

[Translation]

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, the following question will be answered today: No. 108.

[Text]

RADIO CANADA INTERNATIONAL

Question No. 108—**Mr. Lawrence:**

1. On Wednesday, February 18 (budget day) and on Thursday, February 19, 1987, did Radio Canada International broadcast the wrong tape or network feed instead of "The World at Six" newscast at 0000 hours Greenwich mean time (1900 hours eastern standard time) and, if so, who was responsible?
2. Has the person responsible been disciplined and (a) if so, in what way (b) if not, for what reason?

Hon. Flora MacDonald (Minister of Communications): I am informed by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation as follows:

1. Radio Canada International does not tape "The World at Six". The program is fed live by line from Toronto to RCI's Sackville transmitters via an RCI studio in Montreal.

Normally, the feed is carried on the same line every day. On February 18, however, CBC Toronto switched the feed to another line. It advised the Program Distribution and Co-ordination section at the Maison de Radio-Canada in Montreal of the change of line. The Maison, however, failed to notify RCI, whose facilities are housed separately in La Tourelle. It took two minutes and 15 seconds after the start of the program to establish the feed on the new line.

On February 19, the feed from Toronto was delayed, again by two minutes and 15 seconds, due to work disruptions by NABET technicians in Toronto.

2. No disciplinary action was warranted.

* * *

[Translation]

QUESTION PASSED AS ORDER FOR RETURN

Mr. Doug Lewis (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, if Question No. 109 could be made an Order for Return, the return would be tabled immediately.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The question mentioned by the Hon. Parliamentary Secretary has been answered. Is it the pleasure of the House that Question No. 109 be deemed to have been made an Order for Return?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

[Text]

GOVERNMENT REVENUE AND SPENDING

Question No. 109—**Mr. Howie:**

Patent Act

For the fiscal year 1986, based on the accounting practices currently used by the government on a (a) public accounts (b) national accounts basis, what was the government's (i) spending (ii) revenue (iii) interest cost (iv) gross debt (v) net debt?

Return tabled.

[Translation]

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Shall the remaining questions stand?

Some Hon. Members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

PATENT ACT

MEASURE TO AMEND

Hon. Harvie Andre (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) moved that Bill C-22, an Act to amend the Patent Act and to provide for certain matters in relation thereto, be read the third time and passed.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make two points concerning this very important legislation for the future of this country. First, I want to restate the five critical reasons this policy is an important priority for the Government. Then I want to separate the facts from the fiction being perpetrated on the Canadian public by Hon. Members opposite.

The principle of intellectual property, significant industrial benefits, improved multilateral relations, consumer protection and the potential for significant and long-term health care benefits are the reasons I am pursuing these legislative changes as aggressively as I can. Each of these may stand alone. But together they represent a powerful and effective policy for Canada. They also represent a policy change long overdue in this country. In fact, it is a policy that will undo much of the damage caused by the former Government's short-sightedness in 1969 when it decided to deal Canada out of the biotechnological revolution.

Intellectual property rights, the right of inventors or creators to enjoy the benefits of their creativity, is not just a right, it is at the heart of the economies of every modern western industrial society.

If I invent a new widget that revolutionizes industry, my invention is protected by law. If I write a new book, nobody is allowed to plagiarize it. If I break new technological ground, I am allowed to protect that technology. If our Government attempted to remove those rights, the opposition Parties would scream foul, and rightly so.