

of activity following his departure from the House of Representatives, provides me with a shining example of what can be accomplished after leaving this House.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank my colleague and friend, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, for organizing this fitting tribute to a true American legend. I am proud to rise today to add my voice in paying tribute to one of the visionary leaders of the people's House. John Anderson never lost sight of who he represented in Congress and his approach to his duties is something we all can learn from.

John Anderson has been a lot of things. He has been a Republican. He has been an Independent. He has been a distinguished member of this body for 20 years, a Presidential candidate, and a respected law professor. He has fought for electoral reform, U.N. reform and human rights. He has been a friend: to my uncle, Mo Udall, to many other former and current Members of Congress, and to the people of Illinois and the entire United States.

But there are some things John Anderson has never been. He has never been one to blindly accept the status quo. He has never been a man who got stuck in the rigidity of party politics. Perhaps most importantly, he has never been a man to give up; and today, John Anderson is still fighting for what he believes in and teaching a new generation of leaders to do the same.

I remember John Anderson as the man who stood with my uncle to put millions of acres of pristine Alaskan wilderness under federal protection. It's a sad irony that as we celebrate his 80th birthday, many in this Congress want to open up this national treasure to oil exploration. I'm quite certain that had John Anderson's voice been heard here in Congress we might have had a different result.

I remember him as the brave fighter for campaign finance reform who could not reconcile the tremendous power of wealthy special interests with his vision of this republic. I am happy that we have finally passed meaningful campaign finance reform legislation this year, and that John Anderson was able to celebrate with us.

Even when he was in the House, John always put principle ahead of party. He did so when he supported partial public financing of elections; he did so when he became one of the first Congressmen to call for a balanced national energy policy; and he did so again when he publicly questioned the Nixon Administration's illegal expansion of the war in Southeast Asia.

I particularly want to draw attention to John's strong support of campaign finance reform. For me, that's the issue where John showed real courage and leadership. Not only was John's work on this issue a break from party politics, it laid the groundwork for later, more successful efforts to try to get money out of politics. The important work done in this Congress to reform the Nation's election laws was made possible in large part by the brave stand taken by John Anderson and those like him decades ago.

John once said that when big money rules, ordinary voters get left in the cold. And he saw the fight against money in politics as no less than a crusade to purify and strengthen the institution of government so that ordinary people could once again have their voices heard by those who represent them. But John didn't just

talk about reform; John crossed party lines to support the Mo Udall Public Financing bill and other reform proposals during this tenure in the House.

Today, John is still working to reform our system of elections. While he is now calling for more dramatic changes in the way we elect our officials, he has never lost sight of the need to free our system of the pernicious influence of money.

Again, I am proud to be here to honor John Anderson. He was—and still is today—a true American leader. All of us here in this body owe him our admiration and gratitude for his years of public service—both in elected politics and in his private life. Thank you John Anderson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

AFRICAN FOOD CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, last week I was here on this floor for an hour speaking of the crisis in southern Africa, speaking about the famine, speaking about southern Africa's plight. Approximately 13 million people in southern Africa are in danger of starvation. Last week, I talked about the fact that people were resorting to eating whatever they could find, dirt, bugs, weeds, whatever could fill their stomachs. I talked about the depiction of this famine on ABC last week. I raised the question of why it has taken us so long to respond to what is now impending death in these six nations. I have asked over and over again for this issue to be addressed in the Congress of the United States.

On July 18, the Secretary-General of the United Nations launched the consolidated national appeals for the humanitarian crisis in southern Africa. The United Nations is requesting \$611 million for immediate food, medicine, and other emergency assistance to respond to this crisis. This assistance is needed within the next 2 months. It cannot wait until next year.

In the midst of this crisis, the administration is proposing to cut total funding for food assistance programs by 18 percent. This would reduce food assistance funds from over \$2 billion in fiscal year 2002 to less than \$1.7 billion in fiscal year 2003. This lower level of funding would have to provide for the continuing needs of Afghanistan as well as the emerging famine in southern Africa.

On June 20, 2002, I sent a letter to the conferees on H.R. 4775, the Supplemental Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2002, asking them to provide an emergency supplemental appropriation

of \$200 million to respond to the food crisis in southern Africa. This letter explained that an emergency appropriation is essential to enable the United States Government to provide desperately needed assistance to millions of starving people. Sixty-two Members of Congress signed my letter. Unfortunately, the conference committee reported the conference report for the supplemental appropriations act last Friday and provided not one dime, no additional assistance, for southern Africa. This conference report is scheduled to come to the House floor tomorrow. I urge my colleagues to recommit this conference report to the conference committee with instructions to add at least \$200 million for famine relief for southern Africa.

According to Mr. Kenzo Oshima, the United Nations Under Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, there still is an opportunity to avert famine and save lives, but this window is closing rapidly. We cannot afford to wait until fiscal year 2003. We cannot even wait until Congress returns in September. We must recommit the conference report with instructions to add immediate funding for famine relief. The people of southern Africa need our help now.

Mr. Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal includes an article on the United Nations' appeal for humanitarian assistance for the people of southern Africa. I submit this article for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, we can wait and wait and wait and then all feel very sorry when we see dying people in southern Africa depicted on television in the next few months. Or we can do something about it now. I would ask my colleagues to please join me and recommit the conference report so that we can add the needed \$200 million to avoid this devastation, this famine in southern Africa.

U.N. WARNS WEST TO ACT TO HELP SOUTHERN AFRICA AVOID FAMINE

(BY MICHAEL M. PHILLIPS)

WASHINGTON.—Nearly 13 million people in southern Africa face imminent starvation unless the U.S. and other wealthy nations contribute more than \$600 million in food, medicine and other emergency assistance over the next two months, the United Nations warned.

Drought conditions have left six nations struggling to meet their food needs, but a bad situation has been turned into an impending disaster by the repressive policies of Zimbabwean President Robert Mugabe, the U.N. said.

"It is not inevitable that people should die in substantial numbers," said Ross Moun-tain, the U.N.'s assistant emergency-relief coordinator.

So far, donor nations have pledged roughly \$170 million of the \$611 million the U.N. says it needs by September if a famine is to be averted in Malawi, Mozambique, Lesotho, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The U.S. has pledged \$98 million of that for food aid, and Mr. Mountain was in Washington to plead for more in meetings with the U.S. Agency for International Development and the National Security Council.

The brewing famine is the worst the region has seen since a drought 10 years ago threatened 18 million people, the U.N. said. But today's situation may prove even more disastrous. One difference, the U.N. said, is that now the working populations of the countries involved have been gutted by AIDS. In Zimbabwe, for instance, HIV infects 35% of pregnant women, and many households are now headed by children or grandparents.

Zimbabwe's government has pushed the region closer to the edge of catastrophe through policies that have devastated local food production and prevented private food aid from entering the country, the U.N. said. Mr. Mugabe, who kept power through an election widely criticized as rigged, has distributed white-owned commercial farms among his supporters—a politically popular but economically disastrous move in the view of the U.S., U.N., and other foreign entities. The government has barred food imports that don't go through official channels, the U.N. said.

The crisis "is very much complicated in the case of Zimbabwe by a number of policy decisions that have turned that country from one of the grain baskets of Africa into one of the basket cases of Africa," Mr. Moun-tain said.

Zimbabwe needs about half of the assistance the U.N. is requesting.

Sign Chavbonga, press counselor at the Zimbabwean Embassy in Washington, said the food situation is serious, but denied that government policies have worsened the effects of the drought. He said World Food Program aid is starting to reach drought-stricken areas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BLUNT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE HIGH COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to talk about the high cost of prescription drugs, more importantly, the price that Americans pay versus what people in most of the rest of the industrialized world pay for exactly the same drugs.

This particular chart is one that I have used many times here on the House floor and at town hall meetings back in my district. They are beginning to get dated and a little bit frayed, but I want to talk about some of the prices that Americans pay, and what we have listed here is roughly about a dozen of the most commonly prescribed drugs.

One that we have learned an awful lot about last fall when we had the anthrax scare here in Washington, and unfortunately four of our postal workers lost their lives to anthrax, we learned a lot about Cipro. Cipro is a drug made by a German drug manufacturer called Bayer. We in the United States know it as a company that became famous making aspirin, Bayer

Aspirin; but it is a German company, and they make a lot of other pharmaceuticals. But I wanted to point out to my colleagues what we pay for a 30-day supply on average for Cipro is about \$88. It is \$87.99 to be exact. That same drug in Europe sells for an average of about \$40.75, less than half the price for exactly the same drug.

I will say that Tommy Thompson, our Secretary of Health and Human Services, did a good job; he negotiated a very good price on the millions of capsules that we bought at the time that we were concerned about anthrax, and we still are concerned about anthrax, and he got a much better price than that, but this is what the average consumer would pay. A drug like Claritin, which is a very commonly prescribed drug this time of year for allergies that people have, in the United States the average price is \$89. That same drug on average sells in Europe for \$18.75. A drug that my father uses, my 84-year-old, soon to be 85-year-old, father takes a drug called Coumadin. Many seniors take Coumadin. It is a blood thinner and one of the most commonly prescribed drugs. A 30-day supply if you have to go down to your local pharmacy and pay for it yourself sells for about \$64.88. That exact same drug made in the same plant under the same FDA approval sells in Europe for about \$15.80. And so the list goes.

I am not here tonight to beat up on the pharmaceutical industry. It is really not so much shame on them, because they are only doing what any free market company would do and, that is, to exploit a market opportunity that they have.

□ 2115

So it is not shame on them. They have done a great job of developing many drugs that not only save lives but improve the quality of lives not only for Americans but for people around the world. The problem is that the way we have set this system up, because we do not require competition, we have created a monster and the monster is that we are paying literally all of the costs for the research for the rest of the world.

More importantly, there are estimates that at least 60 percent of the drug companies' profits come at the expense of American consumers.

I happen to believe that Americans ought to pay their fair share for prescription drugs. We are a very wealthy country. God has blessed this country. We are the most productive country in the world, and therefore we probably should pay more than the developing countries in Europe, but I do not think that American consumers should have to subsidize the starving Swiss. Let me say too, Mr. Speaker, these are not my prices. I did not make up this chart. These are from a group called the Life Extension Foundation which for more than a decade has been studying the differences between what Americans pay for prescription drugs and what the

rest of the world pays. I also want to point out a chart, because what we are seeing is an incredible inflation rate in the cost of prescription drugs, and what you see here from the latest estimates we have for 2001, prescription drugs went up in the United States about 19 percent. The average Social Security cost-of-living adjustment was a little less than 3½ percent. One does not have to have a degree in statistics to realize that this is unsustainable. We cannot live with this system. So some of us have come together and tried to put together a program that we think will work, and what we are going to be introducing is a bill here in the next several days that will make it very clear that Americans do have access to these drugs at world market prices and it is a simple bill that simply says if it is an FDA-approved drug made in an FDA-approved facility that both consumers and their pharmacists can import those drugs or reimport those drugs into American markets.

And how much can we save? Let me give you an idea. We estimate that you can save at least 35 percent on the drugs coming in, the same drugs made in the same FDA-approved facilities as opposed to what you will pay for them here in the United States. And to put a pencil to that, our own accounting experts, the people at the Congressional Budget Office, estimate that seniors alone over the next 10 years will spend over \$2 trillion on prescription drugs. Two trillion dollars times 35 percent is \$700 billion that we can save.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this very important legislation which will give Americans access to world market drugs at world market prices.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PLATTS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LANGEVIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ADERHOLT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ISRAEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ROGERS of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear