

Soon thereafter, however, it became clear that while the technical amendment aligned the code with long-time Copyright Office practice, it was not uncontroversial. Indeed many recording artists had believed that the work-for-hire clauses of their contracts were unenforceable because contrary to the copyright code: i.e., sound recordings are not listed as works made for hire. They view their contracts as operating as assignments or transfers of copyright. This distinction is important because under work-for-hire, the copyright is owned by the record company for the life of the copyright and the artists' rights are extinguished; under a transfer or assignment, the artist may recapture his or her copyright after 35 years and then either renegotiate more favorable terms with the same company or sell the remaining copyright to another label on more favorable terms. The basic premise of this recapture is that the initial assignment of copyright might not fully reward the unproven artist who is an unknown quantity in a risky business. Once the artist's commercial value is better proven an opportunity is given the artist to reap the rewards of his or her creations that have stood the test of time. That the assumptions of the artists and labels about the status of these works have been diametrically opposed might not have appeared until 35 years after the 1978 effective act of the current Copyright Act, but for this technical amendment.

What ought the status of sound recordings be then? Sound recordings can be something of a hybrid art form lying on a continuum between the individual author writing a song or book and the motion picture where possibly hundreds of employees collaborate on the final work. Sound recordings can be more like the former or the latter, depending on the circumstances. Because the facts can vary so widely—some albums are primarily the product of the producer, some of one artist, some of a group, many have hired musicians or technicians who contribute but do so as part of their normal employment, some recordings are compilations of smaller recordings—it is not clear what general rule would be either most fair to all concerned or would most encourage the continued creativity of recording artists. Since it may take some time, and will require the input of all the affected parties, it seems reasonable at this time to undo last years' technical amendment without prejudice to either side in case litigation should arise later, while we explore whether a more comprehensive rule can be crafted. That is why we have made this change today, containing in the legislative language the congressional intent that neither enactment prejudice any future litigation.

It is my hope that the dialogue on this issue is beginning, rather than

ending, with this legislation. I think it is important to avoid costly litigation if possible. And I believe it of paramount importance that artists are fairly compensated for the work they do. Without the creativity of the artist, the record companies would have nothing to market, and the audience would have nothing to enjoy. For the sake of the future of music, I hope that using new technologies, artists and audience can begin having a closer relationship, where artists are encouraged to stretch themselves creatively and fans are enabled to enjoy artists' work more fully. I think a focused conversation on the relative roles of artists and label, as well as the artist's role in controlling their work in traditional and new media, can hasten that day. If the legislative roundabout on the work-for-hire issue concluded today can serve as such a beginning, then it has served a useful purpose.

I commend this legislation to my colleagues. At this time I also wish to thank my colleagues in the House and Senate who have supported this legislation, and the recording artists and labels who have worked together on this legislation and who will begin the task of exploring what more comprehensive settlement we might reach with regard to the status of sound recordings under the copyright law, which will allow them to continue their creative works.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, more than a week ago I came to the floor to be sure the record was clear that all Democrats had cleared for final passage H.R. 5107, the Work for Hire and Copyright Corrections Act of 2000. I urged the Senate to take up H.R. 5107 without further unnecessary delay. I am glad that the majority has finally decided that action on this consensus bill is appropriate. I still do not know what caused the unexplained 2-week delay on the Republican side.

Representatives BERMAN and COBLE deserve credit, along with the interested parties, for working out a consensus solution in this legislation. The purpose of this bill is to restore the status quo ante, as it existed before November 29, 1999 regarding whether a sound recording can qualify as a "work made for hire" under the second part of the definition of that term in section 101 of the Copyright Act, and to do so in a manner that does not prejudice any person or entity that might have interests concerning this question. The House held an oversight hearing to explore this matter earlier this year and originated this legislation. This bill restores the law to the same place it was before the enactment of section 1101(d) of the Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act of 1999, as enacted by section 1000(a)(9) of Public Law Number 106-113, so that neither side is prejudiced by what was enacted at the end of 1999 or by what is being enacted now. This bill does not

express or imply any view as to the proper interpretation of the work made for hire definition before November 29, 1999. Thus, neither the enactment of section 1101(d) nor this bill's deletion of that language are to be considered in any way or otherwise given any effect by a court or the Copyright Office when interpreting the work made for hire definition.

I congratulate Congressmen BERMAN and COBLE on final passage of this measure.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 5107) was read the third time and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate immediately proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations on the Executive Calendar: Nos. 715 and 716. I finally ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Robert N. Shamansky, of Ohio, to be a Member of the National Security Education Board.

Robert B. Pirie, Jr., of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Those confirmed are Robert Shamansky, to be a member of the National Security Education Board, and Robert Pirie to be Under Secretary of the Navy. I wish them congratulations.

DIRECTING THE RETURN OF CERTAIN TREATIES TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: A resolution (S. Res. 267) directing the return of certain treaties to the President.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 4313

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Senator HELMS has an amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.