of the United States District Court for the District of Idaho held that article V of the Constitution did not permit Congress to extend a ratification deadline, writing, ''Once the proposal has been formulated and sent to the States, the time period could not be changed any more than the entity designated to ratify could be changed from the State legislature to a State convention or vice versa. Once the proposal is made, Congress is not at liberty to change it.'';

Whereas, on March 5, 2021, Judge Rudolph Contreras of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia held in Virginia v. Ferriero, 525 F. Supp. 3d 36 (2021) that the deadline contained in the Equal Rights Amendment Resolution was constitutionally valid and that the legislative actions of 3 State legislatures in 2017 through 2020, purporting to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment, ''came too late to count'';

Whereas Judge Contreras noted, ''Inclusion of a deadline was a compromise that helped Congress successfully propose the ERA where previous attempts to pass a proposal had failed.'';

Whereas, while Judge Contreras found it unnecessary to reach the question of whether Congress could retroactively alter a deadline, he did observe that ''the effect of a ratification deadline is not the kind of question that ought to vary from political moment to political moment ... Yet leaving the efficacy of ratification deadlines up to the political branches would do just that.'';

Whereas, on January 6, 2020, the Department of Justice Office of Legal Counsel issued a legal opinion stating, ''We do not believe, however, that Congress in 2020 may change the terms upon which the 1972 Congress proposed the ERA for the States' consideration. Article V does not expressly or implicitly grant Congress such authority. To the contrary, the text contemplates no role for Congress in the ratification process after it proposes an amendment. Moreover, such a congressional power finds no support in Supreme Court precedent.'';

Whereas the 2020 Office of Legal Counsel opinion also observed, ''Because Congress and the State legislatures are distinct actors in the constitutional amendment process, the 116th Congress may not revise the terms under which two-thirds of both Houses proposed the ERA Resolution and under which 35 State legislatures initially ratified it. Such an action by this Congress would seem tantamount to asking the 116th Congress to override a veto that President Carter had returned during the 92nd Congress, a power this Congress plainly does not have.''; and

Whereas in oral argument before the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in the Virginia v. Ferriero case on September 28, 2022, Judge Robert Wilkins of that Court asked Deputy Assistant Attorney General Sarah Harrington, ''Why shouldn't the Archivist just certify and publish [the Equal Rights Amendment] and let Congress decide whether the deadline should be enforced ...?'', and Ms. Harrington answered, ''The Constitution doesn't contemplate any role for Congress at the back end. Congress proposes the amendment, it goes out into the world, and the States do what they're going to do'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that, under article V of the Constitution, the legitimate constitutional role of Congress in the constitutional amendment process for the Equal Rights Amendment ended when Congress proposed and submitted the Equal Rights Amendment to the States on March 22, 1972;

(2) recognizes that the Equal Rights Amendment expired when its ratification deadline passed with fewer than three-fourths of the States ratifying;

(3) recognizes that Congress has no power to modify a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment after the amendment has been submitted to the States, or after the amendment has expired; and

(4) recognizes that the only legitimate way for the Equal Rights Amendment to become part of the Constitution is provided in article V of the Constitution, and requires reintroduction of the same or modified language addressing the same subject, through approval of a new joint resolution by the required two-thirds votes in each house of Congress.

SENATE RESOLUTION 108—RECOGNIZING THE KINGDOM OF BHUTAN AS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE OPPRESSION AND FORCED EVICTION OF MORE THAN 100,000 BHUTANESE CITIZENS DURING THE LATE 1980S AND 1990S

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 108

Whereas the Kingdom of Bhutan was responsible for the oppression and forced displacement of more than 100,000 Nepali language-speaking Bhutanese citizens, Lhotshampas and Sharchops, in the1990s due to their identity, culture, language, religion, and political opinion;

Whereas many of these individuals experienced unjust detention, torture, and other forms of human rights abuses;

Whereas many political prisoners continue to be held in Bhutanese prisons for protracted sentences;

Whereas persecuted Bhutanese were forced to cross into Nepal, where some remained for nearly two decades in refugee camps;

Whereas thousands of Bhutanese refugees remain in refugee camps in Nepal, and the Government of Bhutan continues to deny dignified repatriation to those who desire it;

Whereas more than 250,000 Nepali-speaking Lhotshampa Bhutanese still inside Bhutan suffer political, social, and economic oppression as the Government of Bhutan has continuously refused to reinstate the citizenships that were stripped during the 1990s;

Whereas such incidences of human rights violations and abuses and extreme acts of violence perpetrated by any individual actor or state should be condemned;

Whereas the majority of the Nepali-speaking Lhotshampa, who were refugees in Nepal, have now resettled in other countries, including Australia, Canada, Denmark, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, and the United States;

Whereas, although Bhutan and the United States have not established diplomatic relations, the two countries maintain warm and productive unofficial ties;

Whereas the Kingdom of Bhutan transitioned to democracy in 2008 and has held successive free and fair elections and transitions of power since that time;

Whereas the Kingdom of Bhutan has been a leader in the global fight against climate change and is the only carbon negative country;

Whereas the Kingdom of Bhutan has stood with the United States and other likeminded countries as the United Nations to condemn Russian aggression in Ukraine; and

Whereas, the Kingdom of Bhutan is a close Indo-Pacific partner of the United States committed to upholding the rules-based international order: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) declares that the Royal Government of Bhutan is responsible for the political, cultural, and ethnic oppression of Nepali-speaking Lhotshampas and Sharchops in Bhutan during the late 1980s and 1990s;

(2) urges the Royal Government of Bhutan to conduct a rapid and unconditional release of all political prisoners, whose crime was demanding democracy and human rights, with due restitution and reparations;

(3) in a spirit of friendship, urges the Royal Government of Bhutan to resume discussions with the Government of Nepal on the status of individuals in Nepal who assert a claim to Bhutan citizenship or residency;

(4) requests the Royal Government of Bhutan to restore citizenship for all Nepali-speaking Lhotshampas that have had it arbitrarily revoked;

(5) requests the Royal Government of Bhutan accept the voluntary return of its citizens from the refugee camps in Nepal; and

(6) urges the Royal Government of Bhutan to enter into a holistic peace building and reconciliation process and institute an independent Truth Commission to publicly investigate any human rights violations and abuses committed during the 1990s, publish its findings, and follow through on its recommendations to ensure no future displacement or oppression of Nepali-speaking Lhotshampas and other minorities in Bhutan.

SENATE RESOLUTION 109—REQUESTING INFORMATION ON SAUDI ARABIA'S HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES PURSUANT TO SECTION 502B(C) OF THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.:

S. RES. 109

Resolved,

SECTION 1. REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON SAUDI ARABIA'S HUMAN RIGHTS PRACTICES.

(a) STATEMENT REQUESTED.—The Senate requests that the Secretary of State, not later than 30 days after the date of the adoption of this resolution, transmits to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, pursuant to section 502B(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(c)), a statement regarding Saudi Arabia's human rights practices that has been prepared in collaboration with the Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor and the Office of the Legal Adviser.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The statement submitted under subsection (a) should include—

(1) all available credible information concerning alleged violations of internationally recognized human rights by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, including—

(A) torture and inhuman treatment of detainees;

(B) execution of people for nonviolent offenses;

(C) discrimination against women;

(D) severe restrictions on religious freedom;

(E) forced disappearances;

(F) transnational repression; and

(G) the denial of the right to life in the context of the armed conflict in Yemen caused by indiscriminate or disproportionate operations;

(2) a description of the steps that the United States Government has taken—

(A) to promote respect for and observance of human rights as part of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's activities, including in the context of the armed conflict in Yemen;

(B) to discourage any practices that are inimical to internationally recognized human rights; and

(C) to publicly or privately call attention to, and disassociate the United States and any security assistance provided for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia from, any practices described in subparagraph (B);

(3) an assessment, notwithstanding any practices described in paragraph (2)(B), whether extraordinary circumstances exist that necessitate a continuation of security assistance for the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia;

(4) if such circumstances exist, a description of the circumstances and the extent to which security assistance should be continued (subject to such conditions as Congress may impose under section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304)); and

(5) other information, including—

(A) an assessment from the Secretary of State of the likelihood that United States security assistance (as defined in section 502B(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(d))) will be used in support of Saudi activities related to the armed conflict in Yemen;

(B) a description and assessment of the actions that the United States Government is taking to ensure end use monitoring protocols for all weapons sold or transferred to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for use in Yemen;

(C) an assessment of any impact or adverse effect to Israel's qualitative military edge of security assistance provided by the United States or other countries;

(D) a description of any actions that the United States Government is taking to address allegations of detention, torture, or forced disappearances of United States citizens by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia;

(E) a description of any actions that the United States Government is taking to deter incidents of intimidation or harassment by the Government of Saudi Arabia against United States citizens, individuals in the United States, and their family members who are not United States citizens, whether living in Saudi Arabia or in the United States; and

(F) a description of any actions that the United States Government is taking to prevent the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia from aiding Saudi citizens accused of violent crimes in the United States to flee from the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 110—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF THE LATE JAMES GEORGE ABOUREZK

Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BUDD, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. VANCE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.:

S. RES. 110

Whereas James G. Abourezk was born in Wood, South Dakota, to Lebanese immigrants in 1931;

Whereas James G. Abourezk earned a degree in civil engineering from the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, graduated from the University of South Dakota School of Law, and practiced law in Rapid City, South Dakota;

Whereas James G. Abourezk served in the United States Navy from 1948 to 1952;

Whereas James G. Abourezk was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1970 and represented the State of South Dakota from 1971 to 1973;

Whereas James G. Abourezk was elected to the United States Senate in 1972, representing the State of South Dakota from 1973 to 1979, and was the first Arab American to serve in the United States Senate;

Whereas James G. Abourezk re-established the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, serving as the first Chair of the Committee after re-establishment;

Whereas James G. Abourezk co-authored and worked to pass Public Law 95–341 (commonly known as the ''American Indian Religious Freedom Act'') (42 U.S.C. 1996 et seq.), the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.), and the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.);

Whereas James G. Abourezk, after leaving the Senate, co-founded and was the first chair of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee;

Whereas James G. Abourezk served as the first Attorney General of the Navajo Nation from 1982 to 1983; and

Whereas James G. Abourezk continued to advocate on behalf of Native American communities after his retirement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate—

(A) has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of James G. Abourezk, former member of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives;

(B) honors the life and legacy of James G. Abourezk for his unwavering dedication to South Dakota as a public servant and his accomplishments in legislating with principle and dedication for the good of the people of the United States; and

(C) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of James G. Abourezk; and

(2) when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of James G. Abourezk.

SENATE RESOLUTION 111—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF MAPLE SYRUP PRODUCTION TO MAINE AND DESIGNATING MARCH 26, 2023, AS ''MAINE MAPLE SUNDAY''

Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.:

S. RES. 111

Whereas the art of making sugar and syrup from the sap of the maple tree (also known as acer saccharinum) was developed by Native Americans of the Northeastern United States;

Whereas the production of maple syrup in Maine has a seasonal window between January and May, which is when temperatures drop below freezing at night and rise above freezing during the day;

Whereas Maine accounts for 17 percent of United States production of maple syrup and is the third largest producer among the States;

Whereas Maine maple syrup producers make more than 575,000 gallons of syrup annually, generating more than $27,000,000 for the Maine economy;

Whereas maple syrup production in Maine supports more than 560 full-time and part-time jobs that generate more than $17,300,000 in wages;

Whereas Maine Maple Sunday has been observed for 40 years, with more than 100 sugarhouses participating from Aroostook to York County, Maine, and attracting thousands of visitors annually;

Whereas Maine Maple Sunday is always observed the fourth Sunday in March; and

Whereas on March 26, 2023, Maine maple syrup producers will host the 40th annual Maine Maple Sunday: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 26, 2023, as ''Maine Maple Sunday''; and

(2) recognizes the contribution and importance of maple syrup producers and their families in the State of Maine.

SENATE RESOLUTION 112—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF FEBRUARY 27 THROUGH MARCH 3, 2023, AS ''PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK''

Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 112

Whereas public education is a significant institution in a 21st-century democracy;

Whereas public schools in the United States educate students about the values and beliefs that hold the individuals of the United States together as a nation;

Whereas public schools prepare young individuals of the United States to contribute to the society, economy, and citizenry of the country;

Whereas 90 percent of children in the United States attend public schools;

Whereas Federal, State, and local lawmakers should—