

We have to talk about these stories because it is time America heard the other side of this debate. There are 2.5 million Americans out there defending themselves and their property by the use of their constitutional right.

In Cumberland, TN, a 28-year-old Jason McCulley broke into the home of Stanley Horn and his wife, tied up the couple at knife-point, and demanded to know where the couple kept some cash. While Mrs. Horn was directing the robber, Mr. Horn wriggled free from his restraints, retrieved his handgun, shot the intruder, and then called the police. The intruder, Jason McCulley, subsequently died. If some Senators on the other side of the aisle had their way, perhaps the Horns would have been killed and Jason McCulley would have walked away.

Earlier today, we heard the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from California read the names people killed by guns in America. Some day they may read the name Jason McCulley. I doubt they will tell you how he died, however, because it doesn't advance their goal of destroying the Second Amendment. But As Paul Harvey might say: Now you know the rest of the story.

Every 13 seconds this story is repeated across America. Every 13 seconds in America someone uses a gun to stop a crime. Why do our opponents never tell these stories? Why do the enemies of the right to keep and bear arms ignore this reality that is relived by 2.5 million Americans every year? Why is it that all we hear from them is, "Pass a new gun control law, and, by the way, call 9-1-1."

I encourage all listening today, if you have heard of someone using their Second Amendment rights to prevent a crime, to save a life, to protect another life, then send us your story. There are people here who desperately need to hear this in Washington, right here on Capitol Hill. This is a story that should be played out every day in the press but isn't. So let's play it out, right here on the floor of the Senate. Send me those stories from your local newspapers about that law-abiding citizen who used his constitutional right of self-defense. Send that story to me, Senator LARRY CRAIG, Washington, DC, 20510, or send it to your own Senator. Let him or her know the rest of the story of America's constitutional rights.

I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one more moment.

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

Mr. CRAIG. Having said all of this, let there be no mistake. Guns are not for everyone. We restrict children's access to guns and we restrict criminals' access to guns, but we must not tolerate politicians who tell us that the Second Amendment only protects the right to hunt. We must not tolerate politicians who infringe upon our right to defend ourselves from thieves and stalkers and rapists and murderers.

And we must not tolerate the politician who simply says: "Pass another gun control law and call 9-1-1."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent I be recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, with great respect to my colleague from Idaho, and I did not come to the floor of the Senate to talk about this, let me say when any of my colleagues stand up and talk about gun control issues that the minority wishes to pursue—let me explain in a sentence or so what we are trying to do. It is not to restrict the opportunity of anyone in this country who has the right to own a gun. We are trying to close the gun show loophole to prevent convicted felons from getting a gun.

Go to a gun store to buy a gun in this country and you must run your name through an instant check because we do not want convicted felons to have weapons. They cannot, by law, possess weapons. Go to a gun store and you have to run your name through an instant check. If it comes up that you are a convicted felon, you do not get the gun. But go to a gun show on a Saturday morning as a convicted felon and buy a gun and you do not have to have your name checked against anything. Go get your gun at a gun show, if you are a convicted felon and want a weapon. We are trying to close that loophole.

Every American should support closing that loophole and should support it now. That does not affect any law-abiding citizen's right to own a gun. All it does is says let's keep guns out of the hands of felons. No one in this Chamber should believe convicted felons ought to be able to go into a gun show and gain access to a weapon they are not by law entitled to have.

I did not come to the floor to speak about that, but I did want to respond to the pejorative suggestion that people on this side of the aisle want to injure the rights of law-abiding citizens to possess weapons. That is just wrong. We are trying to close a loophole that every American ought to support closing—to keep felons from getting guns.

INTERSTATE PRISONER TRANSFERS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this is a picture of a man named Kyle Bell. This brutal criminal killed Jeanna North, an 11-year-old girl from Fargo, ND.

After being convicted and imprisoned, Kyle Bell escaped. How did he escape? When North Dakota authorities were going to transport him to a prison out of State for safekeeping, a prison in the State of Oregon, they contracted with a private company called TransCor to haul him there. As he was

being transported across the country by bus with a dozen or more other prisoners, this child killer escaped. While stopped at a gas station, two guards with this private company were sleeping; another was apparently buying a cheeseburger. Kyle Bell went out through the top of the bus and this child killer walked away.

When I discovered what had happened, I thought to myself, that cannot be. We are turning child killers over to private companies to be transported across the country? But it is true. Then I discovered the record of these companies. You can be a retired sheriff and call your brother-in-law and say: Let's buy a mini van and let's go into the business of transporting criminals. In fact, in one state, a man and his wife showed up with a little mini van to pick up five convicted murderers. The warden of the penitentiary said: You have to be kidding me. They weren't kidding. That is who the State hired to transport these murderers. And of course the murderers escaped in short order.

What I have discovered is we have private companies being hired by State and local governments to transport violent criminals around the country, and those companies have no requirement to meet any standards at all. That doesn't make any sense.

I have introduced a piece of legislation I call Jeanna's Bill that says if any local or State government is going to contract with a private company to haul a violent criminal, they must meet some basic standards. They must meet some regulations. If you haul toxic waste, you must meet regulations. Haul cattle, you must meet regulations. Haul circus animals, you must meet regulations. But some of our States and local governments are willing to turn killers over to private companies who have no such standards to meet at all.

I received a letter in the last few days from the Governor of Nevada. I want to say I pass him my compliments. The Governor of Nevada was sending a convicted murderer named James Prestridge to North Dakota for safekeeping under the Prisoners Exchange Agreement. Mr. Prestridge, along with another fellow convicted of armed robbery, was being hauled to North Dakota by a company that is called Extraditions International.

Mr. Prestridge, this convicted murderer, escaped, as did John Doran, an armed robber. Mr. Doran was found just south of the Mexican border with a bullet through his brain, and Mr. Prestridge was recently apprehended. I wrote to the Governor of Nevada and said: I hope if you still intend to send this convicted murderer to North Dakota you will do it through the U.S. Marshals Service. They will haul violent offenders anywhere across this country for a flat fee and they don't lose them.

I got a letter back from the Governor of Nevada. He said:

In response to your request that Nevada stop using private transport companies, please be advised our prison system has ceased its business relationship with Extraditions International and that all of this State's out of state inmate transfers are now being staffed by our prison system.

Good for him. He said, incidentally, Mr. Prestridge is now not going to be sent to North Dakota. Good for us.

But good for him that he changed the policy. In our State, in the most recent days, the company that let this fellow go, the company whose negligence allowed a convicted child killer to walk away and evade authorities for some months, settled with the State for \$50,000. The State sent them a bill for \$102,000 and the company said: We won't pay it. We'd pay you \$50,000. And then the State says this company is a pretty good company and we will use them again.

My State is making a mistake, in my judgment. I would like every State to make a decision when they are going to transport violent criminals around this country, do it with law enforcement officials, do it with the U.S. Marshals Service. They will do it for a flat fee and then some American family won't have to worry that, when they pull up at a gas station, next to them at the pump is a mini van with two inexperienced folks hauling three murderers. What is that about, in terms of public safety?

It seems to me we ought to have enough common sense in this country when we have convicted someone of killing children, when we have convicted someone of murder or violent crimes, at least we ought not to turn them into the arms of someone inexperienced in the private sector, a company that has to meet no standards at all with which to transport them. That doesn't make any sense to me.

So I say to the Governor of Nevada: Good for you. It is the right decision. I would say to our State: Change your mind. Decide this company should not haul violent offenders in North Dakota and that when you are going to transport a violent offender, the U.S. Marshals Service ought to be used to do it.

I say to every State official across this country: Until we get in place basic standards these companies must meet, you ought not use them for transporting violent offenders. Were I a chief executive of a State, I would not use them anyway because I do not think people who kill children, as in the case of Kyle Bell, ought to be turned over to anyone other than law enforcement authorities to transport them to another place of incarceration.

SANCTIONS ON EXPORT OF FOOD AND MEDICINE

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I want to speak about an issue that is of great importance to my State and to all agricultural producers around the country. That is the issue of the sanctions on food and medicine that now exist in our relationships with some countries around the world.

Our country has been in the habit of saying: We don't like certain countries,

we don't like the way they behave, so we are going to slap economic sanctions on these countries and we have included sanctions on the shipment of food and medicine. So countries such as Libya, Iran, Cuba, North Korea, and others, are in a circumstance of having economic sanctions enacted against them to punish them, and we have included in those sanctions food and medicine.

A group of us are trying to change that. We do not think it is the moral thing to do. What is this country doing, saying to others that we will not allow them to have access to food and medicine? Taking aim at dictators and hurting poor people, sick people, and hungry people is hardly something about which we ought to be proud. This is not a moral policy.

I come from a farm State, so I care about having access to these markets as well. I admit that. Aside from the market side of this, which is important—after all, these countries against whom we have sanctions on food and medicine represent almost 11 percent of the world's wheat markets, and we have said to our farmers: By the way, 11 percent of the world's wheat market is off limits to you. Why? Because we decided we do not like these countries and we are going to make them pay a price. Part of the price we are going to exact is the ability for them to access food and medicine from the United States.

Of course, other countries access it from Canada, Europe, or others. We are the country that decides to withhold food and medicine from these countries.

Last year, we had a vote in the Senate on that. Senator ASHCROFT, I, and many others who pushed to repeal the sanction on food and medicine won with 70 out of 100 votes. We were hijacked by the House of Representatives in conference. I was one of the conferees. They just flat out hijacked us. When it was clear to them we were going to win the issue in conference, they adjourned the conference, never to see them again, and they stripped the provision.

I offered the same provision in the Senate Appropriations Committee, and it is now in the Agriculture appropriations bill. That is coming to the floor of the Senate. We have 70 Senators who said they think it is wrong to continue sanctions on food and medicine. The message in the Senate is: Stop using food as a weapon. It is the right message.

There are a lot of people in the House of Representatives who apparently are willing to do that except for Cuba; Cuba is a special case, and they will not withdraw sanctions on food and medicine with respect to Cuba. In fact, that is what derailed it last year.

I am one person, but I tell my colleagues that I am not going to allow, to the extent I can prevent it, the hijacking of this issue again this year by just two or three people who decide they are going to strip this provision and then have the House and Senate

deal with the broader appropriations issues that do not include this provision.

We have spent a lot of time on this issue. This country is wrong in applying sanctions with respect to food and medicine shipments to countries such as Cuba. Yes, Cuba.

I was in Cuba last year. I have no truck with the Castro government. I think the Cuban government and its economic system have collapsed. But the sanctions that exist with respect to this country's actions against Cuba have represented Fidel Castro's greatest excuse to the Cuban people. He says: Of course my economy does not work; of course my country is in trouble. The United States has had its fist around our neck for 40 years.

It is Fidel Castro's greatest excuse, in my judgment, for an economic system that has failed Cuba. It does not make sense, in my judgment, for us to exact a penalty on the Cuban people, on poor people, on hungry people, and on sick people in Cuba, in North Korea, and elsewhere to continue these absurd sanctions on food and medicine.

We can have a broader discussion at some other time about whether the embargo that exists with Cuba ought to be lifted. That is a different subject, a broader subject. Incidentally, I have strong feelings about that as well. This is a narrower issue: Do we believe it appropriate to continue sanctions with respect to the shipment of food and medicine to countries such as Cuba, North Korea, Iran, and others? The answer ought to be a resounding no.

My colleague, Senator SLADE GORTON from the State of Washington, is in the Chamber. He was a cosponsor of this in the Senate Appropriations Committee. He, I, and JOHN ASHCROFT have issued a statement that says to all within hearing distance that if you think you are going to hijack this issue again this year, think again, because we have 70 votes in the Senate that say we ought not use food and medicine as a weapon, and we intend to insist this year that we prevail on this issue.

I cannot speak for anybody else, but the statement we issued is pretty self-explanatory. I am here to give fair warning to those who want to do what they did last year that it is going to be a pretty difficult proposition if they intend to hijack this issue. We have the votes. Vote on it in the Senate, and it will pass by an overwhelming margin. Allow a vote in the House, and it will pass by an overwhelming margin. The only way those who want to defeat this proposition because it contains Cuba—which is an irrational position, for those who think through this a little bit—the only way they can possibly defeat it is to try to use some hijinks in the process to avoid an up-or-down vote.

I and others intend to see we have a full opportunity to have votes in the