

And the answer lies in almost a century-long series of bills that we have seen here that Congress has voluntarily—voluntarily—enacted and laid down its authority for the Executive to pick up.

Following the disastrous Smoot-Hawley Act of 1930, which plunged our Nation deeper into the Great Depression, Congress passed the following legislation: First, it was the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, which authorized the President to make limited tariff rates without congressional review on top of negotiating bilateral reciprocal trade agreements.

Then it was the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which broadened the President's trade powers to include multilateral trade agreements while also allowing the President to unilaterally impose tariffs if imports could threaten national security.

Then the Trade Act of 1974, which allowed the President to protect U.S. workers by adjusting tariffs if foreign countries engaged in unfair trade practices.

And then just a few years later, it was the International Emergency Economic Powers Act of 1977, which gives the President authorities to address declared emergencies if “unusual and extraordinary” threats exist to national security, foreign policy, or to the economy. So powers include—you probably guessed it—the authority to “regulate” or “prohibit” imports.

So in his April 2 Executive order, President Trump declared a national emergency because of “a lack of reciprocity in our bilateral trade relationships” and our “trading partners’ economic policies that suppress domestic wages.”

He is authorized—he is authorized to do so under the National Emergencies Act of 1976. So I want to be clear about all of this. I know some people might not like it, but all of what he has done is clearly above board.

The President is clearly within his powers to impose tariffs on our allies like Mexico and Canada and the EU just as much as he is with our adversaries like China, Russia, and Iran.

President Trump, and President Biden before him, took this route because Congress has largely relegated tariff authority to the President through the laws that effectively cede to the Executive.

And, my friends, it is just one more example—just one more example—of Congress abdicating instead of legislating.

In my time here, I have seen a troubling pattern in both bodies where the party that controls the White House seems all too comfortable relinquishing authority to the President and then rubberstamping whatever policies the Executive wants enshrined into law. Both Democrats and Republicans in Congress have deferred to the Executive to call the shots, in my view, for far too long.

Now, we use the phrase around here a lot, “coequal branches of government.”

I use it all the time. But the reality is, Congress was created in article I—article I of the Constitution. We are given far more authority than the Executive.

All you need to do is look in your handy-dandy pocket Constitution. Ours is a lot longer, but look at the authorities that we have: Congress may impeach and remove a President and members of the judiciary; Congress can override a Presidential veto of legislation; Congress appropriates the money that funds the operation of all branches of government; and it is Congress that, again, needs to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

We also say a lot around here that “business loves certainty.” I would suggest the country's entire tariff regime being subject to the whims of one individual lends anything but certainty, and that is why—that is why—I have signed onto Senator GRASSLEY and Senator CANTWELL's legislation. They call it the Trade Review Act of 2025, and it would reclaim this branch's authority and duty to help manage tariffs as outlined in the U.S. Constitution.

The bill requires notice to the Congress of the imposition of—or increase in—any tariffs, requires notice to the Congress in 48 hours; and with that congressional notification, it has to include an explanation of the President's reasoning for imposing or raising the tariffs as well as providing an analysis of potential impact on American businesses and consumers.

I can tell you, the Alaskans that I am talking to back home would really like the last part of this, an analysis of: How is this going to impact us?

Another provision within the Grassley-Cantwell act is, within 60 days, Congress would pass a joint resolution for approval on the new tariff. Otherwise, all new tariffs on imports could expire on that deadline.

So what this act effectively would do would be to reaffirm Congress's role with regards to tariffs. It allows for a greater engagement, if you will, between the executive and the congressional branch; allows for the debate; allows for that engagement; allows for that understanding.

Again, I am hearing from folks all over back home because they are worried. We already pay high costs for just about everything in Alaska, but they are worried what it is going to mean for groceries, for cars, for furniture, electronics, coffee.

We had a visit with a group of high school students on the steps yesterday and they were from all over the State. You had some from Ketchikan all the way up to King Cove and out in the Y-K Delta. And the first question from one of the 16-year-olds in that group was: Can you tell me what is going on with tariffs? How is this going to impact us?

You know, I really appreciated that question from that 16-year-old, who is paying attention to what is going on. He has got questions. He is here in

Washington, DC, and he is figuring he is going to get some answers from his Senator.

Alaskans are facing consequences. They want to know that they have a voice in it. And their voice is us. It is their Senator. It is their Representative. That is our role here.

Now, it has been suggested—the President himself has issued a statement about this legislation. He has indicated that he does not support it and that he would veto it. That is absolutely within his power, but we also have powers. We also have powers here in Congress, and we need to assert them.

So I would hope that this bill is maybe just the start—maybe just the toe in the water here where we are starting to see Congress reassert its authority. Because if we don't stand up for the institution, if we don't stand up for the legislative branch of our government by debating this issue and others, but holding votes, debating—let's debate this. Let's have a vote on the Trade Review Act. Because if we just sit back, if we don't assert our authority, we have only got ourselves to blame when we don't like the direction that may be taken.

The Executive has slowly arrogated more and more power since the end of World War II, and it has dramatically accelerated post 9/11, but we here in Congress have stood by, and we have accepted it. We have said it is OK.

I think it is time for Congress to reassert itself, whether it is on tariffs, whether it is on the power of appropriation, whether it is overseeing the bodies and the Agencies that we as a body have authorized. So let's legislate. Let's remember our role is to legislate. We owe that to those that we represent as well as to this institution for the long-term good of the Nation.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

REMEMBERING E. LAWRENCE DAVIS III

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of a dear friend and public servant, Egbert Lawrence Davis III, who went home to be with his Heavenly Father on March 17, surrounded by his loving family.

Everyone who knew Lawrence knew that he loved God; he loved North Carolina; and he loved his country so much that he chose to dedicate his life's work to serving the great State that he called home.

Lawrence served two terms in the North Carolina General Assembly as a State representative and two terms as a State senator. Throughout his career in public service, he served as the chair of the North Carolina Family Business Forum, the president of the Rotary Club of Raleigh, and a board member of the North Carolina Bar Association—just to name a few.

But when asked what he would consider to be the highlight of his career, he said his marriage to his beloved wife Sandra Holderness. Their enduring love

for one another still remains a powerful example for all, including myself, who were fortunate enough to witness their marriage.

And most of all, Lawrence was known as a man of faith who led his life walking hand in hand with Jesus Christ. He was known by his church community as a beloved deacon, elder, Sunday school teacher, choir member, and Stephen Minister.

He lived a life of quiet strength and unwavering faith, continually leaning on the Lord for guidance. Though he is no longer with us, his legacy lives on through his four devoted children, six cherished grandchildren, and beloved great-granddaughter.

I would like to close by reciting a verse that was included in Lawrence's obituary that I believe reflects the man he was to all who knew him, and it was from Micah 6:8.

He has shown you, O mortal, what is good. And what does the Lord require of you? To act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with your God.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

AUTHORIZING REPRESENTATION BY THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL IN THE CASE OF DESMOND BELLARD V. RONALD WYDEN, U.S. SENATOR

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 170, which is at the desk.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 170) to authorize representation by the Senate Legal Counsel in the case of Desmond Bellard v. Ronald Wyden, U.S. Senator.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a lawsuit filed in the Oregon Supreme Court against Senator Wyden. That suit was brought by an individual, Desmond Bellard, who is representing himself without the assistance of an attorney and is attempting to use a civil action known as *quo warranto* to remove Senator Wyden from office for alleged State campaign finance violations in the 2022 election. This suit challenges the Senator's right to be seated in the Senate, an issue which the U.S. Constitution commits exclusively to the Senate.

This resolution would authorize the Senate legal counsel to represent Senator Wyden named as a respondent in this suit in order to remove the case to Federal court and seek its dismissal on the basis of the constitutional commitment to the Senate of the power to seat and remove its Members, the Speech or Debate Clause, and the lack of jurisdiction under Oregon's *quo warranto* statute.

Mr. BUDD. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that motions to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 170) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. BUDD). The Senator from New Hampshire.

SUDAN

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, it wasn't that long ago that Sudan was on a path to recovery after decades of violence and civil war.

Back in 2018, Sudanese citizens took to the streets to protest the conditions in their country. This movement pushed Omar al-Bashir, who was indicted by the ICC for a campaign of mass killing and rape, out of power, and this set the country on a course for a better future. Sadly, that future was disrupted when the military overthrew the civilian-led Government of Sudan.

Then, 2 years ago, the Sudanese Armed Forces, led by General al-Burhan, and the Rapid Support Forces, led by General Hemedti, plunged Sudan into war. In the 2 years since, over 150,000 people have died and 12 million more have been displaced.

You can see this poster reflects the results of what is happening in Sudan. In just 2 years, 12 million more people have been displaced and are in camps. This is actually one of the nicer camps.

With acute famine levels at historic highs, 30 million people are in desperate need of humanitarian aid. You can see some of the Sudanese people with their dishes lined up to get some assistance.

As so often happens during war, the impact has been especially devastating to women and girls. During raids by the armed factions, women and girls have been abducted and forced into sexual and domestic slavery. One U.N. report found that gender-based violence skyrocketed by 288 percent last year. Again, you can see the impact. According to UNICEF, 221 children have been raped, including a case involving a 1-year-old baby.

If this is true, we just can't ignore it as another horrific detail of a distant conflict. The world is watching, and we must hold the people who are perpetrating these acts accountable for their crimes.

The U.S. Government has determined that both the Sudanese Armed Forces and the Rapid Support Forces have committed war crimes and crimes against humanity during fighting in Sudan. And the Rapid Support Forces have led a campaign of ethnic cleansing in Darfur.

In January of 2025, the U.S. Treasury Department took a positive step. It

sanctioned the leader of the Rapid Support Forces and the leader of the Sudanese Armed Forces for their armies' lethal attack on civilians in Sudan. But more needs to be done.

Cease-fire after cease-fire has failed. Peace negotiations have stalled, and outside countries—the UAE, Turkey, Iran, as well as Russia and China—continue to send weapons to the factions. Why? Well, because Russia doesn't want to give up its port access to the Red Sea, China doesn't want to abandon the nearly \$6 billion of investments it has made in Sudan since 2005, and the UAE doesn't want to abandon Sudan's wartime gold trade. According to mining industry sources and research by Swissaid, nearly all of Sudan's gold trade flows through the UAE.

The United States needs to stand up and say enough is enough.

For people who say "Well, what difference does it make? That is Africa. That is a long way away from the United States. Why does it matter?" well, because, sadly, what happens in Africa, what happens in Sudan doesn't stay in Sudan. If you can't be outraged because of the moral horror of what is happening there, you should be outraged because the terrorism and the potential disease that can cross the borders of Sudan can come to the United States, and we have seen that too often in the past.

As ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am committed to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle here in Congress as well as folks in the Trump administration because we must hold these groups accountable for their war crimes. We must support them in ending the violence.

Right now, both sides in the war continue to bomb, to raid, to siege schools, markets, and hospitals. The Sudanese Armed Forces are intentionally denying humanitarian aid. They are blocking medicine and other relief items. The Rapid Support Forces continue to lead an ethnically charged campaign of violence in Darfur.

Sadly, so many of the foreign assistance programs that we had in place have been ended or are under review.

The United States, the Trump administration, and Congress must create a clear policy to address this conflict. We must resume foreign assistance to the region and Sudan to limit further humanitarian suffering. We must set aside our differences, bring an end to the violence, and renew our commitment to setting Sudan back on the path to a civilian-led democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. MORENO). The Senator from Iowa.

NATIONAL DONATE LIFE MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this month of April is National Donate Life Month. This month is the time to raise awareness about the lifesaving importance of organ donation.

There are over 103,000 Americans on the national organ transplant waiting