by focusing on historical figures who were models of compassion and service. Students in the class decided two years ago to focus on the land mine issue, which had been championed by Britain's Princess Diana before her 1998 death.

About two dozen students from the class formed the Land Mine Awareness Club, designed a multimedia presentation on the world land mine problem, and chose the village of Podzvizd in northwestern Bosnia-Herzegovina as a ''sister city.'' The students began taking their presentation to churches, civic groups and other organizations throughout Bergen County, explaining the dangers of land mines and appealing for donations to help remove land mines in Podzvizd.

The students soon formed a non-profit organization, Global Care Unlimited Inc., in order to collect donations on behalf of Podzvizd. In addition to the presentations by the club, the school's 800 students began a campaign of selling paper butterflies—representative of the deadly ''butterfly'' model of land mine—that raised $6,000. To date, the students have raised a total of approximately $15,000 in donations. Last week, Global Care signed an agreement with the U.S. State Department, which will match the private donations dollar for dollar under its Global Humanitarian Demining Program. In all, $30,000 is now available to remove hundreds of mines from a field near a school in Podzvizd.

Global Care Unlimited declares part of its goal to be ''to develop student leadership potential in the areas of organization, communication and technology in the service of humanitarian ideals.'' The students participating in this project have, in fact, learned how to establish a formal, non-profit organization, have learned communication skills by working with the local media and technological skills in putting together the multimedia presentation used in their fund-raising efforts.

Special recognition must go to Mr. Hyman, a teacher who has made a difference not only in the lives of his own students but for the residents of Podzvizd as well. These students clearly took to heart the lessons they learned in this class and put them to use—in my mind, they have become ''heroes of conscience'' themselves.

Mr. Speaker, land mines are horrible enough when used during time of war by soldiers of one army against those of another. But land mines are unlike other weapons that observe a cease-fire when the war ends. Instead, they lie dormant, their locations often forgotten and difficult to find even if records are available. Civilians return to areas that were once battlefields and become victims of land mines even years after a conflict has ended. Approximately 110 million live land mines are estimated to be buried around the world today and one blows up every 22 seconds. Of those injured, 90 percent are civilians—more than one-third of them children. In nations such as Bosnia-Herzegovina, thousands of children with missing limbs are living evidence of the threat posed by land mines. And thousands of others have died as a result of the mines.

That is why I wrote to President Clinton last year, urging him to join the world effort led by Canada to ban anti-personnel land mines. In addition, I have co-sponsored the Land Mine Elimination Act, which would prohibit federal funds from being spent to deploy new anti-personnel land mines. A total of 156 nations support a complete ban of land mines, as do international leaders such as General Norman Schwarzkopf, Pope John Paul II and Bishop Desmond Tutu. I will continue to work hard to achieve the goal of ridding the globe of this man-made menace. This horror cannot be allowed to continue.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating these young people on the magnanimous humanitarian effort. We can all learn from the example offered by these youth. If I may quote from the Book of Isaiah, ''. . . and a little child shall lead them.''

VETERANS' COMPENSATION EQUITY ACT OF 2001

HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 14, 2001

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing H.R. 609, the ''Veterans' Compensation Equity Act of 2001''. This legislation will provide more equitable treatment to approximately 150,000 older veterans who receive service-connected disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs and who are also eligible to receive retirement pay based upon their military service.

Under current law, the amount of military retirement pay received by a military retiree is reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis by the amount of VA service-connected disability compensation the military retiree receives. This reduction in military retirement pay when the military retiree is in receipt of service-connected disability compensation is intended to prevent dual compensation. The notion of dual compensation is simply erroneous. Service-connected disability benefits are paid to compensate a veteran for an injury or illness incurred or aggravated during military service. Retirement benefits are paid to military retirees who have spent at least 20 years of their lives serving our country as members of the Armed Forces. These two programs—military retirement pay and service-connected disability compensation—are completely different programs with entirely different purposes. Payments made by these programs are not and should not be considered duplicative.

The current treatment of military retirees who have service-connected disabilities is simply inequitable. A veteran receiving service-connected disability compensation could become eligible for civil service retirement based on his or her subsequent work as a civilian employee of the federal government. This individual, unlike the military retiree, can receive the full amount of both of the retirement benefit which has been earned and the service-connected disability compensation for which he or she may be eligible.

The ''Veterans' Compensation Equity Act of 2001'' will reduce and then eliminate the offset in military retirement benefits for veterans who are entitled to both military retirement pay and service-connected compensation benefits. Under this bill the offset will be completely eliminated when the retiree reaches age 65.

In many cases, retired military personnel are fortunate enough to have retired from military service unscathed. These military retirees are not eligible to receive VA compensation due to illnesses or injuries incurred or aggravated during their military careers. In addition to receiving military retirement pay they are able to earn additional income through non-military employment and thereby accrue Social Security or other retirement income benefits.

Military retirees who were not so fortunate, are required to forfeit a portion or all of their military retirement pay in order to receive service-connected compensation benefits due to illnesses or injuries which were incurred or aggravated during their military careers. Before we consider tax relief for our Nation's wealthiest citizens, we should allow military retirees to receive the full amount of the retirement benefits they have earned through many years of devoted military service and compensation for illnesses or injuries which were incurred or aggravated during their military careers. These veterans, as a result of their service-connected medical conditions, face diminished employment possibilities and therefore a diminished ability to earn additional income through civilian employment. They may completely lose the opportunity to accrue Social Security or other retirement income benefits.

In general, Social Security disability benefits received by retirees are offset by monies received under state Worker's Compensation and similar public disability laws. However, the 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 compromises reached in the 1976 Act. The result would be an unintended windfail for publishers of collective works.

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