If a friend or family member is exhibiting these signs, you or someone else should urge them to seek medical attention immediately. These signs can save your life or the life of someone you care about.

A recent study indicates that by being prepared for cardiac emergencies, you can increase your chances of survival. The study found that individuals who were properly instructed on how to recognize and respond to cardiac emergencies had a significantly higher survival rate than those who were not.

Some women are at higher risk for heart disease. Common symptoms in women include:

- Unusual chest pain or discomfort
- Shortness of breath
- Nausea or vomiting
- Palpitations or rapid heartbeat
- Lightheadedness

These symptoms can often be mistaken for other conditions, such as anxiety or stress. It is important to seek medical attention if you or someone you know experiences these symptoms. Early intervention can make a significant difference in outcomes.

In conclusion, taking an active role in your heart health is crucial. By being informed, prepared, and proactive, you can help prevent heart disease and ensure a healthier future for yourself and those you love.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 1976 Act, the Act represented “a break with the two-hundred-year-old tradition of American copyright law” and “a 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 their publications, faced a stable secondary market. After giving an article to a publisher for use in a particular collective work, an author could sell the same article to another publisher, in a 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 respectful attorney for a major publisher observed that with the passage of §201(c), authors “are much more able to control publishers’ use of their works 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 reproduce 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 101 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 of copyright owners are reproduction, distribution, and display of the works. 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 right to reproduce 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 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. Accounting history appears to be moving in the direction of a networked environment, CD-ROM distribution is likely to become a less significant means of exploitation. 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 decision in Tasini certainly 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,” but the “use 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 individuals other 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 §101, it was clear that the display of works over information networks could displace traditional means of reproduction and delivery of copies. The 1965 Supplement to 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 result of the advent of electronic data displays where information 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 composition etc.) may well be given wide public dissemination by exhibition on mass communication 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 instances.” 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 conducting 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’ contributions in an electronic environment “by focusing on the medium-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 or means of reproduction,” and the Act in §102’s provision that copyright protection subsists in works of authorship fixed in “any tangible medium of expression,” the fact remains if the Second Circuit’s opinion is affirmed, an injunction to remove these contributions from electronic databases is by no means a foregone conclusion. Tasini is not limited to those cases where freelance contributions have been infringed does not necessarily require that electronic databases be dismantled. Certainly future databases may be more difficult to obtain permission retroactively for past infringements, but the lack of permission should not require

REPRESENTATIONS OF COLLECTIVE WORKS

Although §201(c) provides that publishers may reproduce and distribute a contribution to a collective work for their own use in conditions that may contain every part of an original collective work, as well as any part of that work.

Although “revision” is not defined in Title 17, both common sense and the dictionary tell us that a database 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 articles are disseminated 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 revised version and 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 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 recognized 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’ individual articles.

It is clear that the databases involved in Tasini constitute, in the words of the legislative history, “new,” “entirely different” or “the resulting work is but a new arrangement or coordination of the preexisting material” contained in the databases provide evidence of any similarity to the original collective works to indicate that 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 of revenue to freelance authors, if the Second Circuit’s opinion is affirmed, an injunction to remove these contributions from electronic databases is by no means a foregone conclusion. Tasini is not limited to those cases where freelance contributions have been infringed does not necessarily require that electronic databases be dismantled. Certainly future databases may be more difficult to obtain permission retroactively for past infringements, but the lack of permission should not require
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.