Mr. Chairman, esteemed committee members,

Allow me first to express my gratitude for this invitation and to welcome this initial opportunity for the cultural sector to present its comments on Bill C-27. I am the Executive Director of the Coalition for the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, celebrating its 25th anniversary this year. We bring together over 50 members, unions, professional associations, and French and English-speaking management companies in the cultural sector in Canada. We cover a wide diversity of disciplines: audiovisual, music, digital arts, publishing, visual arts, and performing arts. Thus, we represent over 350,000 creators and nearly 3,000 cultural enterprises. Today, I am in good company, surrounded by three members of the Coalition: the Association nationale des éditeurs de livres, the Directors Guild of Canada, and the Alliance of Canadian Cinema, Television, and Radio Artists. This small sample illustrates only one aspect of the effects of artificial intelligence development on our sector: I invite you to continue

consulting the cultural sector to hear representatives of visual artists, screenwriters, producers, composers, authors, and more.

Our Coalition's primary mission is to ensure that a cultural exception is provided for in trade agreements to preserve Canadian cultural sovereignty. We also ensure that Canada adopts public policies that ensure the protection and promotion of the diversity of our cultural expressions, including in the digital environment. Our action is based on the 2005 UNESCO Convention for the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, which was born out of the concerted efforts of Quebec and Canada. It is worth remembering that Canada was the first country to ratify it.

We are here to comment on a bill that aims to protect Canadians from the risks posed by the rapid developments in artificial intelligence, notably, but not exclusively, generative AI. The 2005 Convention emphasizes that cultural diversity is "essential for peace and security at the local, national, and international levels." In other words, responsible artificial intelligence development must take into account this diversity and ensure its

protection. It is essential for safeguarding our freedom of expression, the health of our democracy, and the maintenance of our sovereignty.

Bill C-27 primarily addresses risks posed to individuals by AI. Like others before us, today we wish to emphasize the importance of also considering the societal risks it poses. Indeed, the objectives of the Law, in Article 4 or the definition of harm found in the text, are too limited. Taking a cue from a formulation found in the European Union's AI Law, for example, we suggest that C-27 should have, among its objectives, the protection of "health, safety, fundamental rights enshrined in the Charter, including democracy - of which cultural diversity is a pillar - and the rule of law, and environmental protection, against the harmful effects of artificial intelligence systems."

The focus of our discussion today is copyright law. This is heartening because we are convinced that Bill C-27 has a significant role to play in this regard. Recently, the Government of Canada conducted a consultation on the impacts of generative AI on copyright law. The cultural sector is unanimous: contrary to widespread perception, Canadian copyright law

does not need major modernization to protect rights holders in response to AI developments. Indeed, it already protects human creation and prohibits unauthorized use of protected cultural content. However, due to the lack of transparency regarding the data used to feed AI systems, the Law cannot be implemented more optimally. This is where C-27 must play a role. Here are two concrete actions that would allow the Copyright Act to regain its full effectiveness, to the benefit of rights holders, but also of Canadians.

1. Drawing inspiration from the European AI Law, we need to go beyond an obligation to maintain data records, as was added by amendment to Article 7(2), and, for example, provide for a sufficiently detailed summary of the use of training data protected by copyright to be made available to the public.

2. Next, it needs to be more clearly stated that C-27 entails responsibilities under the Copyright Act. The accountability framework (Article 12(5)) could thus provide for policies and procedures regarding

the Copyright Act and the use of an individual's voice, image, or reputation.

These additions would be in line with the regulations being put in place internationally and would promote the development of a licensing market based on consent and remuneration for rights holders.

Thank you for your attention, and I would be happy to answer your questions.