

women no longer fear that their rights will be imperiled regardless of where they live and where they come from.

We will not be silent. We will not stop fighting. We will not give up, and we are not going away.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

(The remarks of Senator COLLINS and Senator SMITH pertaining to the submission of S. 1657 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Ms. SMITH. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

PRESIDENTIAL PARDONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, media outlets have begun reporting that President Trump is looking into granting pardons to certain military personnel who have been convicted of committing war crimes in both Iraq and Afghanistan. If these reports are true, I find this to be most troubling.

I have an article here that appeared CNN that says:

The idea of pardons of accused servicemembers who have not yet gone to trial and been convicted that is raising the most concern from some military law experts.

The United States' global influence is due, in large part, to its reputation for upholding human rights and adhering to international humanitarian law and the law of armed conflict, otherwise known as the law of war. As Stephen Preston, a former general counsel of the Department of Defense, wrote in the Department of Defense's Law of War Manual:

The law of war is part of who we are . . . the laws of war have shaped the U.S. Armed Forces as much as they have shaped any other armed force in the world . . . The law of war is a part of our military heritage, and obeying it is the right thing to do . . . the self-control needed to refrain from violations of law of war under the stresses of combat is the same good order and discipline necessary to operate cohesively and victoriously in battle.

Five interdependent principles serve as the foundation of the law of war: military necessity, humanity, proportionality, distinction, and honor. These principles are pillars of America's moral standing in the world that allow our military to be the most lethal fighting force against our adversaries but also the most respected and revered by citizens of the world.

The principles of the law of war are aligned with the constitutional values that our Founding Fathers set forth

and that all generations of U.S. military servicemembers have sworn an oath to uphold and defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Department of Defense policy states that "each member of the armed services has a duty to: (1) comply with the law of war in good faith; and (2) refuse to comply with clearly illegal orders to commit violations of the law of war." By virtue of their oath and training, members of the U.S. military are accountable for their individual and collective actions through the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

The U.S. Government is also obligated to implement and enforce the law of war as required by our Nation's own domestic laws, policies, regulations, orders, and by the multiple treaty obligations we have with other countries.

U.S. military members who are investigated and convicted of violating the law of war, through the prescribed Department of Defense investigative and judicial procedures, have violated international and domestic laws and have failed to uphold their oath and professional ethics. Whether it was My Lai during Vietnam or Abu Ghraib in Iraq, we have seen how the horrific acts committed by a small group of rogue actors can strategically diminish America's global standing, moral leadership, and strengthen our enemies.

We Americans combat extremism, tyranny, and hate to preserve our way of life. Under no circumstance is adapting to the behaviors of our worst adversaries ever justified—ever. If we willfully allow our institutions or the individuals within them to deviate from the laws and standards of conduct that underpin our great Nation, then we lose our way, and the world loses its champion of righteousness and internationally recognized norms and values.

I do not believe anyone in this Chamber disagrees with the laws and values of this country. The matter at hand is whether we will hold people accountable who violate those laws and fail to act on behalf of America with honor. To me, the right answer is very clear: The United States will not willfully commit or condone war crimes, and we must bring those who do commit them to justice regardless of citizenship, affiliation, or background. That is what we stand for as a nation. Those are our values, and that is America's leadership.

Even in the fog of war—especially in the fog of war—we must endeavor to act with the moral clarity that distinguishes the United States of America as a shining city upon a hill.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

THE ARCTIC

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I have asked for a few moments on the floor today to speak about an issue I

care about deeply. It is a part of the globe, a part of the world that, in my view, is truly evolving and is as dynamic an area as anyplace on planet Earth. This is the Arctic.

The Arctic is growing in prominence around the globe. Countries like China, India, and Germany have taken a keen interest in what happens in the far north.

I have had many colleagues ask me: Why should a Senator from, say, the State of Indiana care about the Arctic?

I guess my rhetorical answer would be this: Well, why should China care about the Arctic? Why should Japan, Germany, and India care about the Arctic? If they are paying attention to it, shouldn't we, as an Arctic nation that actually has territory in the Arctic, be interested and focused on this as well?

To be fair, we have made some good progress this year. I appreciate the administration working with us. I appreciate my colleagues here in the Congress who worked with us to ensure that we were able to advance appropriations for the first polar security cutter. This is significant news for the American Arctic. People have heard me say that we have about 1½ icebreakers in the United States right now. We have the Polar Star, which breaks ice down in Antarctica, meeting our obligations there. We have the Polar Sea, which is tied up in Washington State and will probably never see service again. We have a medium-strength icebreaker, the Healey, which does a fair amount of research work. But for us, as an Arctic nation, it is important to have a fleet of icebreakers.

That is what we, as an Arctic nation, must be working toward, so a contract for the design and construction of the first polar-class icebreaker to be built in the United States in the past 40 years was awarded just last month. As a nation, we haven't seen work on an icebreaker in four decades now.

A total of \$20 million is also being provided for long lead time materials for a second polar security cutter. Hopefully, we will be talking about more than just one polar security cutter and we will one day have what this country, as an Arctic nation, should have, and that is a fleet.

But the Arctic is about more than just icebreakers. It is about the people who live there. It is about the environment. It is about its location on the globe. The Arctic is a living and breathing place. I think some people, in their mind's eye, view the Arctic as a frozen wasteland, or perhaps it is a snow globe that just kind of sits up on a shelf and you don't touch it. But it is not. It is home to some 4 million people in the Arctic region. It is not highly populated, but there are people living, working, raising their families, subsisting, and engaging in commerce. It is an important place.

It is a good thing when officials at the highest levels get together to discuss the issues within the Arctic. That

is what happened earlier this month—actually May 6 and 7—at the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting in Rovaniemi, Finland. The Foreign Ministers for each of the eight Arctic nations were in attendance. The significance of that is noteworthy. It was only the second time in the council's 30-plus-year history that all of the eight Ministers were gathered together. I was pleased to be a part of the U.S. delegation that was led by our Secretary of State, Secretary Pompeo.

This was actually the fifth Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting that I have attended going back to 2011, when the ministerial was held in Nuuk, Greenland. At that point in time, it was then-Secretary of State Clinton. That marked the first time the U.S. Secretary of State attended such a meeting. So 2011—it wasn't too many years ago that the United States had a Secretary of State attend.

The Arctic Council includes the eight Arctic nations. The eight Arctic nations are Canada, United States, Russia, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, and Greenland. It also includes six permanent participant groups within the Arctic Council that represent the indigenous populations within the region. Four of those partially reside in Alaska, and those are the Aleut International Association, the Arctic Athabaskan Council, the Gwich'in Council International, and the Inuit Circumpolar Council. While only the Arctic nations have voting rights, the permanent participants have a seat at the table, and they provide valuable input into the council's discussions and deliberations. I think we really saw the impact of the permanent participants at this most recent ministerial.

The council also has 38 observers, including 13 non-Arctic nations—this goes back to China, as I mentioned earlier—13 intergovernmental and inter-parliamentary groups, and 12 non-governmental entities. The number of observers and the number of pending applications to be observers has grown considerably in the past several years. Again, it just goes to demonstrate the rest of the world's interest in the Arctic.

Much of what we have seen reported after the ministerial that was held in Rovaniemi focused not on what happened but on what didn't happen at the ministerial, which was that, for the first time, there was not a signed ministerial declaration.

I was not part of any of the Minister-level discussions that went on either prior to their convening in Rovaniemi or directly prior to the day of the ministerial itself, but the crux of the impasse there was language regarding climate change and how much of the declaration would actually reference it.

This has all been reported very widely in the media, but what has not been reported nearly as broadly are the areas of agreement that were highlighted at the ministerial. All eight nations signed a joint ministerial state-

ment—not a declaration but a statement—which reaffirmed their commitment to maintain peace, stability, and cooperation in the Arctic. That is kind of a given. That is what we want to work for with each ministerial. But the joint statement recognized the diversity of the inhabitants of the region and the rights of the Arctic indigenous people. It also reaffirmed the commitment to sustainable development and the protection of the Arctic environment.

In addition to that very short statement, there was a statement by the chair of the ministerial meeting—the Foreign Minister of Finland—that encompassed what would have been in a declaration had one been signed and noted many of the areas of agreement amongst all the Arctic nations. These were items such as the importance of the role of scientific research, along with traditional and local knowledge, the significance of the Arctic Environment Ministers' Meeting, the Arctic Climate Change Update 2019 report, the outcomes from the Arctic Resilience Forum, the convening of the Second Arctic Science Ministerial. It encourages further work in adapting to climate change impacts, such as permafrost thaw, and responding to weather extremes, including the increased risk of wildfires.

Looking at the Foreign Minister's statement, it was clear that there were many areas and many provisions on which there was cooperation and agreement within the Arctic Council and many areas of agreement on environmental issues as well.

Another topic reported in the news was comments by Secretary Pompeo the day before the ministerial that were pretty direct. They were pretty directed and were directed to Russian and Chinese activity in the Arctic. The Secretary's remarks pointed to a reality, plain and simple. They pointed to a growing reality that today's Arctic is not the Arctic we have known in generations past.

We all still want—I certainly want, as one who works hard on Arctic issues every day—we want those buzz words that are synonymous with the region to continue to apply today and well into the future, words like “cooperation,” “collaboration,” and calling the Arctic the “zone of peace.”

Greater accessibility to the region and its resources, as we are seeing the ice that is receding from the shore—with greater opportunities for commercial transit, you have greater accessibility—is also bringing increased international awareness. You have seen not only a level of interest, but you have seen a level of investment activity and clearly competing interests that are presenting.

Some of this is great news. Fiber optic cable and satellite coverage are bringing a level of connectivity to small, remote, and isolated communities, which is something the communities embrace. With these advance-

ments, we see impacts on the culture and on the values of the indigenous populations.

We are seeing opportunities for tourism. Cruise ships with thousands of passengers are pulling into small coastal communities, which certainly boost their economy, but think about the impact when you have 1,000 people who may want to disembark into a community that doesn't have the infrastructure. It dwarfs the local population and impacts the existing infrastructure there.

Then, of course, whether we like it or not, national security interests are now at the forefront of many of the discussions about the High North. Secretary Pompeo—again, his words were pretty direct. He said:

The region has become an arena for power and for competition. And the eight Arctic States must adapt to this new future.

He also said that the Arctic Council no longer has the luxury to focus exclusively on scientific collaboration, cultural matters, and environmental research. He suggests that there is a new age of strategic engagement in the Arctic.

I don't disagree with the Secretary that military and national security issues are much, much, much more prevalent now than they were only 10 years ago, and it kind of begs the question as to whether the Arctic Council should expand its portfolio and take on these issues. That was the discussion I participated in later that day in Helsinki at the Munich Security Conference that was focused on Arctic security.

When the Arctic Council was established in 1996, military and national security interests were specifically excluded from Council activities. They chose to focus on economic development and resilience, the environment, research, the cultures, and left off of the mission requirements, if you will, the issues of national security and military interest. I think that is probably why we have been able to see such cooperation and collaboration coming out of the Arctic Council for these many years.

Yet, as was mentioned by the Foreign Minister from Finland in a follow-on discussion about the ministerial, it is not as if we can just place a “Do Not Disturb” sign on the Arctic—we as Arctic nations. It has changed. It is changing. Investment is happening. The activity is already occurring. So whether we are ready for it, whether we want it, whether we want to put out that “Do Not Disturb” sign or not, it is happening.

Russia is modernizing, and they are expanding their security posture in the region. Some say it is in a provocative manner; we can argue about that. But it is certainly a manner that suggests that they recognize the value of the region to their national interests, as well as the growing non-Arctic nation attention and access to the region.

China is also quite interested. During the same week as the Arctic Council

Ministerial, the Arctic Circle Assembly held a forum in Shanghai. So think about it. We were having an Arctic Circle Assembly in Shanghai. Think about how far Shanghai is from the Arctic. It highlighted China's interest and their investment in the Arctic. So, again, the geography can say that this is not an Arctic nation, not even a near-Arctic nation, but from scientific research to economic interest in the Arctic's natural resources, China has made it very clear that it has no intention of reducing its interests in a Polar Silk Road.

What Secretary Pompeo made very clear is, look, if there is going to be investment in the region, we all need to be operating by the same rules, and the rules require transparency—transparency when it comes to investment in the region, regardless of who is making it. I would add to that notion that those who live in the region should benefit from any investment in the Arctic, as they are the ones who bear the greatest risk in any economic activity, whether it is on the shore or in the waters.

We recognize there are plenty of opportunities in the Arctic, as we are seeing the impacts of climate change and what that means to an area that is becoming more exposed, but with those opportunities come very real challenges, and we have to address those as well. That includes environmental effects that come with climate change as we see a reduced sea ice cover and the need to develop rules of the road to provide transparency for the growing amount of investment in the Far North by both Arctic and non-Arctic actors alike.

One of the underreported events of the Rovaniemi Ministerial was the signing of a memorandum of understanding between the Arctic Council and the Arctic Economic Council. This new agreement will provide a framework to enhance responsible economic development and build partnerships for issues of common interest and capacity building of Arctic inhabitants. Perhaps this is the first step in developing a framework for transparent Arctic investment and a new age of strategic engagement in the Arctic.

I was very honored to attend both the Arctic Council Ministerial in Finland, as well as the Arctic Circle Assembly in Shanghai. I continue to believe it is critical for us—for those in the administration, for us here in Congress—to actively engage in the Arctic. We have a lot at stake here. The region has a lot at stake, and we need to establish sound policy that will take advantage of all of our opportunities and address our challenges while ensuring that we are working to the benefit of the local residents.

I think it is so important to reinforce that we cannot assume that if we are not stepping it up in the Arctic, that means nobody else is. That is absolutely and positively not the case. There is a level of engagement and

there is a level of interest that is global. We are one of the eight Arctic nations. We have a place; we have a people in the Arctic. We have an obligation, as an Arctic nation, to behave as one.

Alaskans are more than happy to lead whenever and wherever possible, but this is not an Alaska-specific issue. This is not just Alaska. This is all of us as a country. We also need that recognition at the Federal level.

I encourage Members of this Chamber to recognize the importance of the Arctic, to pay greater attention to what is happening there, to make the region a priority in our policymaking efforts, and to help ensure that America, which is an Arctic nation by virtue of Alaska—that we, as an Arctic nation, catch up to all of the others that are looking with great interest, whether making investments or truly making an impression on the Arctic.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

RECOGNIZING PURDUE UNIVERSITY'S ALL-AMERICAN MARCHING BAND.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise today to celebrate the talent and steadfast dedication of Purdue University's All-American Marching Band, which will be performing for the 100th time at the 103rd Running of the Indy 500.

Every year, the "Greatest Spectacle in Racing" attracts hundreds of thousands of fans to our State's capital. Throughout the last century, Purdue University's marching band has become an indispensable part of the annual festivities with their highly anticipated performance of traditional Indy 500 songs and other popular hits.

I commend the efforts and hard work put forth by the band's nearly 300 members. Their dedication in rehearsal is sure to pay off when they take to the famed Indy Motor Speedway this Sunday, welcoming spectators from around the world with familiar favorites, including the now customary performance of the classic "Back Home Again in Indiana."

I especially commend the Purdue University marching band directors, past and present, whose work make this tradition possible. This year, the band will be led by the acclaimed Hoosier, Jay Gephart, professor of music, and Al Wright, chair director of bands and orchestras at Purdue University. I am sure that under his direction, the All-American band will do Indiana proud.

I also recognize Purdue University's first marching band director, the late Paul Spotts Emrick, who initially forged the relationship between the University and the speedway. He directed Purdue's first performance at the famed 500-mile race in 1919, 100 years ago.

I applaud Purdue University's marching band for each year dedicating

themselves to sharing our Hoosier traditions and heritage with millions of viewers around the world. I extend my thanks to all who ensure that the tradition endures, and I look forward to another great performance this weekend from the Boilermakers. Go Boilers.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO MARY NAYLOR

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise, accompanied by an amazing public servant who is completing 29 years and 10 months of working in the U.S. Senate—Mary Naylor, my legislative director. She is angry with me right now for tricking her into this and walking into the Chamber and seeing my whole staff, but I wanted to just say a word to honor her.

When I came to the Senate—elected in 2012 and sworn in in January 2013—obviously, hiring a legislative director was a very, very important challenge that I was dealing with, and I had a number of people who wanted to do the job. There was a wonderful Senate staffer who was about to leave the Hill to see if there was life after the Senate. She wasn't sure whether there was but was really excited to see that. Yet, as tough a negotiator as she was, she let me persuade her to stay for one more term after she had wanted to leave to do other things. She did a remarkable job for me in my first term and has done a remarkable job now into my second term in the Senate. She has been my legislative director since my first day in the body, but as I pointed out, she is now nearly 30 years into serving this institution.

Let me tell you some things about Mary.

She is from Fargo, ND. She came to the Senate in 1989, which was right after she graduated with honors—Phi Beta Kappa—from Northwestern. She first became a legislative assistant for the late Senator Paul Simon in 1991. Then she eventually became the deputy chief of staff to Senator Kent Conrad of her home State. For most of her career in the Senate, she worked with Senator Conrad. When Senator Conrad became the Budget chairman in 2001, she became the Democratic staff director for the committee, and she remained in that position for 12 years until she became my legislative director in 2013.

Some highlights of her tenure with Budget include 10 budget resolutions, the Simpson-Bowles Commission, walking us back from a fiscal cliff in 2011, and a C-SPAN debut—oh, my gosh, a C-SPAN debut—in March 2008 when she testified before the Budget Committee on the fiscal year 2009 budget.