

Hon. Members will recall that in his theories he talked about the withering away of the state; you remember that, Ed.

**Mr. Broadbent:** You were around then, I wasn't.

**Mr. Trudeau:** He talked about the withering away of the state and the replacement of the government of men by the administration of things. I do not want to insult them by saying that that is their philosophy. However, they are certainly leading us in their tortured Tory ways to the situation where the government of men—with all it implies in terms of reconciliation, confrontation and argument—would be replaced by the administration of things, where the state could wither away and the Leader of the Opposition, having become the Prime Minister in such a state, would preside at the non-existence of the Canadian Government and everything would be handed over to the multinational corporations.

[*Translation*]

I would wish him that but not the Canadian people.

[*English*]

**Mr. Young:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think if you test the House you will find that the House Leaders have reached an agreement and that there is unanimous consent to waive the provisions of Standing Order 42(7) to allow the Leader of the New Democratic Party to complete his remarks in reply to the Speech from the Throne without interruption.

**Mr. Nielsen:** Mr. Speaker, there is no need to seek consent to suspend any Standing Order. It has been the tradition, custom and practice of the House to allow the Leader of the New Democratic Party unlimited time to make his address in reply.

**Mr. Pinard:** Of course.

**Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa):** Mr. Speaker, we are certainly getting closer to 1984 all the time! We have just heard, I am sure for the first time in history, someone in Canada call the Leader of the Conservative Party (Mr. Mulroney) a Marxist. The mind boggles. Marx once said, I am sure all the scholars in this Chamber will recall, that he did not regard himself as being a Marxist. I am not sure how the Leader of the Opposition would respond to that observation of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). It does not require us to be near 1984 but simply in the House of Commons to have witnessed two such remarkable speeches of the kind we have just heard.

Before lunch we heard the Leader of the Opposition speak for almost an hour on the Throne Speech without proposing a single concrete solution to the problems that face our country about which he so correctly talked. Then we heard the Prime Minister, in his wonderful dialectical way, rise, lean back and point out that the Leader of the Opposition took an hour to say absolutely nothing, and then take an hour to talk about the nothing that was said and manage in the process not to talk about his own Government's Throne Speech.

*The Address—Mr. Broadbent*

● (1510)

I found part of what the Prime Minister had to say strange. He attacked the Conservative Party. I will say in this context that only the Conservative Party of Canada can make the Liberal Party of Canada look progressive, from time to time. If the Conservative Party consists of such a collection of negatives, such a bundle of social Darwinists, the Prime Minister and his colleagues will have to go some way to explain how the Conservatives since the last election have voted with the Liberals more than 80 times. Maybe it takes one social Darwinist to recognize another. It was of interest to note how the Prime Minister, in his casual way, obviously gearing up for an election fight, defended the 20th century against the Conservatives' 19th century. We have the straw man carefully drawn up for attack. It is certainly good to hear the Liberals attacking the 19th century from their perspective of the first quarter of the 20th century. There is at least that much difference, if one is prepared to concede from time to time on certain issues.

I suppose that accounts for the almost paralytic state that the Conservatives experience from time to time. We have never denied that the New Democratic Party did indeed support a Canadian Constitution and a Charter of Rights for Canadians, certain beliefs we in this Party have had for a long time. The Liberals brought it in, we believed in it and we voted for it. The same collection of Conservatives, in noting that we voted with the Liberals, should remember that since the 1980 election they voted with the Liberals not once, not twice but three times as often as this Party. Maybe they should tell that to the people of Canada.

Unlike my two predecessors, I want to deal with the Throne Speech and deal with the Government of the day. Before doing that, however, I want to pick up on two or three observations made by the Leader of the Opposition. He talked about productivity. I say to the Leader of the Opposition in a straightforward way that, like himself, I was born into a worker's family. I did not have a silver spoon in my mouth, I did not live in a rich house, but I did not live in abject poverty. I do not want to leave that impression. It was an ordinary worker's family. I never became president of a corporation. I frittered my time away going to university, teaching people and trying to understand the world. Perhaps there is some sense of legitimacy in both types of vocations.

I was a little surprised to hear the Leader of the Opposition speak as a businessman about productivity. He told us a little story about Japanese auto making. I thought it was an important attribute of a businessman, especially one who becomes a politician, to be really up to date when talking about such topics. I know a little bit about the automotive industry. He compared the automotive industry in Canada with that in Japan. He suggested there was a great gap in productivity between the automotive industry in Canada and that in Japan. Maybe he should check the most recent facts. He would learn that the productivity increase in the automotive industry in Canada in the sixties, seventies and early eighties far exceeded productivity increases in Canadian industry in general. Today,