

work hard, and get a good-paying job to be able to live the American dream.

This closure is not only going to hurt those kids, this closure is going to hurt those looking to serve our Nation, those young folks who wish to join our military, students like Anthony, who wrote:

I was recommended to go to Job Corps by my older brother, who had graduated from here back in 2013, and he is now working as a contractor for the United States Air Force, and he believes it's all thanks to Job Corps.

If Job Corps closes, I will be at a disadvantage in my pursuit of joining the military, which is my goal. Without Job Corps, I will be unable to earn my diploma and unable to leave with the required certifications for the career that I think will be amazing for my future.

So now just imagine tens of thousands of students just like Samuel, just like Selena, Pamela, and Anthony who are working on building a better life for themselves, working hard. They want to build a better community for everyone. That is who the Trump administration is sacrificing, students like Samuel, Pamela, Selena, and Anthony, kids who want to build a life for themselves. And for what and for whom? Tax cuts for the ultrawealthy—that is who.

As I share these stories, students at Sierra Nevada Job Corps are walking across the stage right now, which could be their final graduation. Meanwhile, sadly, this administration is working overtime to give billionaires like Elon Musk more government contracts, more money, and more tax breaks and putting the American dream out of reach for thousands of students in need. It is putting their future and the future of our communities at risk. Again, I say, for what and for whom is the sacrifice of our kids? It is to give billionaires a bigger tax break.

This program has support from both sides of the aisle. There are Job Corps centers in blue States and red States. Since 1964, this program has helped literally thousands of young folks build a career and build a life. We cannot allow Donald Trump to end Job Corps and kill the dreams and opportunities for young people across our country.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues in both parties to join me in supporting Job Corps and pledging to do everything we can do to fight back against any and all efforts to defund this critical trades program—a critical program for the lives of our young students.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Boulder, Colorado Attack

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, on June 1, the Boulder chapter of Run for Their Lives gathered at the Pearl Street Mall

for their solemn weekly routine. Every week since Hamas's October 7, 2023, terrorist attack, they have shown up to march peacefully in solidarity with the hostages that Hamas kidnapped and continues to hold, over 600 days after that fateful day. They come to sing songs, tell stories, and read the names of hostages to affirm for them and for us and for the world that those hostages have not been forgotten, that they never will be forgotten.

June 1 started like any other early-summer Boulder Sunday—cool and clear and promising the kind of bluebird day we love in Colorado.

The group gathered on the eve of the Jewish holiday of Shavuot for their memorial march. One man, however, was thinking only of violence and hate. Amid his yells of "End Zionists," he unleashed a makeshift flamethrower and launched Molotov cocktails to burn the marchers. He inflicted his terror directly on at least 12 innocent people, including a Holocaust survivor in her late eighties who survived the unfathomable war in Europe only to face anti-Semitic evil once again—only this time in the United States.

If there is any doubt that this was an anti-Semitic hate crime and an act of terror, the attacker has told investigators that "he wanted to kill all Zionist people and wished they were all dead." He said he specifically targeted this group and that he researched and planned the attack for more than a year.

He did not have some intellectual point that he was trying to make about Israel's politics. He was not trying to improve the lives of Palestinians. He simply wanted to kill Jews by burning them in the most painful way possible, and he knew where to find them—at the Pearl Street Mall, marching peacefully on behalf of hostages a terrorist group stole from their families.

America's Founders built this country on the tenets of religious freedom and tolerance. In 1790, George Washington wrote to Rhode Island's Jewish community that the America he was building would give "to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance." This letter affirmed that the Jewish people had a place in the United States—a rare refuge amid Europe's thousand-year pogrom.

The United States, like all countries, has never always lived up to our lofty ideals, but it is our commitment to trying, to striving to become the city on the hill we proclaim to be that has long made this country a beacon to the world and different from almost all other countries in the world. That is why my mother immigrated here rather than somewhere else in Europe or the Western Hemisphere. It is why the world's weary dreamers still give up everything they have to seek a better life in the United States rather than crossing the Gobi Desert for China or the Eurasian Steppe for Russia.

But in recent years, American anti-Semitism has reached unprecedented

levels. The Anti-Defamation League tracked over 9,300 anti-Semitic incidents across the United States last year—the highest number in 46 years of tracking. In 2024, anti-Semites made bomb threats against and vandalized synagogues, including in Colorado. They assaulted congregants at Jewish institutions. They targeted Jewish students with anti-Semitic threats. They protested Israeli policy and Zionism at synagogues as if American Jews are responsible for decisions made by a foreign government thousands of miles away.

American anti-Semitism tends to spike when Israeli-Palestinian conflict flares up, such as following Hamas's May 2021 and October 2023 attacks. But we cannot forget that anti-Semitism is the world's oldest hatred. It long predates the Holocaust, let alone the October 7 or the recent DC and Boulder attacks.

As Ukrainian Jewish author Vasily Grossman—the first journalist to see the Nazi death camp Treblinka—wrote in the mid-20th century, "Anti-Semitism has been as strong in the age of atomic reactors and computers as in the age of oil-lamps, sailing-boats, and spinning-wheels."

Anti-Semitism—even American anti-Semitism—is an ancient prejudice indeed; it is not some kind of knee-jerk response to Israeli policy.

Anti-Semites in America do not aim to make profound points or philosophical points about Israel by throwing Molotov cocktails at elderly Coloradans or gunning down a young couple leaving an event about Middle East peacekeeping in our Nation's Capital. No. These anti-Semites use events in the Middle East as an excuse to express their latent anti-Semitism, their medieval hatred of Jews, who they blame for some swath of society's ills. They want to harm Jews, to add more tragedy to the family histories of the people whose collective chronicle is already overstocked with victims, to say the least.

The Boulder attack, the recent DC shooting, and the thousands of anti-Semitic incidents across the United States over the last few years are a direct result of anti-Semitic rhetoric that has been left unchecked.

Even before this attack, American Jews wondered whether they should hide their Star of David necklaces before leaving the house, whether Friday Shabbat service will be safe, and whether their synagogues will have to hire still more security officials.

This omnipresent fear of anti-Semitic violence makes it impossible for Jews to feel safe in a non-Jewish America and in a non-Jewish world. And this fear produces behaviors like hiding one's Star of David or avoiding Jewish events on a college campus where a dean says the school can't guarantee Jewish students' safety. That amounts to what the historian Simon Schama has called a "passive deprivation of basic civil rights."

Yet how else are American Jews supposed to react when American anti-Semitism has reached record levels? When a terrorist massacres congregants at a Pittsburgh synagogue? When elderly women in Boulder, CO, can't march on behalf of innocent hostages without being targeted by fire?

It is long past time that all American political and community leaders come together to affirm that this fear is unacceptable and that we must fight together the anti-Semitic hate behind it. We must use our voices and our power, whether in the Halls of Congress or in our own communities, to counter anti-Semitism in both words and action. We must speak up because we know the dangers of failing to do so. We must stand with the Jewish community for freedom of speech and religion and against fear, because as Grossman knew and as he wrote, "life can be defined as freedom. Life is freedom." And "freedom is the fundamental principle of life."

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

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

GENIUS ACT

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, you never know what you are going to find these days when you are reflecting on the Trump administration and our oversight responsibilities as the Congress.

It is true that things have changed. Some people might call me old-fashioned for thinking this way, but I think we were a lot better off when we had Presidents who took it as a matter of course that they shouldn't use their office to enrich themselves, and they should put behind them conflicts of interest that raise questions about whether or not they are serving their own interests or their families' interests or the interests of the people of the United States.

That is why Ronald Reagan put, I think, his wealth, which was considerable, into a blind trust. Jimmy Carter, I think, sold maybe his farm or put that in a trust.

I realize it is part of Donald Trump's political charm that he wants to wear his corruption on his sleeve, but that doesn't mean that we have to go along with it, even if some people are entertained by it, which I am not.

And we have a great example of thinking about our responsibility versus his complete lack of integrity when it comes to the service of his public duties and his private interests.

That is the bill—the so-called GENIUS Act—that is on the floor of the Senate right now, where we are considering whether or not to regulate stablecoins, which are part of the

cryptocurrency universe that is new to all of us, certainly in this Chamber and across the country.

I believe very strongly that no President and no Vice President, no Member of Congress, no high-ranking official of our government should be in the business of issuing cryptocurrency, including the stablecoin. And they shouldn't be in the business of pumping them up like some sort of speculator, which is what we are seeing happen, sometimes outside the White House or in the White House.

I saw, the other day, that the President was having a dinner at Mar-a-Lago to reward the people who had been bidding up his meme coins, and they even came to dinner, although he apparently didn't really show for that dinner.

But the legislation we have in front of us would be the first regulations of stablecoins that have ever been done. I think, as part of that, it would be very appropriate for us to say that the President should get out of this business and that any President should be out of the business of issuing their own coins.

It is a weird part of the nature of this asset—this new digital asset—that it is very volatile. The meme coins rise and they fall as part of their price, and the stablecoins are used as a way of transacting around that volatility. But the volatility, every single day, is still captured in this market, and it just seems like a crazy moment when we are living in a time when a President could influence his own net worth to the tune of billions of dollars, just based on pumping up the value of digital currency that he has put out there in the world with his name or that somebody else has put out there in the world with his name.

That is why, yesterday, I offered an amendment to the bill, to the GENIUS Act, that would preclude any President—this President or any other President or any Vice President—from issuing stablecoins. I hope we will consider that amendment on the floor of the Senate. I hope we will vote to pass it, if we are, indeed, going to pass this legislation. And I hope we will have other amendments we consider as well.

I think that the questions that are at issue here from an ethics point of view, from a corruption point of view, go far beyond just the stablecoin. They go to cryptocurrency, generally, and what the President is doing to inflate the value of coins that are issued in his name, whether he has issued them or whether he hasn't.

I look forward to the debate that we are going to have. I think this is an opportunity for us to say that we want to elevate the requirements that each one of us has agreed to live under, as Members of this body and people elected to act in the public interest. I believe the President and his Vice President should face the same standard and the same scrutiny. That is why I offered the amendment that I have.

I hope that, as our colleagues consider the debate that we are going to have, that others will come to the floor with their ideas to strengthen this legislation and make sure that people don't abuse their public office for their own personal economic gain.

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

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

VOTE ON MARKS NOMINATION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the nominee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Marks nomination?

Mr. BENNET. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 287 Ex.]

YEAS—72

Baldwin	Graham	Moran
Banks	Grassley	Moreno
Barrasso	Hagerty	Mullin
Blackburn	Hassan	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hirono	Reed
Budd	Hoeven	Ricketts
Capito	Husted	Risch
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Collins	Johnson	Rounds
Coons	Justice	Schiff
Cornyn	Kaine	Schmitt
Cortez Masto	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kim	Shaheen
Crapo	King	Sheehy
Cruz	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Curtis	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Duckworth	Lummis	Tuberville
Ernst	Marshall	Warner
Fetterman	McCormell	Warnock
Fischer	McCormick	Wicker
Gallego	Moody	Young

NAYS—26

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Schatz
Bennet	Lujan	Schumer
Blumenthal	Markey	Smith
Blunt Rochester	Merkley	Van Hollen
Booker	Murphy	Warren
Cantwell	Murray	Welch
Durbin	Padilla	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—2

Ossoff
Sullivan

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made