

Time Allocation for Bill C-30

and defended this kind of action. He went further, Mr. Speaker. If you check the *Hansard* for December 7 you will find that not only did he want to ram it through in two hours on a Friday afternoon, but he wanted the House to forgo supper hour and have a special Friday night sitting. He could not wait until Monday to get it over with. That Friday afternoon he moved a motion as follows:

That the House sit through the dinner hour and extend the hours of sitting tonight—

That is the kind of rush he was in in those days. How he has changed! What a transformation inside five or six months! He stands here with a straight face and scolds us for taking a full three months to bring in a budget. Is his memory so short that he forgets it was almost seven months before he could bring in that terrible excuse for a budget on December 11 last? He talks about the gag, the guillotine and all the other pretty things he can dream up. Where was his entertaining rhetoric six months ago? Was he silent then? Was he just swallowing or was he doing what he does on most issues—taking whichever side is convenient at the time?

An hon. Member: Shame.

Mr. Simmons: The New Democratic crowd would know all about changing positions, having changed on the constitution and taken both sides—having been for lower interest rates when they were high, and now that they are lower, screaming that they should be higher because of a recession.

An hon. Member: Oh no.

Mr. Simmons: Not all of them, just the spokesman for finance. He was on the radio two weeks ago lamenting that if interest rates go down too much, it might have some severe economic implications. They sat on both sides of the constitution and on both sides of interest matters. They know all about taking both sides, Mr. Speaker, and they have taken them. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I am reminded that today I have on what I call my "Ed Broadbent suit". It is a suit with two inside pockets. In one pocket he carries a speech representing one side of the situation, but if it is not opportune to deliver that speech he just reaches into his other pocket and takes out a speech on the other side of the issue. With only one speech you will notice, Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Ethier): Order, please. I would remind the hon. member that he should not use the name of an hon. member but rather his riding.

Mr. Simmons: I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I should have said the "patron saint of instant solutions"—

Mr. McDermid: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I wonder what Mr. Broadbent's two speeches have to do with rule 75c which we are supposedly debating at the present time.

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member is wondering; he wonders about so many other things. Let us see if we can find something that he can understand.

I am glad to see the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton (Mr. Baker) coming into the chamber.

Mr. Baker (Nepean Carleton): I think I will leave.

Mr. Simmons: He, too, with a straight face talked about the budget. He was leader of a government in the House that could not produce in six months what he condemns us for not producing in three—a budget. He wants a date for the budget and suddenly all his principles go out the window. He talks about trained seals. If he really wants to see some trained seals he should look behind him when we call the vote on this motion.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Simmons: I say to the hon. member for Nepean-Carleton that \$12 billion should not come as a surprise to him. If he looks at the revenue and expenditure program contained in the Tory budget he will find that the borrowing requirement was indeed in the order of \$12 billion, so this should come as no surprise to him.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Eight.

Mr. Simmons: The official opposition was prepared to support a borrowing requirement of \$12 billion when they were the government. Now they ask why we want \$12 billion. I say they should read their own estimates and find out why we want \$12 billion.

An hon. Member: You read them.

Mr. Simmons: I am told that when we were debating Bill C-20 in opposition last December, the mortgage bill, we took two or three days—

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): No, you are wrong.

Mr. Blenkarn: Oh, you went on and on and on.

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Seven days.

Mr. Simmons: The hon. member for Nepean-Carleton says we took seven days. The note I have before me says two or three. Would the hon. member like to put it on the record?

Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton): If it is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, I will read what I said on that occasion when speaking for the government, as follows:

I happen to be quite a reasonable man.

I was speaking of myself, Mr. Speaker.

We have already spent seven days discussing this bill.