

packages, to scan these packages, and to be able to stop some of this poison that is coming into our communities.

The legislation we have with regard to this issue is called the STOP Act. I recently introduced it again this year with Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator RUBIO, Senator HASSAN, and many others here in the Chamber. It is a bipartisan bill, called the Synthetic Trafficking and Overdose Prevention Act, or the STOP Act. It closes this loophole we talked about within the Postal Service and requires the post office to obtain advanced electronic data on packages before they cross our borders, just like the private carriers have to do.

It is not a new idea, by the way. In 2002, Congress placed this requirement on private carriers. That is when it started. It also required that the post office review this and look into this. So, in 2002, this Congress was smart enough to say: This seems to make sense. Let's require the post office to look into it. We have seen the results. The results are that traffickers stay away from the private carriers because they know they can use the Postal Service and get away with it.

Traffickers are lacing the heroin on the streets of America with these synthetic drugs to make them stronger and more addictive. They are getting more people addicted. Fentanyl is also so powerful that it only takes a couple of milligrams—the equivalent of a pinch of salt—to kill you. They say that three flakes can kill you. The fact that heroin is now being laced with fentanyl, of course, makes it much more likely for you not only to have an overdose, because of the strength of this synthetic heroin, but also that you will die from that overdose. Again, it is much harder to use Narcan and to begin to save lives by using that and to reverse the effects of the overdose.

So the STOP Act, to me, again, is something that we definitely ought to do in this Chamber. It would restrict the supply of these dangerous drugs, raise the prices of these drugs, and would make them harder to get. That is going to save lives.

Support for the STOP Act is growing. Our bill has now been endorsed by the Fraternal Order of Police and by the Major County Sheriffs of America. They are convinced that this tool will work. Last Friday, I was in Columbus, OH. I met with Franklin County deputy sheriff Rick Miner, also the deputy chief of the Columbus Police, Mike Woods. We had the Cincinnati and Columbus directors of the Customs and Border Patrol—the chiefs—there to talk about it, and we had the Drug Enforcement Agency's special agents in charge there with us. We also had people who were on the investigative side of the Customs and Border Patrol. The deputy attorney general of Ohio was there, Steve Schumaker, and others. All of these law enforcement people said: Give us this legislation. It is a tool that we need.

We had a hearing today on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, and General Kelly was there. He is the new Secretary of Homeland Security. He agreed with me that the STOP Act would "help [Customs] officers target illegal shipments . . . reduce the ability for the post office to be used for the illicit shopping of all kinds of contraband . . . [and] be helpful to be able to identify packages" of synthetic drugs. He is right. We need the administration's help and push for this legislation as well. Let's get this done.

President Trump, by the way, endorsed this idea last year when he said during the campaign:

We will close the shipping loopholes to China that others are exploiting to send dangerous drugs across our borders and into the hands of our own Postal Service. These traffickers use loopholes in the Postal Service to mail fentanyl and other drugs to users and dealers in the United States. [The] Trump administration will crack down on this abuse and give law enforcement the tools they need to accomplish this mission.

Let's get it done.

Again, I have asked President Trump to raise this issue with President Xi Jinping because China can do a lot more to try to shut down these laboratories in China, to try to stop some of the materials that are coming into the laboratories that make up this fentanyl. By the way, it is in China's interest to do so.

I have received information recently that there is leakage. What does that mean? That means that some of this fentanyl is going out to the countryside, to the suburbs of China, and to the cities of China, and it is affecting their population.

This legislation already has a companion bill in the House. So this is not an issue in which the Senate can act and then we cannot get it through the process because we cannot get it through the House and the Senate. PAT TIBERI and RICHARD NEAL have introduced companion legislation—TIBERI, a Republican from Ohio, and NEAL, a Democrat from Massachusetts. It is bipartisan. It is the kind of legislation that should draw bipartisan support, and we should get it done.

Is it a silver bullet? No, we do not have a silver bullet. There is not one silver bullet. There is a comprehensive approach here, and these two bills that I have talked about are new steps that we should take.

I urge my colleagues to continue to support the CARA legislation. Let's provide full funding. Let's support the Cures legislation in the upcoming appropriations process. Let's continue to engage the good folks back home who are trying, at the tip of the spear, to do all that they can in terms of providing better treatment opportunities and longer term recoveries and who are going into our schools and talking about prevention so as to do all we can to keep people from going into that funnel of addiction.

Let's pass this legislation. Join us in keeping better track of painkiller pre-

scriptions so that potentially addictive drugs do not end up in the wrong hands and so that addictions get treated early. That legislation is important.

Join me and join the 10 other Senators in pushing back against poisonous synthetic heroin, which is coming into our communities, by supporting the STOP Act as a cosponsor so that we can get this bill to the floor and get it to the President for his signature.

I believe these two pieces of legislation, if allowed on the floor, will pass overwhelmingly. I believe the President would sign them. Most importantly, I believe they would begin to save lives in the communities we all represent.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL PARK WEEK

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as a fifth-generation Montanan who grew up just a short drive from our Nation's first national park, Yellowstone National Park, and as chair of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Subcommittee on National Parks, the resolution before us is critically important to reassure the public that the U.S. Senate recognizes the remarkable value our national parks bring to our national heritage.

I especially want to thank my good friend from Hawaii, Senator HIRONO, who serves as ranking member of our subcommittee, for her partnership on bringing this resolution to the floor here this evening. She has been invaluable in working together to bring us to this moment.

In fact, 33 of our colleagues joined us in submitting this resolution—nearly half Republican and half Democrat—including Alaska, Washington, Tennessee, New Mexico, Oklahoma, West Virginia, Missouri, Minnesota, Florida, Michigan, Colorado, Virginia, Louisiana, Ohio, California, Wyoming, Rhode Island, Maine, Arkansas, Wisconsin, and New Hampshire. There are small States and large States, States that boast vast landscapes and big game like Alaska and Montana, diverse ecosystems like the oceans of Hawaii or the Florida Everglades. Other States boast historic and cultural treasures, like our hallowed battlefields in Virginia.

At a time when our country and Congress seem to be torn, it is only fitting that tonight our national parks are going to bring us together for a moment, to bridge this political divide, to bring remarkable opportunities for cultural education, outdoor recreation for

our families and for people around the world to enjoy, and, frankly, to bring us together as family and friends.

As the National Park System begins its second century this year, we have seen record visitation, with 331 million visits in 2016, but record visitation also brings additional strain to our national parks and strain to our infrastructure.

I am hopeful that with the adoption of this resolution, we can all be reminded of the importance of continued investment in our national parks to ensure their legacy truly endures for our children, grandchildren, and for generations to come.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 117, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 117) designating the week of April 15, 2017, through April 23, 2017, as “National Park Week.”

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 117) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise this evening to talk about an issue that will affect families all across Michigan, which is the nomination of Judge Gorsuch to the Supreme Court. He has a long record of siding with special interests and institutions instead of hard-working Americans, and this is of great concern to me. That matters.

I am concerned with his rulings that fail to protect children and students with disabilities in schools, and I am worried that he will limit access to critical healthcare for women and that he is not a mainstream candidate. I can’t support a nominee whom I believe is disconnected from the challenges faced by families in Michigan and across America every day.

There is one important example which relates directly to someone from Michigan that Judge Gorsuch has ruled on. People from Michigan have been hurt by Judge Gorsuch’s narrow judicial philosophy.

In 2009, a Michigan truckdriver named Alphonse Maddin was trying to complete a shipment driving all night, and his brakes froze in subzero temperatures—which we have. The heater in his cab broke as well. He called his company to report the issue and waited for help to arrive.

While he was waiting for hours in the freezing subzero temperatures, he realized he was having trouble breathing and his body was going numb. He called his company to report that he needed to get somewhere warm, but they told him he needed to either wait for the repair person, or drag his trailer even though the brakes were frozen. Worried he might freeze to death, he finally unhitched the trailer from his truck. Mr. Maddin drove off to seek help, returning in just 15 minutes with assistance. He did what any of us faced with a life-threatening situation would do.

A week later, Mr. Maddin was fired from his job, even though he was transparent in his actions and completed his delivery. He completed his delivery, despite the issues caused by his frozen brakes and the broken heater.

Two different entities within the Department of Labor ruled that what the trucking company did was illegal, and that Mr. Maddin was protected under Federal law because his life was in danger. Thankfully, a majority of the Tenth Circuit judges agreed. Judge Gorsuch, however, disagreed, arguing the law did not protect workers who drove away to avoid freezing to death.

According to Judge Gorsuch’s interpretation, Mr. Maddin would have had to choose between his job and his life. What is deeply concerning to me is that when he was asked at his nomination hearing what he would have done, he said he really hadn’t thought about it. Judges should think about what is happening to people in situations as they are ruling in a fair and impartial way. This does not look like the ruling of a mainstream nominee.

His rulings don’t only affect Michigan workers. I am very concerned about Judge Gorsuch’s rulings on legal protections for individuals with disabilities. We passed the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to make sure that children with disabilities got the education they deserved, and that the education would be free and available to all children.

Luke, a young boy from Colorado with autism, was not able to receive the education he needed from his public school. His parents were able to enroll him in a private residential program specializing in children with autism that was more suitable for his needs so he could get what he needed for his development.

His parents applied to the school district for reimbursement, as was appro-

priate, but the school district refused. His parents went to court, and an administrative judge and a district judge both ruled that the school did not provide Luke with the necessary education to meet the needs that IDEA required. However, Judge Gorsuch ruled in favor of the school district, saying that all the school district had to do was provide an education that was more than just the bare minimum—just the bare minimum. He set a very low bar for Luke and for students like Luke, like my nephew Barry.

Just to show how disconnected Judge Gorsuch is from the lives of everyday Americans, look at the Supreme Court ruling which occurred at the same time as Judge Gorsuch’s confirmation hearings. In a different case on the very same issue, the Supreme Court challenged and rejected the standard and interpretation that Judge Gorsuch believed should be provided for children and students with disabilities. They unanimously rejected the standard that he approved. This is not the view of a mainstream nominee. This is not the view of a mainstream nominee.

I am also deeply concerned about Judge Gorsuch’s opinions and how they could affect women’s access to healthcare. In the Tenth Circuit’s Hobby Lobby decision, Judge Gorsuch endorsed the idea that corporations can deny their employees access to essential healthcare services, including birth control. His concurring opinion suggested that he supported the notion that for-profit corporations have the right to deny women insurance coverage or any form of contraception an employer disagrees with. This is both alarming and unacceptable. It once again shows how disconnected Judge Gorsuch is from what women in Michigan and around the country experience.

Judge Gorsuch did not recognize the impact of denying coverage to women employees and their families, and putting those decisions in the hands of their employers. Women in Michigan should not have to pay higher costs for healthcare than men, and they should not be denied essential healthcare services. These dangerous interpretations will continue to take us down a path of permitting and protecting discrimination by corporations and institutions over the rights of workers and consumers. Again, that is not a mainstream nominee.

When it comes to supporting women—not just in healthcare, but in the workplace—Judge Gorsuch has had some extremely troubling rulings. In 2003, a woman named Betty Pinkerton experienced several instances of disgusting sexual harassment from a male supervisor at the Colorado Department of Transportation. Every time she made it clear his comments were not acceptable in any way, they continued over the course of months.

She went to her office’s civil rights staff and submitted a written complaint, and he was removed as her supervisor. She was fired about a week