

(1) To the extent practicable, a list of—

(A) entities in the People's Republic of China or affiliates of such entities that use or benefit from forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region; and

(B) foreign persons that act as agents of the entities or affiliates described in subparagraph (A) to import goods into the United States.

(2) A plan for working with private sector entities seeking to conduct supply chain due diligence to prevent the importation of goods mined, produced, or manufactured wholly or in part with forced labor into the United States.

(3) A description of actions taken by the United States Government to address forced labor in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region under existing authorities, including—

(A) the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.);

(B) the Elie Wiesel Genocide and Atrocities Prevention Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-441; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note); and

(C) the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note).

(d) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex, if necessary.

SEC. 7. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS RELATING TO FORCED LABOR IN THE XINJIANG UYGHUR AUTONOMOUS REGION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6(a)(1) of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 (Public Law 116-145; 22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) Serious human rights abuses in connection with forced labor.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by subsection (a)—

(1) takes effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) applies with respect to the first report required by section 6(a)(1) of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 submitted after such date of enactment.

(c) TRANSITION RULE.—

(1) INTERIM REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the committees specified in section 6(a)(1) of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 a report that identifies each foreign person, including any official of the Government of the People's Republic of China, that the President determines is responsible for serious human rights abuses in connection with forced labor with respect to Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, or members of other Muslim minority groups, or other persons in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

(2) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The President shall impose sanctions under subsection (c) of section 6 of the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020 with respect to each foreign person identified in the report required by paragraph (1), subject to the provisions of subsections (d), (e), (f), and (g) of that section.

SEC. 8. SUNSET.

Sections 4, 5, and 6 shall cease to have effect on the earlier of—

(1) the date that is 8 years after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date on which the President submits to the appropriate congressional committees a determination that the Government of the People's Republic of China has ended mass internment, forced labor, and any other gross violations of human rights experienced by Uyghurs, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, Tibetans, and members of other persecuted groups in the Xinjiang Uyghur Autonomous Region.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee

on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate.

(2) FORCED LABOR.—The term “forced labor”—

(A) has the meaning given that term in section 307 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1307); and

(B) includes convict labor and indentured labor under penal sanctions.

(3) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term “foreign person” means a person that is not a United States person.

(4) PERSON.—The term “person” means an individual or entity.

(5) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term “United States person” means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 65), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE RELATING TO THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARCH 11, 2011, EARTHQUAKE AND TSUNAMI IN JAPAN

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 92, S. Res. 107.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 107) expressing the sense of the Senate relating to the 10th anniversary of the March 11, 2011, earthquake and tsunami in Japan.

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

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed

to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 107) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 11, 2021, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH AND NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 289.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 289) designating June 2021 as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month” and June 27, 2021, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day”.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 289) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 24, 2021, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 15, 2021

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 15; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Liang nomination; further, that at 11 a.m., all postcloture time on the Liang and Remy nominations expire in the order in which cloture was invoked; that the cloture vote on the Cunningham nomination occur at 1:45 p.m.; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator BLACKBURN.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

FOR THE PEOPLE ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, before I begin my remarks, I do want to respond to my colleague and his comments about the For the People Act, which the Democratic Party is continuing to push.

Now, I will say that I am pleased to learn that many of my Democratic colleagues are standing up against the Jim Crow-era policies that their party put in place, the work that their party did with the KKK and other entities to block and obstruct access to the voting booth. And I will remind him also that the 1965 Voting Rights Act was a very solidly bipartisan effort that took place here in this Chamber.

And in regard to their S. 1, H.R. 1, For The People Act, it is anything but the For the People Act. What this would do is make it easier to cheat and harder to vote. We should be working to make it easier to vote and harder to cheat. That is what election integrity is all about, and that is what the American people would like to see.

What this bill would do, their S. 1, H.R. 1, would federalize elections. Now, many in this Chamber may have served on an election commission or been the secretary of state in their State, and they fully appreciate and understand it is the constitutional duty—the constitutional duty—of the States to set the time, place, and manner of elections, and that the voter rolls are maintained there in your local county by citizens who serve on the election commission and who work those polls. But this bill that the Democrats are wanting to pass would, in essence, do away with voter ID.

Do you know what? Recent polling of various and different groups, numerous groups, have shown 80 percent of the American people really support showing a voter ID, showing an ID in order to cast that ballot. Prove that you are who you are. Their legislation would also institutionalize ballot harvesting, something that really offended so many thousands of citizens this year because with mail-out ballots, which they want to institutionalize, some people got three, four, five ballots. You can go online on social media, see pictures or videos of people holding up multiple ballots. That is not election integrity. That is not something that will ensure trust in the system. That would cause more doubt.

We should agree—we should agree, as Members of this Chamber, that we will

work together to ensure that our local and State officials can carry forward with their elections.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, now, one of the most important duties we take on as Members of this Chamber is the confirmation of the President's Cabinet and other top executive branch issues.

Mr. MERKLEY. Would my colleague yield for a question?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Not until I finish my remarks, but I thank the gentleman.

A Senate confirmation hearing is probably the world's worst job interview, but there is a good reason for that. The various candidates who come before our committees are asking to take on some of the most important challenges that we face as a country. And so when the President sends us these nominees for consideration, it is our job to vet their resumes, to vet their records. To go through the motions is not enough. We need to meet with them and review their history.

So imagine our shock when the Biden administration began to send us candidates that made it clear the President expects the Senate to act as a rubberstamp for some of the most controversial and unqualified nominees in recent memory.

His choice for Health and Human Services, Secretary Xavier Becerra, had no meaningful experience in healthcare before his very first day serving as the country's chief healthcare officer. He did, however, have quite a long history of weaponizing the full force of government against people whose views differ from his own.

Alejandro Mayorkas, Biden's choice to lead the Department of Homeland Security, boasted a proven record of corruption from his time serving in the Obama administration. An investigation by the inspector general for the Department of Homeland Security revealed that Mayorkas abused his position as the Director of USCIS to help politically powerful friends violate immigration laws.

Associate Attorney General Vanita Gupta's record as a radical, liberal activist was so diametrically opposed to the beliefs of most Americans that she tried to "evolve" her positions on drug crime and defunding the police just to avoid scrutiny during her confirmation hearing. Of course, by "evolve," I mean she outright lied about her position. And there have been many, many, who have stood on this floor and have challenged her nomination.

Another, David Chipman—this is Biden's pick to lead the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives. He is so anti-Second Amendment, he has endorsed policies that would effectively ban all sporting rifles in the United States. He has no respect for the constitutional right to bear

arms, no respect for the nearly 20 million Americans who hold a concealed carry permit, or the 15.5 million Americans who hold hunting licenses. President Biden chose the anti-gun lobby over the American people when he nominated Chipman for this post.

President Biden's parade of genuinely unacceptable nominees continued this week. Today, the majority leader has decided to move forward with the nomination of Donald Remy to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs. If that name sounds familiar to you, it is because you have heard about Mr. Remy's work in other controversial context. He served as the NCAA's COO and chief legal officer and was the architect of that organization's restrictive policy against name, image, and likeness compensation.

Between September 2018 and August 2019, the NCAA spent more than \$26 million defending an NIL business model that the Supreme Court recently described as "patently and inexplicably stricter than . . . necessary." It was a 9-to-0 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The \$26 million, where does the NCAA get that money? From colleges, from universities, from student athletes. That is where the money came from, and it was used to defend this lawsuit.

But let's not focus on this one policy governing the NIL compensation. We need to keep in mind that Mr. Remy was comfortable using his training as a lawyer and his considerable power as a top NCAA official to maintain the culture of exploitation that defines modern college athletics. I am not sure what led President Biden to believe that Mr. Remy could help lead an agency notorious for its own brand of careless exploitation, but whatever the reason, we have a duty to get in his way.

For our veterans, decisions can be life or death. I have objected to his nomination since I came through the committee. And, quite frankly, I think it is a shame that President Biden refused to nominate someone who could demonstrate an ability to earn back the trust so many veterans have lost in the VA system.

Our veterans who have served this Nation honorably deserve better choices. They deserve at least that much from their Commander in Chief.

This nomination is just one more unserious shot in the dark from an administration that is yet to focus its energy on any one of the long list of problems they say they came to Washington to solve.

A quick scan of the morning newsletters on any given day show a complete lack of direction on the part of the White House and the Senate majority. Will we be working on infrastructure in the next few weeks or are we just going to be handling nominations? Are the most radical elements of the American Families Plan on the table or are we going to pivot to election law? Well, we won't have to flip a coin on that last one.