

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 214, nays 203, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

YEAS—214

Aderholt	Gibbons	Pappas
Archer	Gilchrest	Parker
Army	Gillmor	Paxon
Bachus	Gilman	Pease
Baker	Goodlatte	Peterson (PA)
Ballenger	Goodling	Petri
Barr	Goss	Pickering
Barrett (NE)	Graham	Pitts
Bartlett	Granger	Pombo
Barton	Greenwood	Porter
Bass	Gutknecht	Portman
Bateman	Hansen	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hastert	Quinn
Bilbray	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Bilirakis	Hayworth	Redmond
Bliley	Hefley	Regula
Blunt	Herger	Riggs
Boehlert	Hilleary	Riley
Boehner	Hobson	Rogan
Bonilla	Hoekstra	Rogers
Bono	Horn	Rohrabacher
Brady	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Bryant	Hunter	Roukema
Bunning	Hutchinson	Royce
Burr	Hyde	Ryun
Burton	Inglis	Salmon
Buyer	Istook	Saxton
Callahan	Jenkins	Scarborough
Calvert	Johnson (CT)	Schaefer, Dan
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Schaffer, Bob
Campbell	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Canady	Kasich	Sessions
Cannon	Kelly	Shadegg
Castle	Kim	Shaw
Chabot	King (NY)	Shays
Chambliss	Kingston	Shimkus
Chenoweth	Klug	Shuster
Christensen	Knollenberg	Skeen
Coble	Kolbe	Smith (MI)
Collins	LaHood	Smith (NJ)
Combust	Largent	Smith (OR)
Cook	Latham	Smith (TX)
Cooksey	LaTourette	Snowbarger
Cox	Lazio	Solomon
Crane	Leach	Souder
Crapo	Lewis (CA)	Spence
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Stearns
Cunningham	Linder	Stump
Davis (VA)	Livingston	Sununu
Deal	LoBiondo	Talent
DeLay	Lucas	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Dickey	McCollum	Thomas
Doolittle	McCrery	Thornberry
Dreier	McDade	Thune
Duncan	McHugh	Tiahrt
Dunn	McIntosh	Traficant
Ehlers	McKeon	Upton
Ehrlich	Mica	Walsh
Emerson	Miller (FL)	Wamp
English	Molinar	Watkins
Everett	Morella	Watts (OK)
Ewing	Myrick	Weldon (FL)
Fawell	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)
Foley	Neumann	Weller
Fowler	Ney	Whitfield
Fox	Northup	Wicker
Franks (NJ)	Norwood	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Nussle	Young (FL)
Gallegly	Oxley	
Ganske	Packard	
Gekas		

NAYS—203

Abercrombie	Bentsen	Boswell
Allen	Berman	Boyd
Andrews	Berry	Brown (CA)
Baesler	Bishop	Brown (FL)
Baldacci	Blagojevich	Brown (OH)
Barcia	Blumenauer	Capps
Barrett (WI)	Bonior	Cardin
Becerra	Borski	Carson

Clay	Hulshof	Pascrell
Clayton	Jackson (IL)	Pastor
Clement	Jackson-Lee	Paul
Clyburn	(TX)	Payne
Coburn	Jefferson	Pelosi
Condit	John	Peterson (MN)
Conyers	Johnson (WI)	Pickett
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Coyne	Kanjorski	Poshard
Cramer	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kennedy (MA)	Rahall
Danner	Kennedy (RI)	Rangel
Davis (FL)	Kennelly	Reyes
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Rivers
DeFazio	Kilpatrick	Rodriguez
DeGette	Kind (WI)	Roemer
Delahunt	Klecza	Rothman
DeLauro	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Dellums	Kucinich	Rush
Deutsch	LaFalce	Sabo
Dicks	Lampson	Sanders
Dingell	Lantos	Sandlin
Dixon	Levin	Sanford
Doggett	Lewis (GA)	Sawyer
Dooley	Lipinski	Schumer
Doyle	Lofgren	Scott
Edwards	Lowey	Serrano
Engel	Luther	Sherman
Ensign	Maloney (CT)	Sisisky
Eshoo	Maloney (NY)	Skaggs
Etheridge	Manton	Skelton
Evans	Markey	Slaughter
Farr	Martinez	Smith, Adam
Fattah	Mascara	Smith, Linda
Fazio	Matsui	Snyder
Filner	McCarthy (MO)	Spratt
Flake	McCarthy (NY)	Stabenow
Foglietta	McGovern	Stark
Ford	McHale	Stenholm
Frank (MA)	McIntyre	Stokes
Frost	McKinney	Strickland
Furse	McNulty	Stupak
Gejdenson	Meehan	Tanner
Gephardt	Menendez	Tauscher
Goode	Millender-	Taylor (MS)
Gordon	McDonald	Thompson
Green	Miller (CA)	Thurman
Gutierrez	Minge	Tierney
Hall (OH)	Mink	Turner
Hall (TX)	Moakley	Velazquez
Hamilton	Mollohan	Vento
Harman	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Hastings (FL)	Murtha	Waters
Hefner	Nadler	Watt (NC)
Hill	Neal	Waxman
Hilliard	Oberstar	Weygand
Hinchey	Obey	Wise
Hinojosa	Olver	Woolsey
Holden	Ortiz	Wynn
Hooley	Owens	
Hoyer	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—17

Ackerman	McInnis	Towns
Boucher	Meek	Wexler
Forbes	Metcalfe	White
Gonzalez	Sanchez	Yates
Houghton	Schiff	Young (AK)
McDermott	Torres	

□ 2054

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODIFICATION IN APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule X the Chair announces the following modification to the conference appointment to the bill, H.R. 1119:

Mr. MCKEON is added to the panel from the Committee on National Security to follow Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

The first proviso to the panel from the Committee on Resources is stricken.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

REPORT ON POLICY ON PROTECTION OF NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE AGAINST STRATEGIC ATTACK—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on National Security:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 1061 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1997, attached is a report, with attachments, covering Policy on Protection of National Information Infrastructure Against Strategic Attack.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 28, 1997.

□ 2100

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CALLING ON HCFA TO STOP RESTRICTING USE OF MULTIDEX BY DENYING REIMBURSEMENT WHEN IT IS USED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Duncan] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, every year 54,000 Americans lose a foot or a leg to diabetes. As terrible as this is, one thing that makes this statistic especially heartbreaking is that many thousands of these amputations could have been prevented were it not for Federal redtape. Two-thirds of all amputations in diabetic patients are precipitated by traumatic foot ulceration, which could have been prevented with proper care and modern medical products that are already available.

However, Federal bureaucrats at the Health Care Financing Administration, HCFA, are restricting FDA-approved dressings which have been proven to heal these types of wounds. If this is not a scandal, I do not know what is, people who are having amputations thanks to our own Federal bureaucracy.

Just think how wonderful it will be if we could prevent up to two-thirds of these 54,000 diabetic amputations each year. Sadly, it seems that the Medicare system sometimes gives little or no incentives to doctors, nursing homes, or hospitals to help their patients get better quickly because as long as they are

treating patients they are getting payments from the Government. There are better ways to treat patients, Mr. Speaker, especially diabetic patients.

To get more specific, Mr. Speaker, there is a product approved by the FDA which has been shown through repeat success to have healed repeatedly diabetic ulcerations and to have eliminated the need for amputations. This product is called Multidex. HCFA, however, is restricting the use of Multidex through bureaucratic redtape and needless Government road blocks. The way they are restricting the use of Multidex is by routinely denying reimbursement to providers who use it on patients.

If ever there was an effective way to stop the use of a medicine or a medical product, this is it. This is because most of the patients who have these amputations are senior citizens who are on Medicare. Between the ages of 65 and 74, nearly 17 percent of the U.S. white population, 25 percent of African-Americans, and more than 33 percent of Hispanic-Americans have diabetes. Each year we are spending \$1.5 billion on diabetic amputations. Within 3 years of a major amputation 30 to 50 percent of diabetic patients will die, yet many thousands of these amputations could be prevented with proper care, and this product Multidex, which is being restricted by HCFA, is the most effective treatment available today for these diabetic ulcerations.

I would like to show four pictures, Mr. Speaker, which demonstrate the effectiveness of Multidex, and I apologize for the graphic nature of these pictures, and while these pictures all show the same foot at different stages, and these are the same case, huge numbers of pictures and tests and data have been presented to HCFA from many, many other cases showing similar results.

This first photograph shows the foot of a 75-year-old diabetic patient with a massive ulcer of the right foot. It is a stage four wound with heavy infection, gangrene, and amputation of the left toe. The second photograph shows the same foot 19 days after treatment with Multidex has begun. The infection has cleared, and the healing has begun. The third photograph shows the same foot 25 days after the treatment with Multidex has begun. It is obvious that the treatments are working. The final photograph shows the same foot at the time of discharge. Without Multidex or some similar product this foot would probably never have healed. The foot might have had to have been amputated if Multidex had not been used.

This is obviously a situation where the system has broken and needs fixing. Clearly helping the body to heal itself is a much better choice than amputation from both a quality-of-life point of view and a cost-of-Medicare point of view.

If any part of the Federal Government needs reinventing, Mr. Speaker, it is Medicare. Here is a vital Government service where artificial barriers

need to be broken down and effective products like Multidex need to get to these desperately ill patients. I call on HCFA to stop restricting the use of Multidex by denying reimbursement when it is used. It is a scandal of major proportions to think that thousands of senior citizens might have to have amputations in the next few months because of this bureaucratic redtape.

USDA ACCOUNTABILITY AND EQUITY ACT OF 1997

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, when the history of this century is written, it is my hope that the year 1997 will be recorded as significant in the effort to change the course and the culture of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Known as the People's Department, USDA was established when President Lincoln signed the law on May 15, 1862. It is ironic that the very Department created by the President who signed the Emancipation Proclamation today faces widespread and documented charges of unfair and unequal treatment to socially disadvantaged and minority farmers.

Farmers and ranchers are invaluable resources to all of us. The farmers and ranchers of America, including minority and limited resource producers through their labor sustain each and every one of us and maintain the lifeblood of our Nation and the world. These people do not discriminate. Their products are for all of us. Therefore, it is important that we do all within our power to ensure that each and every producer is able to farm without the additional burden of institutional discrimination rearing its ugly head.

It greatly concerns me, Mr. Speaker, that in my home State of North Carolina there has been a 64-percent decline in minority farmers just over the last 15 years, from 6,996 farms in 1978 to 2,498 farms in 1992.

There are several reasons as to why the number of minority and limited resource farmers are declining so rapidly, but one that has been documented time and time again is the discriminatory environment present in the Department of Agriculture, which was the very agency established by the U.S. Government to accommodate and to assist the special needs of all farmers and ranchers.

Mr. Speaker, the issue was first raised in 1965, when the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights established that USDA discriminated both in internal employee action and external program delivery activities. An ensuing USDA employee focus group in 1970 reported the USDA was callous in their institutional attitude and demeanor regarding civil rights and equal opportunity.

In 1982, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights examined this issue a second

time and published a report entitled "The Decline of Black Farming in America." The Commission concluded that there were widespread prejudicial practices in loan approval, loan servicing, and farm management assistance as administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

However, as no improvement was forthcoming, in 1990 the House Committee on Government Operations, chaired by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] investigated this matter again. In their report entitled "The Minority Farmer: A Disappearing Resource; Has the Farmers Home Administration Been the Primary Catalyst?", the same conclusion was reached in 1990 as had been reached in 1982. That conclusion was that, "Ironically, the Farmers Home Administration had been a catalyst in the decline of minority farming."

In 1997, the General Accounting Office published yet another report on the matter, entitled "Farm Programs: Efforts to Achieve Equitable Treatment to Minority Farmers." While much of the report was inconclusive due to its limited scope, the GAO did find instances of discrimination. Two cases out of the 28 closed in fiscal year 1995 and 1996. The GAO also found that the disapproval rate for loans was 6-percent higher for minority farmers than the 10-percent rate for the non-minority farmer.

The very next month, two additional reports were released: The Office of Inspector General Evaluation report for the Secretary on Civil Rights Issues and the Civil Rights Action Team report. The authors of these hard-hitting reports came to the identical conclusion that those who had looked at this issue 32 years previously, there are significant problems with discrimination within the Department of Agriculture.

On February 28, 1997, the Civil Rights Action Team report was issued and entitled "Civil Rights at the United States Department of Agriculture." It was done by the Civil Rights Implementation Team at USDA, and it documents the decades of discrimination against minorities and women within the Department. Ninety-two recommendations for change were made in the report, 13 which require legislation action.

I have introduced the bill, H.R. 2185, that seeks to implement most of those legislative recommendations within the CRAT report. The bill is entitled the "USDA Accountability and Equity Act of 1997." It consists of three titles; title I, Program Accountability, making changes to the structure of the county committees as well as to the status of county committee employees. County committees are retained, and the tenure of county committee employees is preserved and protected. Title II, Program Equity, makes provisions for those producers who are of marginal financial standing to continue to participate in USDA loans and programs. These provisions recognize