Social Security statute provides that this offset ends when the worker attains 65 years of age. Furthermore, while recipients of Social Security benefits who earn income have their Social Security benefits reduced as a result of their earnings, this offset is eliminated at retirement age (currently 65).

While all veterans who are subject to the concurrent receipt offset are unfairly penalized, my bill would begin to rectify the injustice which falls most heavily on our older veterans. This bill will promote fairness and equity between military retirees and Social Security retirees by eliminating the offset at age 65.

Military retirees who have given so much to the service of our country and suffered disease or disabilities as a direct result of their military service do not deserve to be impoverished in their older years by the concurrent receipt penalty.

I commend Mr. Bilirakis, an original cosponsor of this bill, for his longstanding efforts to address the problems our military retirees experience due to the statutory prohibition on concurrent receipt of military retirement pay and benefits from the Department of Veterans Affairs. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan effort to promote fairness for our Nation's older military retirees.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 2001

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in recognizing February as American Heart Month. I commend the American Heart Association and other organizations for their efforts to raise awareness of heart disease. Their work is essential to reducing the physical, emotional, and economic burden of heart disease on the American public.

Heart disease remains the number one killer in America. Currently 20 million Americans are living with some form of this disease. In 1997 alone, over nineteen thousand North Carolinians died of heart disease. Every American is at risk for heart disease, and most of us have loved ones who have suffered from some form of this disease. The financial cost to the American public is immense. Heart disease, together with stroke and other cardiovascular diseases, are estimated to cost approximately $300 billion in medical expenses and lost productivity in 2001.

One way each of us can help reduce the number of deaths and disability from heart disease is by being prepared for cardiac emergencies. Unfortunately, too many Americans do not know the warning signs of a heart attack. They include uncomfortable pressure, fullness, squeezing or pain in the center of the chest lasting more than a few minutes; pain spreading to the shoulder, arm or neck; and chest discomfort with lightheadedness, fainting, sweating, nausea or shortness of breath. If a friend or family member is exhibiting these symptoms, you can assist them by recognizing these signs, being prepared to call 9–1–1, and administering CPR if needed. Just knowing these signs can save your life or the life of someone you care about.

I urge each of us to dedicate ourselves to learning more about heart disease, how to prevent it, how to recognize it, and what to do if you suspect that someone is having a problem. In the meantime, Congress must continue its strong commitment to the National Institutes of Health so researchers have the tools necessary to find new ways to treat and cure this devastating disease.

TRIBUTE TO ZINOVY GORBIS

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 2001

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Professor Zinovy Gorbis, who will be celebrating his 75th birthday on March 3. Professor Gorbis, a faculty member of UCLA's Mechanical, Aerospace, and Nuclear Engineering Department, committed his life to studying the properties of solid particles suspended in gas or liquid. His contribution to the field deserves our respect and admiration. He is a prolific scientist, holding 17 patents and authoring three extensive field-defining papers and numerous articles. Long before environmental concerns led to the intensive study of aerosols, Professor Gorbis identified gas/liquid-solid systems as the 5th state of matter. His ideas on the unique properties of gas solid systems continue to influence and direct research throughout the world.

Despite the countless number of hours spent researching, Professor Gorbis still found time for his family. And he rarely passed up an opportunity to dance or play chess. Perhaps as well as anyone else, he has always understood the importance of life's simple treasures. Indeed, his passion for life helped him overcome formidable tribulations that most of us could not possibly imagine, As a teenager, he fled to the Soviet Union after German troops invaded his home and he experienced firsthand the horrors of war. As he grew older, he was never fully trusted because he was a Jew, despite the wide recognition and respect he received for his scientific work. In 1975, he was dismissed from his position and precluded from teaching when his oldest son, Boris, applied to leave the Soviet Union. A year later, he fled to Vilnius, Lithuania, waiting for the day that he could live in freedom and continue his crucial work. The Soviets, however, fervently refused to allow his family to emigrate, and Professor Gorbis spent the next decade in oblivion, measuring noise in elevator shafts while his wife suffered from a crippling bone disease.

In 1987, Professor Gorbis and his family were finally allowed to leave the Soviet Union. He soon settled in southern California with his family, where they flourished and became outstanding citizens. Once again, he was able to contribute to science with selfless devotion. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Professor Gorbis for his outstanding achievements. His scientific work and his passion for life inspire us all. We thank Professor Gorbis and wish all the best to him and his family on his 75th birthday.

A VIEWPOINT ON THE SUPREME COURT CASE NY TIMES V. TASINI

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 2001

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD this letter from Marybeth Peters, the Register of Copyrights at the U.S. Office of Copyrights, establishing her position on the U.S. Supreme Court Case, NY Times versus Tasini.

REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS,
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, February 14, 2001.

Congressman JAMES P. MCGOVERN,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN: I am responding to your letter requesting my views on New York Times v. Tasini. As you know, the Copyright Office was instrumental in the 1976 revision of the copyright law that created the publishers' privilege at the heart of the case. I believe that the Supreme Court should affirm the decision of the court of appeals.

In Tasini, the court of appeals ruled that newspaper and magazine publishers who publish articles written by freelance authors do not automatically have the right subsequently to include those articles in electronic databases. The publishers, arguing that this ruling will harm the public interest by requiring the withdrawal of such articles from these databases and irreplaceably destroying a portion of our national historic record, successfully petitioned the Supreme Court for a writ of certiorari.

The freelance authors assert that they have a legal right to be paid for their work. I agree that copyright law requires the publishers to secure the authors' permission and compensate them for commercially exploiting their works beyond the scope of section 201(c) of the Copyright Act. And I reject the publishers' protests that recognizing the authors' rights would mean that publishers would have to remove the affected articles from their databases. The issue in Tasini should not be whether the publishers should be enjoined from maintaining their databases of articles intact, but whether authors are entitled to compensation for downstream uses of their works.

The controlling law in this case is 17 U.S.C. §201(c) which governs the relationship between freelance authors and publishers of collective works such as newspapers and magazines. Section 201(c) is a default provision that establishes rights when there is no contract setting out different terms. The pertinent language of §201(c) states that a publisher acquires ''only'' a limited presumptive privilege to reproduce and distribute an author's contribution in ''that particular collective work, any revision of that collective work, and any later collective work in the same series.''

The Supreme Court's interpretation of section 201(c) will have important consequences for authors in the new digital networked environment. For over 20 years, the Copyright Office worked with Congress to undertake a major revision of copyright law, resulting in enactment of the 1976 Copyright Act. That Act included the current language of §201(c), which was finalized in 1965 of interests.

Although, in the words of Barbara Ringer, former Register and a chief architect of the

1976 Act, the Act represented ''a break with the two-hundred-year old tradition that has identified copyright more closely with the publisher than with the author'' and focused more on safeguarding the rights of authors, freelance authors have experienced significant economic loss since its enactment. This is due not only to their unequal bargaining power, but also to the digital revolution that has given publishers opportunities to exploit authors' works in ways barely foreseen in 1976. At one time these authors, who received a flat payment and no royalties or other benefits from the publisher, enjoyed a considerable secondary market. After giving an article to a publisher for use in a particular collective work, an author could sell the same article to a regional publication, another newspaper, or a syndicate. Section 201(c) was intended to limit a publisher's exploitation of freelance authors' works to ensure that authors retained control over subsequent commercial exploitation of their works.

In fact, at the time §201 came into effect, a respected attorney for a major publisher observed that with the passage of §201(c), authors ''are much more able to control publishers' use of their work'' and that the publishers' rights under §201(c) are ''very limited.'' Indeed, he concluded that ''the right to include the contribution in any revision would appear to be of little value to the publisher.'' Kurt Steele, ''Special Report, Ownership of Contributions to Collective Works under the New Copyright Law,'' Legal Briefs for Editors, Publishers, and Writers (McGraw-Hill, July 1978).

In contrast, the interpretation of §201(c) advanced by publishers in Tasini would give them the right to exploit an article on a global scale immediately following its initial publication, and to continue to exploit it indefinitely. Such a result is beyond the scope of the statutory language and was never intended because, in a digital networked environment, it interferes with authors' ability to exploit secondary markets. Acceptance of this interpretation would lead to a significant risk that authors will not be fairly compensated as envisioned by the

THE PUBLIC DISPLAY RIGHT

Section 106 of the Copyright Act, which enumerates the exclusive rights of copyright owners, includes an exclusive right to display their works publicly. Among the other exclusive rights are the rights of reproduction and distribution. The limited privilege in §201(c) does not authorize publishers to display authors' contributions publicly, either in their original collective works or in any subsequent permitted versions. It refers only to ''the privilege of reproducing and distributing the contribution.'' Thus, the plain language of the statute does not permit an interpretation that would permit a publisher to display or authorize the display of the contribution to the public.

The primary claim in Tasini involves the NEXIS database, an online database which gives subscribers access to articles from a vast number of periodicals. That access is obtained by displaying the articles over a computer network to subscribers who view them on computer monitors. NEXIS indisputably involves the public display of the authors' works. The other databases involved in the case, which are distributed on CD–ROMs, also (but not always) involve the public display of the works. Because the industry appears to be moving in the direction of a networked environment, CD–ROM distribution is likely to become a less significant means of disseminating information.

The Copyright Act defines ''display'' of a work as showing a copy of a work either directly or by means of ''any other device or process.'' The databases involved in Tasini clearly involve the display of the authors' works, which are shown to subscribers by means of devices (computers and monitors).

To display a work ''publicly'' is to display ''to the public, by means of any device or process, whether the members of the public capable of receiving the performance or display receive it in the same place or in separate places and at the same time or at different times.'' The NEXIS database permits individual users either to view the authors' works in different places at different times or simultaneously.

This conclusion is supported by the legislative history. The House Judiciary Committee Report at the time §203 was finalized referred to ''sounds or images stored in an information system and capable of being performed or displayed at the initiative of individual members of the public'' as being the type of ''public'' transmission Congress had in mind.

When Congress established the new public display right in the 1976 Act, it was aware that the display of works over information networks could displace traditional means of reproduction and delivery of copies. The 1965 Supplementary Report of the Register of Copyrights, a key part of the legislative history of the 1976 Act, reported on ''the enormous potential importance of showing, rather than distributing copies as a means of disseminating an author's work'' and ''the implications of information storage and retrieval devices; when linked together by communications satellites or other means,'' they ''could eventually provide libraries and individuals throughout the world with access to a single copy of a work by transmission of electronic images.'' It concluded that in certain areas at least, '''exhibition' may take over from 'reproduction' of 'copies' as the means of presenting authors' works to the public.'' The Report also stated that ''in the future, textual or notated works (books, articles, the text of the dialogue and stage directions of a play or pantomime, the notated score of a musical or choreographic composition etc.) may well be given wide public dissemination by exhibition on mass communications devices.''

When Congress followed the Register's advice and created a new display right, it specifically considered and rejected a proposal by publishers to merge the display right with the reproduction right, notwithstanding its recognition that ''in the future electronic images may take the place of printed copies in some situations.'' H.R. Rep. No. 89-2237, at 55 (1966).

Thus, §201(c) cannot be read as permitting publishers to make or authorize the making of public displays of contributions to collective works. Section 201(c) cannot be read as authorizing the conduct at the heart of Tasini.

The publishers in Tasini assert that because the copyright law is ''media-neutral,'' the §201(c) privilege necessarily requires that they be permitted to disseminate the authors' articles in an electronic environment. This focus on the ''media-neutrality'' of the Act is misplaced. Although the Act is in many respects media-neutral, e.g., in its definition of ''copies'' in terms of ''any method now known or later developed'' and in §102's provision that copyright protection subsists in works of authorship fixed in ''any tangible medium of expression,'' the fact remains that the Act enumerates several separate rights of copyright owners, and the public display right is independent of the reproduction and distribution rights. The media-neutral aspects of the Act do not somehow merge the separate exclusive rights of the author.

REVISIONS OF COLLECTIVE WORKS

Although §201(c) provides that publishers may reproduce and distribute a contribution to a collective work in three particular contexts, the publishers claim

Although ''revision'' is not defined in Title 17, both common sense and the dictionary tell us that a database such as NEXIS, which contains every article published in a multitude of periodicals over a long period of time, is not a revision of today's edition of The New York Times or last week's Sports Illustrated, A ''revision'' is ''a revised version'' and to ''revise'' is ''to make a new, amended, improved, or up-to-date version of'' a work. Although NEXIS may contain all of the articles from today's New York Times, they are merged into a vast database of unrelated individual articles. What makes today's edition of a newspaper or magazine or any other collective work a ''work'' under the copyright law—its selection, coordination and arrangement—is destroyed when its contents are disassembled and then merged into a database so gigantic that the original collective work is unrecognizable. As the court of appeals concluded, the resulting database is, at best, a ''new anthology,'' and it was Congress's intent to exclude new anthologies from the scope of the §201(c) privilege. It is far more than a new, amended, improved or up-to-date version of the original collective work.

The legislative history of §201(c) supports this conclusion. It offers, as examples of a revision of a collective work, an evening edition of a newspaper or a later edition of an encyclopedia. These examples retain elements that are consistent and recognizable from the original collective work so that a relationship between the original and the revision is apparent. Unlike NEXIS, they are recognizable as revisions of the originals. But as the Second Circuit noted, all that is left of the original collective works in the databases involved in Tasini are the authors' contributions.

It is clear that the databases involved in Tasini constitute, in the words of the legislative history, ''new,'' ''entirely different'' or ''other'' works. No elements of arrangement or coordination of the pre-existing materials contained in the databases provide evidence of any similarity or relationship to the original collective works to indicate they are revisions. Additionally, the sheer volume of articles from a multitude of publishers of different collective works obliterates the relationship, or selection, of any particular group of articles that were once published together in any original collective work.

REMEDIES

Although the publishers and their supporters have alleged that significant losses in our national historic record will occur if the Second Circuit's opinion is affirmed, an injunction to remove these contributions from electronic databases is by no means a required remedy in Tasini. Recognizing that freelance contributions have been infringed does not necessarily require that electronic databases be dismantled. Certainly future additions to those databases should be authorized, and many publishers had already started obtaining authorization even before the decision in Tasini,

It would be more difficult to obtain permission retroactively for past infringements, but the lack of permission should not require

issuance of an injunction requiring deletion of the authors' articles. I share the concern that such an injunction would have an adverse impact on scholarship and research. However, the Supreme Court, in Campbell versus Acuff-Rose Music, Inc., and other courts have recognized in the past that sometimes a remedy other than injunctive relief is preferable in copyright cases to protect the public interest. Recognizing authors' rights would not require the district court to issue an injunction when the case is remanded to determine a remedy, and I would hope that the Supreme Court will state that the remedy should be limited to a monetary award that would compensate the authors for the publishers' past and continuing unauthorized uses of their works. Ultimately, the Tasini case should be about how the authors should be compensated for the publishers' unauthorized use of their works, and not about whether the publishers must withdraw those works from their databases.

Sincerely,

MARYBETH PETERS,
Register of Copyrights.

HONORING REVEREND WENDY WARD BILLINGSLEA

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 2001

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in extending deep gratitude to The Reverend Wendy Ward Billingslea for her many years of service to St. Thomas Episcopal Parish School and Church.

Mother Wendy has blessed South Florida with her tireless devotion as a preacher, pastoral counselor, and teacher. At St. Thomas Episcopal Parish, where Mother Wendy worked as an associate rector for the last five years, she demonstrated her strong dedication to the children of our community as she instilled within them her passion for academics and for traditional family values. Mother Wendy continues to be a positive role model for all present and former students at St. Thomas Episcopal School and she embodies community leadership as she ministers to a congregation of 1500 members.

The St. Thomas Episcopal family will suffer a great loss with Mother Wendy's departure, but we wish her well on her new calling as the spiritual leader at St. Andrew's Episcopal Church in Greensboro, North Carolina.

Mother Wendy and her family, Art, Lauren, Kristin and Katie, have all played an important role in the life and ministry of St. Thomas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in extending best wishes to Mother Wendy and in thanking her for the many ways in which she has touched the lives of South Floridians.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ROBERTA CHEFF BROOKS

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 2001

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to the attention of my colleagues the contributions of a great public servant, Roberta Cheff Brooks, on the occasion of her retirement from service to the House of Representatives and to the constituents of the 9th District of California. On February 21st, after more than 30 years in the United States Congress, Roberta will retire from her position as my District Director in our Oakland District office. She will be greatly missed.

Roberta, a native of Wilmington, Delaware received her Bachelor of Arts from Smith College in 1964. She moved to Berkeley, California in 1967 and became very active in local and anti-war politics.

She began her tenure with the House of Representatives in 1971 by working for my former boss, colleague and friend Congressman Ron Dellums. Roberta served as a liaison between the Berkeley Coalition and the Dellums for Congress campaign in 1970. Following that successful campaign, she was asked to work for the new Congressman Ron Dellums in his district office on constituent affairs.

Roberta was a strong voice in the anti-Vietnam War movement. While she worked hard to serve as an active voice for constituent's of the 9th District, she remained active in local politics through the April Coalition and later through Berkeley Citizens' Action.

Roberta's commitment to her community expanded as she became deeply involved with local boards and organizations, as well as, ad hoc groups that included the following: Oakland Perinatal Project (which was the precursor of the East Bay Perinatal Council) and the Coalition to Fight Infant Mortality. With these affiliations, she helped organize ad hoc hearings on infant mortality, which Congressman Dellums chaired as the Chairman of the D.C. Committee.

Roberta was a cofounder of the California Health Action Coalition which worked diligently on the bill Congressman Dellums introduced calling for a National Health Service. She was also part of a national coalition for a National Health Service and helped organize national groups working in several cities in the country to garner support for the bill.

She helped organize hearings on homelessness which Congressman Dellums chaired in Oakland. She served on the advisory board of Legal Assistance for Seniors for many years. She was also on the Board of the Coalition for the Medical Rights of Women and the Perinatal Health Rights Committee.

Roberta organized hearings chaired by Congressman LANTOS who came at the request of Congressman Dellums to investigate labor and safety issues related to the protracted Summit Hospital strike. The hearings contributed to a resolution of the strike and led to a more responsive board which included additional community members.

Roberta's commitment to "free speech" and community supported radio led her to serve on the local advisory board of KPFA radio for a number of years and on the national Pacifica Board of Directors for nine years.

When the 1993 Base Realignment and Closure Commission slated Oak Knoll Naval Hospital, Alameda Naval Station and Naval Rework facility, as well as, the Public Works Center located at Naval Supply Center, Oakland for closure, Roberta joined Sandre Swanson in establishing the East Bay Conversion and Reinvestment Commission. That Commission then proceeded to help establish the Alameda and Oakland Reuse authorities—public bodies on which Roberta served as an alternate and then later as a principal commissioner. These organizations focused on base conversions and provided oversight on reuse plans to convert the military bases to peacetime operations.

Throughout the base conversion process, Roberta's emphasis remained on the human resources component—job creation for workers; working to establish the homeless collaborative which worked with both reuse authorities to create a process which HUD has described as a model for accommodating the homeless in base closure; working hard with the community advisory groups; and working with public benefit conveyances. Roberta cites this as an extremely important part of her work especially since it was so creative, establishing policies and procedures for base closure. She assisted in developing a way to "sell" the federal worker to private industry, and other important projects.

Roberta has worked closely with all of the community health clinics in the district; Chabot Observatory; the Ed Roberts Campus at Ashby BART station; HIV/AIDS; Cuba; issues related to the elderly; and many others. She served on both Congressman Dellums' and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE'S political advisory boards throughout her career.

Her casework load has focused on Federal Workers compensation; Office of Personnel Management (which was known as the Civil Service Commission), and at other times, Social Security and EEOC. She has served thousands of constituents for Congressman Dellums and Congresswoman BARBARA LEE.

When Congressman Dellums retired in February of 1998, Roberta continued her Congressional career with me in April of that same year. She became my District Director and was the first female District Director in the history of the 9th Congressional District. Every member will attest that having a staff member with the ability to develop expertise quickly and thoroughly on a wide range of issues is extremely valuable. With Roberta on my team, I knew that I was getting the best political advice in order to make competent legislative and policy decisions.

Roberta represented me well on many issues and continued to handle some casework as well as extensive issues related to base closures, health, and homelessness. She helped coordinate a major Housing Summit which was sponsored by the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation in August 2000 which was attended by seventeen members of Congress and more than five hundred people.

Roberta is best known for her sound advice. Ron Dellums has said, "the only reason I did anything was because Roberta Brooks told me