials are gone. Now that his credentials are gone they should all go over there and join them. The Social Credit party used to be over there. That is about right where the NDP fits, over where the Social Credit were.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: Their last subamendment destroyed a budget that was going to help Canada in the short term and the long term. It was going to help the medium and lower-income people of Canada. I demonstrated that earlier today. They are so blind in their NDP fanaticism that they destroyed a budget which would have helped the people they say they represent. Now they do not represent them one iota more than I do and they have not got any more of a heart than I have got. But I do not go around every day beating my gums about the great heart I have got. I do not wear it on my sleeve like the NDP.

Why do we in this party want to help the Canadian economy? Why is it we seem to have a fixation with the economy and producing more and more? Why? Because that is the only way we can give the people of Canada who need more, more. You cannot give them more if the pie is shrinking and not expanding. That is why we are concerned with the economy. So if we do not wear our hearts on our sleeve like the NDP it is not because we are not thinking of the little people of this country. The little people of this country are not going to have a thing if the economy of this country goes on for the next four or five years as it has gone on over the last four or five. There will be nothing for those people and we will be in a mad fight because the pie does not grow, it is diminishing. The groups who are suffering will be fighting one another for a piece of the pie and the people who are going to get the pie are the organized sections of society; the senior citizens are not going to get it. The defenceless and the unorganized are not going to get a piece of the pie. That is why we are concerned about the economy. That is why we wanted to take a long-term look, because if we do not take a long-term look there is going to be nothing for anyone. That is why we are concerned.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Crosbie: That is why I am hoping, with the moving of this motion, that we are going to destroy this government next Tuesday. Do not laugh, there may be 30 or 40 statesmen on the other side—there might be. After all, I was a statesman myself once and a member of the Liberal party and I left it. There may be 20 or 30 over there who will take the step to

save Canada next Tuesday by voting for this motion. That is why I have couched it in extremely diplomatic terms, with the assistance of our House leader. So, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker):

That all the words after "that" be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

"This House condemns the government for the regressive nature of its budget and rejects the budget because it fails to assist monetary policy to combat inflation, fails to meet the campaign commitments of the Prime Minister, fails to control government spending, fails to reduce unemployment, fails to help low or middle-income Canadians meet increasing living costs, fails to advance effective policies to achieve oil self-sufficiency and fails to maintain national unity".

Mr. Bob Rae (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, after that exercise in primal therapy I thought I would concentrate on this year's budget.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rae: It is a Liberal budget. I think it was Woody Guthrie who said that some rob you with a six-gun and some with a fountain pen. If the Canadian public was held up by the budget last year there is little question it is being held up by the budget this year. The techniques are different. I do not agree with those people who say there is no difference between the Conservative party and the Liberal party. There is a difference of style. There is some difference of substance.

This is a budget which in its own way is just as unacceptable, just as harsh, just as regressive and just as reactionary as the one which was rejected not only by the NDP last year—surely the member for St. John's West (Mr. Crosbie) could hardly have expected us to support his budget—not simply by the Liberal party united strangely in the thought they could win power. I would remind those members of the Conservative party, who continue to return to those halcyon days prior to February, that between the defeat of the budget and the return of the Liberal government there was an event of some significance. That event was an election.

If you want to take your case to anybody, in terms of blaming them for what happened, I suggest to those members of the Conservative party that they take their case once again to the Canadian people. There are to those who say, "Well, the NDP can hardly be expected to criticize the economic policies of the Liberal party because they were opposed to the economic policies of the Conservative party." I have heard comments such as that. It is a strange and wonderous thing that a person can be opposed to cholera in 1979 and be opposed to leprosy in 1980.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Rae: It is a strange and wonderous thing that we can attack one party of government for following policies which inflict great hardship on Canadian people and provide no economic leadership, and once again when another party takes power we can be just as critical of that same party for following exactly the same trend and the same thrust of policies. In fact, far from it being an inconsistency it is the