

During his nomination hearing, rather than reassuring the committee of his qualifications or judgement, he launched into a diatribe about the so-called Russia hoax, dismissing well-documented foreign interference in our elections as if it were a partisan invention.

Down to my last two pages, Mr. President.

That claim is not just wrong, it is willfully ignorant. The Senate Intelligence Committee conducted a comprehensive, five-volume, bipartisan investigation of the Russian interference in the 2016 election.

Over those five volumes, we detailed how Russia interfered in our democratic process, how those efforts were designed to help Donald Trump, and how individuals affiliated with his campaign welcomed his efforts.

That is not a hoax. That is a fact. Matter of fact, unanimously confirmed by every member of the Senate Intelligence Committee—Republican and Democrat.

Mr. Kent's outright dismissal of it speaks volumes about how he views the truth, intelligence, and accountability, nor can we ignore his troubling associations. Mr. Kent has repeatedly aligned himself with far-right extremist groups, employing a member of the Proud Boys, a white nationalist organization with a record of political violence and extremism, as part of his 2022 campaign for Congress, a campaign for which he also solicited help from white nationalist Nick Fuentes.

At a time when domestic, violent extremism is one of the fastest-growing threats to the homeland, we are being asked to put someone in charge of counterterrorism who has aligned himself with political violence, promoted falsehoods that undermine our democracy, and tried to twist intelligence to serve a political agenda.

I urge my colleagues—particularly those who value the credibility of our intelligence Agencies—to think carefully about what message it sends if Mr. Kent is confirmed. Allowing Mr. Kent to lead the NCTC would not just compromise the integrity of our counterterrorism efforts, it would embolden those who believe loyalty to one man should outweigh loyalty to the truth. It would signal that the politicization of intelligence in service of falsehoods is no longer a disqualifier, and it would make this country less safe.

Mr. President, for these reasons, I join others and strongly urge a “no” on this nomination.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON KENT NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Kent nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. 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 executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGRO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 452 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeben	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Curtis	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	McCormick	Young
Ernst	Moody	
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—44

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Baldwin	Hirono	Schatz
Bennet	Kaine	Schiff
Blumenthal	Kim	Schumer
Blunt Rochester	King	Shaheen
Booker	Klobuchar	Smith
Cantwell	Luján	Tillis
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warnock
Durbin	Ossoff	Warren
Fetterman	Padilla	Welch
Gillibrand	Peters	Whitehouse
Hassan	Reed	Wyden
Heinrich	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—4

Gallego	Markey	Slotkin
Kelly		

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JUSTICE). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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 the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 113, Tyler Clarkson, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

John Thune, Markwayne Mullin, Ted Budd, Tom Cotton, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Joni Ernst, Rick Scott of Florida, Mike Rounds, Bernie Moreno, Kevin Cramer, Roger Marshall, Tommy Tuberville, Jim Banks, John Boozman, John Barrasso, John Hoeven.

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 Tyler Clarkson, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture, 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGRO), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. SLOTKIN) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 453 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Banks	Graham	Moreno
Barrasso	Grassley	Mullin
Blackburn	Hagerty	Murkowski
Boozman	Hawley	Paul
Britt	Hoeben	Ricketts
Budd	Husted	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Justice	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sheehy
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Curtis	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Wicker
Ernst	Moody	Young
Fischer	Moran	

NAYS—44

Alsobrooks	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Baldwin	Hirono	Sanders
Bennet	Kaine	Schatz
Blumenthal	Kim	Schiff
Blunt Rochester	King	Schumer
Booker	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Luján	Smith
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Fetterman	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	

NOT VOTING—3

Gallego	Kelly	Slotkin
---------	-------	---------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 44. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Tyler Clarkson, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Department of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII and as if in legislative session, it be in order for Senator SANDERS to make motions to discharge S.J. Res. 41 and S.J. Res. 34, and if made, the Senate vote on the motions to discharge in the order listed at 9 p.m. today; further, that following the disposition of the motions to discharge the joint resolutions, the Senate vote

on the motions to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 172 and 282 and that the mandatory quorum calls be waived; finally, that if cloture is invoked on any of the nominations individually, all postcloture time be expired and the Senate vote on confirmation of the nominations at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, no earlier than Thursday, July 31, and if 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.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that all votes after the first vote tonight be strictly 10 minutes in length.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 151

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am going to ask for a unanimous consent motion and reserve my remarks until after we have had a chance to address that motion, recognizing that we are dealing with some scheduling issues this evening. But I want to make sure that I reserve the right to actually make a statement about my unanimous consent request after we have had our exchange.

So as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 151 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

This is legislation that would address the tariffs that the President is considering.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2383

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, like my colleague from New Hampshire, I want to make a statement after, but I want to, at the moment, accommodate the scheduling requirements of some of my other colleagues. So I want to make a unanimous consent motion.

As if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2383; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise in opposition

to S. 2383, the Creating Access to Necessary American-Canadian Duty Adjustments Act, and S. 151, the Protecting Americans from Tax Hikes on Imported Goods Act of 2025.

I agree with my colleagues, who will speak in just a moment, that tariffs should be more targeted to avoid harm to small businesses. I made precisely that point at a hearing in the Finance Committee in May.

Similarly, with less than 2 days to go to the August 1 reciprocal negotiation deadline, I appreciate that my colleagues, as well as our constituents, may be nervous about what comes next. However, at this juncture, these two bills are counterproductive to helping American families and businesses of all sizes.

The President's historic trade negotiations are bearing fruit. President Trump already announced new trade deals with major trading partners, including the United Kingdom, Indonesia, Japan, and the European Union. I urge other trading partners to reach a deal by August 1. Consequently, S. 151 and S. 2383 are counterproductive to the progress that President Trump has achieved and is poised to continue achieving in ongoing negotiations with our trading partners.

On April 30, the Senate rejected the IEEPA disapproval resolution on reciprocal tariffs for the same reasons.

For these reasons, I again object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, on Friday, we may be facing the next escalation in the President's trade war. The tariffs that the President announced in April on virtually every country in the world are set to go into full effect tomorrow night at 12:01 a.m. Those tariffs are expected to add about \$2,400 in costs for the average household per year.

That is why I introduced the Protecting Americans from Tax Hikes on Imported Goods Act. This bill states clearly that the International Emergency Economic Powers Act cannot be used to place taxes on imports. If the President needs to block a dangerous product, he still can under my legislation. But if there is a real threat, I think we would want to stop it, not just tax it. That is what my bill does. It makes clear what the Federal court has already found: that IEEPA, the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, does not authorize tariffs.

Passing my bill would give businesses and families more certainty to plan for the future and to keep more of their hard-earned dollars in their pockets.

Virtually every business in New Hampshire that I visited since the President announced his proposed tariffs has said that, in addition to the tariffs, the uncertainty is as difficult for them as the tariffs.

So I am disappointed that Senator CRAPO decided to block this common-sense legislation. Sadly, I am not sur-

prised. But this bill would do so much to help families and businesses in all of our States. It would shield them from higher costs.

We have been hearing about some of these deals that Senator CRAPO referred to that have been reached with the EU and Japan, but let's be clear about what those deals mean because even after those deals—those agreements, trade agreements—Americans are going to be left paying dramatically higher tariffs.

A new analysis this week found that we will be paying the highest tariffs since the Great Depression, and we saw what those tariffs before the Great Depression contributed to.

Now, we just saw a deal announced with the EU by the President and Ursula von der Leyen, the head of the European Commission, forcing 15 percent taxes on imports. Now, compare that to what we were paying in 2024 at this same time. That was about 1.5 percent. So under this great deal that the President negotiated with the EU, Americans are going to be paying 10 times what we paid last year. And with Japan, President Trump agreed to a 15-percent tax. That is also 10 times what we were paying last year.

So let's don't pretend that these are some big wins. The President can announce that, but they are only a slight improvement on a crisis that the President created himself.

At a time when people are rightly worried about the rising costs of living, Trump's tariffs amount to a tax to make everything from clothes, to housing, to food even more expensive. For example, last month, home prices hit a record high, and these tariffs could add more than \$10,000 to the cost of a home. Coffee prices hit a record high earlier this year, and now President Trump wants to put a 50-percent tariff on Brazil—our largest source of coffee. As families do their back-to-school shopping, they are going to see higher prices for clothing and shoes. Those prices could go up by 35 percent by the end of the year. For new parents, just for example, the price of one stroller at Walmart went up 50 percent in 2 months. And there are countless more products that are facing higher prices.

So let's be clear: These tariffs do nothing to bring down costs, and, in fact, they could add, as I said earlier in this statement, about \$2,400 to the average household's yearly expenses. That is money that most families don't have just lying around.

We have all of those costs from these tariffs, and yet, at this moment, 30 hours from when the tariffs will go into effect, we still have seen no official notice implementing any of these deals.

That includes, by the way, no clarity on whether prescription drugs coming from Europe will face a 15-percent tariff starting in 2 days. I had a chance to meet with a pharmaceutical company this week, and they were lamenting what the impact was going to be on prescription drug prices because of the tariffs from the EU.