

So, Madam President, the fact that the President of the United States has invited Erdogan to the White House, after everything Erdogan has done to undermine our values and security, is a shame on the United States. It will undermine our national security interests. It has already alarmed our allies and heartened our adversaries.

It is important that all of us—all of us in this House and Senate—on a bipartisan basis, speak out—as we have been doing—against the shameful chapter in our American foreign policy and national security.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

COUNTERFEITERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Today I am here to discuss the critical need to protect American businesses and consumers from the dangers of counterfeits, particularly counterfeit goods sold online.

Counterfeits do incredible damage to our country's economic competitiveness. They harm intellectual property right holders and the reputation of online marketplaces, undermine the integrity of our supply chains, and even threaten the health and safety of consumers. So it is Congress's responsibility to use its oversight and legislative authority to identify ways to prevent these illicit goods from entering our borders.

Over the past year, I have worked with the Finance Committee Ranking Member WYDEN to investigate how counterfeiters use e-commerce to sell their phony goods to consumers. Last week, we concluded our investigation and issued a report detailing our findings.

Based on the information presented to Senator WYDEN and this Senator by right holders, trade associations, e-commerce platforms, and common carriers, we made five findings in this report, and we identified two legislative recommendations for Congress in this report. I believe these recommendations will enhance existing efforts within the Federal Government to prevent the sale of counterfeits online.

I will talk briefly about our findings today, and I look forward to working with my colleagues—both Republican and Democrat—to identify additional areas for congressional action.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I recognize the value of intellectual property rights and their impacts on society and the economy. Intellectual property rights allow businesses to generate new ideas and develop creative solutions to everyday problems that can make our lives healthier, safer, and more productive. I also understand businesses and innovators rely on those rights to help drive and recoup their investments.

In my own State of Iowa, intellectual property represents more than \$14.4 billion in annual exports for the State, more than 94,000 jobs, and supports more than 2,000 small businesses with

less than 500 employees. However, counterfeits are increasingly threatening these achievements and the hard work of the people that innovate. It has been estimated that international trade for counterfeit goods in 2016 accounted for \$509 billion of world trade.

Counterfeits are found in both physical and online marketplaces, and almost every industry is affected. Scam artists target electronics, automotive parts, and even children's toys, to rip-off consumers and to make a profit. Counterfeits can also harm consumers. Many consumers do not know that counterfeits can be dangerous and that some have been found to contain lead, excessive small parts, and even unsafe chemicals.

In 2018, the Government Accountability Office—or GAO, as we know it around Washington—examined how e-commerce marketplaces are further enabling the sale of counterfeits. GAO found that counterfeiters use online marketplaces to sell fakes to consumers because they can hide their identity by using false or incomplete names. Counterfeiters also post legitimate photos or fake reviews for their products, which makes it harder for consumers to determine whether they are buying a legitimate or fake good.

The Grassley-Wyden investigation showed that the breadth and variety of goods sold online makes it nearly impossible to prevent the sale of all counterfeits. Right holders also told us that their enforcement efforts are hindered in part because the U.S. Customs and Border Protection shares very limited—and often heavily redacted—importation information with these right holders. But right holders need importation information to identify counterfeit sellers and report suspected counterfeit listings.

Counterfeits also pose a threat to e-commerce and to common carriers. Counterfeits smear the reputation of e-commerce and threaten the integrity of the common carrier supply chain network. As such, these parties are critical partners in the fight against the sale of counterfeit goods. However, Customs and Border Protection does not have the authority to share importation information with these parties when it identifies a counterfeit at our border.

During our investigation, these parties told us that this information would give them the ability to better protect our country's intellectual property and allow them to remove more counterfeit listings and block counterfeit sellers. We must look at this problem holistically and with the understanding that right holders, e-commerce platforms, and common carriers are critical partners in the fight against the sale of counterfeit goods and those counterfeit goods being sold online. By sharing more importation information, these parties can better protect the intellectual property rights of our innovators, as well as the health and safety of e-commerce consumers.

Our investigation is but a first step. I will continue to use my oversight authority to look for innovative solutions to protect intellectual property right holders and consumers from the negative effects of counterfeits.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). The Senator from Illinois.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was honored today to attend the second hearing I have attended in the Supreme Court of the United States. If you stand right here on the floor of the Senate and look east through these glass doors, you can almost see the Supreme Court buildings directly across the street. The Supreme Court is, many times, the last stop when it comes to human rights and civil rights. After all the work that has been done by the Congress, by the President, many times, it is the Supreme Court that has the last word.

In the case of *Plessy v. Ferguson*, when the Supreme Court held that segregation was constitutional, that last word was a disappointment. And *Korematsu v. The United States*, when the Supreme Court upheld the internment of Japanese Americans during World War II, that was another disappointment.

But other times, the Supreme Court has risen to the challenge: The famous case of *Brown vs. Board of Education*, which finally struck down the concept of separate but equal; *Obergefell vs. Hodges*, where the Supreme Court recognized the right to marriage equality.

Well, today, the Supreme Court faces another human rights issue involving another group. Just a few hours ago, the street between the Capitol and the Supreme Court was literally filled with thousands and thousands of demonstrators. The issue before the Court today was the fate of DACA, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals.

This measure, DACA, is one that I have worked on for many years—many years. Nineteen years ago, I introduced the DREAM Act. Before that, the term “Dreamer” was hardly ever applied in the conversation about immigration, but now, it has become standard and really defines this group of Americans, people living in America.

In their case, they came to the United States, brought here by their parents, when they were children. They may have had legal entry into the United States, but at some point in their lives, they no longer were legal. They became undocumented, in the words of the law. Most of these young people never knew that status until they reached their teenage years and their parents finally told them the truth of their legal condition.

They had no control over the decision of their parents to come to this country or file the necessary papers. Frankly, many of them were shocked to learn that they were undocumented. They went to school with our kids. They grew up in our communities.

They played on the sports teams. They probably attended the same churches and temples and synagogues as our own kids. They were just part of the group. But they knew—they privately knew they were not. They knew that they were one knock on the door away from being deported from the United States.

It was because of one of these young people that I decided to introduce that DREAM Act legislation 19 years ago. Her name is Tereza Lee, brought to the United States at the age of 2 from Korea by her parents to Chicago. She grew up in a family that struggled to make ends meet. Her father wanted to be a minister, but never quite put that church together. Her mother worked in a dry-cleaning establishment to feed the family. She went to public schools, and as luck would have it, there was a program at one of these schools called the Merit Music program that gave her a chance to learn how to play the piano.

She started playing, and she followed her father around to these churches. Then she took it seriously, and she became an amazing pianist to the point where, when she finished the public high school, she was offered an opportunity to go on for music education at the Manhattan Conservatory of Music. When she filled out her application and reached the point where they asked her nationality and citizenship, she asked her mom: What am I supposed to put on here? Her mom said: I am not sure. We better call Senator DURBIN's office.

They did, and we checked the law, and the law is very harsh. For Tereza Lee—who had lived 15 or 16 years in the United States, beat the odds by finishing high school and developing this great talent at the piano—the law told her that she had to leave the United States for 10 years and apply to return. That is the law.

It seemed unfair to me that a young woman, brought here at the age of 2, should face that as her only legal choice, so I introduced the DREAM Act. It said, if you were brought here as a child, raised in the United States, went to school, and had no criminal record of significance, that you should be given a chance—the chance to make it in the United States to earn your way to legal status and citizenship.

That is what the DREAM Act was all about. We passed it in the House and in the Senate, but never in the same Congress, so it is still not the law of the land. It was 8 years ago when I appealed to my former colleague in the Senate, Barack Obama, as President, to try to help, and he did.

By Executive action, he created DACA, which said that young people like Tereza Lee could apply, go through a criminal background check, fill out the necessary forms, pay the filing fee, and be allowed to stay in the United States for 2 years at a time, renewable, not to be deported, and be able to legally work.

After President Obama came up with DACA, over 780,000 young people came

forward and became protected by DACA. It really changed their lives. For the first time in their lives, they had some government-recognized status. They were no longer just undocumented. Then amazing things happened. They went on and pursued an education, a career, a life, a future. They started realizing their dreams. It was a good and positive thing all around.

Then, President Trump came into office. Initially, he was very complimentary of Dreamers, saying positive things about them, but, unfortunately, over a period of time he changed his attitude about this issue. On September 5, 2017, President Trump announced he was going to end the DACA Program, end the protection for these young people.

It was a sad day and a challenge for us to decide what to do, to try to pass legislation in the Congress that would protect these young people, and we rolled up our sleeves and put together several bipartisan measures in the Senate. President Trump rejected every single one of them. He wasn't going to have it. He was opposed to our enacting legislation that dealt with it.

That repeal of DACA has created uncertainty for hundreds of thousands. A lawsuit was filed in an effort to try to protect them, and the courts said their protection would continue while the case was being argued. The case worked its way through the courts and ended up, this morning, at the U.S. Supreme Court across the street.

I was proud to lead 172 current and former Members of Congress on a bipartisan amicus brief in support of DACA. Now it is clearly up to the Justices in the Supreme Court to follow the law and to reject what I consider to be President Trump's illegal repeal of DACA, but only Congress can provide a permanent solution for Dreamers.

The U.S. House of Representatives has responded to President Trump's cruel decision to repeal DACA by passing the Dream and Promise Act on a strong bipartisan vote of 237 to 187. This legislation is based on the DREAM Act I originally introduced 19 years ago. This bipartisan legislation would give Dreamers a chance to earn their citizenship. The bill passed the House. It is here. It is now up to Senator MITCH MCCONNELL of Kentucky, the Republican leader, to call the Dream and Promise Act for a vote in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I want to make a unanimous consent request in relation to that measure and ask for a consent after we debate my UC request to complete my remarks. I see a Senator on the floor who I believe is here to object. I want to be courteous to her because she has been in the Chair for a while. Can I have a unanimous consent to return to the debate after I make my unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 6

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for clarity, I ask unanimous consent to bring to the floor the Dream and Promise Act for a vote in the Senate—a measure which would address the very issue that is before the Supreme Court today. I am making this on behalf of Senator SCHUMER, Senator LEAHY, Senator ROSEN, Senator TIM Kaine, Senator MENENDEZ, and Senator CARDIN.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 112, H.R. 6; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I am reserving the right to object, and I will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I would like to articulate the reason for the objection to the legislation that is brought forward by my friend the Senator from Illinois.

Once again, I found it necessary for the good of the order to object to a unanimous consent request brought by our friends in the minority. Once again, they are attempting to bypass the Senate's rules on behalf of a piece of legislation this body has not had time to debate, to deliberate, or to consider in committee.

The American Dream and Promise Act passed the House of Representatives by a near party-line vote; unsurprisingly, considering the bill addresses the contentious issue of immigration law. This bill, supported by the Senator from Illinois, would offer temporary legal status to 2½ million undocumented immigrants.

Those affected immigrants have tried to remain in the United States under the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or the DACA Program—a backstop made possible by nothing more than an Executive memo signed by former President Barack Obama.

I think this is important for us to realize that it was an Executive memo that put this program in place. It is not a Federal law. President Trump ended the DACA Program in 2017, arguing the Obama administration's attempt to subvert immigration law on such a massive scale was unlawful and possibly unconstitutional. Soon after, President Trump offered a path to legalization for DACA recipients, but our friends in the minority refused to take him up on that offer.

We have to remember this: There was a path to legalization for DACA recipients that was offered by President Donald Trump. Our friends in the minority said: No; no, we do not want that.

They continued with the issue. I will tell you, every Dreamer in the country should be outraged by the minority's