

themselves will have to decide these matters in advance of the printing of the report.

Committees must be careful to assume their responsibilities in this regard: they cannot heedlessly go forward without deciding such specific matters as the relevance and brevity of dissenting opinions and the form in which these will be appended to the printed report.

[English]

For example, the Special Joint Committee on Canada's Defence Policy presented a two-volume report some weeks ago with the dissenting opinions contained in volume one after the signatures of the co-chairs. This was in conformity with a very explicit motion adopted by the committee to include the dissenting opinions in volume one. But the publication of committee reports in more than one volume is a new phenomenon and this may have contributed to our present difficulty.

• (1515)

[Translation]

The Standing Joint Committee Reviewing Canada's Foreign Policy also adopted a motion to append dissenting opinions to the report, but the committee minutes reveal that the only motion specifically speaking to the question of format is one requiring that the report be printed in a bilingual tumble format. Furthermore, the motion authorizing the printing of dissenting opinions is phrased in general terms and this too may have contributed to the current imbroglio.

The Chair concludes that the report as presented meets the spirit of the Standing Order and that it should be accepted as tabled. While supplies last, the report will continue to be distributed in its present two-volume format. However, I am of the opinion that the report does not meet the letter of the Standing Order. Therefore, should a reprint be required, I am instructing my officials to ensure that the dissenting opinions of the Official Opposition and Reform Party be printed after the signatures of the co-chairs in the same volume.

[English]

The terms of the standing orders which allow for the printing of dissenting opinions must be carefully observed and it is the duty of committees to ensure their observance. To avoid any future confusion, the Chair expects that all committees will ensure by means of explicit and carefully worded motions in keeping with the terms of Standing Order 108(1)(a) that their members are perfectly clear as to the format in which their reports will be presented to the House.

### Government Orders

I thank all members for their interventions and I hope that this clarification of Standing Order 108(1) will be useful to the committees of the House.

## GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

### WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion and of the amendment.

**Mrs. Maud Debien (Laval East, BQ):** Mr. Speaker, I continue my statement on the amendment moved by my colleague for Louis-Hébert to amend clause 58 of Bill C-57.

Clause 58 of Bill C-57 is eloquent, not to say blatant, on this subject. I quote paragraph (a):

(a) to fix the performer's performance, or any substantial part thereof, by means of a record, perforated roll or other contrivance by means of which sounds may be mechanically reproduced,

In inventing the phonograph, Thomas Edison thought that sounds could be permanently recorded for reproduction. Personally, I think that the Canadian government thinks that the Copyright Act is and must remain permanently recorded on obsolete media.

Here is a very small example illustrating how outdated Canada's Copyright Act is. The cultural community in Canada and Quebec is still waiting for a real review of this law passed in 1926, which has been only slightly amended since 1988.

Unfortunately, it is only because of economic imperatives arising from multilateral trade agreements to which Canada is a party that Canada is concerned about the cultural development of Canadians and Quebecers.

The Union des artistes, which appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade studying Bill C-57, is very explicit on this subject. I quote: "At a time when digital technology is breaking down the old distinctions between various audio and audio-visual media; at a time when direct satellite transmissions and the information highway will redefine how our works are consumed and used, Canada is still protecting its creative artists and defending its culture with measures imposed on it because it signed international trade treaties».

• (1520)

Continuing on this route is unthinkable.

The amendment presented by my colleague from Louis-Hébert would simply modernize and update an obsolete, antiquated law and at the same time give our artists a minimum of protection, and I do mean just a minimum.