INTRODUCTION

I hope you will allow me to begin by giving some biographical details to show how it is that I come to be here today and to have the pleasure and privilege of addressing you. After graduating and being admitted to the Bar in Sydney, I went to England and was called to the English Bar. By a strange chance I took up work in 1954 with IFPI, the international organisation representing the record industry in legal matters. So I came to specialise in national, regional and international copyright law: I stayed with IFPI till 1974, when I returned to the Bar in London, eventually in 1992 entering academia to teach international copyright law in the University of London, where I still teach this subject.

When at this Conference I look at the Australian Copyright Act, I see it from two perspectives: firstly as regards my participation in the debates on the 1967 Copyright Bill, and secondly from the point of view of a copyright lawyer having spent over 50 years working in the field of international copyright. So I start with a description of some of the events which occurred during the debates on the Bill in 1967–1968, then give general summaries of how I see the achievements of the Act, and of Australia in the copyright field generally. In another paper, I describe some of the challenges facing copyright as I see them.

May I say that it gives me particular pleasure to give this address in Old Parliament House, where so much Australian history has taken place, where I came in 1967/1968

---

1 LL.B. (Sydney, 1948); Bar of New South Wales (1949); Bar of England and Wales (1953). Professorial Fellow, Queen Mary Intellectual Property Research Institute, Queen Mary, University of London, Visiting Professor, King’s College, University of London. Professor Sterling is one of Australia’s most distinguished copyright law scholars, and the author of the leading reference work *World Copyright Law*, Sweet & Maxwell, 2008 (3rd edition), a unique compendium of the international law of copyright. © J.A.L. Sterling 2009.
to make representations on the Copyright Bill, and which calls to mind friends and colleagues I met then.

PART I: THE PASSING OF THE ACT

Background to the 1968 Act

As indicated by previous speakers, Australian copyright law grew as a branch of the copyright tree planted in the UK in 1710 with the passing of the first copyright law, the Act 8 Anne c.19. Following the 1710 Act a number of Acts extending the scope, duration etc. of copyright were passed in the 18th and 19th Centuries in the UK, culminating in consolidation and formulation of a comprehensive copyright law in the UK Copyright Act 1911, which by one legislative means or another extended or was applied throughout the British Empire as it then was.

Soon after Federation in 1901, Australia adopted its first Copyright Act (1905). This incorporated provisions of UK copyright legislation (not at that stage consolidated), and introduced a number of fresh concepts in approaches to copyright law. Following the passing of the UK Copyright Act, 1911, the Australian Copyright Act 1912 was passed, broadly following the provisions of the UK Act. The UK pattern of preliminary recommendations by a Copyright Committee, followed by publication of a Bill was reflected in Australia by the Report of the Spicer Committee 1959, followed by the presentation of the Copyright Bill 1967. The 1967 Bill led to intense debate and a political crisis (see below) but the Bill as amended passed into law in 1968, coming into force in 1969.

At the international level, the Berne Convention sets the copyright standard for the world. The original text of the Berne Convention (1886) was revised at Conferences in 1908, 1928 and 1948. The 1948 text was the most recent version of the Convention prior to the passing of the 1968 Act in Australia, and (as had all previous texts) the Convention dealt with author’s rights, but not with the related rights of performers, phonogram producers or broadcasting organisations. After 1948, in accordance with resolutions (“voeux”) adopted at the 1948 Revision Conference, studies began for the creation of a separate Convention dealing with these related rights.

So it was that in 1961, the Diplomatic Conference for the adoption of a Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting

---


Organisations took place in Rome, 10–26 October. Some 40 States (among them Australia) sent delegates to the Conference, Australia being represented by Mr. Clive Weston of the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service. International and non-governmental organisations were also represented. I was fortunate to be present at the Conference as a member of the delegation of one of the non-governmental organisations (IFPI).

While the rights of record producers and broadcasters to authorise the reproduction etc. of their phonograms and broadcasts were recognised without opposition, there were two main controversial issues at the Rome Conference, namely the rights of performers to control the subsequent uses of their performances (whether in sound recordings of films) and the question whether performers and phonogram producers should have the right to receive remuneration for the broadcasting and public performance of their sound recordings.4

In the event, the Rome Convention provided (1) that the protection provided for performers shall include the possibility of preventing certain acts of broadcasting, fixation etc. of their live performances (Article 7), and (2) the right of performers and phonogram producers to receive remuneration for broadcasting and public performances of sound recordings; this right was voted into the Convention (Article 12) at the Plenary Meeting on 25 October, 20 votes for, 8 votes against and 9 abstentions.5

Among the countries voting for Article 12 were the UK and Australia. Australia’s vote did not represent mere passive following of the UK, as I know from my discussions with Mr. Weston at the Conference. Australia was entirely free to decide on which way to vote on each issue, and indeed I had no idea of how Mr. Weston would vote until the crucial votes were taken on 25 October. Australia’s acceptance of the principle of Article 12 was to have relevance in the debates on the 1967 Bill.

---

4 For general description of the provisions of the Rome Convention, see J.A.L. Sterling World Copyright Law (3rd edition, Sweet & Maxwell, 2008) ("WCL") Chapter 20, and for the eventual outcome of the dispute on the question of performers’ rights in films (Articles 7 and 19 of the Convention) see WCL para.20.09(1). The dispute concerning performers’ rights in their filmed performances was not finally resolved in 1961. It continues today (cf the lack of consensus necessary to adopt the WIPO draft Treaty on Protection of Audiovisual Performances at the WIPO Diplomatic Conference in 2002).

5 Article 12 permits Contracting States to make reservations on the acceptance or exercise of the right. See also B below.
The need for new legislation

The United Kingdom had updated its Copyright Act 1911 in 1956. Then in Australia followed the Spicer Committee 1959, and its recommendations.6 In 1967, a Copyright Bill for legislation to replace the Australian 1912 Copyright Act was published by the Commonwealth Attorney General. The Bill completely overhauled the copyright law and introduced new provisions, not all related to the solutions adopted in the UK. In this section I wish to deal only with one crucial issue in the debates, concerning one provision of the Bill.

A crucial issue and its resolution: the record performing right

The debates on the Bill leading to the adoption of the UK Copyright Act 1911 were preceded by the Report of the Committee on the Law of Copyright Report 1909 ("Gorell Committee").7 Submissions to the Gorell Committee on behalf of producers of sound recordings ("record producers") included the following passage:

[We desire recognition of] copyright protection for the artistic and manipulative skill employed in the creation of the phonogram, subject, in the case of copyright works, to the rights of the original author … We claim that a two-fold copyright protection should be accorded to the phonogram, on precisely the same lines as the Convention accords protection to the cinematograph …8

The Gorell Committee reported:

The Committee think that protection should be afforded by legislation to the manufacturers of discs, cylinders, rolls and other mechanical devices, necessary to be used in the course of producing sounds, against piracy of these objects or their reproduction, either by means of direct copies or by means of copies produced by sound or otherwise. The grounds for this recommendation are that, as was pointed out in the evidence which has been placed before the Committee, these discs and other records are only produced at considerable expenditure by payments to artists to perform, so as to record the song, etc., and by the expenditure of a considerable amount of ingenuity and art in the making up of these records; and that therefore

---

6 Report of the Committee appointed by the Attorney-General of the Commonwealth of Australia to consider what alterations are desirable in the Copyright Law of the Commonwealth 1959 ("Spicer Committee Report").
8 Gorell Committee Report, pg.44.
the manufacturers are, in effect, producing works which are to a certain extent new and original, and into which the reproduction of the author’s part has only entered to the extent of giving the original basis of production. Therefore, the Committee regard this as one of the things which can be subject of the copyright and further recommend that public performances by means of pirate copies of these records should also be treated as an infringement of the rights of the manufacturer.9

Reflecting the recommendation of the Committee, the UK Copyright Act 1911 provided as follows in s.19(1):

Copyright shall subsist in records perforated rolls and other contrivances by means of which sounds may be mechanically reproduced in like manner as if such contrivances were musical works …

Following the increased use of records for purposes of public performances in cafés, theatres etc. and in broadcasting, in 1933 the Gramophone Company Limited, in order to confirm the ambit of the copyright granted by s19(1), to took a test case against a restaurant company (Cawardine) in whose premises a Gramophone Company record of a musical work10 had been played in public. Mr. Justice Maugham upheld the plaintiff’s claim that the copyright accorded to the record under s19(1) of the 1911 Act subsisted independently of the author’s copyright (if any) in the recorded work, and embraced all the attributes of copyright under the 1911 Act, including the public performance right.11

On the basis of the decision in Cawardine, the UK record industry founded Phonographic Performance Ltd, for the exercise of the record performing right recognised under the 1911 Act, and licensing of such use of records in public places and broadcasting was then commenced.

After the revision of the Berne Convention in 1948, the UK Government decided it was appropriate to consider revision of the 1911 Act, and set up the Committee on the Law of Copyright (Gregory Committee). The Committee’s Report was presented in 1952, and recommended the retention of the record performing right. 12

10 Overture to The Black Domino by Auber (died 1871) (out of copyright).
11 Gramophone Co. Ltd. v. Stephan Cawardine and Co. [1934] 1 Ch.450. The judgement was not appealed. For further description of the case and the history of the record (phonogram) performing right and its recognition in national, international and regional law, see WCL paras 90.01 – 90.15.
When the Copyright Bill 1955 was presented in the House of Lords, two members of the Upper Chamber declared their determined opposition to the retention of the record performing right in the new legislation. “This right got in by a side-wind”, thundered Lord Jowett, supported by Lord Lucas of Chilworth, “and we are determined to see its abolition”.

Some months of intense lobbying by the record industry and broadcasting interests then followed. In the event the right was retained in section 12 of the Copyright Act 1956 (and still remains in the current legislation, the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, sections 16(1)(d), 20).

The campaign for the international recognition of the record performing right had as above described come to fruition with the recognition of the right in Article 12 of the Rome Convention.

The scene shifts to Australia. The Spicer Committee Report 1959, having considered the various arguments and the history of the recognition and exercise of the right, recommended the retention of the right. When a new Copyright Bill was being prepared in Australia, the indications were that the matter would be hotly contested in the debates on the forthcoming Bill. Accordingly in February 1967, I (then Deputy Director General of IFPI) was at the request of the Australian record industry association sent to Australia to assist the association in its campaign for the retention of the record performing right. Throughout my visits to Australia in this connection, I was in close consultation and full agreement with the association on all decisions and steps to be taken.

As a first step, I sought a meeting with the Minister in charge of the Bill, Nigel Bowen Q.C., as he then was. He received me courteously in his Chambers in Macquarie Street, Sydney. I began by saying that this was not a political, but a legal issue and spoke of the history and exercise of the record performing right. When I had finished I expected some searching questions, even, I hoped, some tiny indication of the Attorney-General’s view. But Nigel Bowen simply said “Now I will hear the other side. Good morning”. A great lawyer.

Later, in February 1967, I went to Canberra with the industry representatives and had extensive meetings with Lindsay Curtis, the Attorney-General’s officer responsible for dealing with matters connected with the proposed legislation. Lindsay was the perfect civil servant, courteous, receptive and impartial, and more than that, highly intelligent, an excellent draftsman and blessed with a warm personality and a great sense of humour. There was much drafting of submissions and exchange of views, not only
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13 Then Assistant to the Director General of IFPI, I took part in 1955/1956 in the making of representations to Parliament on the issue.

14 See Spicer Committee Report para.260, and for extensive review of the question, paras 228–264.
about this issue, but also on the issue of the conditions applying in respect of the compulsory licence to make sound recordings.\(^{15}\) I then returned to the UK.

In May 1967, the Attorney General published the Copyright Bill. The record performing right was retained. A fierce controversy broke out. The Government of the day was a coalition of the Liberal Party and the Country Party. The radio stations opposed retention of the right – but the unexpected development was that the small country radio stations providing programs to lonely homesteads and farms of settlements in the outback went to their Country Party MPs and said that payment of royalties for the broadcasting of records would mean that in many cases they would have to terminate their programmes, removing the services and the entertainment to large numbers of persons in the country areas. While the Liberal Party wished to retain the right, the Country Party opposed the right’s retention, and said it would leave the Government if the Liberals insisted on retaining the right. This would have meant an election, and thus the issue had created a political crisis.

At the invitation of the Australian record industry I returned to Australia in October 1967. After meetings with the industry I went to Canberra and the Attorney-General received me in his rooms here in Old Parliament House. The first thing he said was “Mr. Sterling, you told me this was not a political issue and now the Government is about to fall because of it”. I made such apology as one could in such circumstances. “You had better stay here in Canberra and see my people in my Department”, said Mr. Bowen. That was all: we did not speak again.

I settled down in the old Hotel Canberra near Parliament House and commenced a series of meetings with Lindsay Curtis and industry representatives.\(^{16}\) I did not meet

\(^{15}\) Two of my fellow students from Sydney University Law School (Class of ‘48) who were in Parliament in 1967, were T.E.F. (Tom) Hughes and Lionel Murphy. I went to see them (separately) and asked for their support of the record performing right. Tom Hughes (Liberal Party) said he would support the right, as did the Liberal Party. Lionel Murphy (Labor Party) said “But what are you doing for the little man?” by which he meant the rank and file performers in bands and orchestras. I said I would do what I could to encourage the Australian record industry to support participation for performers in royalties paid for the record performing right, and he said on that basis he would support the right.

\(^{16}\) The old Hotel Canberra was then a modest building, one might say redolent of the charm of colonial days, in the dining room of which Members of Parliament were often seen, and where, it was said, the political future of Australia was forged in, it was hoped, confidential conversations. Walking in the sylvan surrounds to Parliament House each morning, one had to be on the alert, as magpies were constantly attacking passersby and it was reported that Parliamentarians had been issued with pop-guns to ward off avian attacks. Two vignettes, both of Prime Ministers, which stay in my mind from visits to Parliament House in 1967/1968, were the dapper figure of Harold Holt as he made a statement to the Chamber and departed from the front bench (at which some of us will be privileged to sit at this Conference) with a sprightly step that reflected his athletic attributes, always to be
any representatives of those opposed to the retention of the right. The pattern was that we would meet Lindsay Curtis and put a proposal on behalf of the industry. Lindsay would convey this to the “other side” and we would meet again in a few days to consider the reply: this process continued for some weeks.

Finally, it was announced that the Government would amend the Bill to specify, *inter alia*, the general rules on the maximum royalties payable for broadcasting of records by commercial and non-commercial stations. Thus the matter was resolved, and the right was retained in the 1968 Copyright Act and remains there still, with the provisions on maximum royalties (ss 85, 152), the right now being embraced in the right of communicating the sound recording to the public. It is understood that there are now moves for the deletion of the maximum royalty provisions on the basis of changed circumstances, technological developments etc.

The campaign in Australia did not end the national battles for the recognition of the right. The same dispute between the industry and the broadcasters arose again in Canada in 1970 – on that occasion with victory for the broadcasters, as Mr. Trudeau’s Government voted in the Canadian Parliament for the retrospective abolition of the right (after the Canadian record industry’s successful case before the Canadian Copyright Tribunal in which the Tribunal fixed tariffs for the exercise of the right).17 Twenty-eight years later the Canadian Parliament voted for the re-instatement of the right.18 In the United States, the right has been recognised (after long debates) in the US Copyright Act (s106(6)) limited to public performance by means of digital audio transmissions, and debates still continue for the extension of the right.19

In sum, the record performing right has been recognised in the majority of national copyright laws (estimated as those of approximately 100 counties), at the international level in the Rome Convention 1961, and in the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty 1996, and at the regional level in the Cartagena Agreement 1969 (founding
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17 The main argument used by those opposed to the recognition of the right in Canada in 1970 was not based on legal or equitable grounds, but on an allegation (unsubstantiated, and vigorously denied by the Canadian industry and performers) that the royalties for exercise of the right would go to the United States.

18 I have been asked by the editors of this publication to record personal memories of the events here related, so I mention that on the cold December night in 1970 when I left the Canadian Parliament building after the abolition vote to fly back to London, I purchased at the departure airport a bottle of Champagne which I vowed to open when the right was re-instated, something I was able to do twenty eight years later.

19 For details see WCL paras 90.03 – 90.15.
Parties Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela) and in the European Community Rental and Related Rights Directive, as consolidated in 2006.

The history of copyright contains many examples of the influence of personalities. In Australia in 1967/1968, possibly determinative was the decision of John Sturman, then General Manager of the Australasian Performing Right Association (APRA), in deciding APRA’s role in the dispute concerning the record performing right. In those days, the “cake theory” was much supported by those in author’s right circles. The argument ran that broadcasters and other users could only pay a certain amount for the use of protected material, and if record producers and performers were to have a share, there would be less of the cake for beneficiaries of author’s rights. It would have been entirely understandable if John Sturman had taken the same view. When I met him in Sydney in February 1967, however, he said “You have your problems. We have ours. You argue your case and we will argue ours. I will remain neutral on this issue”. John Sturman’s attitude was of critical importance, and I am glad to have this opportunity to recognise that.

PART II: ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE 1968 ACT

General

Seen from the international point of view, the 1968 Act is remarkable for its detail and its length: some 600 pages, the longest Copyright Act in the world, as far as I know. A number of provisions of the Act offer precisely described solutions to a number of challenges posed to modern copyright by technological and other developments: some of these provisions are mentioned in B-D below. In addition, it should be mentioned that from the overall point of view, Australia has made distinctive contributions to copyright law and learning, both in the past, and today as regards the continuing development of copyright law in the world context (see E below).

Provisions on moral rights

Amendments to the 1968 Act in 2006 contained some 87 sections relating to moral rights, constituting, as far as I know, the most extensive and detailed legislation on these rights in any copyright law. While the granting of moral rights of attribution and integrity for authors and performers follows the provisions of the Berne Convention and the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty 1996, the provisions go into great detail as to what constitutes infringement, what remedies are available etc. Here I wish to mention one aspect of these provisions which has attracted international attention, particularly in common law countries, namely the provisions on defences
against claims of infringement of moral rights, these provisions introduce a concept of “reasonableness” as a defence in relation to allegedly infringing acts.

Thus, as regards the attribution right, there is no infringement if in the particular case the defendant establishes that it was reasonable in all the circumstances not to identify the author. Section 195AR(2) provides that in determining such reasonableness a number of factors are to be taken into account, which include (besides factors relating to the nature of the work, and the purpose, manner and context in which the work is used) any practice in, or contained in a voluntary code of practice in, the industry in which the work is used, or any difficulty or expense that would have been incurred as a result of identifying the author. There is a similar “reasonableness” defence as regards alleged infringement of the integrity right where the defendant establishes that it was reasonable in all the circumstances to subject the work to the treatment of which complaint is made (s195AS). There are also “reasonableness” defences as regards alleged infringement of performer’s moral rights (ss195AXD, 195AXE).

The abovementioned defences concerning practices, and difficulty and expense of identification, are, it is believed, unique to the 1968 Act. They are, in the international context, important for international study in the context of the exercise of moral rights, not only generally, but particularly as regards use of protected material in online communication.

**The fair dealing provisions**

Section 41A of the 1968 Act, introduced by amendments adopted in 2006, provides that a fair dealing with a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work, or with an adaptation of a literary, dramatic or musical work (or an audiovisual item (section 103AA)), does not constitute an infringement of copyright in the work (or item) if it is for the purpose of parody or satire.

There are apparently no similar provisions in copyright legislation of other common law countries providing that fair dealing for the purpose of parody or satire does not constitute infringement: in these other countries a defence on the basis of parody or satire lies under the general fair dealing (or in the US, fair use) rules.

---

20 Ss 195AR (author’s attribution right), 195AS (author’s integrity right), 195AXD (performer’s attribution right) and 195AXE (performer’s integrity right).

21 In the UK a proposal for a fair dealing exception regarding caricature, parody or pastiche is contained in the Gowers Review of Intellectual Property 2006, Recommendation 12. In some civil law countries (e.g., Belgium, France) there are specific legislative provisions for parody, but in other civil law countries defences are under general provisions or limitations. See WCL para.13.22.
**Space and format shifting**

The 1968 Act, as amended in 2006, contains detailed provisions regarding exceptions from copyright infringement in respect of space shifting (section 109A) and format shifting (sections 43C, 47J, 110AA).22

I do not know of any legislation in any other country dealing specifically and in detail with space and format shifting, as in the Australian Copyright Act.

PART III: AUSTRALIA’S ACHIEVEMENTS IN COPYRIGHT: AN INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVE

**Judicial achievements**

Here are some of the Australian cases which have attracted international interest, particularly in common law countries: references to them will be found both in court decisions in other jurisdictions, and in Government and other reports and studies on current issues in copyright.

- Australasian Performing Right Assn. Ltd. (APRA) v. 3DB Broadcasting Co. Pty Ltd23 [recognition of record performing right]
- Bulun Bulun and anor v R & T Textiles Pty Ltd24 [protection of traditional knowledge: concept of application of principles of confidential information to sacred tribal knowledge]
- IceTV Pty Ltd v Nine Network Australia Pty Ltd26 [analysis of concept of originality]
- Moorhouse v University of New South Wales 27 [principles applying in assessing liability for authorising infringement of copyright]

---

22 See WCL para.10.05. Recommendation 8 of the abovementioned UK Gowers Review proposes introduction of a limited private copying exception for format shifting for works published after the law comes into effect.

23 [1929] VLR. 107; 35 A.L.R. 109; WCL, para.90.02.


27 (1975) 133 CLR. 1; 49 ALJR. 267; 6 ALR. 193; [1976] RPC 151 (HC); WCL, para.13.10.
Rank Film Prod. Ltd v Dodds\(^\text{28}\) [hotel rooms: liability for unauthorised viewing in hotel rooms of TV programs containing material protected by copyright]

Telstra Corpn. Ltd v Australasian Performing Right Association Ltd\(^\text{29}\) [liability for unauthorised provision of protected material in “music on hold” service for telephone subscribers]

Telstra Corpn. Ltd v Desktop Marketing Systems Pty Ltd \(^\text{30}\) [labour as criterion of originality]

Universal Music Australia Pty Ltd v Cooper\(^\text{31}\) [infringing authorisation through linking to sites hosting unauthorised copies of protected material]

\textit{Universal Music Australia Pty Ltd v. Sharman Licence Holdings Ltd}\(^\text{32}\) [infringing authorisation of unauthorised file sharing]

In this connection special mention should be made of the World Trade Organisation Dispute Settlement Body Panel Report on section 110(5) of the United States Copyright Act. This Report on the interpretation of the “three step test” laid down in Article 13 of the WTO Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property (TRIPS) has made a major contribution to the appreciation and application of this fundamental provision of the TRIPS Agreement throughout the world. The Chairman of the Panel was Hon. I.F. Sheppard, formerly President of the Copyright Tribunal established under the Copyright Act 1968.\(^\text{33}\)

\textit{Academic achievements}

Australia has produced a number of academics internationally recognised for the contribution of their writings and teaching of the theory and practice of copyright. The doyen of this group is Professor W.R. Cornish. Among publications of

\[^{28}\text{[1983] 2 NSWLR 553; 2 I.P.R. 113 (NSW SC, 1984); WCL, para.9.10; (cf Rafael Hoteles SL, Case C306/05, [2007] E.C.D.R. 2 (European Ct of Justice)).}\]


\[^{31}\text{[2006] FCAFC 187 (Full Court, Fed. Ct); WCL, para.13.53.}\]

\[^{32}\text{[2005] FCA 1242; [2006] FCA 1 (Fed. Ct); WCL, para.13.53.}\]

international renown by Australian academics are those of Professor Cornish,34 and of Professor Brian Fitzgerald35, and the classic text of Professor Sam Ricketson *The Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works 1886–1986*36, with its second edition, *International Copyright and Neighbouring Rights: The Berne Convention and Beyond* (with Professor J.C. Ginsburg)37, and in the Australian context Professor James Lahore’s *Intellectual Property in Australia – Copyright*. 38 Recent publications of international interest include Dr. Elizabeth Adeney’s *The Moral Rights of Authors and Performers: an International and Comparative Analysis*39, and (with J. Davis) Dr. Tanya Aplin’s *Intellectual Property Law: Text, Cases and Materials*40 and numerous learned articles by Professor Peter Drahos and others, as well as the historical survey of Benedict Atkinson above mentioned.

Organisational achievements

The Australian Copyright Council and the Copyright Society of Australia promote research projects, and hold seminars, and generally provide information on copyright, available for Governments, academics and practitioners, and the public generally, with up to date and detailed studies on the background to, and recent developments concerning, copyright law in Australia, also covering regional and international developments: the online availability of this material being particularly valuable. Organisations representing authors and other copyright owners in Australia have long been established and continue to develop and play their part, not only in the administration of copyright, but also in contributing to studies on copyright reform.

Achievements in the communication area: worldlii and austlii

The World Legal Information Institute was established on the initiative and continues under the direction of Professor Graham Greenleaf of the University of New South Wales. The Institute provides access to over 800 databases in over 120 countries and territories via the Free Access to Law Movement, embracing Legal Information Institutes in Asia, Australasia, Canada, the Commonwealth, Hong Kong, New

---

38 Sydney, Butterworths, looseleaf 1977.
Zealand, Pacific Islands, Southern Africa, United Kingdom and Ireland and the USA, also Droit Francophone and regional sites including Europe (European Union and European Community legislation, European Court of Justice reports etc.), Caribbean, Middle East etc., together with other material (law journals, law reform etc.), forming compendious and convenient access to legal materials throughout the world. For ease of navigation, and breadth of comprehensive coverage the service is as far as I know unrivalled.

CONCLUSION

Australia has achieved legislative, judicial, academic and other accomplishments of world renown in the field of copyright. It is my hope that Australia will continue to give to the world the benefit of its expertise in this field, for the benefit of all peoples. I believe that this is the time, in collaboration with New Zealand, for Australia to provide new initiatives in the Asian Pacific area, as described in my other material submitted to this Conference.