to insure as many of those 10 million children as possible.

Finally, I also want it to be known to the Republican leadership that we need to make sure that environmental protection is a priority in this budget. It is very important to give the EPA the tools to ensure safe drinking water, clean air, and clean oceans, and I personally will fight to keep the commitment to American families for a healthy environment.

Again, Madam Speaker, although I think the problem that I see right now, there are already rumblings by the Republican right to increase the amount of the tax cuts with further cuts in many of these important family first agenda programs, and if the Republican extremists succeed, then American families will be the ones who suffer in the end.

Hopefully, this budget agreement, which I expect to be adopted today, will be the beginning of a process that makes sure that the tax cuts in the budget are mainly targeted to the average working American, and the same is true with the spending priorities, that they help the average American family and not just the wealthy.

INTRODUCTION OF THE AMTRAK PRIVATIZATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HEFLEY. Madam Speaker, what do the Americans think of when they hear the statement ''free of Federal subsidy''? What about ''self-sufficiency''? I think these terms refer to programs that receive no Federal funding. It means that the program runs like a business and its survival is dependent upon its business practices and its customers.

Madam Speaker, someone needs to tell this to Amtrak. Tom Downs, Chairman and CEO of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, or Amtrak, has been frequently quoted as saying Amtrak could become a self-sufficient operation if Congress would give it a permanent source of funding.

Amtrak was created in 1970 as an independent and self-sufficient corporation and was given a one-time grant of $40 million. Twenty-seven years and $19 billion later, I would think Amtrak and Congress would realize that a dedicated funding source is not going to help passenger railroads make money or become self-sufficient. But Amtrak continues to cry ''Show me the money.''

Madam Speaker, let us face it. Amtrak is in crisis. The question is not whether Amtrak can reach sufficiency by 2002, as mandated by Congress. The question has become will Amtrak still be in business next spring?

As long as the Federal Government is involved in Amtrak it will not survive, and it is not as if we have not seen the light at the end of the tunnel. In 1995, with Congress pushing for a balanced budget and making cutbacks, Amtrak realized that they could no longer depend on the Federal Government for nearly a billion dollars every year. To their credit they did what a number of large corporations have done in the 1990's. They undertook a major corporate restructuring and began to look at themselves as a business. They reduced services on 16 routes across the country and saved about $54 million. They cut staffing and tried to improve service and make rail travel more attractive to the average consumer.

Amtrak has shown that if the tough decisions are made money can be saved. Much of the problem, however, is not Amtrak's fault; we are to blame. See, Federal law is prohibiting Amtrak from making the most out of their staffing reductions or forcing Amtrak to provide ridiculously generous severance packages and preventing them from making the truly tough business decisions, and as long as the Federal dollar keeps flowing to Amtrak, we will always attach a fistful of strings.

Today I am reintroducing the Amtrak Privatization Act. Some people will call this the Amtrak killer. I call these reforms Amtrak's only chance for survival. My bill will do three very important things that I think will help Amtrak survive. First of all, we need to let Amtrak operate like a business. Congress should not mandate what routes the trains take or where they should stop. Congress should no more force Amtrak to run an unprofitable route than mandate what items a local mom and pop shop stocks.

The Amtrak Privatization Act will free Amtrak from those Federal controls and allow them to make the necessary cuts to survive. Some routes may be eliminated. But remember, Amtrak has said it will be out of business by next spring if nothing is done. That means all routes would then be eliminated.

So let us say Amtrak eliminates some routes and must lay off some rail workers as a result. Congress has mandated that a laid off Amtrak employee receive up to 6 years full pay, 6 years. Show me another employee who gets full pay for 6 years after being laid off. My bill will allow them to receive a more reasonable 6 months pay after being laid off. Amtrak's labor agreements have got to go.

Finally, this bill creates a glidepath toward self-sufficiency in 2002. Until Amtrak gets off the Government till, including stealing gas tax dollars to support rail, Congress will be trying to mandate how it should operate. I contend if we take all Federal control over Amtrak away, including Federal dollars, Amtrak will find a way to survive. If we do not, Amtrak will stop rolling perhaps even next spring.

IT IS TIME TO ENFORCE HELMS-BURTON AGAINST THE CASTRO REGIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss an important issue: How do we rid Castro, or Cuba I guess, of the despot Castro, is what I should say? Today is May 20. This is known as Cuban Independence Day, when Cuba was granted independence from Spain as a result of the Spanish-American War. However, the Cuba of today is looking for a new independence, one that grants them freedom from the hideous dictatorship of Fidel Castro.

Cuba has been under a dictatorship for about 38 years now. It is no secret that Fidel Castro is still exercising his power in a manner contradictory to the most basic human rights held by all people. This is an absolute disgrace that such a regime exists only 90 miles from my home State of Florida. We, as a Nation, must work to correct this. We should have a long time ago.

Sometimes the only way to undermine a dictatorship short of some direct military force is through the pocketbook. In the past, Cuba could rely heavily on Soviet assistance for propping up its economy. Now that the Soviet Union no longer exists, Cuba must find benefit from a great deal of foreign investment and trading. It has done just that. According to the Cuban Government, 260 joint ventures were concluded by the end of 1996, with more than $2.1 billion in foreign capital.

Madam Speaker, we obviously cannot block all trade with Cuba without a little blockade of the island. However, we can work for a free Cuba that respects human rights in another manner. To that end Congress did its job in 1996 and passed the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, otherwise known as Libertad or Helms-Burton. This legislation tightened the screws on Castro and had a solid chance for significant impact in bringing down the Castro dictatorship. It would have done so through three significant provisions. It codified all existing Cuban embargo Executive orders and regulations, it denied admission to the United States to aliens involved in the confiscation of United States property in Cuba or the trafficking of confiscated property in Cuba, and it allowed U.S. nationals to sue for money damages in U.S. Federal court those persons that traffic in United States property confiscated in Cuba when Castro took over.

The first of these provisions may not be waived by the President, but the President was granted authority to waive title III in Helms-Burton, in part allowing U.S. nationals to sue in Federal court, if he determines that such a delay would be in the national interest

and would expedite a transition to democracy in Cuba. It is unfortunate that President Clinton, on January 3, 1997, decided to waive title III of Helms-Burton for the second time and has indicated that come the early part of July he will probably waive it for the third time. It was an outrageous move that kowtowed to our allies and to the business interests abroad rather than to the American national security interests.

It is outrageous because the biggest problem facing us is seeing the demise of the Castro dictatorship in Cuba is not a mystery at all. It is our allies in Europe, Canada, and Mexico who trade with Castro, sustaining his illegitimate regime. What is most disturbing is that some foreign firms not only work with Castro, but do so using stolen U.S. property.

When Castro took power in Cuba, he confiscated private property of countless United States firms and interests. Not only did he rob these Americans of their rightfully owned property, he then continued to use these assets, retaining the profits to sustain his regime. This continues to this day.

Furthermore, there are private foreign interests taking advantage of the confiscated property, making money in Cuba on stolen United States property. Practices such as this should not be tolerated anywhere in the world regardless of the circumstances. This unjust enrichment is taking place in Castro's Cuba despite the fact that title III of the Helms-Burton Act would have stopped that from happening.

□ 1045

It would have placed a significant disincentive to deal in confiscated U.S. property, making foreign firms benefiting from unjust enrichment in Cuba subject to United States lawsuits, United States courts, if they do business in the United States.

Even though President Clinton succumbed to the interest of foreign businesses and waived title III, just the threat of sanctions resulted in several foreign companies reconsidering their investments in Cuba. If the current administration would actually follow through and implement all of Helms-Burton, we would see a great number of foreign interests reconsidering their Cuban involvement, thereby cutting off critical cash to the Castro regime.

Unfortunately, President Clinton has made a horrible decision, knowing that the business interests of our neighbors are putting pressure on those governments, and those governments on our governments. Instead, he has thwarted the national interests of our people in bringing democracy and respect of human rights to Cuba and of our private citizens and businesses who would have the right to recover their lost profits from foreign profiteers dealing in property stolen by Castro if they could just sue in United States courts.

Is the administration going to continue to look the other way, or will the United States actually work for democracy in Cuba? When are the tough decisions going to be made that will actually bring Castro down?

What has happened is a picture of hypocrisy. The law was signed with much fanfare and praise that Cuba would finally see some measures, only to have those tough measures immediately waived after enactment, and then again in January of this year, and probably again in July. Is that responsible? Is that honest? Madam Speaker, it is not.

I urge the enforcement of the Helms-Burton Act and will submit a bill in July to make sure that that waiver provision no longer exists if Mr. Clinton continues to waive that provision.

CARDIAC ARREST SURVIVAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PRYCE of Ohio). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I am here to talk about a bill that I will be introducing today. The bill I am referring to is the Cardiac Arrest Survival Act. If this bill should become law, I say to my colleagues, it has the potential of saving thousands of lives each year.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to work with the American Heart Association on this important measure. Passage of this act would go a long way toward making the goal of saving the lives of people who suffer from sudden cardiac arrest possible. It would ensure that what the American Heart Association refers to as a cardiac chain of survival could go into effect.

Madam Speaker, the four links in a cardiac chain of survival are, one, early access to emergency care; early cardiopulmonary resuscitation; early defibrillation, which I will explain later; and early advanced life support.

While defibrillation is the most effective mechanism to revive a heart that has stopped, it is also the least accessed tool we have available to treat victims suffering from heart failure.

Perhaps it would be helpful for those of my colleagues listening and not well versed on the subject if I just take a moment and walk you through what we mean when we use the term ''defibrillation.''

A large number of sudden cardiac arrests are due to an electrical malfunction of the heart called ventricular fibrillation, or VF. When VF occurs, the heart's electrical signals, which normally induce a coordinated heartbeat, suddenly become chaotic and the heart's function as a pump abruptly stops. Unless this state is reversed, then death will occur within a few minutes, 160 seconds. The only effective treatment for this condition is defibrillation, the electrical shock to the heart.

My colleagues might be interested to know that more than 1,000 Americans each and every day suffer from cardiac arrest. Of those, more than 95 percent die. My colleagues, I find that unacceptable, because we have the means at our disposal to change those statistics, and that is why I am committed myself to this cause.

Studies show that 250 lives can be saved each and every day from cardiac arrest by using the automatic external defibrillator [AED]. Those are the kinds of statistics that nobody can argue with. Right now, the chance of survival due to sudden cardiac arrest is less than 1 in 10. We could change those odds for people through the development of model state training programs for first responders.

Madam Speaker, did my colleagues know that for each minute of delay in returning the heart to its normal pattern of beating it decreases the chance of that person's survival by 10 percent? Currently, only 14 States offer CPR training in schools and 28 States authorize first responders to use automatic external defibrillators. However, less than one-half of emergency medical technicians and less than one-fourth of nonemergency medical technician first responders in the United States are even trained or equipped with a defibrillator. Fortunately, one of those States is my State of Florida.

No one knows when sudden cardiac arrest might occur. According to a recent study the top five sites where cardiac arrest occurs, and I will list them in order of prevalence, at airports, county jails, shopping malls, sports stadiums, and golf courses.

I believe we all should take great comfort in knowing that those who are rushed to help us, to resuscitate us, have the most up-to-date equipment available and are trained to use it.

Some of my colleagues might ask, if 27 States have laws authorizing nonemergency medical technician first responders to use AED's, why do we need to pass this legislation? The reason is quite simply that prehospital medical care, which includes training, equipment, and standards of care, experiences variations from State to State, which in turn delivers inconsistent care to the public. Some might say that this is just another Federal mandate. They would be wrong in that assumption.

This legislation merely directs the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute to develop and disseminate a model State training program for first responders and bystandards in lifesaving first aid, including CPR, and direct the development of model State legislation to ensure access to emergency medical service.

Several of my colleagues might ask, will this not cost a lot of money? No, it will not cost the Government any money because we would encourage the private sector, such as those working in the medical community, to form a partnership with industry to help defray the costs. Overall, we envision this