

Advocating violence against women is unbecoming of all Canadians. It is a shameful and a despicable act of cowardice. Intimidation of this nature belongs in the gutter with the filth and the mire.

Had the vice-president of the Liberal or Progressive Conservative parties made such remarks their resignation would have been demanded by party members and leaders alike.

How dare any NDP member of Parliament ask any question in this House on women's issues as long as Mr. Bean co-leads their party. The New Democratic members opposite must demand Mr. Bean resign.

* * *

CANADA POST

Ms. Lynn Hunter (Saanich—Gulf Islands): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak of the impending closure of Postal Station A in Saanich, British Columbia.

Economically this station is completely viable. There is a two-year waiting list for postal boxes and revenues are up by 17 per cent this year, despite having over eight contracted out private operations within a three kilometre radius. Customers have experimented with going to private retail outlets, but have returned to Station A because of the superior knowledge of the unionized staff.

Clearly individuals and small businesses in my riding prefer to deal with a real post office.

In Saanich, the effectiveness of a postal station versus privately run outlets has been proven. Canada Post is now proposing to close this revenue generating post office, possibly the most successful in greater Victoria.

I have a suggestion for Canada Post, as well as this government. Rather than fly top executives across the country for the Grey Cup, or lease executive boxes in the SkyDome, take a good hard look at providing top quality service to the customer, the taxpaying citizens of my riding.

Oral Questions

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

• (1420)

[Translation]

CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS

Hon. André Ouellet (Papineau—Saint-Michel): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister responsible for Constitutional Affairs. This week in Montreal, at a meeting with the *Conseil du patronat* the minister announced that the government was willing to amend its proposals on the economic union. I think everyone agrees it would be useful to revise section 21 of the Constitution, to try and establish a real common market in this country. However, the government is certainly not taking the right approach.

Which of its three proposals—14, 15 or 16—does it intend to change? And does the government intend to inform the House of Commons or the senators and members of the House of Commons sitting on the joint committee of the House of Commons and the Senate which is considering the constitutional proposals? I want to make quite clear to the minister that we do not intend to waste our time considering proposals the government has already rejected.

Right Hon. Joe Clark (President of the Privy Council and Minister responsible for Constitutional Affairs): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the hon. member's information is once again not quite correct. After a very useful conversation with the *Conseil du patronat*, I told them that I understood their interest in having a situation where the provinces and the federal government, acting as partners, would be able to take initiatives to accelerate Canada's economic union. That was always what we had in mind. I told them that if there seemed to be a difference between what we intended and how it was expressed, we were of course prepared to change the wording. I added that the parliamentary committee was the place where such changes should be considered. The federal government has made certain proposals, and these proposals can be improved. I intend, and I think this is quite normal, to be involved with others in conversations on any potential improvements. The *Conseil du patronat* understands, and I hope the House of Commons does now, that improvements must be made through the Joint Committee.