

are contradictory to the fundamental principles of academic freedom and the free exchange of ideas that they claim to promote.

While the supporters of this boycott claim to be standing up for the rights of Palestinians, what they are actually doing is presenting a one-sided and inaccurate representation of reality in Israel and ignoring Palestinian violence. The simple truth is that, throughout history, Israel has made numerous concessions in the pursuit of peace while seeking only the right to exist.

Anthropology teaches respect for cultural differences, but it is clear that some in academia didn't learn that lesson. Let's hope a majority of the members of the American Anthropological Association take time to understand the implications of this shameful resolution and vote "no" when it is put to a vote before the organization's full membership in April.

EVERY STUDENT SUCCEEDS ACT

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to praise the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, a landmark piece of bipartisan legislation that fixes the outdated policies of No Child Left Behind.

This legislation takes into consideration the collective criticisms of teachers and students and parents and, well, everybody really involved with education.

The Every Student Succeeds Act benefits low-income students, minority students, and English language barriers to learners by requiring schools to include student data about these groups into their accountability process.

High-stakes testing will no longer monopolize our class time. Schools will now have the flexibility to pilot innovative testing measures, allowing more time for learning in the classroom.

I was also proud that both Chambers included final language, which I supported, to include statistics for homeless students so that we can identify and aid some of our most needy students. Every child has a right to a quality education. I am so happy we were able to pass this act.

FAIRNESS FOR ALL AMERICANS

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about fairness and liberty, two deeply held values that define us as Americans. I am proud that our great Nation is moving toward a more inclusive society.

In a historic ruling this past summer, the Supreme Court of the United

States determined that our Constitution guarantees marriage equality. That ruling is a reflection of human rights. It is also an economic and compassionate issue which, as Republicans, we should embrace.

Not sacrificing our values is what the GOP stands for, limited government that respects individual liberty. But even with marriage equality, everyday LGBT Americans still lack basic legal protections. All Americans deserve equal protection and equal rights under the law.

As a founding member of the Congressional LGBT Equality Caucus, I will continue to work to ensure that the principles of respect, fairness, and justice are enjoyed by all, no matter their sexual orientation or their gender identity.

VIOLATION OF UNITED NATIONS SANCTIONS BY IRAN

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recent Iranian ballistic missile tests in direct violation of sanctions by the United Nations show that this regime cannot be trusted.

This week a panel of experts from the United Nations confirmed that the tests in October and November violated sanctions placed on Iran in June of 2010.

The tests also stand in stark contrast to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the agreement unveiled by President Barack Obama, which is intended to curb the Iranian nuclear program.

This is a plan which would roll back sanctions against the regime at a time when the United Nations Security Council is considering new sanctions due to these missile tests.

The idea that we should reward Iran by removing economic sanctions, providing billions to a regime that has long been the leading state sponsor of terrorism, is dangerous.

Past performance is a good indication of future actions. Iran has a decades-long history of misrepresentation to the global community, especially in regards to its nuclear program.

I urge the President to abandon the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action in order to make sure not \$1 flows into the coffers of this terrorist regime.

HONORING OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIFORM

(Mr. BRAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the two Virginia National Guard-based aviation units who will be deploying to Kuwait. According to an announcement made December 4, 2015, by Major General Timothy P. Williams, the Adjutant General of Virginia, approximately 40 of our brave U.S. sol-

diers assigned to Company A, 2nd Battalion, 224th Aviation Regiment, and Detachment 2, Company B, 777th Aviation Support Battalion, are scheduled to begin serving on Federal Active Duty in early June 2016.

I am especially proud of my former intern and Virginia native, Specialist Jack Neblett. Jack has served in the Virginia National Guard for 4 years. Jack will be leaving his family and friends for at least 1 year while on tour.

When interviewed about the deployment, Jack said: "I think it's most important to recognize we're on a mission to defend the Constitution of the United States. We're all family, and I have great friends here. They're all professionals, and they love doing what they do."

I am truly grateful and proud of our men and women in uniform. They courageously defend our Nation and preserve our freedom, and they will continue to do so. We must remember daily the sacrifices our military servicemembers make to protect our freedom. Our Nation must keep its commitments to those who sacrifice to keep us free.

□ 1445

E-FREE ACT

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to tell the story of Lisa Conti of Pennsylvania, who is one of tens of thousands of women who has been affected negatively by the permanent sterilization device known as Essure.

In 2010, 10 months after the birth of her son, Lisa underwent the Essure procedure. Her doctor said it was a perfectly safe, nonsurgical procedure with no downtime—the perfect option for a single mother, he said. Unfortunately, like so many others, following the failure of the device, Lisa now lives with chronic pain, multiple surgeries, and depression. What was supposed to be a simple procedure has cost her several jobs, time with her children, and years of her life.

I rise as a voice for the Essure Sisters in order to tell this Chamber that their stories are real, that their pain is real, and that their fight is real. Mr. Speaker, my bill, the E-Free Act, can halt this tragedy by removing this dangerous device from the market. Too many women have been harmed.

I urge my colleagues to join this fight because stories like Lisa's are too important to ignore.

PROTECTING AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, as we think about the history of America, one of our finest hours as a country came on the shores of France on D-day—June 6, 1944.

We are all familiar with the general details of that battle—the missed zone drops of the paratroopers the night before, the slaughter that met the first assault on Omaha Beach, and the heroics of our rangers at Pointe du Hoc. But, Mr. Speaker, among the lesser known facts, the troops that hit Utah Beach, under the command of General Theodore Roosevelt, actually landed in the wrong place; and while landing with his men and realizing his error, General Roosevelt responded by saying, “The war starts here.”

Mr. Speaker, after American forces landed on that day, fought across Europe with key allies, and, ultimately, defeated the Nazis, the United States was cast into the role of the world’s lone superpower. Now, not perfectly, but at great sacrifice to our country, we then began to create the space for international order. We forged the conditions for international commerce, including helping other countries develop their economies and create governing systems rooted in high, universal ideals.

Mr. Speaker, as we know, times have changed. We no longer live in a unipolar world, and in the wake of last month’s horrifying attacks in Paris, America’s longstanding ties with the French have gained a new significance. The Islamic State, called ISIL, targeted a stadium, cafes, and a theater—an act of nihilistic destruction against innocent civilians who were just beginning to enjoy their weekend.

Beyond just destroying large swaths of the Middle East and many of its inhabitants, precipitating the greatest refugee crisis since World War II, again, this so-called Islamic State has now killed French secularists and Catholics, they have attacked the Russian Orthodox by blowing up a civilian airliner, and they have killed Shiite Muslims in Beirut.

But now, Mr. Speaker, it has happened to us. In San Bernardino, a couple embraced this twisted religious death cult, deciding to kill innocent people in order to satisfy a bizarre, apocalyptic vision.

Mr. Speaker, foreign policy is complicated, especially in the Middle East, but this new level of terrorism has brought three critical issues into focus.

First, the international community has a responsibility to fight ISIL. The world constantly pushes America to the forefront of needed military action, but the entire community of responsible nations, including certain Sunni Arab countries, must engage in this conflict.

It is not the United States’ responsibility alone. We can lead—we will lead—but it must be in solid concert with responsible world powers. France has now properly responded with its own air campaign, backed by our intel-

ligence. This resolve could compel more Europeans to rethink their vulnerability and take decisive action themselves. The United Kingdom has now expanded its effort as well.

Second, Mr. Speaker, it is time to face a gruesome reality—that the targeted and systematic violence against Christians, Yazidis, and other religious minorities in the Middle East is genocide. “Genocide” is a powerful word, but the world must recognize this grim reality and work to support the most vulnerable minorities in the Middle East. No responsible approach to this tragic situation unfolding in Iraq and in Syria can ignore their plight and the plight of other innocent people.

In an attempt, Mr. Speaker, to elevate the world’s consciousness about this difficulty, I have introduced H. Con. Res. 75, a resolution of the House of Representatives, calling the slaughter of Christians and other ethno-religious minorities by its proper name—genocide. Similar measures are being introduced in parliaments throughout the world.

Christians and other vulnerable minorities in the Middle East and elsewhere must be accorded tolerance and religious liberty—one of the cornerstones of our own society. Thankfully, the resolution now has 160 bipartisan cosponsors, and it is gaining swift and broad support throughout Congress. Hopefully, we will bring this legislation to a vote for next year, and it will serve to elevate the consciousness of the world as to this horrific problem and will, perhaps, provide a gateway for constructive policy considerations.

Christianity in the Middle East is shattered. Christians, Yazidis, and others are a vibrant but an endangered spectrum of minorities, and they need our help now. In the face of ISIL’s onslaught, we must help them by forming an ecumenical alliance. We cannot afford to wait. These ancient faith traditions have every right to maintain their ancient homelands and, in turn, contribute to a stabilizing diversity of voices in both culture and new forms of governance.

Third, the related issue of refugees and migration points to the collapse of the nation-state order. Now, granting asylum is a responsible, humanitarian impulse, but simply accommodating more asylum to the tragedy is a reaction and not a viable, long-term policy proposition and one that has to be reconciled with both national security and capacity concerns.

Attacking the injustice that leads to refugee flight must be a top priority, followed by new political structures that allow people to remain where they are in safety or to return to their ancient homelands. This is a precondition for long-term stability in the Middle East. An immediate step could be the enforcement of safe zones, especially for the vulnerable minorities in Iraq and Syria.

In the country of Syria, there is an old Roman road named Straight

Street. It runs through the middle of the capital of Damascus. Mr. Speaker, you might remember the road from the Biblical story. After Saint Paul was blinded and knocked from his horse, God told him to visit the house of Judas and seek out a Christian named Saul. Tradition holds that the house of Judas still stands on Straight Street even today.

Syria is an ancient country made up of peoples with mixed cultural traditions. Four years ago, as we all know, a civil war broke out. The halting and gruesome conflict, which has killed hundreds of thousands and has displaced millions, is now entering a new phase with new complexities.

The dictatorial leader of Syria, Bashar Assad, faces a shifting patchwork of enemies, including ISIL. He has clung to power in the coastal regions of that country, where he continues his dynasty’s bloody rule. Ironically, he is a trained ophthalmologist who practiced for years in London, only to assume power after the death of his elder brother. It is hard to understand Assad’s motive, except, perhaps, to protect his own religious minority tradition, called the Alawites.

A couple of years ago, I predicted that Assad would not survive long, but as some uprisings descended into a winter of irrational religious extremism, causing more destabilization and helping to create the conditions for terror groups like ISIL to metastasize, Assad has tenaciously maintained control over much of western Syria. In his battle for control, his murderous regime has contested armed opposition groups, some of them also murderous, and it has all worsened the conflict. Yet, Mr. Speaker, here is a very conflicted reality: The preservation of some stability in certain Syrian zones has offered safety to other religious and ethnic minorities.

Two years ago, the House of Representatives confronted a choice. The President called for military action against Assad after Assad’s use of chemical weapons. I voted against the President’s proposed intervention, as did a vast majority of my colleagues. We felt that the United States did not need to enter into another military entanglement in the Middle East, and many people expressed justifiable fears that, if Assad were overthrown, something even worse might replace his government.

Events since then have given that fear additional credibility. Had the United States succeeded in toppling Assad, ISIL might have seized even more of that country, perhaps threatening Lebanon and gaining proximity to Israel’s borders.

Now enter Russia into the equation. During the debate over whether to strike Assad, Russia brokered a deal to help facilitate the acquisition and destruction of the government’s chemical weapons, voiding the immediate possibility of a military confrontation between Washington and Damascus. Now,

2 years later, Russia has, once again, taken an active role in the Syrian civil war, enhancing and building military bases in Assad's territory and launching air strikes against Syrian opposition groups, including ISIL.

Several factors are influencing Putin's latest gambit to empower Assad.

First, Putin wants to revive a Russian sense of nationalism—an almost metaphysical understanding of a Russian realm of influence. Look back at his recent speech at the U.N. He rejects a unipolar world wherein the United States sets the rules for commerce and governance and values. Furthermore, he is suspicious of liberal democracy, preferring, instead, his idea of stability even if it is achieved at the hands of strongmen.

Second, Russia has a longstanding diplomatic, security, and economic arrangement with the Syrian Government, enabling him to expand his country's military presence there while also bolstering his political standing at home.

Third, Syria also has a rich Orthodox Christian heritage that survives as a minority faith in Assad's controlled territory. Putin sees his venture as protecting that familial alliance. Foreign policy analysis has largely overlooked this consideration as an important dimension of Putin's motives.

Russia claims to be fighting the terrorists. If true, their intervention could emerge as a point of convergence for the United States, Russia, and civilized interests; but that remains somewhat hypothetical at this moment, and there are significant signs of conflict escalation.

□ 1500

Russia could help avert humanitarian disaster by focusing more intently on attacking ISIL. Currently, Putin is also choosing to fight other Syrian opposition forces with the possibility of furthering the protracted civil war.

The best scenario would be for Russia's involvement to create the space for a transition period for a new, more stable governing structure to replace Assad in the West. ISIL could be further pushed into the eastern desert, and a true international coalition could emerge to defeat this threat to civilization. Advancing this scenario is a key policy marker in what should be the overarching geopolitical strategy of the United States.

Of the many possible futures for the Middle East, one must certainly be avoided: Islamic militants sweeping across places like Straight Street in Syria, continuing to destroy ancient monuments in Palmyra and Nimrod, killing all the way from Mosul to the Mediterranean, threatening to raise its black banner of death from Damascus to D.C.

The prevention of peril in the 21st century requires a new cooperative strategic arrangement to fight dark

ideology, twisted theology, and barbarism across the globe. ISIL represents ninth century barbarism, but with 21st-century weaponry. ISIL is battling the very essence of civilization. Beyond the bloodshed itself, ISIL attacks the underlying philosophical proposition of the West that all persons have inherent dignity, which is the source of our rights.

Mr. Speaker, we stand at a solemn crossroads. The world must fight back on two fronts against ISIL and for the time-honored philosophical principles and values that sustain an orderly existence in the flourishing of any truly good society.

So depends the beauty of Paris. So depends the protection of communities like San Bernardino. So depends the security of the world and the protection of innocent people everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, I had an extraordinary privilege this summer on the 71st anniversary of D-day. This is a picture, a photo, of Utah Beach, one of the beaches where our troops first stormed through, where General Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., came through with his men and declared, "We'll start the war from right here."

General Roosevelt went on 1 month later to die in battle of a heart attack. He was ill. He disguised his illness because he wanted to be in leadership with his troops.

He is buried at the Omaha Beach Cemetery, which contains nearly 10,000 American troops who gave their lives. He is buried next to his little brother, Quentin Roosevelt, who was an aviator, a flier, in World War I. Here you have two sons of a President of the United States who gave their lives in the two great wars of last century.

On this spot, Mr. Speaker, there is a new monument. That is a Higgins boat troop carrier with a replica of soldiers storming onto the beach. I am very proud of the fact that this monument is a replica of one that is in Columbus, Nebraska, a small town in my congressional district. It was built by the people of Columbus, shipped here, and placed for the 71st anniversary celebration of D-day.

A great sacrifice financially and time-wise, many people in the community of Columbus came together to build this extraordinary monument as a gift to France, but primarily as a perpetual memory of those who fought and died.

Both Quentin Roosevelt, General Roosevelt, and so many other young men and women gave their lives for a set of interlocking ideals, the beauty of liberty and the protection of human dignity, which, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, in our fallen world, must sometimes be preserved by a willingness to confront darkness, by a willingness to confront that which is irrational.

It is this same struggle, the same struggle that took place here, that we must engage in today. Unlike this struggle, it requires a different global effort, but it is the same struggle for

the tranquility of order, for the security of the world, and for the protection of America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF ED FENDIG, JR.

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in remembrance of Mr. Ed Fendig, Jr. Ed was born in Brunswick, Georgia, in 1927 and moved to St. Simons Island shortly thereafter. Growing up, he was a very active Boy Scout, achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

Through his late teens and 20s, he served in the Navy in the Philippines and later in the Georgia Air National Guard in Casablanca. Between services, he played football on scholarship at the University of Georgia. Go Dawgs.

While stationed in Casablanca, he would go down to the port and watch the tugs dock and undock merchant ships and fell in love with the work. Shortly after returning from North Africa, Ed's application as an apprentice bar pilot was approved. Ed served actively as a State-licensed bar pilot in the Port of Brunswick for 37 years.

In addition to a full-time bar pilot, he also ran two long-time family businesses, Fendig Sign Company and Fendig Tire Company.

Ed was a man of many talents and held a list of accolades. He was a community leader, but, more importantly, he was a husband, father, and grandfather.

My thoughts and prayers go out to the Fendig family.

FUNDING BILL IS REFLECTION OF PRIORITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, if a funding bill is a reflection of priorities, then the omnibus that we are considering right now is the clearest snapshot of what is wrong with our Nation.

We are talking about lifting a 40-year ban on the export of crude oil, risking thousands of jobs and rising gas prices for working families immediately after joining the most important climate agreement ever created.