

My prayers are with the families of the victims. I am heartbroken for the loss of Representative Hortman and her husband. I can't get their faces—those nice pictures of such nice people—out of my mind.

On the other hand, I am glad to hear Senator Hoffman and his wife are making progress toward recovery. May God bless them all and their loved ones.

SENATE SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Mr. President, as we convene, I want to start with this: My highest priority right now is working with the Senate leadership on both sides, the Senate Sergeant at Arms, and Capitol Police to ensure everyone's safety. This weekend, I asked Capitol Police and the Sergeant at Arms to increase the security for Members, including Senator PADILLA and the Minnesota Senators. Knowing that the Sergeant at Arms, her entire operation, and the Capitol Police are there to help us right now is comforting.

Tomorrow, the Senate will hold an all-Members' briefing, organized at my request and that of Senator THUNE, with the Sergeant at Arms, to talk about security for Members. The Sergeant at Arms and Capitol Police are doing an outstanding job and have bent over backwards, under very difficult circumstances, to keep everyone safe. Tomorrow's briefing will be a chance for them to convey what they are doing for Members to keep them safe.

NATIONAL PROTESTS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, second, I would like to take a moment and step back and share a quick word on the events of this weekend—the good and the bad alike.

On one hand, this weekend we witnessed one of the largest peaceful demonstrations in American history. Nearly 5 million Americans took to the streets and made their voices heard against the rise of authoritarianism on our shores. I was proud to be one of them. We gathered in the streets. We gathered in front of State capitols. We gathered on beaches and at national parks and in cities and towns, big and small alike. For the most part, the demonstrations were peaceful. In some cities, there were acts of unlawful disruption, and those who broke the law should be held accountable. I have always been clear that the right to free speech is fundamental but must be exercised peacefully.

But, again, for the most part, the millions who marched this weekend did so peacefully. In many cities, there wasn't a single incidence of lawbreaking. In fact, the demonstrations were much more than just simply peaceful; they were inspiring. After all the attacks we have seen this year against our institutions and our values, it is so comforting to know that the roots of democracy run deep in this country; and even though we may dis-

agree fiercely, the marches remind us we can stand up for our country and our democracy while still keeping the peace.

What happened in Minnesota, however, should be a warning. Political violence is not just on the rise in America; it is becoming all too normal, and it falls on all of us to stop it. When lawmakers are shot in their own homes, when a Governor's mansion is set ablaze, when the spouse of a Speaker of the House is nearly beaten to death, when a violent mob storms the U.S. Capitol, and when a gunman tries to assassinate the President of the United States, it is not enough to just condemn these acts and move on. We need to recognize something needs to change. Condemning violence is only the first step—necessary—but a first step. We must all work together to address violence's root causes. We must take a serious look at the toxic forces that are radicalizing too many Americans into embracing violence.

Most of all, when violence strikes, the answer is for us to come together regardless of party. That is especially important for U.S. Senators. Sadly, we didn't see that this weekend. I wish I didn't have to say this, but I was deeply disappointed and sickened to see a Member of this Chamber use the tragedy in Minnesota to take cheap, political shots at the other side on social media and risk escalating a perilous moment. What the senior Senator from Utah posted after the shootings was reckless and beneath the dignity of his office. For a Senator to fan the flames of division with falsities while the killer was still on the loose is deeply irresponsible. He should take down his post immediately and apologize to the families of the victims.

And this isn't even about politics. This is about simple human decency. Our divisions run deep, but we are still all Americans. We may disagree sometimes, many times, maybe most of the time, but we are still human beings. The victims this weekend—no matter what party they belonged to—still leave behind kids who now will never speak to their parents ever again.

So I say to my colleagues: Now is the time to speak with moral clarity. Every single one of us must condemn political violence no matter where it comes from and work together to eradicate its root causes.

We cannot be silent because silence only serves to enable more violence. And in the meantime, I will continue to work with Leader THUNE, with the Capitol Police, the Sergeant at Arms, and all of my colleagues to ensure the safety of every Senator and our staffs.

This is a dark moment for America, but I believe firmly in my bones we will endure.

ALEX PADILLA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, on Senator PADILLA, what happened last week to Senator PADILLA was be-

yond the pale. I don't care who you are or what your views are, there is never justification for Federal agents to put their hands on a Member of the U.S. Senate, throw him onto the ground, and cuff him for no reason other than he was doing his job. The way agents treated Senator PADILLA is what you see in totalitarian regimes.

It is outrageous that Secretary Noem let this happen and then lied about the incident after the fact. Neither the Senate, nor any member of government, can tolerate a Member of this Chamber being treated in this way. Secretary Noem has proven herself to be derelict in her responsibilities.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 130.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Rodney Scott, of Oklahoma, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 130, Rodney Scott, of Oklahoma, to be Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

John Thune, Pete Ricketts, Bill Hagerty, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Roger F. Wicker, John R. Curtis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Bernie Moreno, Katie Boyd Britt, Mike Lee, Mike Rounds, Deb Fischer, Steve Daines, Rick Scott of Florida, James Lankford, Jon Husted, Ted Cruz.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 145.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Gary Andres, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

Mr. GRAHAM. I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the Andres nomination.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 145, Gary Andres, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

John Thune, Eric Schmitt, Bernie Moreno, John Boozman, Jim Justice, Dan Sullivan, Pete Ricketts, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Jon A. Husted, Ted Cruz, Rick Scott of Florida, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Ashley B. Moody, Marsha Blackburn, Katie Boyd Britt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Gary Andres, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. JUSTICE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the

Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 44, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 313 Ex.]

YEAS—44

Banks	Graham	Moody
Barrasso	Grassley	Moreno
Blackburn	Hagerty	Mullin
Boozman	Hassan	Ricketts
Capito	Hawley	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Schmitt
Collins	Husted	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Sheehy
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Lummis	Tuberville
Curtis	Marshall	Whitehouse
Daines	McConnell	Young
Ernst	McCormick	

NAYS—33

Alsobrooks	Heinrich	Padilla
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blunt Rochester	Kaine	Schatz
Booker	Kim	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Slotkin
Coons	Klobuchar	Smith
Durbin	Lujan	Van Hollen
Fetterman	Markley	Warner
Gallego	Merkley	Warren
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenthal	Kennedy	Rosen
Britt	Moran	Schiff
Budd	Murkowski	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Murray	Sullivan
Duckworth	Ossoff	Warnock
Fischer	Paul	Welch
Justice	Peters	Wicker
Kelly	Risch	

(Mrs. HYDE-SMITH assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. MORENO assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). On this vote, the yeas are 44, the nays are 33. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

GENIUS ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss S. 1582, the GENIUS Act.

I believe that this legislation as it is currently drafted is fundamentally flawed. It exposes taxpayers, con-

sumers, and the financial system to unacceptable risk, and it creates venues for criminals, terrorists, and rogue governments to finance their illicit activities. Despite these dangerous flaws, we will not have the opportunity to offer one, single substantive amendment, and with a bill of this nature, the legislative process should require a very significant amendment process.

This legislation before us places the government's stamp of approval on so-called stablecoins, which are crypto dollars that could be minted by anyone—Amazon, Walmart, Facebook, X, the Trump family, and even foreign companies. It gives stablecoin issuers an enormous privilege: a U.S. Government license to effectively create dollars without demanding very much of anything in return.

Here is how the business works. You give a stablecoin company a dollar. The company gives you back an IOU that is recorded on a blockchain. The stablecoin company takes your dollar and invests it in various assets that generate interest and yield. The company keeps that interest and yield, but it is supposed to give you back your dollar whenever you ask for it. You can also take the IOU, which you receive for your dollar, and transfer it to other people, and you can use it to buy other things, mostly other crypto.

If this sounds similar to a bank, that is because it is. Banks allow customers to send and receive money. Stablecoins allow customers to do the same thing—just outside the banking system and purportedly in a faster and cheaper way. Now, competition can force banks to do a better job, and it should be more convenient for consumers to transfer funds. However, I believe that competition should come from the merits of the product and the underlying technology, not from regulatory arbitrage as provided in the GENIUS Act.

The light-touch regulatory regime in this bill is premised on two faulty assumptions. First, it assumes customer funds are safe because they are fully reserved with one-to-one backing of all customer liabilities. Second, it assumes that stablecoin issuers are inherently risk-free because they engage in only one activity: issuing stablecoins. But experience tells us that these kinds of assumptions are flawed.

During the 2008 financial crisis, we saw institutions with very similar if not these exact characteristics fail and get billions in taxpayer bailouts. We were assured that money market funds were low risk because they were fully reserved with shares pegged to a dollar. We were assured that derivatives were innovative tools that didn't need heavyhanded regulation. We were assured that Fannie and Freddie were safe because they engaged in one simple business. However, taxpayers needed to backstop \$2 trillion in money market fund liabilities. The government gave AIG—an insurance company