# A "Canadian Content Creator's View"

# of the Copyright Modernization Act (Bill C-32)

November 2010

*by George Geczy, Co-Founder and Co-Owner, BattleGoat Studios, Ancaster, Ontario*

## Contents

About the Author... 1
First Impressions of C-32, the Copyright Modernization Act 2
How to Fix C-32 2
A "Canadian Content Creator's" View of the Copyright Modernization Act 3
Consideration of the Cultural and Societal impacts of C-32 5
Some General Examples of issues with C-32's Anti-circumvention restrictions: 6
Conclusion 10
Some other organizations opposing the anti-circumvention provisions of C-32 10



## About the Author...

There is a considerable amount of rhetoric in the Copyright debate about people with "hidden" agendas and the desire to see unbalanced legislation (one way or the other), so I think it is important to point out that I have been a digital content creator since 1980 and a business owner since 1982, originally developing software for computer systems that pre-date the IBM PC. Today I am co-owner of *BattleGoat Studios*, a PC Game Development company that has produced two games that have been released worldwide in over two dozen countries, published in seven languages. We are working on our third title for release in 2011. My past, present and future is based on digital media content creation; I do not earn any other income or lobbyist commissions, **all my income at the present and for the foreseeable future is from the sale of creative content protected by copyright**.

I have also been involved with digital copyright issues since the early 1980's, and my first submissions to the Government on copyright reform were in September 2001. I have since made submissions to each opportunity for consultation and feedback on Copyright, FTAA, and ACTA. I do also volunteer for a number of community organizations, and all of those positions are unpaid. I am past Chair of the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce Science & Technology Committee, and past Chair of the Hamilton Public Library Board. I have also been a Board Member of the Industry-Education Council.

## First Impressions of C-32, the Copyright Modernization Act

There are elements to be commended in C-32. The support for a "notice-and-notice" regime instead of the oft-abused "Notice-and-takedown" is to be praised. The specific recognition of new Fair Dealing rights including Backups, Format Shifting, Privacy, Accessibility, Non-commercial User Content, and Education exceptions is also a very strong positive element of this legislation.

**Unfortunately, Section (47) of C-32, which adds the new Technological Protection Measures regulations, is so inherently flawed and unbalanced that it not only overshadows the progress in other sections of the bill, but in facts eliminates them by its "over-riding" nature.**

In comments made in June 2010 the Minister of Heritage has said that the bill strikes a balance and "everyone got some water in their wine". However Section (47) is more like arsenic in the wine, it destroys the progressive elements of the bill by invalidating them, and without changes this section makes the bill unacceptable and entirely unbalanced.

## How to Fix C-32

The addition of one simple principle to C-32 would make the bill acceptable:

***That the circumvention of Technical Protection Measures be permitted for non-infringing uses.***

This would meet the requirements of the WIPO treaties, and it would properly permit consumers to use their Fair Dealing rights and exemptions. It would still afford protection to content creators and publishers, especially against the "large scale" infringement that Ministers Moore and Clement say are the targets of Copyright Reform.

## A "Canadian Content Creator's" View of the Copyright Modernization Act

Some Reasons why Section (47) of Bill C-32, the Anti-circumvention provisions, is seriously flawed:

### 1) They are overwhelming anti-consumer, and unbalance Copyright by giving Media distribution companies unprecedented control of the use of products consumers buy.

- Bill C-32 permits format-shifting – EXCEPT if digital locks are used.
- Bill C-32 permits backups of digital media – EXCEPT if digital locks are used.
- Bill C-32 adds a number of desired "Fair Dealing" provisions – EXCEPT if digital locks are used.
- Bill C-32 adds Library and Educational provisions – EXCEPT if digital locks are used.
- Bill C-32 permits time-shifting and PVR recording – EXCEPT if digital locks are used.
- Bill C-32 does not allow breaking digital locks on "Abandoned" content legally purchased.
  *Old Games that require per-use verification; Music stores that moved away from DRM*

### 2) Limited rights for Circumvention for Disability, Privacy, Security, and specific other uses are hobbled by unreasonable restrictions on Circumvention Technologies.

- Restrictions on production and sharing of circumvention technologies make it nearly impossible for users of available exceptions to legally obtain the proper tools to do so.[1]
- Restrictions on use of the tools makes their legal use questionable or impossible.[2]

### 3) Library, Educational and Fair Dealing protections and rights must be protected

- Government FAQ bullet point "*Users want more flexibility to use copyrighted material*".[3]
- In C-32 Anti-Circumvention rules are paramount in each case, eliminating flexibility.

### 4) Customers must be able to have tools to balance Industry actions

- Content creators including songwriters, filmmakers, many authors, game studios, and more are opposed to strict anti-circumvention provisions.
- Ministers Clement and Moore have made an example of Digital Music's abandonment of TPMs in light of consumer pressure; however a significant contribution to this decision was the ability of consumers to circumvent those TPMs in the first place, making them ineffective. Without the balance of tools in the hands of consumers to permit access to their non-infringing permitted uses, content distributors have unreasonable control over products consumers purchase.

---

[1] For Example Proposed Copyright Act Section 41.14 allows circumvention to prevent or verify reporting of personal information to third parties; Section 41.14(2) requires circumvention tool providers to ensure that the tool is only used for this purpose, and also that the tool does not "unduly impair" the TPM. Both of these requirements cannot reasonably be met in many circumstances.

[2] Proposed Copyright Act Section 41.16 allows circumvention by persons with perceptual disabilities, however 41.16(2) says this circumvention must "not unduly impair the technological protection measure"; operating a screen reader, for example, requires substantial removal of TPMs and would not pass this test.

[3] Industry Canada Website: http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/crp-prda.nsf/eng/rp01183.html

**5) History demonstrates that future innovation is stifled by artificial restrictions, and is encouraged when copyright restrictions are eased.**

The two most significant shifts in media consumption in 30 years:

- *Home Video Recording (Sony Corp v Universal Studios, 1984)*[4]

  Universal Studios, representing major US movie production studios, fought to the Supreme Court to prevent Sony Corporation from being able to sell "Home Video Tape Recorders" to consumers, citing protections of the US Copyright Act.

  The Supreme Court ruled for Sony Corporation, and home video recorders were permitted to be sold. In the years following, Universal Studios made more money off of their "Home Video" releases than they did for their Theatrical releases of most titles.

- *MP3 Player (Diamond Multimedia Systems v Recording Industry Assoc of America, 1999)*[5]

  The Recording Industry Association of America, representing most of the large US record labels, argued that the Diamond "Rio" MP3 violated the US Copyright Act by allowing CD recordings to be format-shifted (called "space shifting" in the decision). The Court ruled in Diamond Multimedia's favour, and as such the MP3 became legal, opening the door for the iPod, iTunes, and entirely new methods of distributing and consuming music.

New restrictions should not stand in the way of innovative new uses of media, or else the "next" major innovation may not survive a copyright challenge. Additionally, companies and entrepreneurs working on new technologies will be encouraged to work out of friendly jurisdictions, such as those with more flexible circumvention regulations.

**6) Recent Worldwide Legislation and Negotiations are working to ease Digital Lock Rules.**

While the passage of the United States *Digital Millennium Copyright Act* in 1998 represented the "high water mark" for protection of Digital Locks/TPMs, recent developments have shown that the pendulum has begun to shift back to a balanced approach worldwide. Some examples:

- In the United States, the Library of Congress has this year passed significant new exemptions to the DMCA for TPM circumvention for Education, Documentaries, and many private uses.[6]
- The WIPO itself is discussing significant exemptions and restrictions on Digital Lock protections, such as the proposed draft "*WIPO Treaty on Exceptions and Limitations for the Disabled, Educational and Research Institutions, Libraries and Archive Centers*"[7]
- New Copyright Legislation in New Zealand (2008), Finland (2006), Norway (2005), as well as proposals this year from India[8] and Brazil[9] all allow much more flexibility than C-32.

The Government's stated desire is to have a modern Copyright law ready for the future, but the over-riding TPM protections in C-32 are already outdated and are based in the past.

---

[4] SONY CORP. OF AMER. v. UNIVERSAL CITY STUDIOS, INC., 464 U.S. 417 (1984)
http://www.law.cornell.edu/copyright/cases/464_US_417.htm

[5] U.S. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals RECORDING v DIAMOND
http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cgi-bin/getcase.pl?court=9th&navby=case&no=9856727

[6] http://www.copyright.gov/1201/

[7] WIPO Draft Treaty: http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/copyright/en/sccr_20/sccr_20_11.pdf

[8] http://prsindia.org/uploads/media/Copyright%20Act/Copyright%20Bill%202010.pdf

[9] http://www.cultura.gov.br/consultadireitoautoral/lei-961098-consolidada/

## Consideration of the Cultural and Societal impacts of C-32

There has been a gradual shift in the public and business perception of Copyright over the past few decades, from it being a temporary and limited right to being a long-term guarantee of commercial exploitation rights. However the historical context cannot be forgotten, that *"to promote the progress of science and useful arts"* involved not only an incentive to create new works, but also an expectation that they would become available into the Public Domain upon the expiry of the Copyright term.

This holds true even from a business perspective; not only do businesses have an expectation as a "corporate citizen" to look at benefits to society as a whole, but content creation businesses require building upon prior art to advance and innovate. Whether modern musical compositions that draw from renaissance classical music, or Disney movies that retell traditional fairy tales, there is a tradition of evolution in media. C-32 impacts this in a number of ways:

- There is no allowance for the circumvention of TPM's on public domain content.
- There is no allowance for the circumvention of TPM's on non-infringing content such as that licensed under a Creative Commons license.
- There is no allowance for the circumvention of TPM's on abandoned content or obsolete TPM's (bankrupt companies, unidentifiable authors, etc). In some cases abandoned content is not functional unless the TPM's are broken (such as video games that require online activation after the online server is no longer available, or DRM music that requires an online license after the license authenticator has gone out of business.)
- There is no allowance for the circumvention of TPM's on content when its copyright expires.

In June 2010 the WIPO published a comprehensive report titled "*Scoping Study on Copyright and Related Rights and the Public Domain*"[10]. This very thorough and comprehensive report looks at the many issues surrounding Public Domain content, and identifies TPMs as a significant threat for reasonable access to public domain content. Additionally the report makes specific recommendations, for instance that *"WIPO Treaties should be amended to prohibit a technical impediment to reproduce, public communicate or making available a work that has fallen into the public domain. There is no legal basis for the enforcement of technical protection measures applied to the public domain."* The report goes even further to criticize attempts to "appropriate" public domain content by the addition of "ancillary copyright works", such as when a modern introduction is added to a Shakespeare play.[11] The WIPO report specifically recommends that even with ancillary new content added, or format-shifted, the public domain content should not enjoy copyright protection and TPM protection, as "*Technological measures mainly protecting public domain works, with an ancillary and minimal presence of copyrighted works, should not enjoy legal protection*".[12]

At the same time as the increased commercialization of content in the 20th century came a reduced awareness of its cultural significance. While nobody would question the cultural significance and imperative for preservation of a Shakespeare play or Beethoven symphony, cultural media in the past decades has suffered significant content losses when commercial entities do not see a financial benefit

[10] WIPO Public Domain Study: http://www.wipo.int/ip-development/en/agenda/pdf/scoping_study_cr.pdf

[11] ibid page 45

[12] ibid page 70

in preservation. A prime example of this is the fact that one of the recognized and longest-running TV series of all time, the BBC's *"Doctor Who"*, is missing any form of existing copies of most of its first season of episodes; the BBC re-used the video tape to save money. In the US, significant episodes of TV history, such as the first "Tonight Show" episode with Johnny Carson, are also similarly lost.

While modern media distributors now recognize the commercial benefit of retaining television and theatre programming, the same "lost culture" effect is now occurring with new technologies such as computer games, Internet Sites, blogs, user-generated content, and social network interaction.

C-32 exacerbates the problem of protecting cultural content:

- There is no circumvention exception for Digital Archiving by institutions such as Libraries
- There is no circumvention exception for archiving of personal material (backups/format shifts)
- There is no circumvention exception for the new Fair Dealing rights for Libraries and Education

The Government's consultations on copyright reform throughout 2009 generated significant responses, and while many responses (on both sides of the issue) were form-letter style, there were also hundreds of original responses from individual Canadians. These included many content creators (artists, writers, songwriters, musicians, software developers) that spoke out against strong TPM protections. The vast majority of responses expressed concerns with the damaging effects of overly-restrictive protections.[13]

## Some General Examples of issues with C-32's Anti-circumvention restrictions:

**Uncertainty over the extent of the restrictions**

In an interview with Jesse Brown of TVO's "Search Engine" podcast on June 14, 2010, Industry Minister Tony Clement discussed the anti-circumvention restrictions.[14] He stated specifically that broadcasters were permitted to circumvent TPMs to enable Fair Dealing use of media under the "Broadcasting Undertakings" section of the legislation (Proposed Copyright Act Section 41.17). After investigation by legal and other experts this was determined to be specifically not true, and that the proposed 41.17 does not provide this Fair Dealing TPM circumvention right.[15]

It is interesting that one of the Ministers responsible for this legislation would so fundamentally mis-understand the level of restrictions that his bill places on Fair Dealing uses of locked media.

Also interestingly, Minister Clement's answers to questions asked to him over "twitter" also feature some unusual responses, for example: *"Question: Does #C32 make it illegal to possess/make software that 'can' break a lock? TonyClement_MP: Cant manuf, sell or use. But you CAN possess!"*[16] (Creating the legal oddity of being able to 'possess' software that you can't 'use'), and after saying "*Yup"* to the question "*can I still buy CD's and rip them*", then being corrected with "*But not if they are digitally locked*

[13] Copyright Consultations 2009: http://www.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/008.nsf/eng/h_00001.html

[14] TVO "Search Engine": http://feeds.tvo.org/~r/tvo/searchengine/~5/CzAROARjUjo/800837_48k.mp3

[15] TVO "Search Engine": http://feeds.tvo.org/~r/tvo/searchengine/~3/6MFvC33A1hw/800839_48k.mp3

[16] http://twitter.com/TonyClement_MP/status/15419224665

*down*", he responded "*Correct. But that's not ind practice*".[17] This seems to indicate the legislation feels there is balance in *current* industry practice, but the imbalance in the TPM restrictions proposed result in no protections against industry removing rights that users have come to expect.

Another question of interest is how the proposed legislation would deal with the "Sony Rootkit" approach[18], where Sony used a form of TPM for audio CD's that silently installed software on a user's computer without asking permission. One interpretation of C-32 would be that removing the unauthorized "Rootkit" file would actually be illegal (as a circumvention of a TPM) if the Rootkit did not collect or transmit personal information.

**Does the WIPO require such strict TPM protections?**
The answer here is clearly "No". There is significant legal analysis that concludes that a more flexible approach that allows circumvention for non-infringing purposes is permitted under the WIPO Internet treaties. Most states that have ratified the WIPO Internet treaties have adopted this flexible approach. Recent examples that permit the use of circumvention devices and technologies for non-infringing uses are Australia's *Copyright Amendment Act (2006)*[19] and New Zealand's *Copyright (New Technologies) Amendment Act 2008*[20].

**Is the WIPO moving away from overly restrictive TPM protections?**
This appears to be true, and in fact the WIPO is attempting to codify exceptions and limitations into future treaties on copyright. The Twentieth Session of the *Standing Committee on Copyright and Related Rights* of the WIPO was held from June 21st to 24th in Geneva, and it produced a number of reports and drafts that work to considerably expand copyright exceptions, while limiting the scope of TPMs.[21] The "*Scoping Study on Copyright and Related Rights and the Public Domain"* discussed earlier is one such report. Another is a proposed draft "*WIPO Treaty on Exceptions and Limitations for the Disabled, Educational and Research Institutions, Libraries and Archive Centers*"[22] As the title indicates, this draft treaty sets out to define copyright exceptions for a number of groups, similar to the Fair Dealing exceptions of C-32. Unlike C-32, however, this draft treaty specifically allows the circumvention of TPMs for these purposes. To quote Article 13: "*Contracting parties shall ensure that beneficiaries of the exceptions and limitations listed in Article 2 have the means to enjoy the exception where technical protection measures have been applied to a work, including when necessary the right to circumvent the technical protection measure so as to make the work accessible."*[23] While it is clear that draft WIPO treaties have a long way to go (and a lot of lobbying to survive) before they ever come up for ratification, the results of the Twentieth Session of the *Standing Committee* make it clear that there is a very strong desire among a large number of WIPO members to "re-balance" copyright treaties and provide clearly defined exceptions and limitations, including allowances to circumvent TPMs for non-infringing uses. There is no reason why C-32 cannot do this now.

---

[17] http://twitter.com/TonyClement_MP/status/15284063109

[18] Sony Rootkit – Wired: http://www.wired.com/politics/security/commentary/securitymatters/2005/11/69601

[19] Australia Copyright Amendment Act 2006: http://www.copyright.org.au/pdf/acc/infosheets_pdf/g096.pdf

[20] New Zealand 2008: http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2008/0027/latest/whole.html#DLM1122643

[21] WIPO Standing Committee 20th Session: http://www.wipo.int/meetings/en/details.jsp?meeting_id=20200

[22] WIPO Draft Treaty: http://www.wipo.int/edocs/mdocs/copyright/en/sccr_20/sccr_20_11.pdf

[23] ibid page 8, Article 13

**Will restrictions on manufacture and importation of circumvention technologies prevent their use?**
There are three primary groups of users of circumvention technologies: commercial counterfeiters, individual "pirates", and consumers using the tools for their Fair Dealing rights (format shifting, backups, etc). The first group will have no problems in creating these tools using their illegal profits to fund any required technical work. The second group will be able to access circumvention tools through online networks of enthusiasts and "hackers"; only the latter group (the legal group) is most significantly impacted. This is not to say that commercially available circumvention tools are not used for infringing purposes, but there is a common-sense relationship in that those who buy circumvention tools also tend to buy their other media, and those that illegally copy media are more likely to obtain their tools in a similarly non-commercial fashion.

**Overly restrictive TPM protections create a lack of respect for Copyright law as a whole**
This is mirrored in the *Globe and Mail* article from June 14, 2010, *"Magic seals are made to be broken"*[24], among many other articles and blogs, which point out that a copyright law perceived to be "silly" and unfair is more likely to be broken. At the very least, many users will continue to break TPMs to continue their Fair Dealing rights, and as such C-32 makes criminals out of consumers performing legal acts. At the worst, a perception that the law is unbalanced and unfair will be used by consumers to justify a more widespread lack of respect for copyright protection.

**What about new technologies that rely on TPMs?**
It has been suggested that strong protection of TPMs is required to enable new technologies such as music streaming services[25], digital rentals, and trial versions of software. It should be noted that by permitting circumvention of TPMs for legal uses, circumvention for infringing uses remains illegal. Additionally, creating the tools or processes for circumventing TPMs on these new technologies remains relatively easy for advanced users, so if those users are already violated copyright by illegally obtaining or copying media, the additional act of illegally creating circumvention tools will not be a significant deterrent. Preventing access to circumvention tools harms legal uses of those tools (Fair Dealing, accessibility) far more than infringing users that can obtain those tools in other ways. And as mentioned above, many new technologies specifically rely on accessibility to media, and restrictive TPM protections would prevent those technologies (see above examples of the MP3 player and Home Video recording).

**What about the Interoperability Exceptions?**
The proposed Section 41.12 (Interoperability of computer programs) actually creates a significant number of questions and "grey areas", as the level of circumvention and access required to make programs and media interoperable is significant, usually requiring the removal or circumvention of any existing TPMs. This section is an important element of C-32, though many will use it as a "back door" to share information and tools for circumvention. The Personal information Section 41.14, though more restrictive, also creates some of these grey areas. Given that, it makes more sense to have the "front door" open and to permit use of circumvention tools for non-infringing uses in the first place.

**What about the Canadian Chamber of Commerce's Position in support of C-32?**

[24] Globe And Mail, June 14, 2010: http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/technology/ivor-tossell/magic-seals-are-made-to-be-broken/article1602902/

[25] Music Streaming Examples: www.rhapsody.com, www.spotify.com

While the Canadian Chamber is correct to be concerned about counterfeiting of goods and piracy for commercial gain[26], their expansion of this concern to personal non-commercial acts seems more motivated by US-based lobby groups and generally discredited statistics[27] incorrectly claiming that Canada is a "piracy haven". Regarding the extent to which anti-circumvention rules should be applied to non-infringing uses, there appears to have been no consultation or discussion with Canadian-owned media industries or individual Chamber and Board of Trade members across the country. I myself have been a Hamilton Chamber of Commerce member for 25 years and have not had the opportunity to share my views with the Canadian Chamber on this topic. There appears to be no basis for the Canadian Chamber's support of strong anti-circumvention regulations except for the influence of US-based lobbying on this issue.

**What about concerns of video game industry associations regarding TPM protections?**
The Entertainment Software Association (ESA) has been particularly outspoken on the need for very strong TPM protections. ESA Canada Executive Director Danielle LaBrossiere Parr wrote an op-ed on this topic recently[28] where she details this position. It should first be noted that ESA Canada does not represent the Canadian video game industry at large. The largest independent video game developers in Canada are not members of ESA or ESA Canada, and in fact none of the listed game development members of ESA Canada are Canadian owned[29].

More specific to ESA Canada's position, she states *"Canada needs a legal framework to support an increasingly competitive and innovative new economy"*, and that without strong protections, *"Canadian jobs and competitiveness are at stake"*... *"We must do everything we can to maintain Canada's market position"*. However, in the same article she points out that *"Canada is now the third largest video-game producing country globally, with an industry conservatively estimated to be worth $2-billion annually and employing some 14,000 people"*. In an earlier press release[30] the ESA stated *"A strong bill ... is critical to the success of Canada's digital economy."*

It must be pointed out here that over the past decade Canada's video game industry has grown dramatically, far exceeding the growth of any other jurisdiction, to the point were as mentioned we are the third largest worldwide producer. Yet all of this was accomplished under our so-called "outdated" copyright regulations. There is absolutely no evidence to support a claim that lack of TPM protections has hindered growth in Canada's digital sector; in digital gaming, Canada's growth is unparalleled and unprecedented. There is no evidence to support a claim that developers would consider leaving Canada if TPM protections were not "absolute"; in fact, many major new studios (divisions of multi-national media companies) have been announced in the past two years, again in an environment without such TPM protections in place.

Finally, the ESA claims that protection of TPMs is required to "prevent cheating" in video games. I think it is obvious that cheating while playing video games is not an issue that requires legal protection, nor would most cheaters (who tend to be advanced users) be concerned about breaking TPMs to do so.

---

[26] Canadian Chamber of Commerce "A Road Map for Change" (2007)

[27] Business Software Alliance on Canada Piracy Statistics: http://www.michaelgeist.ca/content/view/4005/125/

[28] ESA op-ed: http://www.calgaryherald.com/technology/gamers+should+love+copyright+bill/3175415/story.html

[29] ESA Canada members: http://www.theesa.ca/members.php#

[30] ESA Canada Press Release: http://www.theesa.ca/press_release.php?id=22

## Conclusion

After reading C-32 in its entirety twice, and also reading a red-lined version of the modified Copyright Act, I have reached the conclusion that, without C-32 Section (47) (the TPM protections), the proposed legislation is actually quite fair and reasonable. While there are some things that I would suggest a bit differently, overall the balance is maintained (and even improved), and some of the most draconian elements from certain other jurisdictions (such as "notice-and-takedown" and "three-strikes") have been avoided. However, as stated in my introduction, Section (47) in its current form destroys much of that progress due to its "over-ride" nature. **By modifying the legislation to allow the manufacture and use of circumvention tools for non-infringing uses, balance and fairness can be restored.**

## Some other organizations opposing the anti-circumvention provisions of C-32

**Canadian Library Association**
http://www.newswire.ca/en/releases/archive/June2010/03/c9963.html
*" CLA is heartened that Bill C-32 gives users some new rights, but is disappointed that longstanding rights, the heart of copyright's balance, as well as the new rights, are all tempered by the over-reach of digital locks."*

**Retail Council of Canada**
**Canadian Bookseller Association**
http://www.retailcouncil.org/mediacentre/newsreleases/current/pr20100603.asp
*" Retailers support the limited and legitimate use of technological protection measures as long as it does not prevent consumers from exercising their users' rights to engage in fair dealing, as well as private copying, archival backup and time and format shifting for private purposes and for access to public domain material."*

**Business Coalition for Balanced Copyright**
*Members include: Computer and Communications Industry Association, Canadian Wireless Telecommunications Association, Canadian Cable Systems Alliance, Canadian Association of Internet Providers, and individual members such as Bell Canada, Cogeco Cable, Rogers Communications, Google*
http://www.newswire.ca/en/releases/archive/June2010/03/c9749.html
*"BCBC members agree that some parts of the legislation unfairly restrict consumer freedom and need to be revised before being passed by Parliament such as the inability to circumvent digital locks for private use."*

**Documentary Organization of Canada**
http://www.mediacastermagazine.com/issues/story.aspx?aid=1000373473
*" DOC finds it deplorable that the government has not considered exclusions for accessing content for non-infringing purposes"*

**Canadian Association of University Teachers**
http://www.caut.ca/pages.asp?page=894
*"By imposing a blanket provision against all circumvention, the government will lock down a vast amount of digital material, effectively preventing its use for research, education and innovation, and curtailing the user rights of Canadians."*

**Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada**
http://www.aucc.ca/publications/media/2010/copyright_06_03_e.html
*" AUCC is concerned about the overly strict prohibition against circumventing the technical measures used to protect works in digital format. We fear that this prohibition will diminish users' rights that are an integral part of the proper balance in copyright law."*