

high esteem here? No matter how busy his schedule, he always took the time, and we would visit. So, I have lost a great friend, adviser, and teacher.

There is one other thing, though, I will not miss—his great negotiating ability on the first tee. He loved the game of golf, and he played it with great passion.

We do not say goodbye very often in our country; we just say, "So long." Even though our trails will part now, they will cross again someday.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO ALAN SIMPSON AND MARK HATFIELD

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, there are two others of my colleagues on this side of the aisle about whom I would like to speak briefly this morning. The first, of course, is one who has been the subject of innumerable tributes already, the wonderfully delightful and witty senior Senator from Wyoming, ALAN SIMPSON.

There is almost nothing I can say that can add to the tributes that have already been made. ALAN SIMPSON is unique. The single wittiest Member of the Senate, whose legion of stories is so great that you can hear one 3 years after you first heard it, without having listened to it in the interim, and it is as funny the second time as it was the first. I must confess there were a number that I tried to memorize so I could tell them myself. To be in a place of informality with ALAN and to listen to what he has to say is an extraordinary privilege.

But, of course, that does not make him a U.S. Senator. Commitment and hard work and dedication to principle are what make an outstanding Member of this or of any other legislative body. And the degree of thoughtfulness and attention that Senator SIMPSON has focused on a wide range of issues, those representing his own quintessential rural Western State, but even more significantly those that affect the future of the United States, its place in the world, its society and its culture, all have fallen within the ambit of ALAN SIMPSON's interest.

Whether it has been the almost constant support of a strong and successful foreign policy for the United States, whether it has been his thoughtful examination of questions relating to the budget and the tax relief of the American people, his dedication to seeing to it that this Congress and administration actually seriously begin the attempt of balancing the budget, whether it is on his latest crusade for more

thoughtful, balanced and strong immigration policy or a myriad of other issues, ALAN SIMPSON's views are sought out by his companions and given great weight by them.

Perhaps the finest symbol of the reach and scope of ALAN SIMPSON's interest and influence is his years of short radio debates with Senator KENNEDY, the leading Member of the other party. While I heard only a few dozen of them, each one shows Senator SIMPSON's patented wit, as well as his ability to get to the absolute heart of the particular issue.

Those are sets of qualities that are not likely soon to be duplicated here in the U.S. Senate, and as a consequence, every Member will miss ALAN SIMPSON as a U.S. Senator, and I believe I can say that every Member of the U.S. Senate will miss ALAN SIMPSON as a friend whom they see on each and every day.

Last in this series, but far from least, Mr. President, is my friend and neighbor, MARK HATFIELD, the senior Senator from Oregon. We are brought together, of course, by geography, by the fact that so many of the regional challenges that affect one of our States affects the other as well. By the very real geographic fact that rivers join together rather than separate and the boundary between our two States, through most of its length, is the Columbia River.

So, in any event, we would have been pushed together for the solution or for answers to these regional questions, but our association is far greater than that. I can say, Mr. President, that when I arrived in this body in 1981 and viewed my 99 colleagues, the single individual who most closely fit the best possible academic or idealistic profile of a U.S. Senator was MARK HATFIELD, in bearing, in demeanor, in dress, in voice, in mind and in ideas.

MARK HATFIELD is an individual who, as much as any other I ever met, is able to combine a great loyalty toward a set of ideas and directions which make and preserve a political party, with an independence of judgment and an unwillingness to delegate his final decisionmaking authority to anyone else. That is a very difficult balance, Mr. President, but MARK HATFIELD, I am certain from the beginning of his career, certainly during the 14 years that we have been here together, has perhaps best exemplified that wonderful balance: a chairman of an Appropriations Committee, tolerant, willing to listen to the views of others within his own party and in the other party, a firm and fine negotiator with whatever administration is in power, but at the same time, someone who never has lost sight of his goal of a more thoughtful, more peaceful, more generous America.

MARK HATFIELD's influence on this body will live for many years, perhaps for generations, after he has left. Others, beside myself, will look back and say that MARK HATFIELD was their ideal of what a U.S. Senator ought to be.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAREWELL TO SENATOR KASSEBAUM

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, for much of her life and political career, NANCY KASSEBAUM has been in the company of political giants. There was her father, Alf Landon, who had served as Governor of Kansas and was the Republican nominee for President in 1936. And there is that other Senator from Kansas, Bob Dole, who happens to be this year's Republican nominee for President.

Entering the U.S. Senate is intimidating enough—but to be following a path forged by two such powerful figures must have been truly overwhelming.

NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM was more than equal to the challenge. She quickly emerged as a thoughtful, powerful, and highly respected force in this Chamber.

In fact, she was elected to the Senate by defeating her opponent by a larger margin than had Senator Dole when he squared off against the same person.

In office, she established herself as a moderate, centrist force in her party and in the Senate, which she is. But Senator KASSEBAUM's moderation was never mistaken for lack of fortitude. No one can be more determined or more tenacious in pursuit of a cause or a principle.

Again, her service as chair of the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee has been characterized by fairness, tolerance, and moderation. It has been characterized by her efforts to make America a better place to live and work, as witnessed by her recent cooperation with Senator KENNEDY in securing passage of the Kennedy-Kassebaum legislation to improve access to decent health care for millions of Americans.

Indeed, Senator KASSEBAUM has worked to make life better for all people in all lands. As chair and ranking member of the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee, she has worked to improve the lives of the young and the impoverished on that continent.

There is an infectious optimism about her, as she has always found the glass half-full, and she has that wonderful ability to make others feel the same way. There is a basic decency about her as she always seeks the high road.

In announcing her retirement from the Senate, she did not disparage politics or politicians. There were no cheap

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