

*Extension of Sittings*

opposite me, became the Premier of British Columbia as a result of the election of 1972. He had a mandate. Did he have a mandate! He brought in auto insurance. I remember that campaign when the Hon. Member went around the province. He never said: "I will get you auto insurance for \$25". He never said that. What he did say is: "The Government has a fleet of vehicles and do you know what they have? They have coverage for \$25. Would it not be nice if you and I could have that kind of insurance?"

He never said that he would provide \$25 car insurance, because I think he knew he could not do that. However, once he got his mandate, boy, did we get auto insurance. Not for \$25, but for about ten times \$25. Something like \$250.

We got auto insurance on the basis of his mandate. What was that mandate?

**Mr. Cooper:** He had a majority.

**Mr. Friesen:** Yes, 39.59 per cent of the vote.

**Mr. Cooper:** What?

**Mr. Friesen:** That gave him a mandate to give us auto insurance in British Columbia. Wow! At least we did four points better than that. We got 43 per cent and that ought to give us a mandate.

Not only did he give us auto insurance, he gave us a land freeze. I remember the demonstrations around the province during that land freeze. It escalated the price of land for developers so they could make a healthy profit. Those people who are always fighting land developers lined the pockets of land developers during that land freeze. How did he do that? With that overwhelming majority of 39.59 per cent.

We had bumper stickers all over British Columbia during that time, because he ruined the mining industry, which read: "Welfare, B.C.'s No. 1 Industry". He did that all on a mandate of 39.59 per cent.

Did he have a mandate for that? Do we have a mandate today? I think the Government is entitled to its legislation.

I was elected in 1974, when we were campaigning on wage and price controls. It so happened that the Liberals were elected under Mr. Trudeau with a majority of about 43 per cent. Did that prevent him from bringing in the six and five program a year later? Not at all, even though he campaigned for exactly the opposite. I suspect the Hon. Member for York West (Mr. Marchi) supported him. He campaigned on exactly the opposite. He got a mandate of 43 per cent. That did not stop him one bit.

• (1440)

In 1980, Mr. Trudeau was elected again with no overwhelming mandate. It was less than 50 per cent. What did we get out of that? The bell ringing. Why? Because of the National Energy Program. Had he told us in the campaign that he was going to give back-in provisions for Petro-Canada? Did he tell us at that time that he was going to confiscate lands? Not at all. But on the basis of 43 per cent he said he had a mandate for the back-in provisions, and to confiscate lands. That is why we had the bell ringing, by the way. It was because the Government was not entitled to legislation it had not campaigned on. The Government did not provide a manifesto that declared forthrightly what it was going to do.

I come back to what this House ought to be providing by way of tradition, and what the political system in Canada ought to do. It should be to provide a clear message to the Canadian people during the election campaign on what the issues are for each political Party. Our responsibility as political leaders in each campaign is to make sure that our electorate understands clearly what we stand for, if we are to be elected. Believe me, I think all Members in this House in this Thirty-fourth Parliament understand very clearly what they were campaigning for in this election. The public certainly understood. They knew that it was one overriding issue. That was made clear by the Leader of the Opposition when he said: "Give the people the chance. Give them the voice. Give them the choice". The people have spoken. It was one issue. It is our mandate.

Members of the Opposition have every right to stand, to debate, and to outline their principles, their objections, and what they stand for. They have not only the right; they have the duty to do that. We are trying to provide them with that opportunity.

That is why we tried to table the legislation as soon as we came into the House. That is why we cannot understand why the Opposition forced two votes at least just on tabling the Bill. That took up an hour that could have been spent on debate of the legislation. It was taken away from us. What we are saying is let us establish the tradition as has been established in the United Kingdom.

As political Parties during the election campaign we decide on our manifesto. We decide what we plan to implement, if we are elected. We must make the