

jokes or cheap shots. Instead, she announced her retirement by encouraging young Americans to choose politics as a future endeavor.

"Politics is the lifeblood of democracy," she explained. "We have become a great nation because so many Americans before us chose to be involved in shaping our public life, focusing our national priorities, and forging consensus to move forward."

Now, as NANCY KASSEBAUM moves forward to the next phase in her life—as she says, "to pursue other challenges, including the challenge of being a grandmother"—I, and every Member of this Chamber, wish her the best.

FAREWELL TO SENATOR BROWN

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I have had the good fortune to know Senator HANK BROWN for some time.

Since being elected to the Senate in 1990, he has been a tenacious advocate for the principles he holds, especially on matters of fiscal restraint. His service on the Senate Judiciary, Veterans' Affairs, and Budget committees were all marked by his consistent support of conservative-Republican causes.

But, I point out, Mr. President, that while few people can be as vigorously partisan in pursuit of the causes in which they believe, even fewer people could be more respectful or more polite in their opposition.

Senator BROWN is genuinely liked and admired by Members on this side of the aisle, many of whom he has worked with during his service on the Senate Budget, Judiciary, Foreign Relations, and Veterans' Affairs committees. This also includes those he worked with under difficult, strenuous circumstances like the Clarence Thomas hearings and the BCCI scandal. Furthermore, he has worked with Democrats to help preserve our precious, but limited environment, through efforts like getting the Rocky Mountain Arsenal declared a national wildlife refuge. Working with HANK BROWN has been a pleasure.

Although he is leaving us after only one term, this worthy adversary, and the qualities he brought with him to the Senate, will be missed by Democrats and Republicans alike.

In announcing his retirement, Senator BROWN said that he was looking "forward to being full time in Colorado." I can understand and appreciate that. Colorado is a beautiful State filled with wonderful people. I wish him the best.

Mr. HATCH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION REFORM LEGISLATION IN THE 104TH CONGRESS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as the 104th Congress winds to a close, I wanted to take this opportunity to comment on the demise of the Food and

Drug Administration reform legislation.

It has been extremely disappointing to me that efforts to prod the FDA into meaningful reform have not been fruitful. It is doubly disappointing because, our colleague, Senator KASSEBAUM, and her staff have spent countless hours crafting a solid reform bill, a bill that won overwhelming, bipartisan support from the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

In remarks before this body earlier this year, I outlined my views on the need for FDA reform and the principles which should be embodied in any reform legislation. I continue to believe that reform of this tiny, but important, agency is sorely needed, reform that will both streamline its operations and preserve its commitment to ensuring the public health.

I know that many who have worked on the FDA issues are discouraged, but we can be proud of three significant reforms to food and drug law this year: the first being the drug and device export amendments I authored with Representative FRED UPTON; the Delaney clause reform embodied in the pesticide legislation the President recently signed; and the animal drug amendments so long championed by Senator KASSEBAUM. It seems, therefore, that the revolutionary course we charted for FDA reform at the beginning of the 104th Congress, evolved into a path evolutionary in nature, but still productive nonetheless.

Much more remains to be done, and I will continue to work with my colleagues next year to advance the work we started this year. There are many priorities for further action, among them—speeding up generic drug approvals, clarifying how tissue should be regulated, expediting medical device approvals, deficiencies in the foreign inspections program, and rigorous oversight of the Dietary Supplement Health and Education Act's implementation.

Another issue that I would like to see addressed next year is one that has been periodically on the FDA radar screen: the issue of national uniformity in regulation of products that fall within the FDA's purview.

In 1987, FDA Commissioner Frank Young, in response to California's Proposition 65, was on the verge of issuing an FDA regulation that would have acted to preempt certain warning statements required by the State of California. In fact, in August of that year, Commissioner Young wrote the Governor of California to underscore his concerns about the potential negative effect of Proposition 65 on "the interstate marketing of foods, drugs, cosmetics and other products regulated by the FDA."

Further, Commissioner Young pointed out that "the agency has adequate procedures for determining their safety and taking necessary regulatory action if problems arise."

Although ultimately this regulation was not issued, the 1991 Advisory Com-

mittee on the Food and Drug Administration, chaired by former FDA Commissioner and Assistant Secretary for Health, Dr. Charles Edwards, examined this issue. The panel recommended that Congress enact legislation, "that preempts additional and conflicting State requirements for all products subject to FDA regulation."

The issue of Federal preemption is extremely important for several industries, especially over-the-counter drugs, cosmetics, and foods. I was heartened when the Labor and Human Resources Committee approved Senator GREGG's amendment on national uniformity for over-the-counter drugs during consideration of the FDA reform legislation, S. 1477, but was disappointed that Senator GREGG did not extend the concept further in his amendment.

Let us take the cosmetics industry as a case in point.

In the United States, the cosmetics sector of the economy represents an estimated \$21 billion in annual sales, a significant amount by almost any measure. It consists of over 10 billion individual packages that move through the stream of interstate commerce annually. These include soap, shampoo, mouthwash, and other products that Americans use daily. These hundreds and hundreds of product lines, and thousands and thousands of products are each subject to differing regulation in the various States—even though all must meet the rigorous safety, purity and labeling requirements of Federal law.

Given this volume of economic activity, it is imperative that manufacturers be able to react quickly to trends in the marketplace; they must have the ability to move into new product lines and move in to and out of new geographic areas with a minimum—but adequate—level of regulation to ensure the products are not adulterated and are made according to good manufacturing practices.

Today, cosmetics manufacturers are competing more and more in a global economy, and are making products consistent with the international harmonization of standards in such large marketing areas as the European Union. A single nationwide system for regulating the safety and labeling of cosmetic products would be a great step in helping that industry move toward the international trends in marketing. At the same time, it would be a more efficient system, since allowing individual States to impose varying labeling requirements inevitably leads to higher prices.

In other words, the time has more than come for enactment of a national uniformity law for cosmetic regulation. It is my hope that this issue will be high on our congressional agenda next year.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to offer my great respects to Chairman KASSEBAUM for the hours, weeks and months of time she has devoted to the