

*The Address—Mr. Wightman*

consequence to the authors, and of even greater consequence, in our view, was the fact that a common understanding had been reached irrespective of the import of the specific issues. The fact that the specific recommendations were in large part ignored was not as disheartening as the lack of encouragement for our efforts.

The throne speech emphasizes the fact that this government is committed to consultation rather than confrontation. I see in the totality of the throne speech a thrust which recognizes that consultation, to be productive, must take many forms. One of the most important forms could be bilateral discussions between organized labour and management if it is the will of the parties of interest to enter into such discussions. I would want to emphasize the latter part of that statement because labour and management in Canada should understand that if they decide to take such an initiative the government will view its proper role as being to facilitate their efforts, not to dictate to them.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Wightman:** It seems to me that this is a time for healing in the field of labour-management relations as much as any other aspect of our national life. It is a time for recognizing the practical limitations of collective bargaining and the reality that progress may be necessarily slow. But surely on the occasion of this newly constituted government, it is also an occasion when we can start from the presumption of a clean slate in terms of the relationships between government, labour and management. I say this notwithstanding full recognition of the particular dispute going on at the Montreal port. We dare not ignore the past, but for the present it seems to me that we can start from an assumption that the parties aspire not only to the common good of Canada, but to the respect and confidence of each other. Nor is it too much to expect the parties to recognize that just as the accommodative process of collective bargaining requires mutual understanding, respect and confidence can only come about as a result of mutuality of effort.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I turn to the subject of Petro-Canada. Some of my constituents have expressed concern over the question of security of oil supply, and rightly so. Yet they have been quick to accept that the Government of Canada has every bit as much authority as Petro-Canada to deal with the question of supply. Many of them want a major Canadian oil company owned by Canadians and they want Petro-Canada kept as a strong, operative company.

If my understanding is correct, I can assure my constituents and members opposite that these are precisely the concerns which we anticipate that the task force will address and meet in the context of the report soon to be submitted to us. Moreover, the task force report notwithstanding, they are precisely among the concerns which this government will address and meet.

Given our commitment and given that these two concerns are central to the statements made yesterday by the Leader of the Opposition and by the Leader of the New Democratic

[Mr. Wightman.]

Party, it would appear that these concerns are being met. However, if it is the view of the opposition that Petro-Canada can only be owned by the government and not by the people of Canada, at that point we part company.

Yesterday it was suggested that on this issue the Prime Minister is marching to a non-existent drummer. I want to assure this House that on this issue, as on the range of issues dealt with in the throne speech, I hear the same beat. I march gladly and proudly with the Prime Minister of Canada, not only because I am convinced that it is in the best interest of Canadians to do so, but because I suspect that the beat we hear is not so much a drum beat as the heart beat of a nation.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Lloyd Axworthy (Winnipeg-Fort Garry):** Mr. Speaker, as the roll call of people introducing themselves into this throne speech begins to accumulate, I am very pleased that you have occupied the chair when you did so that I may be allowed some small nuance of original tact to introduce myself; and may I be the first, sir, to compliment you on your election to the position of Deputy Speaker. I know that you will provide the same kind of conscientious, careful watch over this House as does the permanent Speaker.

I must confess at this juncture to being a little nervous, having listened to the debate regarding the recognition of the Social Credit party. It brings back recurring nightmares of my previous state in life when I occupied one of the more exclusive associations, being the only Liberal in the Manitoba legislature. I can say that if the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Roy) thought he had trouble getting recognized, he should try getting an office once in a while; then he will know that he is in real trouble. However, I do strike a sympathetic chord for his concern about the necessity of ensuring that, no matter how small the number in a party, it is in many cases the ideas and principles that one represents that counts. We in our group certainly have no hesitation or compulsion in recognizing the right of the Social Credit members to speak their minds.

I would like to pay my respects to the mover and seconder of this motion. They set a very high standard of elocution and commitment which all of us who are in the freshman class will find it difficult to measure up to. I must confess to being somewhat intrigued by the interesting discussion of the hon. member for Erie (Mr. Fretz) as he weaved in and out of a very fulsome praise for the orchard trees of the Niagara peninsula speckled throughout with fulsome praise for his leader. I do not know what position the hon. member took in the last Conservative convention, but I am not sure whether he was more in favour of the flora or the fauna in this case. I think that he was trying to send out a political signal for all of those to read.

I would also like to pay my respects to the Prime Minister (Mr. Clark) although he is not in his seat. He was kind enough to single me out yesterday, but probably his misguided jab is an indication of what we can expect in the future, that he is partly right and mostly wrong. He is partly right in saying that