

As a small label owning mostly in-copyright works, I have mixed feelings about some of the proposals put forward.

One has to remember that EMI, for example, have never considered it important to lobby to extend their rights until now. Only the continued saleability of artists approaching OOC status (such as the Beatles) has drawn their attention to the fact they may be losing something important. If they were concerned with music rather than money, I would have more sympathy with them.

I would hope that the major labels who have shown no interest whatsoever in preserving or reissuing their heritage material, OOC or otherwise, would not succeed in having the extension granted retrospectively, this would be a death-knell for small reissue labels if they were required to pay for OOC recordings coming back into copyright.

I would suggest that a short extension period of, say, five years be granted so that those companies who choose to make their archives available on CD would be given license to continue to enjoy copyright within that time and possibly for a further period of five years. Those companies who do not make the recordings available would see their recordings go out of copyright as before.

Allowing large conglomerate companies to protect material they have no interest in releasing or licensing to third parties would, in my view, be unfair to the many small companies who perform a valuable service to those who appreciate old recordings by making them available, often with little sales expectation. A workable solution, if a copyright extension is granted, might be a compulsory license to allow the manufacture of a limited quantity of recordings (say 200) over 50 years old on the payment of a lump sum to be divided between the owning company and the National Sound Archive.

I hope you will consider these, or similar, proposals.

Yours truly

John Beecher
Rollercoaster Records