

support this work should make up for those payments and that artists should not have to be involuntary donors of their time. We are certainly in favour of handicapped persons having prompt access to materials under copyright.

[*Translation*]

I did not agree with the majority report in three areas. As far as employers' and employees' rights are concerned, I am on the side of employees. The majority report favours the employers. With regard to home recordings, I have a different proposal to make, which is better, I think. It is obvious that home recordings deprive their creators of income from copyright. Instead of buying a cassette or a record, people make recordings. A tax on tapes, cassettes and VCRs can be directed to creators, not to collective management companies. This is a way to compensate the artists for lost income caused by this new technology of home recording. Unfortunately, if we proceed through copyright, most revenues, up to 90 per cent, will be exported abroad, mainly to the United States. The problem of export of revenues is the reason why I object to the recognition of the right to broadcast.

A certain form of recognition is fair and necessary. Yet, it would be irresponsible to give new rights resulting in enormous losses of scarce revenues.

[*English*]

Canadians might wonder why a resident of Windsor should have to pay for local rebroadcasting rights for which the Detroit citizen does not have to pay. Because the American corporations ABC, NBC, CBS and the Hollywood majors have asked for it, that is no reason why we should be making Canadians pay for something their neighbours across the border do not have to pay for.

● (1815)

Finally, I would like to point out that we have to look at the costs in copyright. We want to see new rights but when we have had \$100 million in reduced budgets for the Arts community, I would be very reluctant to see a new exportation of scarce resources outside the country. One of my questions is can we have a firm guarantee that there will be a restoration of these cuts before we contemplate more exporting of these scarce resources to the United States?

A copyright is a means to an end. We must consider the needs of the whole cultural community. We must consider funding to the CBC, Canada Council and so on, and deal with the copyright question in that broader context.

Mr. Geoff Scott (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Communications): Mr. Speaker, it seems like old home week talking about copyright revision with the Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald), to whom I would like to pay public tribute for the very significant contribution she made to the subcommittee on the revision of copyright. Even though she did agree with the majority of the recommendations, she did not agree with every Hon. Member of the Committee on certain points. Both of us worked long and hard on the copyright committee. It was a formidable challenge to, in effect, rewrite the "Bible" on copyright and change a law

which is more than 60 years old. Indeed, it is downright ancient.

The Hon. Member has raised two questions. The first question concerns the time at which the legislation will be introduced. I can assure the Hon. Member that legislation is now being prepared and will be introduced as soon as possible. As the Hon. Member knows, the subcommittee worked for 10 months on copyright revision. We heard 111 witnesses, considered over 300 written submissions and attended many lively meetings over the summer months to discuss the many different issues. After all this work, all members of the subcommittee share the Hon. Member's concern that legislation be introduced quickly. As Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Communications, I am hopeful that the Bill will be drafted so that it can soon be enacted into law. I am told that some drafting work is already under way and I will continue to urge that it be completed with dispatch.

The Hon. Member's second question associates the cut-backs in arts funding with the subcommittee recommendations aimed at providing new copyright protection for creators. With respect, one has nothing to do with the other. The cut-backs in arts funding was part of a broad Government policy to reduce expenditures. The arts, like other groups, were required to bear a portion of that burden. On the other hand, the subcommittee recommendations to provide new copyright protection would benefit the arts community. In fact, I am informed that the reaction of creators to the report has been most favourable.

The outflow of royalties problem to which the Hon. Member refers, and which was part of her minority report, is not at all what it may appear to be. There are three reasons for this. First, much of the new copyright protection recommended by the subcommittee would be reciprocal. Canadians would have to receive protection abroad before non-Canadians would be protected in Canada. Protection abroad would create an inflow of royalties which would help offset any outflow.

Second, the Hon. Member has shared in the subcommittee's recommendations to provide some new protection which will cause an outflow. Yet others she has not agreed to. I do not see this as being particularly consistent. Although the Hon. Member has reasons for her position, other Hon. Members of the subcommittee did not agree with that reasoning. The majority has consistently recommended that creators be protected when their works are being used without their consent or without payment.

Finally, the subcommittee is convinced that protection for creative work, which is so justly deserved, should not be denied to Canadian creators because it would cause an outflow of royalties. It has been repeatedly pointed out by witnesses that it only takes a few—and I think probably more than a few—Brian Adams and Margaret Atwoods to turn the negative outflow into a positive inflow. Copyright protection is essential to ensure that Canadian creators can continue their work.

I am proud of the subcommittee's hard work and long hours on our new charter of rights for creators. I repeat to my hon. friend that I want to see legislation before this House based on