

v. *Arte Publico Press*, 59 F.3d 539, 548 (5th Cir. 1995), the University of Houston petitioned for certiorari. The Supreme Court remanded the case for reconsideration in light of its decision in *Seminole Tribe*. See *University of Houston v. Chavez*, 517 U.S. 1184 (1996). On remand, the Circuit panel majority concluded that Congress could not condition a state's activities that are regulable by Federal law upon their "implied consent" to be sued in Federal court, 157 F.3d 282, 287 (5th Cir. 1998), and that Congress could not use the Fourteenth Amendment to enforce the copyright and trademark laws, 157 F.3d at 287, 290. The *Florida Prepaid* decisions prompted the Circuit to return the case once again to the original panel for further consideration. Last month, that court decided that the University of Houston enjoyed sovereign immunity against suit in Federal court for copyright violations. *Chavez v. Arte Publico Press*, No. 93-2881, 2000 U.S. App. LEXIS 2490 (5th Cir. Feb. 18, 2000).

The final disposition of the *Chavez* case was in keeping with another Fifth Circuit panel's earlier conclusion that the State of Texas could raise sovereign immunity against a claim of copyright infringement by an artist who believes his work was infringed by the design of a Texas license plate, *Rodriguez v. Texas Commission on the Arts*, 53 U.S.P.Q.2d 1383 (5th Cir. 2000). In *Rodriguez*, the Circuit panel concluded that the rationale of *Florida Prepaid* applied squarely to copyright law and that the Copyright Clarification Act of 1994 (17 U.S.C. § 511) did not validly abrogate Texas' sovereign immunity against suits for copyright infringement. 53 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1384. Together, all of these cases create uncertainty for the uniformity and consistency of the United States intellectual property system and could raise substantial concerns for our international obligations in the field of intellectual property.

To address the issues raised by these cases, the USPTO has asked several Constitutional and intellectual property scholars to serve as panelists for a March 31 conference. The conference will also include state officials. Panelists for the March 31 conference will likely include the following individuals: Preeti Bansal (Solicitor-General of New York), Erwin Chemerinsky (University of Southern California Law School), Dan Farber (University of Minnesota Law School), Jane Ginsburg (Columbia Law School), Marci Hamilton (Cardozo Law School), John Jeffries (University of Virginia Law School), Mark Lemley (Boalt Law

School, Berkeley), Daniel Meltzer (Harvard Law School), Daniel Schweitzer (National Association of Attorneys-General), Eugene Volokh (UCLA Law School), and Ernie Young (University of Texas Law School). (Institutions and affiliations are listed for identification purposes only.) Other panelists are also being considered at this time.

The March 31 conference is intended to allow the panelists to engage in a broad discussion of all the issues raised by the *Florida Prepaid* cases. Conference attendees may provide their individual views, observations, proposals, and reports, both during and for a two week period after the conference. All such materials received by PTO will be made available to the public. PTO anticipates integrating the work of individual panelists into a final report from the conference, which will also be made available to the public.

The USPTO anticipates that there will be several morning and afternoon sessions, each devoted to specific issues, including, but not limited to: (1) The *Ex parte Young* doctrine as it applies to intellectual property cases; (2) Possible legislative approaches to abrogate Eleventh Amendment state sovereign immunity in intellectual property cases; (3) Possible systems for state waiver of Eleventh Amendment immunity, including those which couple waiver to participation in the Federal intellectual property system and/or full participation in specified spending programs of the Federal Government; (4) The adequacy of remedies in state courts for private intellectual property owners; and (5) The possible effects of the *Florida Prepaid* decisions on the United States' international obligations in the field of intellectual property. Some of these sessions may provide an opportunity for questions and answers with conference panelists.

Dated: February 24, 2000.

**Q. Todd Dickinson,**

*Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks.*  
[FR Doc. 00-5511 Filed 3-6-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-16-U**

---

**COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION**

**Notice of Meeting**

*Agency Holding the Meeting:* Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

*Time and Date:* 11:30 a.m., Friday, March 10, 2000.

*Place:* 1155 21st St., NW, Washington, DC, 9th Floor Conference Room.

*Status:* Closed.

*Matters to be Considered:* Rule Enforcement Review.

*Contact Person for More Information:* Jean A. Webb, 202-418-5100.

**Jean A. Webb,**

*Secretary of the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 00-5590 Filed 3-3-00; 11:36 am]

**BILLING CODE 6351-01-M**

---

**COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION**

**Notice of Meeting**

*Agency Holding the Meeting:* Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

*Time and Date:* 10 a.m., Wednesday, March 29, 2000.

*Place:* 1155 21st St., N.W., Washington, D.C., Lobby Level Hearing Room.

*Status:* Open.

*Matters to be Considered:* Public Hearing on the Proposed Revision of the Commission's Procedure for the Review of Contract Market Rules.

*Contact Person for More Information:* Jean A. Webb, 202-418-5100.

**Jean A. Webb,**

*Secretary of the Commission.*

[FR Doc. 00-5591 Filed 3-3-00; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6351-01-M**

---

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**Notice of Proposed Information Collection Requests**

**AGENCY:** Department of Education.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed information collection requests.

**SUMMARY:** The Leader, Information Management Group, Office of the Chief Information Officer, invites comments on the proposed information collection requests as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. On February 28, 2000 an emergency notice was published incorrectly. Comments should have been solicited for the information collection, "Criteria for Distribution of the \$134 million FY2000 Appropriation for School Improvement" instead of the "Guidance to SEAs on Procedures for Adjusting ED-Determined Title I Allocations to Local Educational Agencies (LEAs)." In addition, the notice should have stated that a regular collection was being processed as well. Therefore, this notice acts as the regular notice.