

Government Orders

This bill will provide protection to the design of the topography rather than to the functions performed by the circuit or the circuit itself. The act will provide protection to owners of rights by giving them exclusive statutory rights to control certain actions. The legislation will provide exclusive rights with regard to the unauthorized copying of a protected topography or substantial part of it; the unauthorized manufacturing of an IC product incorporating the topography or a substantial part of it; the importation or commercial exploitation, which includes a sale lease offering or exhibiting for sale, lease or commercial distribution of a topography or a substantial part of it, or of an IC product which embodies a protected topography or a substantial part of it and, finally, the importation or commercial exploitation of an industrial article which incorporates an IC product that embodies a protective topography or a substantial part of it.

The exemptions to this protection are that the owner of a product will have no control over its use, sale, rental or redistribution once it is sold. Unauthorized copying is permitted for the purposes of teaching and research and it is permitted in the process of taking apart an IC to design a new topography. This act will protect chip technologies for up to 10 years.

One of the things that may occur in the committee stage of this legislation is a specific review of those exemptions to see whether, irrespective of the consultation process that has gone on to bring forward legislation, there are still aspects of those exemptions that perhaps need some tightening up. I do not have any specifics, but it is a question I raise in the context of second reading debate.

Finally, we are encouraged that the government is moving to protect Canadian industries on the leading edge of new technologies. This is also another opportunity to once again highlight the government's lack of action in protecting firms like Connaught and Lumonics, which I mentioned earlier.

• (1230)

In both cases, the arguments were made by the government and the business community that both firms needed infusion of capital to continue to do their research and development efforts. They were both sold to foreign firms. It does not matter which foreign firms they were sold to. The fact that they were sold to interests outside Canada is the key element. It was done

so because it was argued that Canadian buyers could not be found.

If the Government of Canada is serious about ensuring that these leading edge industries remain competitive and innovative, then its needs to find domestic sources of capital to ensure that we retain control over these vital economic resources. If we do not take those steps, all the copyright legislation in the world will not protect Canadian designers and inventors, because they will not be here. They will be in the United States.

Remember what happened with the Avro Arrow? We lost our leading edge in the aviation industry as a result of another Conservative government. We lost the human resources that were involved in the development of that product. We are seeing it happen time and time again.

It is great to provide copyright legislation to protect the leading edge industries in the IC field, but at the same time we have to make sure that we have the economic protection so that we do not see those inventions or creations never happening here in Canada again.

That is my contribution on behalf of my caucus. I look forward to completing the second reading debate and moving on to other matters.

Mrs. Sheila Finestone (Mount Royal): Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate the position taken by my colleague that the Liberal caucus supports this bill in principle, although there will undoubtedly be a serious discussion on the details of the legislation at committee stage, if our experience with Bill C-60, the copyright bill, is an experience upon which one can rely. There were so many amendments that I lost track of the numbers. There were well above 50 or 60 amendments.

It is extremely important and I argued this at the time of the copyright bill, which had been five and a half years in development and perhaps many years before that, that the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the present House leader, should have taken more interest in his part of the bill. It was a shared bill between communications and culture and the minister. He paid no attention to the fact that in this world of rapidly changing technology, the semi-conductor chip was one of the most important and key elements to be reviewed and revised under the copyright law.

The minister did not see fit to pay attention to his duties and so it went unattended to. Here we are with little patchwork quilts coming in. There are major areas of copyright legislation that are uncovered. For example, there is the whole question of our educators and the problems that they are facing, and school children and