

*Oral Questions*

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, over the past four years 15,400 or 32 per cent of Canada's steel workers have lost their jobs.

Why is the government bulldozing NAFTA through Parliament without a steel pact in order to end unfair U.S. trade harassment of Canadian producers?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is well aware of the efforts we have made to engage in discussions with the United States administration.

I am sure he is well aware of the efforts that have been made by the Canadian industry to engage in similar discussions with its counterparts as well as efforts made by the Canadian labour movement in trying to engage in discussions with the U.S. labour movement on this very question.

He is also well aware that neither the government nor industry nor labour has been successful in gaining the support necessary for the type of agreement he proposes. We still are working at trying to find ways of raising the understanding of the integration in the steel industry between the two economies. That work will continue and hopefully will have some results that will recognize this integration in a relationship between the two countries in a very important industry such as steel.

• (1445 )

**Mr. Jim Peterson (Willowdale):** Mr. Speaker, the minister's one big lever is NAFTA. Why does he not use it to get a steel pact?

One of the reasons Canada is losing manufacturing jobs, including steel jobs at more than twice the U.S. rate is the very low labour standards in the United States. Twenty states in the United States have either no minimum wage or else their minimum wage is \$4 an hour or less. There are 20 U.S. states that have right to work laws.

Will the NAFTA side agreement on labour conditions look not only at Mexican working conditions but also at unfair U.S. labour practices that will continue to siphon jobs out of Canada?

**Hon. Michael Wilson (Minister of Industry, Science and Technology and Minister for International Trade):** Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend is being somewhat idealistic when he asks that question.

He refers to 20 states that have certain labour requirements. He might reflect on the fact that the other 30 states have not been able to convince the 20 states of the error of their ways and cause some changes in those labour requirements.

Does he believe that Canada will have more influence over those 30 states when some of the states are some of the most populous in the country? Let's get realistic.

\* \* \*

**IMMIGRATION**

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, my question is for the minister of immigration who received notice of this question this morning.

A woman refugee from Iran, Sima Sedghi, was detained for seven days, tortured and whipped for wearing sunglasses and nylons. Now she is wanted by the Iranian state for peaceful political activity in a country where dissidents are arrested and without trial, tortured and even executed. She has now been ordered deported from Canada.

Ms. Sedghi clearly qualifies under the new guidelines for women refugees. I ask the minister to put a hold on her deportation and review her case under the new guidelines.

**Hon. Bernard Valcourt (Minister of Employment and Immigration):** Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member that this case will be reviewed under the new guidelines.

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Burnaby):** Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the minister's response and I will be anxious to hear how that review goes.

Another 35 or more women refugees are also facing deportation because the old guidelines did not take into account the lack of protection for women from violence or the severe consequences for disobeying laws designed simply to control women.

The Canadian government is now saying it is wrong to deport women in these circumstances. Is it not just as wrong for the women who have already been ordered deported?