

GENIUS ACT

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the so-called GENIUS Act, which we are going to vote on in a few minutes here in this Chamber.

It is a bill that I think could have gotten to a place where it makes sense, but I am not going to be supporting the legislation because, among other things, we haven't had a real debate on it. We have had no opportunity to offer amendments to make the bill better, and it is still falling short in some really fundamental ways that I am really worried about.

I am really worried about the risk to money laundering that I don't think is well addressed in this bill. I am really worried about the regulatory structure, which looks absolutely nothing like the structure that is required for our banks and for foreign banks that want to do business here in the United States.

I think we may come to rue the day that we didn't put guardrails in place to protect the American people from what could be a catastrophic effect on our economy just because we had the failure to have the foresight to see the potential risks that we could face.

For example—just one example—we commonly require financial institutions like banks to have a subsidiary here in the United States that is regulated by the laws of the United States before they are able to offer banking services to my constituents in Colorado and to all the 330 million Americans whom we have. There is nothing like that in this bill. There is nothing like that in this bill.

If some administration official deems a foreign jurisdiction is somehow good enough without it actually being good enough, without it having the benefits of the best regulatory environment in the world, which is ours, then people can do business here issuing crypto; in this case, stablecoins. I think that is a big mistake.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I think it is a huge mistake that we didn't take on the issues of money laundering that cryptocurrency are presenting and the challenges that it is causing to law enforcement. I think that is a big problem. It is not that we couldn't have fixed it, but we chose not to fix it.

As I mentioned earlier, there has not been an effort to make the bill better. There has been no amendment process. Unusually, I had an amendment in this bill for one brief shining moment. I came down to the floor and offered an amendment, and it actually was accepted. It has been decades around this place, I think, since that has happened.

All that amendment said was the President and the Vice President and the Members of Congress should not issue crypto; in this case, stablecoins. I would be surprised to learn that 90 percent of the American people think the President or the Vice President or the Members of Congress should issue their own crypto coins while they are in office. That would be shocking to learn.

The American people clearly would like a legal regime here that prevents their elected officials, including the people in this body, including in the House of Representatives, including, and most particularly, in the White House should not enrich themselves while they are in office.

That was my very simple amendment. That was referred to as the "Bennet amendment." I am proud of that fact.

This is not even hard. There is no reason the President—any President—should be issuing crypto while they are in office or a Vice President. There is no reason any person on this floor should do it or anybody in the House of Representatives should do it.

And, now, in a partially regulated regime, where we are not dealing with that question, we are sending a signal to the American people that this digital currency has the seal of approval of the entire U.S. Government, of our regulators. That is potentially very dangerous to the financial institutions that may participate in this and to the American people themselves.

I have nothing fundamentally against crypto. I have nothing fundamentally against stablecoins. But I think it is fundamentally wrong that elected officials should be able to enrich themselves in this new digital environment. Maybe it is not 98 percent, but I bet you 9 out of 10 Americans agree with me.

I will say that this is just one more indication of the U.S. Senate not doing the people's business, of not living up to the expectations of the folks who designed this Chamber to begin with.

This bill is going to pass with votes from the Democratic Party, even though there was not a single amendment voted on as part of this bill. I object to that as a Democrat. I can't stop it because there are 60 votes for this legislation, but I think we would have been a lot better off on this bill—just like with almost any bill that comes to the floor of the Senate—to have an open amendment process. I would have loved to have the opportunity to see people vote on a bill that bans Members of the Senate and the House and the President and the Vice President from issuing their own crypto credits.

I would have liked to have had a debate that said, Is it a good idea to have foreign governments or foreign investors speculating publicly in the cryptocurrency that a President has issued? Is it a good idea to have foreign entities making \$2 billion investments in currency that is issued by American politicians? That is crazy.

We could have fixed that in this legislation. Not only did we not fix it, we didn't even have a debate on it. We didn't even have a single amendment come to the floor, we were in such a hurry to do the bidding of the proponents of this legislation.

I would urge all my colleagues to vote no on this procedural motion, to go back to the drawing board to have a

proper negotiation, to write a piece of legislation that actually would provide the seal of approval in a meaningful way to American investors and to American consumers, and when it comes to the issuing of cryptocurrency and stablecoins, that we would have heeded the common sense of the American people who would have said: Do not ratify the corruption that is going on in our Capitol.

I don't think that is too much for the American people to ask for.

I hope my colleagues will reconsider their position, and we will have the chance to have a proper debate and a proper negotiation on this bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. 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. MERKLEY. Mr. President, we are living in a time of open government corruption that few of us thought could occur here in the United States of America. We sometimes recognize it and expect it in countries far away where authoritarian figures take a slice of every contract that moves through the government but not here in the United States of America, and yet here we are.

President Trump has planted a "Government for Sale" sign on the White House lawn, and individuals and foreign governments are funneling money into his pocket and his family's pocket in order to gain access and influence.

The GENIUS Act attempts to set up some guardrails for buying and selling a type of cryptocurrency—one type—called a stablecoin. We need guardrails that ensure that government officials aren't openly asking people to buy their coins in order to increase their personal profit or their family's profit.

Where are those guardrails in this bill? They are completely, totally absent. The GENIUS Act doesn't set up guardrails for the President or the Vice President. It doesn't set up guardrails that prevent an open invitation for people to buy access and influence by buying cryptocurrencies that increase the wealth of elected officials. Without such a guardrail, this bill should never pass.

We have the opportunity now to debate anti-corruption amendments, but I understand the majority leader has decided to cancel any amendments from being considered here on the floor of the Senate. Whether those are amendments that protect the consumer from scams in which seniors are directed to go and change their cash for cryptocurrencies at an ATM—a new way of sending their money overseas that doesn't go through a bank teller who might possibly warn against a scam;

whether it is plugging the many holes in this bill in order to have a proper regulatory framework; or whether it is to address the open corruption, none of those amendments are going to be considered—not a one—after the majority leader promised an open amendment process.

I would say to my colleague: If you promise an open amendment process, deliver it because people made votes on the motion to proceed to this bill based on that promise, and now you have broken it. That is a breach of trust. It is simply wrong in this body, where your word is your bond.

Now, I understand that you changed your mind because you didn't like one of the amendments your own Member proposed. Your own Republican caucus Member proposed an amendment you didn't like—a convenient opportunity to prevent this body from debating a whole set of important ideas related to this bill to protect consumers, to have better regulatory safeguards, and to end the corruption that is so evident right now.

Even at this last moment, I would say: Colleagues, vote against ending debate on this bill because without those votes to protect consumers, to increase the safeguards for regulation of this industry, and to address the corruption, this bill shouldn't go forward. So vote against it, and restore the vision the majority leader laid out that we would have that type of debate on this bill when the motion to proceed was voted on.

The public deserves us having that debate as well. And shouldn't they know where we stand on these issues? Because that is the feedback loop for the next election: Where do we stand?

But if we dodge having a real debate on real issues on the floor of the Senate, they don't know where we stand on improving the regulatory safeguards; they don't know where we stand on blocking the personal scams ripping off our seniors; they don't know where we stand on the crypto scams that we are becoming so familiar with.

You have all heard of a meme coin. Maybe you haven't. A meme coin is basically a digital baseball card. And President Trump has one. It is called the \$TRUMP coin. The \$TRUMP coin, you can own. You can buy it. You pay a dollar to the Trump family, and you get—well, what do you get? Nothing. Nothing. You don't even get an email with a picture of a coin, but you think of it like that. You get a register on an investment site that shows you now own a dollar coin. You get nothing. This coin can't even be used to buy anything.

So what it is, is the President saying: Give me your money. Open your wallet. And I will give you nothing—nothing—of tangible value.

Maybe the closest approximation would be a digital baseball card. That is it.

Now, he held a dinner at his golf course out in Virginia. For that dinner,

he said: I am going to invite the 220 people who give me the most money by buying my meme coin. Open your wallet. Give me millions of dollars. You will get a special dinner, special access, and I will give you a digital baseball card.

Anyone who thinks that those 220 people who spent some \$140 million-plus to attend that dinner were seeking to buy digital baseball cards—well, we have a London bridge to sell you in the middle of the desert in Arizona. Nobody gave the President millions of dollars through acquiring his meme coins in order to get a digital baseball card. They did it because they knew that was the price to pay for access and influence. They were responding to the "Government for Sale" sign on the lawn of the White House.

It isn't just conjecture that that is the case. We know it is the case because various folks told us. For example, Javier Selgas, CEO of Freight Technologies, Inc., announced that his company had bought \$2 million of Trump's meme coins. They had given Trump \$2 million. And he said: We want to buy \$20 million. Whether they did or not, I don't know because there is no disclosure. He said "I want to buy that \$20 million of coins"—that is, to give \$20 million to President Trump—so he will have a better policy regarding the movement of freight between Mexico and the United States of America.

Thank you to the CEO of Freight Technologies for laying out very clearly what everyone knew: This is a scheme to sell influence on the U.S. Government, to make the President and his family mega rich.

There is a second type of coin the Trump family is involved in, and this one can be used as currency in international transactions. Now, this type of coin—why would you use it? Well, maybe you want to launder money. That would be a good reason to use it. Maybe you want to smuggle arms around the world. Maybe you want to be involved in drug transactions. Maybe you are plotting a terrorist act. Those would be good reasons to use a digital coin rather than using dollars or another currency that is overseen by basic banking regulations around the world. You want a currency where people can't see you buy it, can't see you own it. You can buy it here and convert it back into cash somewhere else. It is great for money laundering, great for crime.

So along comes a company called MGX, and that company is headed by the National Security Advisor of the United Arab Emirates. That company says: Hey, President Trump, we will buy \$2 billion of your special digital coin that we can use to invest in another company called Binance.

And with this coin, what does the President get? He gets that \$2 billion—or rather his company does—and they put that into investments, and Mr. Trump and his family keep the pro-

ceeds of those investments—even if that investment is only earning 4 percent. Over the course of a year, that is \$80 million being given to the President's family in order to gain influence.

What did the UAE want? They told us. United Arab Emirates said: What we want are AI chips, and we want an AI center in the Emirates. Well, that was in March, and then they announced that they are going to buy Trump's \$2 billion of coins.

And then what did President Trump do? He went to the Middle East, and he said: You know what, I have a great idea: Let's give you AI chips to create an AI center in Abu Dhabi—one of the Emirates.

UAE requested a policy. They bought \$2 billion of Trump coins, and Trump delivered the policy.

That is corruption. That is the Mount Everest of corruption. That is corruption at a level never seen in the history of the United States of America.

We could vote on an amendment on this bill to end that corruption if the majority leader honors his commitment to an open amendment process. So I request of the majority leader that he honor his commitment and have that open amendment process.

Otherwise, it is an endorsement of this corruption, and I don't think any Member—certainly on this side of the aisle—wants to endorse corruption. And I would suggest that I don't think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to endorse corruption.

So let's vote on an amendment to end it.

And certainly, this provision wouldn't apply just to the President and Vice President, not just to the senior adviser. It applies to us too. We shouldn't be selling meme coins as an open way for people to give us personal gifts. Not one of us should be saying: Do you want access and influence? Buy my digital baseball card and buy it at high volumes, make me a rich man, make my family rich for generations to come, and you get special access.

That is exactly what is going on right now.

Colleagues, again, this is the moment. We are on a bill related to cryptocurrencies. In fact, the entire bill is about cryptocurrencies. So let's make this the moment that we actually debate amendments that improve the regulatory structure that has been laid out in the bill, that proceeds to address some of the consumer scams, including ATMs that convert dollars into digital coins being used to scam our seniors out of their lifesavings. And, yes, let's debate amendments that end this type of crypto corruption.

Let's rip that sign off the White House lawn that government is for sale. Let's never again have a CEO say: I am buying \$2 million of Trump's coins in order to influence a policy involving trade between Mexico.

Let's never again have a company tied to the Government of UAE say: We

are going to buy \$2 billion of Trump coins in order to influence policy and get an AI center established in our nation.

Never, never, never should our government be up for sale in this fashion, and this is the moment when we can take that on if the majority leader honors his commitment to an amendment process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Hagerty-Gillibrand substitute amendment to the GENIUS Act, legislation to regulate the cryptocurrency assets known as stablecoins.

Over the past several years, top U.S. financial regulators—both Democrats and Republican administrations—have repeatedly called on Congress to do their job: Regulate this new industry; do your work; do the oversight; do the accountability; write legislation; and pass a law.

They repeatedly called on Congress to regulate stablecoins, recognizing their global role in the global economy. Both administrations have recognized that for the United States to remain the financial capital of the world, Congress needs to pass clear regulatory rules that protect consumers and foster innovation here at home.

I started working on this legislation 3 years ago with CYNTHIA LUMMIS. This is not a bill written quickly for any reason but to regulate an industry that needs rules of the road.

To date, Congress's failure to act has left the digital asset space as a Wild West, where American consumers are vulnerable to scams, and businesses are desperate for the regulatory clarity they need to compete with foreign countries, foreign entities that do business in our markets effectively.

Doing nothing and protecting the status quo is not only irresponsible, it is unacceptable. Unlike the United States, our global competitors have moved to regulate the space.

In 2023, the European Union passed comprehensive cryptocurrency regulation, and numerous meaningful provisions went into effect last year. China's central bank has been promoting the digital yuan, which threatened the U.S. dollar's role as the global reserve currency.

Global commerce will soon be conducted using stablecoins. It is imperative to keep the U.S. dollar as the global reserve currency of the world and stablecoins to be pegged to the dollar, not the Chinese yuan.

There is reason for both consumers and small retailers to be supportive of this legislation. Stablecoins offer faster, more affordable ways to settle transactions that will benefit everyone.

Earlier this year, Senators HAGERTY, ALSOBROOKS, SCOTT, LUMMIS, and I introduced the bipartisan GENIUS Act, which is the strongest effort to date to regulate and create a clear regulatory

framework for the payment stablecoin industry.

It has a number of commonsense provisions relating to consumer protections, reserve requirements, illicit finance, national security, foreign issuers, separating of banking and commerce rules—just to name a few.

It had an excellent markup in the Senate Banking Committee, where Senators had many of their concerns addressed, bipartisan amendments were accepted. The result was a true bipartisan product that passed with strong bipartisan support, including votes from five Democrats.

Over time and through subsequent negotiations, this bill has only become stronger with several additional improvements to strengthen consumer protection, clarify disclosure rules for Members of Congress, and implement other changes that close loopholes, prevent money laundering, and establish stricter and more specific standards.

The latest version of this bill earned support from a bipartisan majority of both Republican and Democratic members of the Senate Banking Committee.

The strong bipartisan nature of this effort has been demonstrated by the fact that the bill has continued to pick up new support with each additional vote.

I am very grateful Senator HAGERTY is here. Together, we had a very strong bipartisan working relationship. If you could see a document itemizing every change that has been made since the minute we introduced this bill, it is volumes long.

It is extraordinary how open this process was; how many Senators were able to give serious critical thinking to the bill to make it better to bring bipartisan support behind this effort.

I can't thank Senator HAGERTY enough for his leadership, his patience, and his willingness to create a bipartisan regulatory framework for an industry that desperately needs it.

I have been in the Senate now since 2009. I have never seen a more generous bipartisan process than I saw on this legislation. I have never seen a more serious group of Senators get together to try to write legislation of first impression than I saw in this process.

I know the people who are averse to this bill have their own political view. I think it is extremely unhelpful that we have a President who is involved in this industry, and I would love to ban his activity.

But that does not diminish the excellent work in this legislation. It does not diminish the hard work the bipartisan group of Senators put into this to make a difference and to write a law that can protect consumers, that can protect our financial services industry, that can protect the strength of the dollar, and that can protect people who would like access to capital.

Thirty percent of Americans are unbanked or underbanked. Many of those Americans have found access to the capital markets and access to cap-

ital through cryptocurrency and blockchain technologies.

This stablecoin bill represents the first incident that we are trying to make access to capital a reality for more Americans, to have our safety and soundness rules, our know your customer rules, our illicit finance rules, our protections of a one-to-one dollar banking.

None of that exists today. Because of the work of this legislation, we actually have a regulatory framework that can protect consumers in the future.

I just want to thank Senator SCOTT and Senator HAGERTY for their extremely honest and thoughtful approach in working on bipartisan legislation, which I am very proud of the effort we have made.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes, followed by Senator SCOTT of South Carolina for up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled rollover vote.

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

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of my legislation, the Guiding and Establishing National Innovation for U.S. Stablecoins Act—otherwise known as the GENIUS Act.

I would like to thank Senator GILLIBRAND for her kind comments and her hard work in this and Senator SCOTT, who so ably chaired our committee. And I am very pleased to say that we are at a point now where America can actually see a comprehensive and clear regulatory framework come to bear for payment stablecoins.

For too long, the lack of any such framework has forced digital asset innovation beyond our borders here in America and into foreign countries. It has jeopardized our Nation's financial leadership. And frankly, as Senator GILLIBRAND said, it has put American consumers at risk.

Meanwhile, our slow and outdated payment rails—frankly, rails that were developed back in the 1970s and 1980s—have failed to keep pace with many other overseas jurisdictions. To modernize our payment system and to restore our Nation's competitive edge, we must act now.

That is why I have introduced the GENIUS Act. This legislation takes a commonsense, bipartisan approach to regulating stablecoins. Allow me to concisely explain what the GENIUS Act does.

It clearly defines a payment stablecoin as a digital asset pegged to a fixed value backed by U.S. Treasuries and used for transactions.

It describes clear procedures for institutions to issue stablecoins. It establishes a regulatory regime that balances the responsibilities of both Federal and State authorities.

It implements standards that ensure safety, stability, and consumer protection. And it provides rigorous safeguards to deter illicit activity, to increase transparency, and to aid the vital work of law enforcement.

These provisions are pragmatic and forward-looking. They both protect consumers and promote innovation. And, crucially, they represent bipartisan agreement, reflecting that both Democrats and Republicans recognize the vast potential of this emerging technology.

The benefits of stablecoin innovation are immense. By reducing friction in the payment process, they can improve the speed and the efficiency of cross-border transactions.

Faster and cheaper transactions can unlock much needed working capital for American businesses and provide individuals with more effective tools for making international payments.

Moving aspects of our payment system to the blockchain has been shown to increase efficiencies in capital markets. Innovators are constantly uncovering transformative use cases, and the rapid pace of innovation will only increase with regulatory clarity.

Stablecoins also advance a vital national interest by driving demand for U.S. Treasuries. A recent report forecasts that with a well-crafted U.S. regulatory framework, stablecoin issuers could become one of the top holders of U.S. Treasuries by the end of this decade. Frankly, it could happen even sooner.

This would strengthen our fiscal position and cement the dollar status as the world reserve currency. If we fail to act now, not only will these benefits slip away, we will also fall behind in global competitiveness.

Without a regulatory framework, stablecoin innovation will proliferate overseas and not in America. And if we fail to act, Americans using this new technology will be left with no choice but to rely on foreign stablecoins that lack vital consumer protections. And, critically, inaction would surrender our leadership to the Chinese Communist Party, a party that aggressively advances its own digital currency.

We can avoid this outcome, but only if we all unite behind this legislation. In the spirit of patriotic cooperation, I want to thank Senator SCOTT, Senator LUMMIS, Senator GILLIBRAND, and Senator ALSOBROOKS who cosponsored an earlier iteration of this bill and who have worked hard with me every step of the way to make this a strong bipartisan effort.

And I also extend gratitude to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who supported this legislation in the Banking Committee and contributed to the consensus product that we now see before the U.S. Senate. We have an opportunity to cement America's financial dominance for decades to come and demonstrate that this body can come together and pass legislation that benefits our country and its citizens.

I urge all my colleagues to join me in advancing the GENIUS Act. And I urge those watching from afar to view this critical vote for what it is, a statement of support for a vital innovative technology and a demonstration of our willingness as a body here in the U.S. Senate to work for America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Mr. President, I rise in support of the GENIUS Act. Today is a good day to watch a bipartisan coalition do what we were sent here to do: work on behalf of the American people.

Today, the United States can take a bold and historic step forward not just for financial innovation, but also for American leadership, consumer protection, and economic opportunity.

With the bipartisan GENIUS Act, we can do more than just pass a bill. We can deliver results for the American people. We can bring clarity for a sector that has been clouded by uncertainty, and we can make it known: The United States will lead, not follow, in the digital asset revolution.

When I became chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, I promised to prioritize innovation, accountability, and smart regulation in the evolving digital economy, and we have the opportunity to deliver on that promise. The GENIUS Act will be the most significant digital assets legislation ever to pass the U.S. Senate.

It is the product of months of bipartisan work. And I also want to thank the bill's sponsor BILL HAGERTY, who went out of his way to make this legislation a bipartisan success by partnering with Senator ALSOBROOKS, working with Senator GILLIBRAND, along with our colleagues on this side of the aisle, Senator LUMMIS, and myself. I am incredibly proud to see the hard work of Senator HAGERTY pay off—not for him but for the American people.

That is what makes this process such a special one. It is what makes the U.S. Senate the most deliberative body in the world today. This is a victory for working families, small businesses, and everyday Americans who deserve faster, cheaper, and safer access to financial services. It is a win for innovation because this framework will give entrepreneurs the confidence to build here in the United States of America and not abroad.

And it is a win for national security, because the GENIUS Act brings stablecoin issuers under strict anti-money laundering standards, cracking down on bad actors at home and abroad. Let me be clear, this did not happen by accident. It happened because we led.

To those who said Washington could not act, to those who doubted bipartisanship, let's prove them wrong. Let's show that principled leadership, conservative values, and common sense can still move this country forward together.

And I would not be complete in my comments if I did not stop and thank the Senate Banking staff for their hard work and their dedication. It would be incomplete if I did not stop and thank Senator HAGERTY's staff for their hard work, countless hours; and Senator GILLIBRAND's staff for her dedication and their dedication to this issue; and, certainly, Senator LUMMIS and her staff, who spent countless hours making a good product better.

Let's finish the job and get this bill to President Trump's desk for signature.

WAIVING QUORUM CALL

I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum.

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 senior assistant legislative 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 amendment No. 2307 to Calendar No. 66, S. 1582, a bill to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes.

John Thune, David McCormick, Bernie Moreno, John R. Curtis, Bill Hagerty, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Markwayne Mullin, Ashley B. Moody, Tim Scott of South Carolina, Tom Cotton, Deb Fischer, James E. Risch, Katie Boyd Britt, Lindsey Graham, Shelley Moore Capito, Jim Justice, John Barrasso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2307 to Calendar No. 66, S. 1582, a bill to provide for the regulation of payment stablecoins, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

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 Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 305 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Alsobrooks	Cortez Masto	Gillibrand
Banks	Cotton	Graham
Barrasso	Cramer	Grassley
Booker	Crapo	Hagerty
Boozman	Cruz	Hassan
Britt	Curtis	Heinrich
Budd	Daines	Hickenlooper
Capito	Ernst	Hoeven
Cassidy	Fetterman	Husted
Collins	Fischer	Hyde-Smith
Cornyn	Gallego	Johnson