

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

COMPROMISE GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to announce my support and my hope that all of us will support the bipartisan compromise that will be proffered this afternoon by Senator COLLINS, myself, Senator HEITKAMP, and others on the Democratic side to actually put something on the floor that is not designed to fail but is designed to pass.

Many of us have been concerned that we use lists that actually mean something. We believe that somebody who is not allowed to fly, somebody who is on the no-fly list, should not be allowed to purchase a weapon but that those people who find themselves in that position should be afforded due process protections as well, as is necessary under the Constitution.

The problem with the broader watch list that there was an amendment on last night is it is a broad watch list with more than a million people. There are bits and pieces of information from many of our intelligence agencies. It isn't really designed for this purpose. So what we have done with this compromise piece of legislation is taken the no-fly list, as well as what is called the selectee list, which is a slightly broader list of those who are allowed to fly but are retained for additional screening. These are defined lists, much smaller, and affect a much smaller group of Americans.

If you find yourself on these lists, then the Attorney General would have the ability to block that gun purchase, but you would be given robust due process protections as well, where you could challenge it. The presumption of innocence would be there, and it would be the government's job to actually prove that you belong on that list and should be denied the purchase of a weapon. If the government could not prove their case, the government would actually pay the attorney's fees as well. So there are strong, robust due process protections here as well.

But this is simply based on the principle that if you are denied the right to fly, it stands to reason that, without additional checks, you should not be able to purchase a weapon.

That is what this compromise piece of legislation is all about. A lot will be said outside of this body—that it is intended for other purposes—but I would encourage everyone to look at the legislation we are offering this afternoon. It has bipartisan support—unlike most of what has been put forward so far—and it has growing support as well.

We actually believe we ought to put something on the floor that will pass, not just protect one party or the other in terms of an election coming up. We want to actually have an impact on the situation.

With that, I urge support for the bipartisan compromise we are going to offer this afternoon.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

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

UNITED KINGDOM AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on September 2, 1939, the House of Commons convened to debate whether to declare war on Germany for having invaded Poland. Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain seemed ambivalent and didn't immediately call for a declaration. Clement Atlee, the Labor Party leader was absent that day. When his deputy rose and declared that he would "speak for Labor," Conservative MP Leo Amery famously yelled from across the floor: "Speak for England!"

I am here today to speak for England, for Great Britain, indeed for all of the United Kingdom. This Thursday, June 23, the British people will answer a momentous question: Should the United Kingdom remain a member of the European Union or leave the European Union?

I have not stated nor will I state today a position on this question. The British people alone should decide their policy toward the Continent. What I will defend is their sovereign right as a people to decide this question free of external influences, foreign threats, and hysterical fear-mongering.

The "great and the good," the Davoisie elite, are united in horror at the prospect of a British exit from the EU. According to these Eurocrats, if the British people choose to leave the EU, then the people must be punished. Some have called for immediate tax increases and budget cuts should the "Leave" campaign win. Business leaders threaten to move jobs out of Britain and to the Continent. Many economists speculate that recession is the best possible outcome, with depression the more likely outcome.

Most disappointing of all, foreign governments have made egregious threats of retaliation in trade, financial matters, and other economic matters, both to punish the British people for exercising their sovereign right of self-government and to intimidate the other peoples of Europe from doing the same. I would say the only thing they

aren't predicting is war and pestilence—but they are. Indeed, one leading Eurocrat said a British exit could mean "the end of Western civilization."

If the Davoisie elite were doing even a passable job of governing their own countries, perhaps their unsolicited advice might be heeded. But let's face it. Europe is beset by its own problems, not the least caused by the democracy deficit in the European Union. With no coordination or democratic accountability, the Eurocrats last summer allowed migrants to overrun their continent. Most of these migrants lack the job skills and education to contribute meaningfully to European economies. Some migrants went on rampaging crime sprees, and terrorists infiltrated the migrant flows to enter France and commit the Paris attacks. Meanwhile, the migrant flow continues across the Mediterranean, with hundreds dying en route. What is the Eurocrats' policy? "If you survive the trip, you can stay." How is that moral? How is that wise?

The economies of Europe aren't much better. Many countries are trapped beneath unpayable mountains of debt, saddled with austerity plans merely to make the next repayment and avoid default. Unemployment is high, and for young people it is rampant and chronic. Growth is negligible. In fact, the only continent with lower growth than Europe is Antarctica.

I am amazed, maybe even a little amused, that despite these and other manifest failures, the Eurocrats presume to lecture the British people. Perhaps they hope "Project Fear" will sufficiently intimidate the Brits into voting for "Remain." After all, if the EU loses Great Britain, Europe will lose 350 million pounds a week, and it will lose a dumping ground for a quarter million migrants a year. The stakes are pretty high for Brussels.

But that doesn't justify their flagrant interference with Britain's domestic politics. Since the Davoisie elite are threatening to punish the Brits if they leave the EU, let me say in response that the American people will stand with our British cousins no matter what they decide. If the Continent dares to retaliate against Britain, I will do everything in my power to defend and strengthen the Anglo-American alliance that built so much of the modern world and on which it still depends.

The Eurocrats may want to pressure Britain, but perhaps they might recall that Britain is not the only land where pressure can be brought to bear. On my last trip to Europe, I heard from many political and business leaders who were eager—desperate, even—to consummate the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership. The Paris and Brussels attacks vividly reminded us that the small continental countries depend heavily on American intelligence to support their counterterrorism efforts. Of course, need anyone be reminded which NATO country underwrites the independence and security of

Europe, particularly in the face of a revisionist Russia?

It would be regrettable if a continental temper tantrum imperiled these important relationships with the United States. One would hope that cooler heads will prevail in the capitals of continental Europe should the British people elect to leave the EU. One would hope that Brussels, Berlin, Paris, and other capitals will realize that Britain, in or out of the EU, is a NATO ally, a trading partner, and a friend in freedom. One would hope that a British exit, if that is Britain's choice, would be followed by the spirit of magnanimity, generosity, and continued friendship. But hopes aside, one should know this: The American people will stand with Britain, in or out of the EU, and will stand against punitive retaliation against the British people.

Of course, I must admit that, unfortunately—though not surprisingly—our own government is also sticking its nose where it doesn't belong. President Obama traveled to London last month to say that a newly free Britain would go to “the back of the queue” in trade negotiations with the United States. U.S. Trade Representative Michael Froman has cautioned: “We're not particularly in the market for [free trade agreements] with individual countries.” This strange combination of arrogance and ignorance is all too typical of the Obama administration. The United States has a bilateral trade agreement with Oman, after all. But negotiate a new bilateral trade agreement to support the special relationship with Great Britain, our ancestral ally? No, sir, we will have none of that nonsense.

So, for the record, let it be noted that the American people will stand up to the “great and the good” not only on the Continent, but also here in Washington if this or any future administration tries to punish Britain should it leave the EU. Just as I will do everything in my power to preserve our special relationship against continental meddling, so will I do the same with any administration that doesn't fully appreciate that relationship. I suspect many other Senators feel the same.

Put simply, there will be a new bilateral trade agreement, NATO will survive, our Five Eyes intelligence partnership will continue, and the special relationship will remain a bedrock for the prosperity and security of both our nations. The British people can cast their votes certain of those things.

The British people deserve nothing less. Were it not for them, Europe—indeed, the world over—might still be a mere plaything of kings and tyrants. Of all the peoples of the world, surely the Brits have earned the sovereign right to govern their own affairs, free of external influence or threats of retaliation. Like most Americans, I stand in admiration of Great Britain, and I stand with the British people, in or out of the EU.

I also call on the Davoisie elite, on the “great and the good,” to spend a little less time fulminating about British democracy in action and a little more time looking in the mirror at their own failures. Populist insurgencies are raging on both sides of the Atlantic, on both the left and the right. Rather than obsess about Great Britain, rather than keep the populists at bay one desperate election at a time, these leaders should consider why these insurgencies are gaining in every election—stagnant wages for the working class, uncontrolled migration without regard to economic need or cultural assimilation, Islamic terrorists massacring our citizens, and a loss of national honor around the world.

This record is not pretty. In politics, as in medicine, it is usually better to address the cause than the symptom. If our leaders addressed these challenges more creatively, more forthrightly, more effectively, perhaps neither the British people nor so many other people would be disappointed in their leaders to begin with. Let the British people manage their own affairs, whether right or wrong in your eyes. In the words of Scripture, whatever you may think of their mote, take care of your own beam first.

Mr. President, 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. COTTON. 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 JOEL SPENCER

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Joel Spencer of Little Rock, AR, as this week's Arkansan of the Week for his dedication to educating the next generation of computer coders, teaching students computer coding skills, and training other teachers as well.

Studies show that students who learn coding and computer science at a young age are more successful later on, and Joel Spencer wants to make sure each child who comes through his classroom has the opportunity for that success. Joel is an elementary science specialist and teacher in the Little Rock School District and each week teaches over 500 students. But his dedication to learning doesn't end there. Joel also conducts an afterschool computer Science First club, a Lego MINDSTORMS robotics club, and various other day camps around the State to introduce Arkansas students to programming. To say he is passionate about computer science education is an understatement.

Children aren't the only ones Joel teaches. He is also dedicated to helping his fellow teachers become better educators. Joel serves as an affiliate train-

er for Code.org, a nonprofit dedicated to expanding access to computer science and increasing participation by women and underrepresented groups. Through his work with this organization, Joel has trained over 1,000 teachers in code curriculum. He was also part of the committee that developed and adopted the K-8 computer science standards in Arkansas.

Joel's dedication in computer coding education hasn't gone unnoticed. He received the Arkansas Association of Instructional Media Technology Teacher of the Year Award for the State of Arkansas and is also a nominee for the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching. And during National Teacher Appreciation Week earlier this year, he was one of the computer science teachers recognized by President Obama at the White House.

While he was in town for that ceremony, Joel made some time to visit my office and share his passion for computer coding education. I am proud that Arkansas has teachers like Joel, who are making students' futures brighter each day.

It is my honor to recognize Joel Spencer as this week's Arkansan of the Week, and I am confident that the future of our State and Nation is brighter because of his work to inspire students to rise to the challenges of the 21st century.

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

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

ISIS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I came to the Senate floor to discuss the numerous foreign policy failures of the Obama administration. While there has been no shortage of examples over the past 7 years, I wish to revisit one particular subject from the litany of this administration's errors—the very serious national security threat that President Obama once called a JV team.

Last November, President Obama participated in an interview with the host of “Good Morning America,” George Stephanopoulos, who asked him the following question: “But ISIS is gaining strength, aren't they?”

The President's reply:

Well, no. I don't think they're gaining strength. What is true is that from the start, our goal has been first to contain, and we have contained them.

Just 1 day later—1 day later—ISIS gunmen and suicide bombers attacked Paris and killed 130 people. Less than a month after that, 2 ISIS-inspired terrorists killed 14 people in the first