

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.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MATTHEW T. MCGUIRE TO BE UNITED STATES EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

NOMINATION OF GENTRY O. SMITH, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF FOREIGN MISSIONS, AND TO HAVE THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Matthew T. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years; and Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes of debate, equally divided in the usual form.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly our colleagues will have an opportunity to vote on two nominations that are being recommended by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I see that Senator CORKER is on the floor, and I thank him for his help in bringing these two confirmations to the floor of the Senate. Both of these individuals are well qualified, and I urge our colleagues to support both nominations.

One is the nomination of Matthew McGuire to be United States Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The other is the nomination of Gentry Smith to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions.

Mr. McGuire is the Assistant to the Secretary and Director of the Office of Business Liaison at the Department of Commerce, where he leads engagement with the business community, works to strengthen the international economic position of the United States, and advocates for U.S. trade and investment. Prior to joining the U.S. Government, Mr. McGuire worked as a senior executive in the financial services industry for more than 8 years, but he also has been active with nonprofit and civic organizations throughout his career, working on a range of public policy issues across the country and around the world.

In a world where global health, environmental resources, and security challenges far outstrip any one country's ability to respond, it is in our clear interest to have strong U.S. leadership in the World Bank—the foremost international organization promoting economic development, poverty alleviation, and good governance around the world.

Prominent Members of the House of Representatives emphasized this critical role of the World Bank in their May 15 letter supporting Mr. McGuire's nomination. Representatives MEEKS, CLAY, MURPHY, SEWELL, MENG, RANGEL, and others stated that Mr. McGuire's senior executive experience in the financial services industry and leadership roles with nonprofit and civic organizations working on public policy issues around the world "make him distinctly qualified for this position." Mr. McGuire's highly relevant experience in his current position at the Department of Commerce, added to his extensive background working in both for-profit and nonprofit sectors, make him an excellent choice to represent the United States at this institution that is so crucial for global stability. I am confident he will serve with distinction.

Gentry O. Smith is currently a Senior Advisor at the Bureau of Diplomatic Security. The Office of Foreign Missions assists and regulates services for foreign missions in the United States, negotiates with foreign diplomatic representatives to improve operating conditions for U.S. diplomatic missions and personnel abroad, ensures that U.S. diplomatic missions abroad receive equivalent treatment with respect to benefits, privileges, and immunities accorded by the host countries, and, as necessary, adjusts the benefits accorded to foreign missions in the United States on the basis of the principle of reciprocity.

Mr. Smith has an exemplary record of serving his country for well over a quarter of a century, starting with his service as a Raleigh police officer. Mr.

Smith's thorough and highly relevant experience as a Regional Security Officer for American Embassies in Egypt, Japan, and Burma, and his employment with the Bureau of Diplomatic Security as Director of Physical Security Programs, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Countermeasures, and Senior Advisor gives him the expertise and fortitude to head the agency responsible for both improving the operating conditions for U.S. diplomatic missions and for adjusting the benefits accorded to foreign missions if our missions abroad face mistreatment.

Mr. Smith is a proven leader with extensive management experience and skills, and I am confident he will be an excellent Director of the Office of Foreign Missions.

Let me also point out that I know our committee has been very, very busy. We have been able to successfully steer towards enactment the bill for congressional review of the Iranian nuclear agreement. We recently were able to report out in a 19-to-0 vote State Department authorization. I must say that not a day goes by that our committee is not doing some work on behalf of the Senate and the American people.

But I need to point out that we need to pay more attention to getting the President's nominees to the floor with recommendations from our committee. If we complete these two nominations tonight—and I assume that we will—I believe that will make four nominees on which we have completed our work in confirmation that the President has sent to us. There are nine other recommendations, five of which are career officers, that have been reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and have yet to be brought to the floor. Five of those nine are career people, and yet we have had no action on the floor of the Senate. Of more concern, there are 35 nominees currently pending before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Of these 35, only 4 have had hearings, and 22 of the 35 are career diplomats.

I understand we have had an extremely busy schedule within the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Senator CORKER and I have talked about this, and I know we will use our best efforts to get these nominations moving forward. I just really wanted to report that because I think we need to work—not only our committee but the leadership of the Senate—to make sure the President's nominees are timely considered and are timely brought forward to the full Senate. I know Senator CORKER has been a true advocate of that process and certainly worked very well in the last Congress to make sure our committee acted in a timely way. I look forward to working with Senator CORKER in this Congress to advance those nominees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise in support of these two nominations. I appreciate the distinguished ranking

member, Senator CARDIN, for reading out their bios. They are Foreign Service officers and have been in government service for some time. I applaud their desire to serve at this level and certainly plan to support them here at our 5:30 vote and hope other Members of the Senate will.

As to the point regarding nominations, I think our committee last year couldn't have acted in a more speedy fashion in getting nominees out. I know we are starting a new Congress, and there is a little backlog that takes place. But I can assure the Senator and others on the committee and others in this body that I have no desire to hold up especially Foreign Service officers who have committed their lives to the Foreign Service and have handled themselves in such a professional manner nor, actually, other nominees. So I do look forward to working with Senator CARDIN to clear some folks through. I know we have had conversations today regarding moving them across the Senate floor. I know every time there is a recess, typically a large swath of people are actually moved out right before recess. Hopefully, that will be the case as it relates to some of the Foreign Service nominations that are here.

But I appreciate the Senator raising it. I appreciate the way he works with me, and I look forward to things picking up speed now that the backlog of the first-of-the-year beginning and some of the many activities that have been under way have been completed. So I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, again, let me thank Senator CORKER. It has been a real pleasure to work with him on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He has put the interest of the Senate and our Nation as the principle guiding force and the appropriate role for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In that regard, there is an amendment pending that we will be voting on tomorrow on the National Defense Authorization Act. It comes under the jurisdiction of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Let me comment on that, if I might. That is an amendment offered by Senator ERNST, and her amendment would provide temporary authority to provide arms directly to the Kurds, the Kurdish regional government's security forces, outside the process established with coordinating all U.S. weapons deliveries and training with the Government of Iraq and Baghdad. Not only is it the U.S. policy to ensure that all armed transfers are coordinated and approved by the Government of Iraq, it is also the law of our country.

I very much oppose this amendment, and I just want my colleagues to understand why I hope they will reject this amendment. I know it is well intended, but it would undermine the authority of the central government.

What we are looking for, how we are going to ultimately be able to bring stability to Iraq, we need to have a central government that represents all the communities of Iraq, that represents the Shias, represents the Sunnis, represents the Kurds. If the central government cannot be the co-ordinating entity, then we are going to have a void in that country which only fuels the ability of organizations such as ISIS to be able to get recruits and resources for their terrorist activities.

We are sending military advisers, funding, and arms to the Iraqis and leading a global coalition and working every day with the Iraqi leaders and communities at all levels because we have an interest in a stable, unified, and Federal Iraq. To achieve this goal, we must have the confidence of all of the Iraqi leaders, and that is why it is important for us to coordinate our strategy through a central government.

I want to make one other point absolutely clear. There is absolutely no evidence that the Baghdad government is delaying or denying arms to the Kurds. To date, the United States and the anti-ISIL coalition has provided over 47 million rounds of ammunition, thousands of artillery pieces and rifles, 1,000 AT4 shoulder-fired, anti-armor systems, hundreds of vehicles, including Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles, known as the MRAPs, and European missiles to counter vehicle-borne improvised explosive devices. They have been receiving arms.

We have received letters, both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee, from Secretary of State Kerry and Secretary of Defense Carter in opposition to the Ernst amendment.

If I might quote from Secretary Kerry, where he said:

Any language that calls for preferred treatment for one region of Iraq strengthens voices that have been working against the pragmatic reconciliation policies advocated by Prime Minister Abadi. . . . It also reinforces Iran's narrative that the United States seeks Iraq's partition and that Iran is Iraq's only true and reliable partner. The result, therefore, is the precise opposite of what may have been intended: the language strengthens ISIL and other extremists, weakens Iraqi voices committed to working with the Coalition to degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL, increased Iran's prominence, and erodes state authority at a time when such authority is vitally needed to isolate and defeat extremist actors.

What Secretary Kerry is saying is—it should be pretty obvious—that in order to diminish Iran's influence in Iraq, you need a central government that has the confidence of the Sunni population and the Kurdish population. If, on the other hand, we are talking about trying to divide the country, that we are going to deal differently with the Kurdish defense and not through the central defense, then it feeds into the point that the United States is not serious about developing a unified Iraqi authority. We must

have that if we are going to be able to succeed in Iraq.

What Secretary Carter said, Secretary of Defense:

Directly arming the Kurds or other groups within Iraq is inconsistent with the long-standing U.S. foreign policy of working to maintain a stable, unified, Iraq. . . . Legislative language of this type risks undermining the Government of Iraq and undercutting ongoing coalition military operations that are conducting in coordination with the Government of Iraq to degrade, destroy, and ultimately defeat ISIL.

Once again, we have our two top individuals both telling us this would be counterproductive. I know my colleague is well intentioned with her amendment, but the fact is that the only way we are going to succeed in Iraq is if we can have a Government of Iraq that has the confidence of all the communities and an Iraqi Government that believes the United States is not picking sides among the ethnic communities in Iraq and that Iraq does not have to rely on Iran for its security needs.

That means this amendment could be counterproductive to those very goals, our very goals in Iraq. When this amendment comes up for vote tomorrow, I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I will be supporting the nominee who is going to be shortly voted on.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to rise on the third anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program for all of the young men and women it has helped—young men and women who came to this country as young children through no choice of their own. Their parents made that decision for them. The only country they have ever known is that of the United States. The only flag they pledge allegiance to is the American flag. The only national anthem they know is “The Star-Spangled Banner.” And because of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, they have had temporary deportation relief and work authorizations so they could achieve their full potential as young Americans.

I celebrate what we call this program, DACA, Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, with great pride because I pushed very hard to make it a reality. I spoke to the President many times about granting long overdue administrative relief to DREAMers, who are Americans in every way except for a piece of paper.

And 3 years ago with the tireless advocacy of DREAMers, the immigrant community, community leaders in cities and towns across America, and with the help of countless Members of Congress, the President took action and changed the lives of millions of young men and women living in this country, allowing them to fully contribute to the country they call home.

Today, the dream is still very much alive. This Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program has harnessed the talent of hundreds of thousands of young Americans in immeasurable ways since its successful inception, and it is a success because of the bold Executive actions taken in June of 2012.

In an immigration system that is as flawed as ours, the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program has been a beacon of hope, one step toward a more fair and just reality for immigrants in our great country. The numbers tell the story.

The action gave 700,000 young immigrants a chance at a better life. It has strengthened our economy and has generated roughly \$422 million in application fees over the last 3 years. It has allowed young Americans to open bank accounts, get a driver's license, get a new job, prepare for the future with a growing sense of stability, economic security, and financial solvency.

This program has been a model of success, shaped by the courageous individuals who have decided to come forward, register with the government, pass a criminal background check, work hard, and take advantage of the opportunities the deferred action program provides.

In my home State of New Jersey alone, more than 25,000 young people have been granted the peace of mind that comes with temporary protection from deportation and the ability to work. We are talking about young people who attend our schools, serve our communities, people who dream just like all children dream of becoming doctors or teachers, artists, and entrepreneurs with a full stake in America.

We are talking about people like Deyanira Aldana, who graduated from Essex County College just this past May. She came to the United States when she was 4 years old. She now works and lives in New Jersey with her mom and dad and older brother and sister who are also DACA recipients. She plans on becoming a substitute teacher and is grateful to the doors the deferred action program has opened to her.

Deyanira, like other new Americans and future Americans, is part of the rich fabric that forms New Jersey's and America's histories and destiny. Her family represents who we are as a nation. They embody the spirit of American life, which has always been shaped by the hopes, dreams, and courage of those who have made it to this country and called it their home.

It is appropriate that these deferred action beneficiaries—the children of

immigrants we refer to as DREAMers—have the chance to fully contribute their talents and live the American dream because of the deferred action program. In the absence of comprehensive immigration reform, DACA allows them to live with dignity and fulfill their full potential. Because of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, hundreds of thousands of DREAMers no longer have the fear of deportation and family separation hanging over their heads and now are our newest college students, teachers, and small business owners. If we look closely at who those individuals are, we see that this program is about families like Deyanira's. By removing the fear of deportation, of being unnecessarily torn from your loved ones at a moment's notice, more families can now live in peace, with dignity, and with real hopes of building a stronger future together.

Three years later, we see how our Nation's dreams and aspirations are more attainable when DREAMers can achieve their full potential. The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program is living proof that all of America benefits when an undocumented individual steps out of the shadows and is able to fully contribute to the economy through their ingenuity, skills, and hard work.

We need to build upon programs like DACA, not turn our backs on extending opportunities to those who are willing to work hard for them. It is long past time for us to replace the lingering anxiety and fear in immigrant communities with smart policies that make good on America's promise to provide opportunity and freedom for all.

For many, the dream began with the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program. For others, that dream is still delayed. I look forward to the day the President's more recent Executive actions announcing the Deferred Action for Parental Accountability Program and expanded DACA are implemented.

Despite the obstructionism of some, I am confident justice will ultimately prevail, and the President's actions will be upheld by our courts. I will continue to fight not just for the DACA recipients but for their parents, other DREAMers, and for every immigrant family. I will continue to fight for comprehensive immigration reform that will fix our Nation's broken immigration system once and for all, not just because it makes good economic sense but because it is the right thing to do.

I am not alone. Seventy-two percent of Americans believe undocumented immigrants who currently live in the United States should have a path toward permanent residency and ultimately to legal citizenship. Americans continue to overwhelmingly support fixing our broken system, and the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program's success should further encourage Congress to move forward, for-

tified by the conviction that comprehensive immigration reform is a fight worth fighting for.

Let me close by saying, in the meantime, I join my colleagues in commemorating DACA's anniversary as a day that marks 3 years of smart and successful policy, as a step in the right direction, and as a foundation upon which we can continue to build. It is an opportunity for the American dream to be realized by some of the youngest and best and brightest whom we have in the Nation. Many of these young men and women—I have met them—are valedictorians, salutatorians, and we need to use their intellect, energy, and creative talents to build a better America.

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

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

VOTE ON MCGUIRE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Matthew T. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years?

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 62, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 208 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Alexander
Ayotte

Baldwin
Bennet

Blumenthal
Booker

Brown	Gillibrand	Murray
Cantwell	Grassley	Nelson
Cardin	Hatch	Peters
Carper	Heinrich	Portman
Casey	Heitkamp	Reed
Cassidy	Hirono	Reid
Coats	Johnson	Sanders
Collins	Kaine	Schatz
Coons	King	Schumer
Corker	Kirk	Shaheen
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cotton	Leahy	Tester
Donnelly	Manchin	Tillis
Durbin	Markey	Udall
Ernst	McCaskill	Warner
Feinstein	Menendez	Warren
Flake	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Mikulski	
Gardner	Murphy	Wyden

NAYS—24

Barrasso	Hooven	Roberts
Blunt	Isakson	Rounds
Boozman	Lankford	Sasse
Capito	McConnell	Scott
Daines	Moran	Sullivan
Enzi	Paul	Thune
Fischer	Perdue	Toomey
Heller	Risch	Wicker

NOT VOTING—14

Boxer	Graham	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sessions
Cochran	Lee	Shelby
Crapo	McCain	Vitter
Cruz	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SMITH NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

800TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAGNA CARTA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Eight hundred years ago on this very day, at the field of Runnymede alongside the River Thames in England, King John granted the document that came to be known as the Magna Carta—in our language, the Great Charter. This was the result of negotiations between King John and rebellious barons who objected to what they saw as violations of their customary privileges. By affixing his Great Seal to the document 800 years ago today, the King accepted limits on his power to impose his will on his subjects.

It was a momentous occasion, as evidenced by the fact that four original

copies of the Magna Carta remain carefully preserved, but its significance has grown over time. It is true that the original Magna Carta was only in effect for a couple months before King John then at that time got the Pope to annul it. Subsequent Kings voluntarily reissued the charter as a way of gaining the support of the barons, and portions still retain legal force in England today.

While many of the specific provisions in the Magna Carta dealt with very medieval concerns, such as how heirs and widows of deceased barons should be treated, a couple clauses resonate very strongly to this very day.

No free man shall be seized or imprisoned or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any other way, nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgment of his equals or by the law of the land.

To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay justice or rightful justice.

In these clauses, you can see the specific right of habeas corpus that was included in the U.S. Constitution as well as a right to speedy trial by jury in the Sixth Amendment. You can also see a reference to property rights. Moreover, what comes through is the overarching theme of the Magna Carta—something very basic to U.S. governance—the rule of law or what John Adams called “a government of laws, and not of men.”

In the 17th century, the Magna Carta was increasingly cited to criticize the King's exercise of arbitrary power in the tug-of-war for supremacy between the English Crown and the Parliament. It became a potent symbol of an inviolable liberties of Englishmen.

For instance, when William Penn was put on trial in England for practicing his Quaker faith, he used the Magna Carta in his defense. He later wrote a commentary on the Magna Carta for a work printed in Philadelphia called “The Excellent Privilege of Liberty and Property Being the Birth-Right of the Free-born Subjects of England,” which contained the first edition of the Magna Carta printed in the New World. In this work, William Penn explained the significance of the English tradition where the ruler is bound by the law, in contrast to countries such as France, where the King was actually the law.

He wrote, again quoting William Penn:

In England the Law is both the measure and the bound of every Subject's duty and allegiance, each man having a Fixed Fundamental right born with him, as to freedom of his person and property in his estate, which he cannot be deprived of, but either by his consent, or some crime, for which the law has imposed such a penalty for forfeiture.

It is in this environment that the English philosopher John Locke developed his theory of natural rights, which was so influential in the drafting of the Declaration of Independence. The natural rights philosophy went a step further than the ancient rights of

Englishmen, positing that the rights are God-given and self-evident and that the very purpose of government is to secure those rights.

However, you can clearly trace the lineage of the notion of limited government and consent of the governed to the Magna Carta. In fact, the original version of the Magna Carta contained a clause limiting the ability of the King to levy certain taxes on the barons without first consulting them. I think you can clearly see that this is an early version of what we say: No taxation without representation.

While that provision did not last, the custom of needing consent for taxation eventually led to the evolution of the parliamentary system and representative government. Still, it is important to note that representative government grew out of even more fundamental principles, such as the rule of law, limited government, and the notion that citizens retain rights that the government may not in any way violate.

Our Founding Fathers thought that representative government was the best way to guard against tyranny and preserve the rights of citizens. But that is not sufficient, because without a strong tradition of respect for the rule of law, even duly-elected governments can descend into tyranny. Now, remember the history of Germany pre-World War II. Hitler came to power as a result of a democratic process and then proceeded to act in the very definition of tyranny.

In more recent times, Vladimir Putin was elected President of Russia and then stifled opposition and consolidated power to himself, essentially putting himself above the law. When Sergei Magnitsky stood up for the rule of law in Russia and exposed corruption at the highest levels in that country, he was imprisoned in appalling conditions, where he died a slow, agonizing death.

By contrast, the 800-year old Anglo-American tradition of the rule of law acts as a crucial safeguard to our liberty—not only that, but it is also an essential foundation for prosperity. An organization called World Justice Project has ranked countries based on various factors that indicate how a strong the rule of law is in that particular country. The countries at the top tend to not only be ones we recognize as very free but also tend to be much more prosperous than countries ranked at the bottom of the rule of law index.

Now, maybe to us in America that makes common sense. I think it is common sense. You are less likely, then, to work hard to generate wealth or invest in a business if you cannot be sure that the law will protect what you worked for. Still, we should not take this 800-year-old document and tradition for granted. It will continue to preserve our liberty and provide for our prosperity only so long as it retains the reverence it has built up over the generations.