

1,000 children, 100,000 children, or 5 children who will benefit from a cancer treatment because of this new requirement in which these adult drugs will have to be tested on children. We don't know.

Standing here today, believing that we all walk on Earth and our days are numbered to the glory and grace of God, frankly, we don't know if one of our own children, God forbid or someone we deeply love or one of our children's classmates will be impacted by pediatric cancer. But we know that 1 in about 300 children will be. So the chances are that at some point, we will once again have someone we care deeply about impacted. We hope that when that moment comes, if it does, that there will be options for their parents and their doctors and that they will have the opportunity to use for them treatments that perhaps would not have been available, had this requirement not been in the law. That is why I hope and I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in supporting this initiative.

In fact, sometimes we give these speeches with a sense of mystery: If this passes; if it doesn't pass; there is no reason this isn't going to pass. We all expect the FDA reauthorization bill to pass. I imagine when people vote on this tomorrow, they will read the title of the bill, "FDA Fee Reauthorization." It sounds like taking care of the normal course of business—it is important in its own right, by the way—that this is just this bureaucratic exercise to reauthorize an expiring law. Embedded in that law is a very important law, one that I hope will lead to real life-changing innovation in a way that will impact lives, change and save the lives of children here in our country but ultimately in other parts of the world as well.

That is why I felt it was important to come to the Senate floor and, obviously, urge my colleagues to support this initiative but also to urge my colleagues to be proud of it.

We are about to go home, whether it is tomorrow or next week, and answer to our constituents for all the things we didn't do. There are some significant issues we have not confronted and solved for the country, but this is a significant issue. There aren't going to be a lot of articles written about it; there aren't going to be blaring headlines on the websites about it, mailers and campaign commercials. That doesn't mean it isn't important. We live in a society where oftentimes good news doesn't draw ratings, and good news doesn't drive eyeballs and clicks to a website. It doesn't make it unimportant. It doesn't make it insignificant.

This is significant. This is an opportunity. This is evidence that more often than perhaps people realize, fellow Americans of different points of view, representing diverse States and communities, who approach the political process with very different ideologies and aims, come together to make a difference. I am pleased that

while there are many things we have not done, we will leave here tomorrow or next week knowing that at least we did one thing that will matter. It is an important thing because these children whom we are trying to help do not have the time to continue waiting for us to step up and take action.

I thank the Chair.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VERMONT POLICE CHIEF'S RESPONSE TO PRESIDENT TRUMP

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Brandon del Pozo proudly serves as the chief of police in Burlington, VT—Vermont's largest city. He arrived in Vermont 2 years ago, after serving for nearly two decades with the New York Police Department, where he rose through the ranks and learned hard lessons on the streets of such a large urban center. One needs only to sit with Chief del Pozo for a short while to understand his commitment to community service and to community.

So it comes as no surprise that Chief del Pozo grew alarmed when he heard President Trump recently tell a law enforcement gathering that police should not be "too nice" to those who are placed under arrest, seeming to suggest that police should go against the very policies that exist to protect against police misconduct. We cannot tolerate this kind of public comment and certainly not from the President of the United States. There is nothing the least bit humorous in any of this. In fact, President Trump's comments have undermined the efforts of police departments across our Nation to build trust within their communities at a time when that trust is most needed.

As a doctoral candidate holding three master's degrees, Chief del Pozo is well studied in the rules of engagement. He is also a talented writer. In an essay he submitted to CNN, Chief del Pozo responded directly to the President's comments, writing: "Policing requires dealing with the emotions cops are bound to feel when they witness the worst things one person can do to another. It is criminals who act on these emotions and attack other people. Restraint is what separates policing from vigilantism."

It is a viewpoint that is real, told through the eyes of an experienced street cop who works in reality, not reality TV. I ask unanimous consent that Chief del Pozo's full CNN essay be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From CNN, July 31, 2017]

TRUMP ON POLICE BRUTALITY: HAR HAR HAR

(By Brandon del Pozo)

When I was a New York Police Department cop in East Flatbush in 2000, I once rushed into an apartment building with fellow officers on a call of an assault. We found a boy in the hallway under attack. He was crying, and bleeding from stab wounds inflicted by his mother's boyfriend. The boy ran into my arms. Our sergeant confronted his attacker. He could have shot the man. Instead, he fought him into submission.

The boy had been stabbed because he had called the police while the man was attacking his mother. She was lying on the hallway stairs in a pool of blood. That her son had served as a distraction was probably the only reason she survived. "You saved our lives," the boy sobbed. He hugged me. His blood and tears wet my shirt.

As the suspect sat there in handcuffs waiting to be led away, I asked him why he had stabbed a child. "Boy gotta learn not to get in a man's business," he said. "So now he learned." A fury rose within me that nearly caused me to shake. "We should have shot you," I said.

But we didn't shoot him, nor did we lay a hand on him once he'd surrendered. Policing requires dealing with the emotions cops are bound to feel when they witness the worst things one person can do to another. It is criminals who act on these emotions and attack other people. Restraint is what separates policing from vigilantism.

Now we have a President who appears to want police to satisfy their primal urges. Either as a joke—as White House press secretary, Sarah Huckabee Sanders has now suggested—or as one of many true things that have been said in jest, President Donald Trump addressed a roomful of officers on Long Island on Friday and invited them to be "rough" with their suspects. He advised them to be free with their hands as they shoved arrestees into squad cars, to "not be too nice." His grin and his pause for an ovation erased any uncertainty about his message.

An elected official could only say what Trump said if he didn't understand policing. People who've gained this type of experience know the real possibility of a cop losing his temper, how hard we have to guard against it, and how much it would erode the trust we strive for between police and the people they serve.

It also seems like the President doesn't understand certain things about America. There has been enough confirmed police brutality here to send chills down the spine of a reasonable person watching the President and a crowd of cops joke and laugh about it. It's like laughing about the dire consequences of inadequate health care, or the opioid crisis.

It's also clear that President Trump has never had to fire or arrest a police officer: The cop sits there in front of you, replaying a moment in his mind, wishing he could take it back. He put on the uniform to be one of the good guys, and now he's on the opposite side of the table. He worries about supporting his family.

The way to get our officers to retirement safely, after a satisfying career, is to lead them through policing's cauldron. Excessive force could get them fired or arrested. Making light of it is a failure of leadership.

It was hard to watch a roomful of officers laugh and applaud in response to Trump's remarks. The only charitable explanation was that it indicated a sense of relief that the President understood how vicious some criminals are and how frustrating the work of bringing them to justice can be. The more

likely explanation is that the President has a talent for bringing out the darker side of people, and this was another example of it.

What we witnessed will drive a deeper wedge between the police and the citizens whose mistrust of them has grown. It will cast doubt on legitimate uses of force.

What troubles me the most about the President's remarks, however, is the way they patronized police officers. He has never held a wounded child in his arms or had to decide whether to punch or shoot a man with a knife. He has never had to race to the scene of a police shooting and choke on his feelings as he hunts for a suspect with precision and restraint. His remarks failed to take police work and its hazards seriously.

When I later served as a precinct commander in the Bronx, a sergeant of mine was suspended because he stood there and did nothing as he watched an officer slam a handcuffed suspect's head into the street. A narcotics detective had been shot during a scuffle with a drug crew, the responding officers were blind with rage, and one exacted revenge. When a video surfaced, the emotions didn't convey. It just looked thuggish, like the cop was a criminal, too. By his own account, it seems the President would also have been inclined to stand there and do nothing. There are thousands of American police chiefs who know what these situations require. They want to protect their officers by leading them in the right direction. We don't need the President joking with them about giving in to their baser instincts.

TRIBUTE TO MARY ALICE MCKENZIE

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is a privilege for each of us to represent our constituents, and it is a great honor to be able to recognize the contributions many of them make to our communities at home. On this occasion, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mary Alice McKenzie, a fixture in the Burlington, VT, community. Ms. McKenzie has served as the executive director of the Boys & Girls Club of Burlington since 2007, and during her tenure at the club, she has had a lasting impact on the lives of thousands of Vermont children. The community is grateful for her service.

Ms. McKenzie comes from a business and legal background—a nontraditional path to her current position that provided her with a unique set of skills. Mary Alice began her work at the Boys & Girls Club after serving as the chief executive officer of McKenzie Meats from 1985 to 2000. She then spent several years in the Vermont State college system as general counsel and served with the law firm Paul Frank & Collins before taking over at the Boys & Girls Club of Burlington in 2007.

At the Boys & Girls Club, Mary Alice has focused her efforts on education. When she realized how few club kids were going on to higher education, she enacted the Early Promise program, which targets children at a young age who may need additional academic services and then provides college scholarships to older youth. As of today, the scholarship fund has investments totaling \$2.3 million from which to draw. In a short time, the club hopes to be able to help 60 Burlington chil-

dren achieve their academic goals in high school and beyond.

The Boys & Girls Club plays an important role in the lives of more than 1,000 Burlington children. Aside from the academic services, the club also works to ensure a safe and stable community for its young members. When Ms. McKenzie began hearing reports of suspected drug use occurring in a park across the street from the club, she assembled a task force of local law enforcement officials, social workers, and policymakers to work towards a solution that would ensure the safety of club kids. The Boys & Girls Club expanded activities in the park and eventually took over use of an old storage building which is now an academic center.

Ms. McKenzie has also focused her efforts on children who have experienced trauma. Under her leadership, the club has started a program to help children deal with the issues that stem from trauma at a young age. Their goal is to create stability for children whose home lives may be turbulent due to issues such as homelessness and addiction. These are profoundly difficult situations for youth to handle, and the efforts of the staff at the Boys & Girls Club are surely appreciated.

These efforts have not gone unnoticed. Not only is Ms. McKenzie beloved by members of the club who tell stories of her kindness and generosity, but in 2014, Ms. McKenzie was granted Champlain College's Distinguished Citizen Award for her years of service to the community. This award was well deserved; there are few people who dedicate themselves to service in the way that Mary Alice McKenzie has.

During her tenure at the Boys & Girls Club of Burlington, Mary Alice McKenzie has repeatedly identified significant issues within the community and worked to find creative and lasting solutions. As she concludes her years of service with the club, it is clear that her efforts have paid off. The Boys & Girls Club has more teens moving on to college than ever before, and the club continues to expand, providing an invaluable space for Burlington's youth to spend their free time. I am very grateful for Mary Alice's tireless dedication, and I look forward to seeing what the future of her career brings. Marcelle and I think of her as a dear friend.

CBO ESTIMATE OF H.R. 2430

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, the Congressional Budget Office released its estimate of H.R. 2430, the FDA Reauthorization Act of 2017, in July 2017. Information related to this House-passed bill can be found at the Congressional Budget Office's website with the following link: <https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/115th-congress-2017-2018/costestimate/hr2430.pdf>

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION USER FEE REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the commitment letters from the Secretary of Health and Human Services to the chairman of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives regarding reauthorization of the Biosimilar User Fee Act, Generic Drug User Fee Act, Prescription Drug User Fee Act, and Medical Device User Fee Amendments.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH &

HUMAN SERVICES,

Washington, DC, January 4, 2017.

Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education,
Labor and Pensions, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2012 (GDUFA) enacted as title III of the Food and Drug Administration Safety and Innovation Act [Pub. L. 112-144], expires at the end of Fiscal Year 2017. With this letter the Administration is providing our recommendations for the reauthorization of GDUFA for the Fiscal Years 2018-2022 (GDUFA II).

Under GDUFA, the revenues generated from fees paid by the generic pharmaceutical industry have been used to expedite the process for the review of generic drugs and to support and augment regulatory science and drug development. The expenditure of these funds is in accordance with the statute and provides resources to meet the performance goals and procedures that were developed by the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] in consultation with representatives of regulated industry. FDA estimates that the fees negotiated in GDUFA II will average approximately \$493.6 million per year, adjusted annually for inflation.

Throughout this process, the FDA has solicited input and worked with various stakeholders, including representatives from consumer, patient, academic research, and health provider groups, and negotiated with the regulated industry, to develop reauthorization recommendations for GDUFA that would build upon and enhance the success of the program. In addition, we have complied with the statutory requirements to solicit public comments on our recommendations, and the summary of public comments is posted on the agency web site.

Our recommendations build upon the successes of existing programs and performance goals with step-wise improvements allowing FDA the resources to establish a generic drug review program that can keep up with the ever-expanding generic drug industry. The recommendations will bring all Abbreviated New Drug Applications (ANDAs) under a common review goals scheme which calls for faster review cycles of 10 months for standard ANDAs and eight months for priority ANDAs. Priority status will be reserved for drug shortages, first generics, sole source generics and other public health priorities. The negotiated recommendations provide that FDA will communicate deficiencies to industry throughout rather than at the end of a review cycle, increasing the chances for applicants to remedy deficiencies and obtain approval in fewer cycles. This will allow for improved predictability and transparency and enable industry advanced business planning.