Parliamentary Committee just before the deadline of 15 March.[10] It is published below in the hope that it will stimulate further discussion of intellectual property rights between the archival community in Canada and those responsible for revising our current copyright legislation.

The *White Paper* will be helpful to archivists *if* implemented. Among the revisions it proposes, archivists should be pleased to see the addition of separate categories for sound recordings, cinematographic works, and computer programmes. The exemption allowing archival institutions to reproduce collections for reference and preservation purposes is a welcome addition, as is the provision bringing unpublished materials into the public domain in the same manner as published materials.[11] However, there are still several areas in the *White Paper* which have not been sufficiently defined or where inappropriate changes have been made. These areas are discussed in the submission which follows. A final note: as Chairman of the ACA Copyright Committee, I was invited by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Communications and Culture's Sub-Committee on Copyright Revision to attend its public hearings on copyright revision in Toronto on 11 June 1985. Questions concerning the ACA brief were posed. The minutes of these proceedings can be found on pages 9:28 to 9:38 of the *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence of the Sub-Committee of the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture on the Revision of Copyright*, Issue No. 9, Tuesday, June 11, 1985, Toronto, Ontario. At the time, the Sub-Committee on Copyright Revision was impressed with the ACA brief. It is unfortunate for archivists and users of archives that the Sub-Committee's report entitled *A Charter of Rights for Creators* contains none of the enthusiasm for our concerns which was expressed by the Sub-Committee at the public hearings in June. The Sub-Committee on Copyright Revision specifically stated that there is to be no fair dealing with unpublished materials. The *Report* gives one the feeling that this Sub-Committee simply does not understand who archivists are and what they do. The ACA Copyright Committee's *Response to A Charter of Rights for Creators* also appears in this section of *Archivaria*.

Association of Canadian Archivists' Committee on Copyright: A Submission to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Communications and Culture, March 1985

1. General Comments

To strike a balance between the rights of creators and the rights of users to reasonable access to copyrighted materials is a difficult task. The major problems for archivists are

10 Many thanks must go to the members of the ACA Copyright Committee: Jean E. Dryden of the Provincial Archives of Alberta; Grace Hyam of the Public Archives of Canada; Ruth May and Kathryn Dean of the University of Manitoba Archives; and Dr. Robert Morgan of the ACA Executive. Their fine comments and suggestions in regard to the proposals in the *White Paper* proved extremely valuable in editing and compiling the brief.

11 *From Gutenberg to Telidon*, pp. 10, 83, 43, and 57.

the ambiguity and impracticality of the present law. Archivists have no desire to deprive copyright owners of a fair reward for their works, but under the present law, many actions are technically infringements of copyright even though they do not damage the copyright owner in any way, financially or otherwise.

Generally speaking, the proposed revisions in the *White Paper* will be helpful to archivists, and we sincerely applaud these recommendations. Among these recommendations, we are pleased to see the addition of separate categories for sound recordings, cinematographic works (p. 10), and computer programs (p. 83). The exemption which is permitted to archival institutions wishing to reproduce collections for reference and preservation purposes is truly a welcome addition (p. 43), as well as the provision bringing unpublished materials into the public domain in the same manner as published materials (p. 57).

However, there are still several areas (discussed below) which have not been sufficiently defined or where inappropriate changes have been suggested.

2. Subject Matter of Copyright Protection

Correspondence forms an important part of archival collections. Creative and/or informative writing in this form is invaluable to research. As far as we can determine, there is a complete lack of reference to correspondence per se in the proposed revisions to the *Copyright Act.* Does the omission of this form of creativity indicate that letter writers do not hold copyright? Should we assume this form of creativity is covered under literary works and therefore subject to copyright protection?

Recommendation: that the revised *Copyright Act* specifically mention *correspondence* as a form of writing for which the creator holds copyright with the same rights and privileges accorded to copyright owners of published and unpublished literary works.

3. Rights Attaching to Subject Matter

a) Publication

The definition of *publication* (p. 18) remains too general and ill-defined. Since for all classes of works except photographs the term of copyright depends on whether the work is published or unpublished, a fuller definition of publication is required.

What does the "issue of copies to the public" really mean? Does it mean the selling, leasing or the lending of copies to the public?

Who is "the public"? Is it the public at large, i.e., the general public? Does public mean a specific group of people, i.e., a specific audience or clientele?

If photocopies of a scholarly paper to be read at a conference may be picked up at the conference by conference participants, does that constitute publication? Or does publication not occur until that particular paper is included in the published proceedings of the conference? Making a small number of photocopies available to a limited group is in a sense "issue of copies to the public" but it is doubtful that the author of such a paper would consider the paper published until the printed proceedings of the conference were available.

It has been suggested by some that depositing materials in an archives can be construed as publishing or issuing copies to the public. Once on deposit, these materials can be viewed by the public. Should this example truly be seen as publication? If it is publication, then archives will have to close their doors because the primary responsibility of archivists is to acquire and preserve archival material and to make it available to the public.

In a final example, does photocopying one hundred copies of selected original documents in an archival repository for use by a class of students constitute publication? Once again, copies are issued to a *limited public* but it is doubtful whether anyone would now consider the documents involved as published. Even if these documents could now be considered published, the administrative difficulties in keeping track of the different status of different items within the same collection would be extremely complicated.

The examples outlined above suggest that some thought should be given to what constitutes "issuance" and who is "the public."

Recommendation: that *publication* be clearly defined in the new *Copyright Act* with respect to what constitutes the "issue of copies to the public," and to who is "the public." The definition should be thoroughly clear and not interfere with the archivist's duty to acquire and preserve archival material and to make it available to the public.

Will copies of published and/or unpublished materials furnished to users of archives for research/reference purposes be construed as publishing or issuing copies to the public? Where the archives owns the copyright, there is no problem. However, are the proposed revisions re: fair dealing and the exemption to copy for reference and preservation purposes sufficient to protect archival institutions in this example, particularly where copyright is not owned by the institution?

b) Droit de Suite

We are pleased to hear that the Government is of the opinion that the difficulties inherent in the effective exercise of such a right (droit de suite) would outweigh the benefits which would accrue to visual artists.

If such a right were granted in the new *Copyright Act*, the costs involved would be a further charge against the already limited and dwindling acquisition budgets of archival institutions. Fewer works of art would be available to public collections.

Recommendation: that the Government not implement *droit de suite* in any new copyright legislation.

4. Ownership

a) Commissioned Works

In order to maintain consistency, the proposed revisions to the *Copyright Act* state that "the author of any work is the initial owner of the copyright therein" (p. 31) subject to an agreement to the contrary, and notwithstanding the fact that the work was commissioned.

Is the proposed revision to be retroactive with respect to *works* presently housed in archival institutions? Or will the proposed revision apply only to those *works* commissioned after the new legislation on copyright goes into effect?

Whether the proposed revision, if enacted, is retroactive or not, how does the Government plan to notify businesses, organizations, and private individuals that they no longer are the first owner of commissioned works, subject to a contractual agreement to the contrary?

Recommendation: that the proposed revision re: *commissioned works* clearly state whether the revision is to be retroactive or not — since it may affect the copyright status of some of the *works* already housed in archival repositories.

b) Works Made in the Course of Employment

In works created in the course of a person's employment, archivists would generally prefer that copyright be held by the employer. This seems fair because the employer has paid the person's salary and also, in many instances, has paid for the storage of the papers for some years. When an archives receives the papers of any corporate body, it is administratively easier to make one agreement on copyright ownership with the current officials than to trace all the employees and/or their heirs.

For example, when dealing with an archival collection of papers of a company or business, the copyright on any incoming correspondence is held by the various authors (or their heirs) of the documents. If the new law states that employees hold copyright in works created in the course of employment, the copyright on outgoing correspondence would be equally complex and diffused because it would be spread among the various individuals responding to correspondence on the company's behalf. Surely, it would be much more straightforward as far as archives are concerned to have the employer hold the copyright in works created by staff members.

Of course there will still be problems for archivists, especially if the new law does not define the duration of copyright on corporate records. It also appears inevitable that, whichever rule is selected (whether the employer or the employee is judged to be the first owner of copyright) there will be a provision for written agreements to the contrary. By the time the papers get to an archives, usually many years after they are written, it will be very difficult to establish whether there was any such agreement. Since our international agreements prevent us from requiring copyright owners to go through any formalities to establish their copyright, we may have to accept this problem. However, from the archivist's point of view, it would be best if there were a requirement that these employer-employee agreements be filed in a designated location.

Recommendation: that the copyright in works created by employees in the course of their employment remain with the employer (subject to any agreement to the contrary) and where there are agreements to the contrary, they should be filed in a designated location.

c) Works Created by Crown Employees

Wherever possible, treatment of Crown employees should be as consistent as possible with that of private sector employees; and having the copyright held by the Crown (subject to any agreement to the contrary) would ensure more consistent treatment.

Recommendation: wherever possible, works created by Crown employees should not be treated any differently from those created by employees in the private sector.

d) Photographs
It is proposed that the ownership of the copyright in a photograph belongs to the photographer or the creator of the image rather than the owner of the negative (p. 29). Is this proposal to be retroactive, or will it apply only to photographs created after the new copyright legislation takes effect?

Many of the photographs presently housed in archival collections throughout the country are not identified as to who their creators are. It is inconceivable that archivists should be required to track down the thousands of photographers who created these images. Where would we start?

Recommendation: If the Government decides to grant ownership in photographs to those responsible for their creation, then archivists need to know whether the new revision is retroactive as it may affect the copyright status of photographs already in their collections.

e) Sound Recordings and Cinematographic Works
In the case of sound recordings and cinematographic works, the owner of copyright will be "the person principally responsible for the arrangements undertaken for the making of the work" (p. 30). For complex professional productions involving many people, the determination of who has copyright will be quite difficult, and further clarification should be added so this area will be better defined.

Even if further definition of *principal responsibility* is not possible for complex professional productions, the case of *oral history interviews* should be specifically dealt with. Is the interviewer or the interviewee principally responsible for the making of the work? While the interviewer may have made the first approach, and undertaken the arrangements for the interview to take place, the interviewee is the person whose words and recollections are the substance of the work, and it seems that the interviewee may have some rights in the product. In order to clarify this issue, it would be desirable, from an archives point of view, to have a specific indication that the interviewer is the copyright owner in the absence of an agreement to the contrary. The copyright on the *edited transcript* of the oral history interview should be vested, subject to any agreement to the contrary, in the interviewer as well.

Recommendations: that *oral history* interviews and their accompanying *edited transcripts* be specifically mentioned in the revised *Copyright Act* with copyright vesting in the *interviewer*, subject to any agreement to the contrary;

that for complex professional productions involving many people, the determination of who owns the copyright be better defined.

5. Limitations on Rights

a) Unlocatable Copyright Owners
This section addresses unlocatable copyright owners of published works; one of the proofs required to obtain a licence to publish is "proof that the work against which the licence is sought has been published" (p. 37).

Archives hold unpublished materials. The new legislation will allow these materials to enter the public domain in the same manner as published materials.

However, a problem remains for those materials which are covered by copyright. If archives do not hold copyright (and this is often the case) they cannot authorize the publication of a "substantial part" of these unpublished materials. The users of archives wishing to publish substantially hitherto unpublished materials must seek the permission of the copyright owner. When the copyright owner cannot be located, or is not known, they should be able to apply to the revised Copyright Appeal Board for licence to publish.

Recommendation: that this section be expanded or revised to clarify that when copyright owners of *unpublished* materials cannot be located (or are not known) and the use of their works could constitute infringement, that application to the *Revised Copyright Appeal Board* can be made for licence to publish. *Unpublished materials* should be defined to include photographs, manuscripts, maps, charts, sound recordings, and cinematographic works, to name but a few.

b) Fair Dealing (Fair Use)

Archivists applaud the proposed revision that "fair dealing" or "fair use" apply to both published and *certain* unpublished works (p. 19). There appears to be no compelling reason not to allow "fair use" considerations to apply to unpublished materials, especially since the distinction between published and unpublished works is to be reduced.

However, while the proposed "fair use" clause (pp. 19, 39-40) is a great improvement over the existing legislation, more clarification is needed. Does "fair use" apply only to *certain* unpublished materials (p. 19)? If it does, then should these not be defined in the new legislation? Archivists suggest that there should be a "fair use" exemption applying to all works whether they be published or not. "Reproductions of unpublished material used only for research and reference purposes do not in any way deprive the owner of the copyright of any expected economic reward and thus should not interfere with the incentive function of the system." (Jim Keon, "The Canadian Archivist and Copyright Legislation," *Archivaria* 18 (Summer 1984), p. 97).

Archivists should be able to advise users with respect to the "fair use" of materials in their archives for which copyright is not held by the archives. The definition of "fair use" to be used in the revised legislation is "a use that does not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work or subject matter and does not reasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the copyright owner."

However, before we can advise our users on "fair use," we must have a better definition in the revised legislation as to what is meant by the "normal exploitation" of a work, as well as clearly defining what the "legitimate interests" of the copyright owner are. The answers would vary considerably in addressing a single question of "fair use" from archivist to archivist and from copyright owner to copyright owner.

Consider the following example. If a researcher wishes to make a photocopy of selected original documents from various archival collections for research and reference purposes only, such use certainly does "not conflict with the normal exploitation of the work ... and

does not reasonably prejudice the legitimate interests of the copyright owner," since the author(s) of such documents may be dead and the heirs very likely have no knowledge of or concern about use of their ancestors' documents.

By specifically exempting reprography from the concept of "fair use," are researchers, such as the one described above, forbidden to consider their photocopying as a "fair use" of the material? Or, is the archival exemption described on page 43 the only defence or justification available to those who want to photocopy for research purposes? Remember, much archival material must be reproduced in its entirety to be of any use, i.e., charts, plans, maps, photographs, and drawings.

Recommendations: that the new revisions re: "fair use" apply to *all* unpublished materials and *not* just *certain* unpublished works;

that the new legislation clearly state that copying *unpublished materials* for reference/research purposes is to be a "fair use" with respect to these materials;

that an attempt be made to clarify what is meant by "normal exploitation" and "legitimate interests" with respect to the "fair use" of materials in an archives.

c) Archival Purposes

Archivists applaud the new revision permitting libraries and archives to make copies of unpublished, out of print, or otherwise unavailable material already in their collections for reference or preservation purposes (p. 43).

However, does the above exemption allow archivists to reproduce these materials and to make them available to bona fide researchers for research use? Remember that much archival material must be reproduced in its entirety to be of any use.

Does the proposed revision allow copies of these materials to be loaned or deposited in another library or archives for research purposes only? Archivists argue that *it should* as a means to making their holdings available to the public, especially to users who live away from the location of the archival repository. Such an exemption would effectively legitimize practices such as the loaning or duplication of microfilm copies of archival collections through interlibrary loan for use in other archives or libraries.

Finally, can the above uses be interpreted as "fair uses" using the exemption on page 43 as justification for "fair use"?

Recommendation: that the proposed exemption re: archival purposes be expanded or revised to specifically state that it is a "fair use" to make copies of unpublished, out of print or otherwise unavailable material already in archivists' collections for reference/research, or preservation purposes, and that "fair use" also extend to the making of copies of these materials so that they may be loaned or deposited in another library or archives for reference or research purposes.

d) Ephemeral Recordings

Archivists are pleased to see the proposal that after the period covered by the exemption, broadcasters will be allowed to retain an archival copy of the program for study and research purposes (p. 45).

In the past, many historically and culturally valuable programs that were broadcast were destroyed or erased from tapes. The new revision in the *Copyright Act* would stop this practice of *losing* forever *valuable information* if broadcasters were not only *allowed*, but *required* to keep *archival copies* of ephemeral recordings.

Recommendation: that broadcasters *be required* to keep an archival copy of ephemeral recordings for study and/or research purposes.

6. Term of Copyright

Archivists applaud the decision that the term of copyright should be the life of the author plus fifty years, for both published and unpublished material (pp. 56-57). This is a great improvement over the present law, which implies perpetual protection for unpublished works.

The proposed terms for published and unpublished sound recordings, cinematographic works, and computer programs are also highly welcomed by archivists (pp. 55-56 and p. 83).

However, many authors of archival material (photographs, sound recordings, cinematographic works, manuscripts, etc.) are not well known and/or identifiable and it will often be virtually impossible to establish dates of death in these cases.

a) Photographs

Concerning the duration of copyright on photographs, archivists would prefer that copyright lasts for fifty (50) years after the making of the negative, i.e., the present law be retained.

We understand the desire for consistency and extending the term to life-plus-50 would make the term of copyright on photos consistent with that on other works. But the present law is so clear and so easy to administer, we wonder whether the theoretical reasons for making the change outweigh the administrative costs.

The proposed revision poses some difficulty for archives because many of the photographic images in archival repositories are not those of well-known professional photographers. Rather they are snapshots from a variety of sources where the photographer often is not known. All the problems we have had over the years concerning copyright on manuscript material will now also apply to photos.

It will be difficult, if not impossible, to establish the identity of the copyright owner; whether he/she is still alive; if not, his/her death date; and who, if anyone, has inherited the copyright.

Part of the rationale in proposing a change in the term of copyright seems to be the assumption that it is easier to locate the date of death of the photographer rather than the

date the photograph was taken. From practical experience with archival photographs, archivists can state that quite the *reverse* is true. The further difficulties associated in tracking down the heirs of photographers can be mind-boggling at best.

In general, it is much easier to determine the date of the photograph rather than the death date of the photographer (especially where the photographer is not known or not well-known). Perhaps where the identity of the author is not known, the proposed revision re: works of unknown authors (p. 57) i.e., the term of protection for works of unknown authors is to be the same as that given to unpublished sound recordings and cinematographic works — seventy-five years from creation — may be applied to photographic works of unknown authors. We strongly suggest that this should be the case, unless, of course, the present legislation re: duration of copyright in photographs is retained.

Archivists also want to know whether the life-plus-50 years provision is to be retroactive? If it is not retroactive but takes effect when it is proclaimed, archivists foresee complications in dealing with copyright on works of currently active photographers. The date a photograph was taken will become vital to figure out which copyright regulation it falls under, thus countermanding one of the reasons for the amendment.

Fifty years is quite a long time during which the photographer and his/her family may reap the reward for taking an especially fine photograph. We would prefer that the term of protection remain as it was in the present act, thus enabling archivists to apply the copyright law with more certainty.

Recommendation: that the present copyright legislation re: duration of copyright in photographs *be retained*, i.e., fifty (50) years from the making of the original negative.

b) Works of Unknown Authors

Archivists are pleased with the proposed revisions re: works of unknown authors. However, we would like this section expanded so that users wishing to publish unpublished materials where the author is unknown, may apply to a *Revised Copyright Appeal Board* for a licence to publish. Unpublished materials should be defined to include the various types of archival materials, such as photographs, sound recordings, cinematographic works, manuscripts, and computer programs to name but a few.

Recommendation: that this section be expanded or revised so that users may apply to a *Revised Copyright Appeal Board* for a licence to publish unpublished materials where the owner of the copyright is not known (or unlocatable).

c) Crown Copyright

Archivists would like a specific statement of the duration of Crown copyright on unpublished government records. It is not acceptable to say that the term will be the same as for each category of work created (p. 58) because that will usually be life-plus-50, and since the Crown as an institution does not die, this would mean perpetual copyright (which is contrary to the spirit of the proposed legislation).

However, this problem might be resolved, as suggested on page 75 of the *White Paper*, by a declaration that Crown copyright will not be enforced for certain classes of works.

Archivists everywhere are hoping that the Crown will announce its intention not to enforce copyright on unpublished government records that are open for research.

Recommendation: that the Crown announce its intention not to enforce copyright on unpublished government records that are open for research.

d) Corporate Records

Archivists would like to see a statement in the new legislation concerning duration of copyright on *unpublished corporate records.*

The present law does not address this issue and neither does the *White Paper.* If a company has been in existence for a long period of time (more than 100 years, for example) and is still in operation, does it retain copyright on all of its unpublished corporate records, even the earliest ones? Archivists would presume so, but precision is required in this area.

We also need to know what happens to the copyright on corporate records of a company that has gone out of business. Do the former owners or officers retain copyright for a certain length of time?

Because of the large number of business papers that have recently been placed in public research institutions, these questions are very important for archivists.

Recommendation: that the revised *copyright legislation* specifically define copyright duration in *unpublished corporate records* to be the life of the author (corporation) plus fifty (50) years. This recommendation is consistent with the life-plus-50 provisions afforded other works, as well as our recommendation that copyright ownership be vested in the employer, subject to an agreement to the contrary.

7. Conclusion

Generally speaking, the proposed revisions in the *White Paper* will be helpful to archivists, and we sincerely applaud these recommendations. However, as one has just seen, there are still several areas which have not been sufficiently defined or where inappropriate changes have been suggested.

Archivists (and librarians, it is presumed) are quite worried about being liable in any action being brought where even if their only role was to supply, in good faith, a copy for research purposes and *that researcher* then breaches the law. Should not the onus be placed most centrally where the breach took place?

Archivists should ensure that they inform users of copyright law, but it is the user's responsibility to determine if copyright prevails and to obey the law.

In addition, a large proportion of most archival holdings was not made with a profit motive in mind and by far the largest number of the sources of these documents do not really care if copyright is asserted on their behalf, yet copyright will apply fully and no doubt will hamper research by stopping some copying for research purposes only. This is given an additional dimension because it will hinder the researchers or users who live away from the location of the archival repository.

Finally, archivists have no desire to deprive copyright owners of a fair reward for their works, but under the present law, many actions are technically infringements of copyright even though they do not damage the copyright owner in any way, financially or otherwise.

We wish to thank the Standing Committee on Communications and Culture for inviting the public and concerned groups, such as ourselves, to submit their recommendations on the *White Paper* for consideration.

8. Summary of Recommendations

2: that the revised *Copyright Act* specifically mention *correspondence* as a form of writing for which the creator holds copyright with the same rights and privileges accorded to copyright owners of published and unpublished literary works.

3(a): that *publication* be clearly defined in the new *Copyright Act* with respect to what constitutes the "issue of copies to the public," and to *who* is "the public." The definition should be thoroughly clear and not interfere with the archivist's duty to acquire and preserve archival material and to make it available to the public.

3(b): that the Government not implement *droit de suite* in any new copyright legislation.

4(a): that the proposed revision re: *commissioned works* clearly state whether the revision is to be retroactive or not — since it may affect the copyright status of some of the *works* already housed in archival repositories.

4(b): that the copyright on works created by employees on the course of their employment remain with the employer (subject to any agreement to the contrary) and where there are agreements to the contrary, they should be filed in a designated location.

4(c): Wherever possible, works created by Crown employees should not be treated any differently from those created by employees in the private sector.

4(d): If the Government decides to grant ownership in photographs to those responsible for their creation, then archivists need to know whether the new revision is retroactive as it may affect the copyright status of photographs already in their collections.

4(e): that *oral history interviews* and their accompanying *edited transcripts* be specifically mentioned in the revised *Copyright Act* with copyright vested in the interviewer, subject to any agreement to the contrary.

4(e)i: that for complex professional productions involving many people, the determination of who owns the copyright be better defined.

5(a): that this section be expanded or revised to clarify that when copyright owners of *unpublished materials* cannot be located (or are not known) and the use of their works could constitute infringement, that application to the *Revised Copyright Appeal Board* can be made for licence to publish. *Unpublished* materials should be defined to include photographs, manuscripts, maps, charts, sound recordings, and cinematographic works to name but a few.

5(b): that the new revisions re: "fair use" apply to *all* unpublished materials and *not* just *certain* unpublished works.

5(b)i: that the new legislation clearly state that copying *unpublished materials* for reference/research purposes is to be a "fair use" with respect to these materials.

5(b)ii: that an attempt be made to clarify what is meant by "normal exploitation" and "legitimate interests" with respect to the "fair use" of materials in an archives.

5(c): that the proposed exemption re: archival purposes be expanded or revised to specifically state that it is a "fair use" to make copies of unpublished, out of print or otherwise unavailable material already in archivists' collections for reference/research, or preservation purposes, and that "fair use" also extend to the making of copies of these materials so that they may be loaned or deposited in another library or archives for reference or research purposes.

5(d): that broadcasters *be required* to keep an archival copy of ephemeral recordings for study and/or research purposes.

6(a): that the present copyright legislation re: duration of copyright in photographs *be retained*, i.e., fifty (50) years from the making of the original negative.

6(b): that this section (works of unknown authors) be expanded or revised so that users may apply to a *Revised Copyright Appeal Board* for a licence to publish unpublished materials where the owner of the copyright is not known (or unlocatable).

6(c): that the *Crown* announce its intention not to enforce copyright on unpublished government records that are open for research.

6(d): that the *revised copyright legislation* specifically define copyright duration in *unpublished corporate records* to be the life of the author (Corporation) plus fifty (50) years. This recommendation is consistent with the life-plus-50 provisions afforded other works, as well as our recommendation that copyright ownership be vested in the employer, subject to an agreement to the contrary.

Association of Canadian Archivists' Copyright Committee: A Response to A Charter of Rights for Creators

In June 1985, the Executive of the Association of Canadian Archivists extended the mandate of the ACA Copyright Committee for one more year. Its new mandate for 1985-86 was to monitor the activities of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Communications and Culture's Sub-Committee on Copyright Revision.

The Parliamentary Sub-Committee on Copyright Revision (henceforth referred to as the Sub-Committee) received over three hundred written briefs, including that of the ACA, and heard testimony from 111 witnesses at public hearings held in Ottawa,