The memorial also recognizes officers who were placed in danger and survived. Named after Reno Police Officer James Hoff, who was killed in 1979 by the suspects he was investigating, the memorial hosts an annual ceremony attended by State and local officials and members of the law enforcement community. It is always a privilege to attend this annual event honoring the heroism of fellow Nevadans whose names and legacies are enshrined in this memorial.

At this year's ceremony, we honored and celebrated the life of Detective Chad Parque, who served with the North Las Vegas Police Department for 10 years. At just 32 years old, Detective Parque tragically lost his life after his department vehicle was struck head-on by another vehicle earlier this year. Detective Parque is survived by his wife, children, and siblings, and mourned by all of those who had the privilege to know him.

In describing Detective Parque, a fellow law enforcement officer said:

He was a ten-year officer and you could see the fire in his eyes as if he had just signed on. He loved his community.

He served with passion and dignity. He will never be forgotten for the many contributions to North Las Vegas and to our great State.

His plaque is now alongside other members of Nevada's law enforcement community who were enshrined on this memorial from past years and whose stories continue to inspire all of us.

In 2016, at least 144 law enforcement officers across this country lost their lives in the line of duty, a sharp increase from the previous year.

Let's not forget that behind the names—the many names—of those who have fallen are the people, spouses, children, and parents who may not have had a chance to say good-bye. Most of us will never know their pain, but we are deeply appreciative of their unwavering support for their community. While there is nothing we can do to bring back those who died in the line of duty, I am committed to doing everything I can at the Federal level to try to prevent it from happening to one more officer and one more family.

I am proud to support the Back the Blue Act, legislation that increases penalties for killing law enforcement officials. The bill ensures that anyone who purposely targets law enforcement should, and would, face justice for that crime.

The Nevada law enforcement community has my full support this Police Week—and every week and every day, each year they are on the job.

To all our law enforcement officials, we are all indebted to you and your families for all your sacrifices, and I am personally and sincerely grateful for your dedication to the people of Nevada.

To our protectors, our peacekeepers, and those who are first to answer the call for help and who run toward, not away, from danger, we thank you, and we honor you.

I yield the floor.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I oppose Jeffrey Rosen's nomination to be Deputy Secretary of the Department of Transportation. Mr. Rosen has a troubling history of standing with industry over consumers and opposing common sense public health and environmental protections.

In both his time as general counsel at the Department of Transportation in the George W. Bush administration and his private sector work on behalf of industry, Mr. Rosen advocated for limits on the agency's authority to protect health and safety through the regulatory process. In one case when he was at the Department of Transportation, the National Highway Transportation Safety Agency proposed a weak standard for the required strength of vehicle roofs, which could collapse in rollovers. In addition to the weak standard, the rule would make it difficult for consumers who had been in accidents to seek damages from the companies responsible.

Mr. Rosen has also repeatedly questioned the necessity of limiting carbon emissions from vehicles. He opposed efforts to improve fuel economy standards that have spurred innovation, cut pollution, and saved consumers at the pump.

Mr. Rosen's ideological approach to regulation appears bent on minimizing rulemaking at any costs, regardless of the need. He has advocated for one-in, one-out regulatory schemes and ''regulatory budgeting'' that place arbitrary limits that would interfere with the ability of agencies to implement the law.

Agency leadership must focus on their mission and use the best available science and data to guide implementation of the law. Based on Mr. Rosen's history, I am concerned that he may politicize rulemaking, so I must oppose his nomination today.

Mr. HELLER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

USER FEES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, last year seems like a long time ago, but just 5 months ago, 94 Members of this body voted for a bill called the 21st Century Cures Act. Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL called it the most important legislation of the year. The Presiding Officer, the Senator from Ohio, had a major role in that legislation, especially the part having to do with opioids. This was legislation to spur research and development of cures, devices, and treatments for some of the most deadly and some of the most stubborn illnesses and diseases.

Dr. Frances Collins, head of the National Institutes of Health—which he calls the ''National Institutes of Hope''—last year offered what he called bold predictions about major advances that we could expect over the next decade with a sustained commitment to medical research. One prediction of Dr. Collins is that science will find ways to identify Alzheimer's before symptoms appear, as well as how to slow down or even prevent the disease. Another is that doctors could use the patient's own stem cells to rebuild his or her heart. An artificial pancreas will help diabetes patients by tracking blood glucose levels and by creating precise doses of insulin. He also predicts a Zika vaccine, a universal flu vaccine, and an HIV/AIDS vaccine in the next 10 years. To relieve suffering and deal with the epidemic of opioid addiction, Dr. Collins predicts new, nonaddictive pain treatments to manage pain.

The 21st Centuries Cures Act became a law last year and authorized 4.8 billion new dollars for medical research, on top of the support Congress already provides through the annual appropriations process. Because of bipartisan support, that was an extra $2 billion last year and an extra $2 billion this year. The way we add up money around here, over 10 years, that is $20 billion over 10 years last year and another $20 billion this year, which includes the $4.8 billion authorized in the 21st Century Cures legislation, all for medical research.

The next step in our efforts to turn Dr. Collins' predictions into a reality and to help America's patients benefit from all the research we are helping support is to fund the Food and Drug Administration. The FDA, as we call it, is the agency responsible for making good on the promise of the 21st Centuries Cures Act to actually reach America's patients.

Before September 30 of this year, four different FDA user fee agreements need to be reauthorized. They need to be acted on by the Senate, by the House, and sent to the President of the United States. These user fees are paid by manufacturers of drugs and medical devices and account for $8 billion to $9 billion over 5 years and over a quarter of all FDA funding.

Last week, 21 of the 23 members of the Senate HELP Committee voted to send to the Senate floor a bill reauthorizing those four user fee agreements based on recommendations from industry and from the FDA after a thorough and lengthy public process.

The FDA Reauthorization Act, sponsored by me and by Senator MURRAY, the distinguished Senator from Washington who is the ranking Democrat on our Senate HELP Committee, reauthorizes the four user fee agreements that expire at the end of September. The four agreements are, No. 1, the prescription drug user fee, which accounted for 70 percent of the brand drug review budget last year; No. 2, medical device user fee amendments, which accounted for 36 percent of the medical device review budget in fiscal

year 2016; the generic drug user fee amendments, which accounted for over 75 percent of the generic drug review budget in fiscal year 2016; and the biosimilar user fee amendments, which accounted for 29 percent of the biosimilar review budget in fiscal year 2016.

So here is my message to colleagues: The U.S. Senate has the opportunity to provide Americans with a prompt, bipartisan reauthorization of the Food and Drug Administration user fee agreements and, in doing so, take the next crucial step in helping Americans see the benefits of the results of our 21st Century Cures Act passed last year. If we do not move quickly to pass these agreements in late July, the FDA will be forced to send layoff notices to more than 5,000 FDA employees to notify them that they may lose their job in 60 days.

As I said, these reauthorizations are based on recommendations both from industry and from the Food and Drug Administration after a thorough public process. The FDA posted meeting minutes after every negotiation and held public meetings before discussions began and to hear feedback on the draft recommendations last fall.

Patients were also involved in developing commitment letters. We have received support from patient groups asking us to authorize the agreements expeditiously.

In Congress, over the last 15 months, the Senate HELP Committee, of which I am chairman and Senator MURRAY is the ranking Democrat, had 15 bipartisan briefings, some of which were with the Energy and Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives, and heard, as well, from the FDA and industry about the reauthorization.

Our HELP Committee held two bipartisan hearings earlier this year on the Food and Drug Administration medical device and drug user fees and released a discussion draft of our legislation on April 14, which provided 2 weeks for public comment.

I go into all this because I want everyone to see how thoroughly this has been discussed and how important it is.

The committee then worked in a bipartisan way to incorporate comments from the public and from members of the committee.

The manager's amendment—which we approved in the committee last week, as I said, by a vote of 21 to 2—includes many priorities that are broadly bipartisan. Here are a few examples: legislation from Senators ISAKSON and BENNET to improve the medical device inspection process; a provision from Senator HASSAN, Democrat, and Senator YOUNG, Republican, to improve communication about abuse-deterrent opioid products; from Senators FRANKEN, Democrat, and Senator ENZI, Republican, a provision to encourage medical device development for children and make sure FDA has the appropriate expertise to review devices for children; from Senator BALDWIN, a provision to make sure the full experience of clinical trial participants is studied; from Senator BURR and Senator YOUNG, additional reporting to make sure that the FDA is meeting their goals and that we can do proper oversight of the new agreements. It includes legislation by Senators CASEY, FRANKEN, and WARREN on a pilot project on studying medical devices after approval to make sure they work as intended. A provision from Senator CASSIDY requiring additional guidance for complex generics, like EpiPens, so manufacturers know what they have to do to make a generic version, was also included. A provision to make new hearing aid technology available came from Senators WARREN and ISAKSON, as well as a provision from Senators ROBERTS, DONNELLY, and BURR to allow more appropriate classification of accessories used with medical devices.

In the committee markup last week, we unanimously adopted these bipartisan amendments, which follow: an amendment from Senator COLLINS, which reflected legislation from Senators COLLINS, FRANKEN, MCCASKILL, and COTTON on improving generic drug development and helping to lower prescription drug costs; an amendment from Senators HATCH, BURR, and CASEY to improve patient access to clinical trials.

A delay in reauthorizing these agreements would delay the review of drugs and devices submitted after last April 1—more than a month ago. If we don't pass these reauthorizations into law on time, which means by the end of July, an FDA reviewer who gets started reviewing a cancer drug submitted to the agency in April would be laid off on October 1, before the reviewer is able to finish his or her work. In addition to harming patients and harming families who rely on medical innovation, a delay in the reauthorization would threaten America's global leadership in biomedical innovation.

After reviewing the recommendations from industry and from the FDA, I am convinced these are good agreements for patients. The sooner we pass this legislation, the better, to give certainty to patients, doctors, FDA reviewers, and companies.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS' BENEFITS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2017

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 10, S. 419.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 419) to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefits program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 216) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The bill (S. 419), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 74, S. 139.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 139) to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 139) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Rapid DNA Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. RAPID DNA INSTRUMENTS.

(a) STANDARDS.—Section 210303(a) of the DNA Identification Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14131(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5)(A) In addition to issuing standards as provided in paragraphs (1) through (4), the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall issue standards and procedures for the use of Rapid DNA instruments and resulting DNA analyses.

''(B) In this Act, the term 'Rapid DNA instruments' means instrumentation that carries out a fully automated process to derive a DNA analysis from a DNA sample.''.

(b) INDEX.—Paragraph (2) of section 210304(b) of the DNA Identification Act of