

Adjournment Debate

The Committee recommends, for instance, that Committee proceedings be televised as well. This report, Mr. Speaker, contains proposals that would make the committees much more dynamic. Televising committee meetings would give Canadians a chance to familiarize themselves with this other important aspect of parliamentary life.

Also, the Committee mentions that the broadcast network is not as dynamic or imaginative as it could be. Would rebroadcasting of the proceedings change anything in this regard?

Could it be that better explanations of House proceedings, the broadcasting of conferences, some phone-in programs on public affairs, as the Committee suggests, would make Canadians more interested in the political life?

Would it be a good solution for the future future of our network to take for a model the American network *C-Span*, which televises 24 hours a day the congressmen's proceedings and those of the House and Senate committees? We would then televise the House and the Senate committees meetings and have public affairs programs.

Should we open the network to programs produced outside of Parliament, namely reports on seminars and conferences.

You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that cable distributors play an equally important part in the provision of this service.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Charest): Order. The time allotted for Private Members' Business has now expired.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 46 deemed to have been moved.

COPYRIGHT—INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION. (B) ARTS FUNDING

Ms. Lynn McDonald (Broadview-Greenwood): Mr. Speaker, the question I would like to address this evening relates to copyright. There has been a report of the subcommittee on copyright revision which included a charter of rights for creators. In my opinion, it is an excellent document. It contains 137 recommendations and almost all of them are very good.

Artists have waited a very long time to have greater recognition of their economic and moral rights of copyright. Of course, even a very good set of recommendations is not going to have any impact until legislation is prepared and brought forward. We had an indication from the Government that we could expect legislation in February. I very much hope that it

will be put before us in February because this is a matter of very great importance to artists.

Artists have been patient long enough. Many of them live below the poverty line. I do not wish to exaggerate the impact that new rights of copyright will have on their incomes but certainly it will have a positive impact. It is about time that artists got this additional support.

Some of the changes proposed are housekeeping changes because this Act has not been revised in any significant way in more than 60 years. There is some recognition of new rights and these are important new rights. They include the exhibition right, a new right in choreography, full rights in musical compositions, a right to edition, new recognition of performers' rights, a new category of audio-visual works and the right to computer input. There is also the recommendation regarding a right to rental which will mean new income for people who are losing money through lost royalties to rental. There is the recommendation of payment for public use by other means not through copyright. That is certainly a recommendation we hope will not only be accepted but better funded and put into action promptly.

● (1810)

[Translation]

We proposed a clarification and an extension of moral rights. The work is to a large extent the expression of the personality of its author. The present Act does not protect these rights. Furthermore, in the French text, it is rather a privilege than a right.

Consequently, the Sub-committee recommends that the new Act fully recognize that moral rights are as important as economic rights. All the recourse provided for violations of an economic right should be applicable to violations of a moral right. It can be stressed here that a large increase in available sentences in courts for violations, fines up to one million dollars, instead of the present fines of approximately \$200, has been recommended.

[English]

The principle of compulsory licensing was reviewed by the committee, an obnoxious principle and one which we have managed to avoid with some small exceptions. There is one exception with which I am not entirely in agreement. We have almost entirely gotten rid of this notion.

One important part of our work was to close the loopholes with respect to the exceptions, which meant that artists became involuntary donors of their time. It is quite proper for artists to give of their time for charitable purposes, but surely this should be on a voluntary basis and they should receive a tax receipt for it, as do other Canadians. Artists groups persuasively argued against these exemptions. We went along with them with the sole exception of the case of the production of materials for the handicapped. We were certainly in agreement with the principle that access has to be provided. We also agreed that there should be some payment, although it would be a very trivial one. We expect that public agencies which