

as is the case far too often when the majority of employees are women, the management of this company is trying to ignore them. These employees receive an average wage of only \$4.51 per hour, which is far below the poverty line for a single mother. An employee with 30 years of service with the company will receive a whopping pension of less than \$90 per month.

These workers have every right to demand fair compensation for their work, and the company has a social responsibility to deal with them fairly and to accept their right to form a union to speak with a collective voice. If the company refuses to live up to its responsibilities, then it is up to society to impose sanctions. The workers are asking the consumers of Canada to boycott this department store chain, and the other chains, K-Mart, Jupiter, and Big Top which have the same owners.

This boycott has been offered support from the CLC, the OFL, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Thunder Bay, and the United Food and Commercial Workers. I hope it will also be endorsed by all consumers of Canada who understand that fairness and a decent standard of living are the right of all workers in this country. I ask that they join with me and my colleagues and say: "I can't shop at Kresge's any more!"

\* \* \*

#### CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY

##### ELIMINATION OF PENSIONERS' TRAVEL PASSES

**Mr. Bill Gottselig (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, I would again like to bring to the attention of the House the matter of the elimination of pass privileges by CP Rail for CP Rail pensioners. When the issue first came to light last summer CP Rail indicated that it was a decision arrived at during union-management negotiations. CP Rail has now indicated that passes for pensioners and employees were a privilege and not a right, and that they have been replaced by a comprehensive health package at no cost to the pensioners. Pensioners, as well as all residents of my constituency, are already fully covered by our provincial health plan.

The letter of September 16, 1985, from the President of CP Rail addressed to all CP Rail retirees falls far short of providing an adequate explanation regarding the elimination of these pass privileges.

There was a clearly documented agreement between union and management, dating back to 1936, that employees of the CPR, and pensioners who retired in good standing, were entitled to pass privileges for life.

The CPR received land grants and mineral rights as well as many financial advantages during the planning and construction stage. In view of this, Mr. Speaker, I call on CP Rail to accept its corporate responsibilities and restore pass privileges to all pensioners.

S.O. 22

[Translation]

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

##### REQUEST THAT GOVERNMENT WITHDRAW BILL C-70

**Mr. Jean-Claude Malépart (Montreal-Sainte-Marie):** Last weekend, Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to meet with several mothers and a good many people responsible for family organizations, and they all wanted to know what the word of the Government is worth. They reminded me that the consultation paper tabled by the Government last January concerning child benefits contains a sentence which goes like this: "The commitment of the Government is that no savings resulting from program changes should be transferred to deficit reduction". A few months later, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Wilson) tabled a Budget document stating that net federal expenditures will be reduced by \$15 million in 1985-86 and by \$40 million in 1986-87. All this money, \$55 million, will come from cut backs in income support programs for families with children.

Those people are also wondering why the Government did not implement the unanimous recommendations made by various groups whereby the child tax credit exemption should be reduced because it benefits wealthier people. According to the document, a well-to-do person with an income of \$80,000 will get \$363 more whereas a man with a \$10,000 income does not get anything. Those people would just like to know why the Prime Minister and his Conservative Government do not honour their words and commitments and withdraw Bill C-70.

\* \* \*

[English]

#### WAR CRIMINALS

##### OPPOSITION TO SOVIET AUTHORITIES PROVIDING EVIDENCE

**Mr. Andrew Witer (Parkdale-High Park):** Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Deschenes Commission of Inquiry heard arguments regarding the possibility of the Commission travelling to the Soviet Union to gather evidence. Taking into consideration the abominable record of human rights violations by the U.S.S.R., does the Commission really expect to find evidence that has not been tampered with and tainted?

Members of Parliament asked to appear before the Commission to address this very question of Soviet evidence and the merits of such a proposed trip. They were denied the opportunity to voice their views and those of their constituents. How can the Commission naively believe that Soviet authorities have justice in mind when they themselves committed atrocities during the war and continue to be the most repressive Government in modern times?

It is even more surprising, Mr. Speaker, to hear groups which so effectively discredited the Soviet judicial system, especially with regard to trials against Soviet citizens, now argue that the Commission would be shirking its responsibility if it did not go to the U.S.S.R. The Commission would be in a