

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.