

combatants, lawful or unlawful. When we capture them, we hold them. We do not release them so they can go back to the war and kill us. We are going to send soldiers out to capture them, and then once they have been captured, we are going to release them so they continue into the war? It goes against all common sense. As Justice Jackson once said: The Constitution is not a "suicide pact."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SESSIONS. So they have to be treated properly and that sort of thing, but they do not have to be released. We captured, for example, Nazih Abdul-Hamed al-Ruqai last year for conspiring with bin Ladin to attack U.S. forces in Saudi Arabia, Yemen and Somalia and for his part in the 1998 bombings of two U.S. Embassies in East Africa that killed 224 people before 9/11. He is a treasure trove of intelligence.

U.S. forces went in and captured him, took him away at risk of their lives. He had been undergoing interrogation on the USS *San Antonio* until he said he was sick and not doing well. So what happened? They took him to New York, where he was formally arrested and taken into the custody of the U.S. Justice Department, and put into the civilian justice system. The purpose of capturing him was to get intelligence. This is a warrior. We want to talk to him. We want to see what we can learn about him. Even the New York Times said "his capture was seen as a potential intelligence coup because he had been on the run for years and so would, presumably, possess information about al Qaeda." However, when he appeared in Federal court, he was appointed a lawyer, guaranteed a speedy, public trial—the things that prisoners of war are not entitled to—yet this has been happening over and over again. Al-Ruqai's cooperation ended, leading to a major lost opportunity to obtain valuable intelligence.

This evidences a serious lack of understanding of the nature of the conflict we are engaged in. It evidences a policy that is dangerous to our safety. It is wrong to send Americans to capture people such as this and then treat them in a way that allows them to minimize the opportunity to obtain intelligence.

Indeed, the gravest danger with bringing enemy combatants to U.S. soil is that the President cannot absolutely prevent their release into the United States. And, once foreign nationals are here, there are legal limits on the government's ability to remove them from the U.S. The reality is, once here, their fate is no longer simply up to the administration but also a federal judge.

There are many examples of foreign nationals who have committed murder

and other serious crimes and were released into the U.S. when our government could not transfer them to another country.

This risk extends to the detainees at Guantanamo Bay. We saw that in the case of *Kiyemba v. Obama*. There, the D.C. District Court ordered the release into the United States of a group of ethnic Chinese Uighers who were detained at Guantanamo, many of whom had received military-style training in Tora Bora. Fortunately, the D.C. Circuit reversed the decision based on the fact that the Gitmo detainees had not been brought to the United States. If, however, Gitmo detainees are brought here, a judge may very well order them released into the United States if they cannot be removed to another country. That very real risk obviously does not exist if Gitmo detainees are not brought to the United States in the first place.

The course this administration has chosen on national security matters has steered us into a head-on collision with reality. The American people unequivocally oppose transplanting terrorists from Gitmo into their own communities, either for detention or trial. Our primary goal is to prevent future terrorist attacks, especially through obtaining intelligence. We should not jeopardize that goal in order to afford foreign terrorists who seek to harm the United States and its citizens the rights and privileges granted to ordinary criminals. The administration's policy has put this country at grave risk.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

#### LORI JACKSON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVOR PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, photographs on this poster are of a young woman, Lori Jackson, a Connecticut resident, who died tragically, needlessly, savagely in Oxford at the hands of her estranged husband.

Lori is the reason I have introduced legislation named after her to close a gaping loophole in our Federal law—well, she is not the only reason. Tragically, there are thousands of other women and some men who have shared her fate because of a gap in Federal law that permits intimate partners to continue to have firearms, even when they are under restraining orders from the court. Those restraining orders are placed against them because they evidence clear danger to their partners, whether their husband or their spouse.

The reason they pose danger is that they become violent. The gap in the law is it applies only to permanent restraining orders, not temporary ones.

Lori Jackson sought a temporary restraining order when her estranged husband threatened her physically and her two 18-month-old twins at their home. She sought and she obtained a

temporary restraining order and literally the day before that temporary restraining order was to become permanent and the prohibition against her husband having a firearm would have gone into effect, he gunned her down at her parents' home where she had sought refuge with her children—gunned her down and savagely and severely wounded her mother as well with those same firearms.

The temporary restraining order against Lori's husband was completely ineffective, powerless to prevent him from using that gun against her and killing her—and her mother, severely wounding her.

Tragically, Lori's story is far from unique. Jasmine Leonard also had a temporary restraining order against her husband. She died last week after her husband shot her.

Chyna Joy Young celebrated her 18th birthday just days before she was shot and killed by her estranged boyfriend, despite the temporary restraining order she had against him. Young was 3 months pregnant.

Barbara Diane Dye was granted a temporary restraining order and then fled to Texas. She returned only for a hearing on the permanent restraining order, and that is when her husband cornered her in a bank parking lot and shot her repeatedly with a .357 magnum revolver, killing her there.

When domestic abusers have access to firearms, it isn't only abuse victims who are at risk. A violent husband under a temporary restraining order in Brookfield, WI, followed his wife to the salon where she worked. Not only did he shoot and kill his wife but he killed two additional people and wounded four more.

After Erica Bell got a temporary restraining order against her husband, he came to her at church. He followed her there. He shot and killed Erica and he also shot four of her relatives, including her grandparents, great-aunt, and a cousin.

This scourge of domestic violence, combined with the epidemic of guns in our society causing gun violence, is a toxic recipe, and we must do more against domestic abuse. That is why I have formed an organization in Connecticut called Men Make a Difference, Men Against Domestic Violence. It is a program launched in cooperation with our largest domestic prevention and response agency, Interval House, which does a wonderful job against domestic violence. It is a commitment of prominent men, all men, providing role models for young men and boys to reach out to other males and take action to prevent domestic violence. We can truly make a difference as men. We can fight domestic violence. We can gradually make progress against it because it is a cycle.

More than 70 percent of all men who commit domestic violence have seen or experienced it in their own lives, and these kinds of organizations can help stop and stem domestic violence. But

domestic violence, combined with guns, is a recipe for death.

As our former colleague Frank Lautenberg used to say: "The difference between a murdered wife and a battered wife is often the presence of a gun." Women are five times more likely to die as a result of domestic violence when there is a gun in the home than when there is not.

So I have introduced the Lori Jackson Domestic Violence Survivor Protection Act. It is a long name. The most important part of the name is Lori Jackson, because her story tells it all.

There is no reason we should fail to protect women when they are protected by a temporary restraining order rather than a permanent restraining order. In fact, there is every reason to provide more protection in the first week or 2 weeks when there is a temporary restraining order in place. Remember, the temporary restraining order is granted not on a whim or a question, because of specific, credible evidence that an intimate partner poses a physical danger, and it is granted by a judge after considering that evidence.

The moment of danger in a relationship such as Lori Jackson's is when one partner tells another—it may be a spouse, it may be a boyfriend, a girlfriend—she is leaving, she wants a divorce. That is the moment of maximum rage. That is the moment of greatest danger. That is the moment of uncontrollable wrath.

At that moment of greatest danger, the law is at its weakest. There is no prohibition against that enraged, impulsive, hurt, angry individual from continuing to possess or purchase a firearm.

The Lori Jackson Domestic Violence Survivor Protection Act very simply closes that gaping loophole in our law, providing that just as with a permanent protective order, an individual subject to a temporary restraining order cannot purchase or possess a firearm. It is a very simple, commonsense measure, but it can help save lives. It can help save others such as Lori Jackson and the individuals whom I have named—many of them courageous, strong individuals like Lori Jackson who broke with an abusive relationship.

The experts in this field will tell us that is among the most difficult things to do, and it puts a woman at her most vulnerable point in the relationship. Again, that is the time when current law fails her. That is the reason we should close that loophole.

Other measures are also important and necessary.

I salute our colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR for her proposal that will close an equally important loophole in our law relating to people who are convicted of stalking. That is an eminently important and sensible step to take. It will keep guns out of the hands of stalkers; likewise, Representative

MOORE's legislation to help States enforce our gun laws.

Similarly, the comprehensive measure of mental health initiatives, school safety steps, background checks, is part of a comprehensive effort to stop gun violence in our country. They are all important and necessary.

I thank my colleague and friend Senator MURPHY of Connecticut for championing them as a teammate in this effort, and he has joined me in supporting this legislation.

I named this legislation after Lori Jackson as a memorial to her and a gesture of sadness and outrage at her death.

Every man or woman who has lost his or her life through a domestic violence gun homicide deserves to be memorialized on this floor, as does every victim of gun violence. With more than 1,000 names added as victims every year, I believe we can honor them best by passing this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in honoring Lori Jackson, Jasmine Leonard, Chyna Joy Young, Barbara Diane Guy, and Zina Daniel, all of the women who have lost their lives to domestic abusers and whose lives might have been saved. We can't know for sure. There is no certainty they would be alive today, but we know their chances would have been better if that temporary protective order had also protected them from an abuser who possessed or bought a firearm at that moment of maximum danger.

We continue to grieve in Connecticut for all victims of gun violence, especially the 20 beautiful children and 6 great educators who lost their lives. This past Sunday I attended in West Haven the opening of a 24th playground. Where Angels Play is the name of the playground organization headed by a firefighter, a very resolute, steadfast, public servant, Bill Lavin. This playground, honoring one of those children, was on the beach in West Haven—a moment of haunting and exquisite beauty—when all of us gathered in honor of Charlotte Bacon on a sun-filled day, Father's Day. Joel and JoAnn Bacon and their son Guy were with us.

Each of those playgrounds is a memorial to those children who died, and we have likewise honored the six great educators who perished.

There are ways to honor and remember and memorialize these victims. Alexis Volpe in Middletown did a small garden, and she was joined by the Daisy Scouts there.

All of them are beautiful in their own special way, but action is the best way to honor the memory of the victims of gun violence, action to adopt commonsense, sensible measures that will help prevent gun violence in the future. None is more important than honoring, remembering, and acting to save others such as Lori Jackson, who will always be with us in spirit and memory.

I thank my colleagues who have joined me in this effort, Senators DUR-

BIN, MURRAY, BOXER, MURPHY, HIRONO, WARREN, and MENENDEZ, sponsoring the Lori Jackson Domestic Violence Survivor Protection Act.

I yield the floor for my good colleague and friend, the Senator from West Virginia.

#### CELEBRATING WEST VIRGINIA'S 151ST BIRTHDAY

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Connecticut. I appreciate his unwavering commitment to continue to fight for justice and fairness for all, and he does it every day.

I am here to say happy birthday to West Virginia. Tomorrow, June 20, we will be 151 years old, and I rise to honor my great State.

I have often said this: Some of us were lucky enough to be born and raised there—and I am one of the lucky ones—some people were smart enough to move there, and some people just wish they could get there. So under any circumstance, we will take you.

This is a State that truly embodies a brave and daring declaration of statehood that is unprecedented in American history.

Born out of the fiery battles of the Civil War, West Virginia was founded by patriots who were willing to risk their lives in a united pursuit of justice and freedom for all. Since that day 151 years ago, June 20, 1863—when our State officially became the 35th State admitted into the Union—West Virginia's rich culture and strong traditions grew.

That year the Great Seal of the State of West Virginia was adopted—and we all have our seals and preambles in all of our States—depicting who we are as a people and our culture. With our birth date's inscription forever engraved in its center, the seal features a big boulder rock with two crossed rifles and a liberty cap sitting on top to express our State's importance in fighting for liberty and justice.

On either side of the boulder stand two men: On the left, a farmer stands with an ax and a plow to represent agriculture. On the right, a miner stands with a pickax and a sledgehammer to represent industry. Finally, along the outer ring is carved the text "State of West Virginia" and "Montani Semper Liberi," which means "Mountaineers Are Always Free."

That Great Seal of West Virginia, designed in 1863 during America's bloody Civil War, leaves a lasting imprint of who we are as the people of West Virginia.

Just like the farmer and miner on our seal, we cannot forget the countless others who fought for our freedom and embarked on our State's improbable journey to independence from Virginia and to our very own place in the Union—a land of the free and home of the brave. We believe—and we believed way back then—that justice would prevail.