

Supply

The fact that the Liberal Party has brought forward this motion today is not only a manifestation of its mischief making but quite frankly, a manifestation of the bankruptcy of its own intellectualism and lack of substantive policies to bring forward to this House today.

We saw that when watching the Leader of the Opposition. I am looking forward over the next few months to seeing his policy pronouncements. He made one the other day that was a real winner. He told us that after two years today, he is going to scrap the GST. Then he told us that maybe he will not scrap the GST, maybe he will modify it. Then the next day, he will say, I guess the GST has got to stay. Now we have the definitive announcement that the GST is going.

Stay tuned, folks. One of these days, if he gets to be Prime Minister—that is a fantasy idea if ever there was one—he will tell us in his first budget where he is going to get the \$15 billion, \$16 billion, \$17 billion worth of revenue that the GST is providing. Stay tuned, folks, we can have only one idea a year. That is it for now. Scrap the GST. It will take him another year to come up with an idea of what on earth we are going to do to replace it.

If we believe what we read in the news, what he is going to replace it with is a hidden tax on food. That is kind of a neat idea. It will go over really well, I am sure, with people from coast to coast. If my friends opposite were seriously interested—

Mr. Wappel: You're being a hypocrite, Peter.

An hon. member: They are scared, Peter.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. McCreath: Mr. Speaker, I thought I had the floor and I say to my hon. friends: withdraw.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): Order, please. I ask the hon. member for Scarborough West to show more restraint. I heard the word hypocrite and I believe this expression to be unparliamentary.

Does the hon. member for Scarborough West wish to add anything else?

[English]

Mr. Wappel: If your ruling, Mr. Speaker, is that that is an unparliamentary term, then I of course withdraw it. I will let the people of Canada decide when they go to

McDonald's and pay GST on their food to reflect on the comments of the hon. member.

[Translation]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. DeBlois): I appreciate the hon. member's reaction.

I now recognize the hon. member for South Shore.

[English]

Mr. McCreath: Mr. Speaker, I was not at all offended by my friend's little bit of enthusiasm. I was digging a little bit too close to home with my comments. That might have been the problem.

In any event, to get back to the subject, since we have the subject of unemployment insurance before the House today, we might as well try to talk a little bit seriously about it. My friends opposite have made a great deal of noise about the whole business of voluntary quitters, for example, and sexual harassment.

I have not seen exactly how many cases have been brought in the area of sexual harassment. I understand it is a very limited number. What is important when we look at this issue is that we remember that what is exempted from that is the concept of just cause.

I believe the Minister of State in her remarks made reference to this question. Having sat many months on the committee on Bill C-21 and travelled coast to coast to hear a lot of people come before that committee and express their concerns with respect to the need for a definition of just cause, the committee, and I might say to give credit where credit is due on the initiative of the member for Ottawa West, brought forth an amendment. When that amendment which provided for that definition came before this House, what did my friends opposite do? They voted against it.

Earlier I heard the member for Hamilton East talk about members over here abstaining. She said, and I quote her directly: "You have either got to line up with the workers or with General Motors". When it came before this House to define this concept, where was she? She abstained or at least she did not vote for it. She did not vote against it. I have it here, the amendment and the definition. I guess she did not line up either with the workers or with General Motors on that particular occasion. It will be interesting to see when the legislation comes forth again where she lines up.