Foreign Extraterritorial Measures Act

debate. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie) alternates between a buffoon and a statesman. I do not know which role I prefer, probably the statesman.

I congratulate the Minister on finally dealing with the Bill and also the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Crombie). It is always a pleasure to hear him in the House. I know this Bill was a tall order for him, but he made short work of it.

Something that came up during debate on the Bill that I would like to talk about for a second is the matter of extraterritoriality. This Bill is a bit of a counterweight to the Government's efforts to open ourselves completely to foreign capital. We have seen this in Parliament in the past week with the changing from FIRA, an agency to look at foreign investment and make sure it was in Canada's interest in terms of jobs, research and so on, to a new agency called Investment Canada whereby we are wide open to foreign investment, too open in my view. Obviously the Minister of Justice disagrees with me.

• (1240)

In his remarks, the Minister mentioned that Members were trying to give examples of extra-territoriality and the difficulties that would be caused. I am not an expert in this area, but I know that in the area of energy, an area about which I know a little bit, the United States could pass emergency energy legislation during an oil crisis or could even pass legislation that anticipates an oil crisis. There could be difficulties in the Middle East or the Gulf states and Exxon, a large multinational corporation, might divert, as it once did in the past, oil that was bound for its subsidiary company, Imperial Oil of Canada. Canada's largest oil company, to the parent company in the United States. That is a broad example of extra-territoriality. Under this Bill, there is not very much that we could do about that. If Exxon were to ship its oil that was bound for Canadians to the United States, then perhaps we could do something about it on the order of an American tribunal.

I brought that example up to show why we in the NDP feel the way we do. However, we are not anti-American and the Minister did not say that we are, although I have heard it bandied about the House. We feel very strongly that we must be careful because we do not have an equal relationship with our great friends in the United States. The United States is a huge empire and we have become and are becoming more and more its colony. There was a book written by Arthur Lower, I believe, entitled Colony to Nation. It is a standard Canadian textbook on Canadian history and politics. It depicts how Canada has moved from a British colony to a free and independent nation. I am afraid that we are going to move from colony to nation to colony. I think that is the danger in the thrust of the Government when it says "ready, aye ready" to the Americans.

In the early part of the century, Arthur Meighen, a previous Conservative Prime Minister, said "ready, aye ready" to the British. The Conservative Party was a Party that wanted to keep Canada a British colony. The progressive forces in this country fought and won the battle and made Canada a nation.

I would not like to see us go back to the regressive forces of the country as represented by an element of the Conservative Party which is saying "ready, aye ready" to another colonial power, the United States.

Mr. McDermid: You guys are paranoid.

Mr. Waddell: I do not think we are paranoid. The whole thrust of Canadian history has been to fight for an independent country. Indeed, that is the whole point and I will sit down now. The whole point of this Bill is to try to make sure that American laws that apply extra-territorially do not apply to Canada.

I am saying to the Government that we support this Bill for the reasons indicated by the Minister of Justice and for the reasons I have just indicated, but I would warn the Minister of Justice, in his capacity as a statesman, to be careful. As Tommy Douglas once said, when you are dealing with the Americans, it is like having the elephant dancing among chickens; every fellow for himself. They are a little bigger than we are. We do not need to be paranoid, afraid or anti-American but we do need to be careful and we have to make sure that we do not become an American colony just like we were a British colony in the past. I will conclude with those remarks and with the hope that Bill C-14 can pass through the House today.

[Translation]

Hon. Jean Lapierre (Shefford): Like my colleague who has just resumed his seat, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise at the conclusion of this debate and say to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie) that the fact that he has introduced this Bill in the House and that Hon. Members unanimously support it reveals to what extent Parliament is fully aware of the danger that a country such as the United States may represent for the interests of Canada. I should think that, during the short debate today, the Minister of Justice must have realized just how much the messages sent to the Americans by his leader must always be dispatched with some reservations in his mind. He must be made aware that his good faith-and I am convinced that his leader is full of good faith-might cost a bundle to Canada if he is being overly naïve. As we are debating extraterritoriality today, we know full well that, on the part of the United States, it has definitely been a lack of respect for Canadian sovereignty over our own land. No Member of the House would ever stand still before anyone encroaching on Canadian sovereignty, and I am pleased the Minister of Justice (Mr. Crosbie) has finally introduced the Bill for adoption by the House.

I would suggest, however, that this prudent approach will have to be maintained in the future. I rather doubt that the leader of the Minister would ever want to become governor of the State of Canada. Keeping in mind that no one wants to become a governor or a servant knight, his party, ours and the New Democratic Party will have to be ever wary of any American move.