

M.T. Broyhill and Sons, to the area. He attended Fork Union Military Academy as well as George Washington University.

Before he took his seat in the House of Representatives in 1953, Congressman Broyhill served in World War II, where he became a decorated Captain and commanded a rifle company. During the Battle of the Bulge, he was captured by the Germans. However, he rejoined the advancing U.S. forces six months later after he and a fellow soldier escaped from a prisoner of war camp. Among his military awards was a Bronze Star.

Upon his return from World War II, he joined his father's real estate firm, becoming a partner and general manager of the company. He was president of the Arlington Chamber of Commerce, Chairman of the Arlington County Planning Commission and in 1950 was elected president of the Arlington Republican Club.

In 1952, he won his seat in Congress on his 33rd birthday. Congressman Broyhill was known as an effective politician with a boyish grin and an easy conversational manner. A strong advocate for Federal workers and the postal service, Congressman Broyhill was especially well known for the way he attended to the needs of his constituents. The Washington Post accredited this personalized service to Congressman Broyhill's sense of kinship with his constituents stating, "He is, simply, one of them. He is a war hero turned postwar booster, a hell-of-a-fellow".

On a personal level, I cut my teeth working on Joel Broyhill's campaigns. I attended his election night parties at the Old Broyhill Building on Lee Highway and remember the long night in 1964 when he narrowly escaped the LBJ landslide, as well as his huge victory over Clive Duval in 1966, when he came on the stage and exclaimed "How Sweet It Is".

After leaving office, Congressman Broyhill returned to his family's real estate and investment business, which developed several neighborhoods in Northern Virginia. He remained engaged in politics and served as campaign manager for JOHN W. WARNER's successful first campaign for Senate in 1978.

Congressman Broyhill's first wife, Jane Marshall Bragg, died in 1978. He is survived by Suzanne Broyhill, his wife of 25 years; three daughters, Nancy, Jane and Jeanne; a step-daughter Kimberly; four grandchildren; and three great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to pay tribute to the life and work of Congressman Joel T. Broyhill, and express my deepest condolences to all who knew and loved him.

MILITARY COMMISSIONS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2006

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation which threatens to overturn two centuries of legal precedent, and which undermines our Nation's longstanding international obligations enshrined in the Geneva Conventions.

As Members of Congress we have no higher priority than the security of the American people. It's our duty to see that anyone who

murders Americans is properly tried and punished. This responsibility requires us to address the disastrous detainee policies put in place by the Bush Administration. Republicans and Democrats have sought to create a sustainable legal framework that gives our judiciary the tools to deliver justice to our enemies in swift, clear and fair terms. Above all, our methods must reflect the ideals of our Constitution and the highest standards in protecting human rights and due process under the law.

The bill before us fails to meet these standards. Instead, it erodes the protections of the Geneva Conventions and reverses two centuries of American jurisprudence by denying habeas corpus protections for the accused. More dangerously, it fails to eliminate the use of torture, which has seriously undermined global support for our fight against terrorism.

As a member of the House Intelligence Committee I'm very familiar with the challenges we face in the fight against terror, and nothing I have seen has convinced me that the measures in this bill will make us safer or provide an effective framework for bringing our enemies to justice.

The Geneva Conventions exist not to embolden our enemies but to protect our own soldiers from harm should they be captured or detained. Our failure to embrace these standards of treatment opens the door to misconduct by our enemies, a reality that many current and former military experts have spoken out against. Former Secretary of State Colin Powell put it best by saying that redefining our obligations under the Geneva Conventions will encourage other countries to "doubt the moral basis of our fight against terrorism." Furthermore, it would put our own troops at risk. No one doubts the wisdom of Secretary Powell in these matters and it's reckless of this body to ignore his counsel.

Habeas corpus rights, likewise, do not give comfort to the guilty, nor do they help to free terrorists in our custody. They exist only to protect the innocent, and their proper application helps reduce the risk of detaining the wrong individuals. The failure to provide habeas corpus rights was a key issue in the Supreme Court's decision to declare the Administration's original tribunal system unconstitutional. Denying these rights again with this bill creates a serious threat to the constitutionality of the legislation, and makes it more than likely that we'll all be back here in a year, or 5 years from now, trying once again to create a system that will bring terrorist enemies to justice.

Finally, this bill fails to set an appropriate standard for the treatment of prisoners and relaxes the restrictions on the use of torture embodied in Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions. The bill grants the sole authority for interpreting the Geneva Conventions, including Common Article 3, to the President, giving the Administration the option to relax or simply ignore these protections outright. The bill also specifies that the restrictions on the use of torture laid out in the Army Field Manual which apply uniformly to U.S. military personnel and facilities, do not apply to other U.S. agencies engaged in the fight against terror, including the CIA.

Our security depends on effective and lawful interrogation practices that yield dependable, actionable intelligence. This legislation gives the Administration a blank check to define its

own methods for interrogation and opens the door for abuses. We've already seen where permissive interrogation rules can lead . . . it's called Abu Ghraib. Certainly what we have lost in credibility in the eyes of the world community and the Iraqi people weighs heavily against any information that has been obtained. To ensure accountability Congress must have the ability to review and set standards for interrogation practices around the world. Doing so ensures not only their legality, but ultimately their effectiveness. This bill takes that responsibility out of our hands.

Mr. Speaker, for all the stated reasons, this bill should not become the policy of our great Nation and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

THE DETERIORATING PEACE IN SUDAN

HON. GREGORY W. MEEKS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2006

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, people are being massacred in Darfur, Sudan by the Sudanese Government's proxy militia called the Janjaweed. The Janjaweed have been unleashed to carry out a scorched earth campaign against innocent civilians from three African communities in Darfur causing death, destruction, and displacement.

After the Holocaust in which 6 million Jews of Europe were murdered as a result of Adolf Hitler's plan called the "Final Solution", Germany's deliberate and systematic attempt to annihilate the entire Jewish population of Europe, the world said "Never Again."

In 1994, from April to June, 800,000 Rwandans were brutally slaughtered in one of the worst cases of human suffering of the 21st century. The U.S. and the international community failed to mount an intervention to stop the genocide, instead, we stood by watched and did nothing. The United Nations had a front row seat to these atrocities for they were on the frontlines but did not have the mandate to stop the slaughter. After the Rwandan genocide, we looked back and said, "Not on my watch."

From August 1998 to April 2004, 3.8 million people or 38,000 people per month have died in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, DRC. Today, the people of the DRC are still suffering the affects of a lack of a serious commitment to end the lawlessness in their country.

Mr. Speaker, it is our watch and genocide continues to happen in Darfur, Sudan. What will be our excuse for not acting this time? We have witness testimonies from survivors of the genocide and other documentary evidence that the Sudanese government is acting with intent to destroy groups in Darfur because of their ethnicity.

The United Nations estimates the number of people affected by the conflict at almost 4 million and according to the World Food Program, nearly 3 million people are reliant on humanitarian aid for food, shelter and health care. The Sudanese government and regional insecurity continues to obstruct aid workers from reaching displaced villagers. This phenomenon coupled with a lack of adequate funding will cause the number of people dying each month to increase significantly.

The Khartoum government has demonstrated that it cannot be relied upon to address the humanitarian crisis. The government's use of import restrictions and routine harassment of aid workers and obstruction to food aid deliveries is according to U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, "a violation of international humanitarian law." Also, The United Nations' International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur report found that the Sudanese government has committed major crimes under international law, including a pattern of mass killings, rape, pillage and forced displacement that constitutes war crimes and crimes against humanity. The U.N. must act now to protect civilians.

History will remember that we waited for the approval of a genocidal regime before going in to protect innocent Darfurians. We must act now. The world will remember that this Republican Congress, Republican Senate and Republican White House did not do all it could to stop the deaths, destruction and displacement that is occurring in Darfur.

It has been 2 years since then-Secretary of State Colin Powell declared that, "genocide has been committed in Darfur, and the government of Sudan and the Janjaweed bear responsibility." I have supported and continue to support the 7,000 member African Union Mission in Sudan, AMIS. As it stands, AMIS has no mandate to protect civilians, lacks the troop strength, financial, and logistical support necessary to stop the ongoing genocide. However, given these insurmountable odds, the A.U. force has performed admirably. AMIS' mandate was set to expire on September 30, 2006, and the A.U. has consistently called for transition of AMIS to the U.N. force. Khartoum vehemently opposes this request and consequently opposes U.N. Security Resolution 1706 but with much reluctance, Khartoum has agreed to extend AMIS' mandate until the end of the year.

The United States continues to call on the Sudanese Government to recognize the severity of the humanitarian crisis in Darfur and immediately agree to a transition of AMIS to the U.N. President Bush has failed to leverage the diplomatic might of the presidency to overcome the objections of the Sudanese Government to a U.N. force entering Darfur. Instead, we have accepted the stalling tactics of the Sudanese administration: Only a massive U.N. force can legitimately and credibly protect civilians, ensure humanitarian access and fully carry out the extensive monitoring and implementation duties spelled out in the Darfur Peace Agreement.

The Darfur Peace Agreement, DPA, establishes critical security, wealth-sharing and power sharing arrangements that address the long-standing economic and political marginalization of Darfur. To date, the criteria's of the DPA have yet to be implemented thus creating a sense of uncertainty for Darfur.

We must leverage our compounded international diplomatic efforts to work with members of the Security Council such as China and Russia to overcome Sudanese President al-Bashir's objections to U.N. Security Council Resolution 1706 and allow the 20,000 U.N. forces to enter Darfur and begin to provide immediate security to Darfurians. The international community should not take a backseat to Khartoum's objections nor should the deployment of the troops be contingent upon Khartoum's consent.

The situation on the ground continues to spiral out of control. Violence is causing surges in malnutrition and starvation rates. Humanitarian aid organizations have been cut off from helping those in need. Twelve humanitarian aid workers have been killed in the last 2 months. Twenty-five humanitarian aid vehicles have been hijacked causing humanitarian aid organizations to pull out of northern Darfur leaving major populations vulnerable.

Under pressure from the Congress, the President recently appointed a Special Envoy for Darfur, Andrew Natsios. Securing civilians should be Mr. Natsios' primary responsibility. Further, he should have a strong mandate and staff to ensure he is successful in achieving this mandate.

The Government of Sudan is deploying 26,000 Sudanese troops to Darfur in preparation for a major offensive. At the same time, the Sudanese Government is opposed to U.N. forces entering Darfur and continues to object to the African Union troops remaining in Darfur if they transition into a U.N. force. The actions by the Government of Sudan should raise concern for the safety of the people of Darfur.

Sudanese armed forces—Janjaweed militia—are still using vehicles that they've painted white to look like African Union troops and they continue to steal gasoline from the A.U. It is despicable to know that the Sudanese Government in Khartoum continues to use helicopter gunships and Soviet-era Antonov planes to bomb villages and drive innocent unarmed civilians from their mud-and-thatch hut homes.

An international force is needed immediately to stop the killings, rapes, and pillaging in Darfur; provide security to facilitate humanitarian assistance programs for internally displaced people; enforce the cease-fire between the government in Khartoum and the rebel groups in Darfur to allow for political negotiations; and, facilitate the return of civilians to their land, reconstruction of homes, and provide a secure environment.

Mr. Speaker, we should be immediately deploying a U.N. peacekeeping force in accordance with U.N. Security Council Resolution 1706 and immediately implement all previously passed U.N. Security Council resolutions. The people of Darfur should not have to wait. We must act not before it is too late, we must act now before there is no one left to protect.

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND DR. FRED L. DAVIS, SR.

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 28, 2006

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Reverend Dr. Fred L. Davis, Sr. on the occasion of his retirement from the Community Church of God in Ypsilanti, Michigan, after 39 years of service.

A native of Boligee, Alabama, Dr. Davis came to the Ypsilanti area in 1968 with the intention to serve and help those in his community. He has provided this service with his leadership at the Community Church of God. Dr. Davis also worked as a Supervisor at General Motors for more than 30 years. His preparation and training for this service included a strong and supportive family and church and it

was supplemented by studies at the Detroit Bible College, where he received his diploma in 1961. Dr. Davis was also awarded an honorary doctorate's degree in 1996 from the Detroit Extension of Faith Evangelistic Christian Schools.

During his tenure, Dr. Davis implemented many different programs at Community Church of God, including Alcoholics Anonymous, narcotics and substance abuse assistance, food and clothing distributions, marriage and singles therapy classes and tutoring. These programs, which Dr. Davis started and facilitated, have helped to strengthen and improve the church and its community.

Dr. Davis' service has not been limited to only to his congregation. He has served as the Ypsilanti Police Department Chaplain since 1992, providing aid and comfort to the brave men and women of the department in their times of great need. He also currently serves as an active member of the United Way and the Hope Clinic and is on the executive committees for the United Negro College Fund and the Ministerial Alliance of the Ann Arbor/Ypsilanti Area.

I applaud Dr. Davis for his many years of service. I know that he and Verlouis Davis, his wife of 54 years, will enjoy this new phase of life, but will continue to give back to the community in the Ypsilanti area. Once again, I salute the work of Dr. Fred Davis and I wish both he and his wife many more years of happiness.

MILITARY COMMISSIONS ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 2006

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 6166, the Military Commissions Act of 2006. There are many glaring problems with this bill. It gives the President unilateral discretion to interpret the meaning and application of provisions in the Geneva Convention that relate to torture, which could result in the allowance of humiliating and degrading interrogation practices. It redefines the definition of an "unlawful enemy combatant" to include any individual who "materially" and "purposefully" supported hostilities against the United States. This new definition is so broadly worded; it could include someone who made an economic contribution to an organization that they did not know was on a terror-watch list. It still allows into evidence information that was obtained through torture and coercion, as long as it was obtained before the passage of the Detainee Torture Act. Perhaps most damaging is the stripping of the United States courts' habeas corpus jurisdiction to review detentions, eliminating one of the most fundamental and important precepts of our American Constitutional tradition.

The court-stripping provisions included in this legislation would do serious harm to the longstanding rule that the government cannot just imprison people without giving them the opportunity for a fair and impartial determination that the detention is in accordance with the Constitution. Consider the case of Maher