America. Let them try to explain why the disintegration of ways of life that give both opportunity and security is good.

As John Maynard Keynes once wrote, "Long run is a misleading guide to current affairs. In the long run we are all dead." I will add: dead, dead, dead.

I am getting sick and tired of these administrations. Democratic and Republican, who run to West Virginia and want the votes there and turn around and fail to take a stand for American goods, American industries, and American men and women workers.

John Maynard Keynes also wrote, "Practical men, who believe themselves to be quite exempt from any intellectual influences, are usually the slaves of some defunct economist."

How many Washington Post editorialists we lose their jobs if our trade laws are eviscerated? How many libertarian think tanks will be shut down when the free trade dystopia is established? Shall we take their views—the views of some defunct economist—as gospel, or shall we listen to those who earn their living by the sweat of their brow?

When God evicted Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden, they were told to earn their bread from the sweat of their brow, and that is why we are still doing it. I say listen to those who earn their living by the sweat of their brow. Go to Weirton to the steel town; go to Wheeling to that steel town, at Wheeling-Pitt with over 4,000 workers. I believe that is right. Go over there. Say to them: Boys, get in touch with your House Members and get in touch with your Senators and get them to vote for—they do not call it fast track. What is it they call it? It is a sugarcoated pill. Tell your Senator to vote for that. If they will not say it out loud, that is fast track. Tell your Senator to vote for that.

I am for expanding international trade. Who wouldn’t be. But let the trade be fair. Let us have a level playing field, and let us not neglect our responsibilities in this Senate to participate meaningfully in the formulation and implementation of U.S. trade policy.

I am not saying the Senate ought to vote on every duty and every tariff on every little toothbrush and every little violin string that is sent into this country. I am saying there are some big questions this Senate ought to be able to speak to and to vote on. At least on 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6, let’s have a vote by this Senate.

One way we can reassert our constitutional role with respect to foreign trade is to create a Congressional Trade Office modeled after the Congressional Budget Office.

My colleagues might recall this was one of the many ideas discussed in the report of the U.S. Trade Deficit Review Commission. Senator Baucus and I are working on legislation that would give us a trade office with the information resources and expertise necessary to permit us to discharge our oversight responsibilities.

That is what we need. We need to exercise our oversight responsibility. We cannot do it if we gag ourselves, if we cannot speak, if we cannot amend. We cannot fulfill our responsibilities under the Constitution. We cannot fulfill our responsibilities to the people who sent us here.

Can anyone guess how many trade agreements have been negotiated without fast track? The President is running around saying: Oh, I have to have this; I have to have this in order to enter into these trade agreements. Can anyone guess how many trade agreements have been negotiated without fast track? The extraordinary authority was first granted to the President in 1974? The answer is in the hundreds. We have had fast track on this Senate floor 5 times in the last 27 years, but in the meantime, hundreds of trade agreements have been negotiated, the most recent examples being the U.S.-Jordan agreement and the U.S.-Vietnam agreement.

I think we need an analysis of all the trade agreements concluded over the past 27 years. Let us try to determine if the Founding Fathers were completely off the mark when they gave Congress authority over foreign commerce.

I believe that any impartial study of this history will demonstrate that we have trade agreements without surrendering our constitutional authority over foreign commerce. If negotiation of trade agreements is in the interests of other nations, they will be at the table. They will be at the table, in my judgment, Congress or no Congress. Is there any serious argument to the contrary?

Let me be clear. I am thinking of a Presidential nominee some years ago who said this. For the moment I have forgotten his name. He said this: I didn’t say that I didn’t say it; I said that I didn’t say that I said it.

And then he said: Let me be clear. I didn’t say that I didn’t say it; I said that I didn’t say that I said it.

He said then: Let me be clear—after the audience had laughed.

Let me be clear. I am not suggesting that we noodle away at a Presidentially negotiated trade agreement by considering myriad small amendments. No, Congress should not focus on the minutiae. There may, however, be a small number of big issues in such an agreement that go to the root of our constituents’ interests. We must have the authority to subject those issues to full debate and, if necessary, amendment.

In closing, I reiterate that we should put our trust in this document which I hold in my hand, the Constitution of the United States—not in fast track but in the Constitution of the United States and in the people for whom it was created and ratified: the people of America.

Let us not give away even one piece of our national birthright, the Constitution, without at least demanding and proof of that its tried and true principles must be modified.

Let us preserve our authority as Members of Congress to participate fully in the process of concluding international trade agreements. Let us not permit the globalization bandwagon to roll over us, to weaken our voices, to sap the vigor of our democratic institutions, and to blind us to our national interests and the needs of our communities.

If we cannot uphold this banner—the Constitution of the United States which I hold in my hand—if we cannot uphold this banner, the banner of our more than 200-year-old constitutional Republic, if we cannot play a constructive role in taming the free-trade levianthan, then we are unworthy of our esteemed title.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

IN RECOGNITION OF RAYMOND BOURQUE

Mr. Kerry. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment that I know my colleague from Massachusetts agrees with me to pay special recognition and tribute, celebrating the career of one of New England’s most beloved sports figures, Raymond Bourque, who announced his retirement today.

Over the course of a 22-year career in the National Hockey League, this future-certain Hall-of-Famer set a standard for all athletes—playing with a special kind of determination and grit and, above all, class that has been recognized by his fellow players and by sports fans all over this country and indeed the world.

He came to us in Boston from Canada as a teenager to play for our beloved Boston Bruins, earning Rookie of the Year honors for that first year in 1979 to 1980.

Many make a large splash with a lot of headlines in the first year, but Ray proved, even as he won Rookie of the Year, to be more marathon than sprinter. Through perseverance and a deep dedication to his craft, he played his way into the hearts of sports fans across the region and throughout the league.

For over 20 years, touching literally the lives of millions, through those 20 years, he was the foundation on which the Boston Bruins built their teams and chased the dream of bringing the Stanley Cup back to Boston. Alas, that was not to happen.

The statistics, however, of his chase speak for themselves: The highest scoring defenseman in league history; a 19-time All-Star; a five-time Norris Trophy winner as the league’s best
defenseman. But in many ways it was more than goals and assists and legendary defense that won him the tremendous respect of Boston fans. It was his performance beyond the game itself.

December 3, 1987, is a day that remains indelibly imprinted in the hearts and minds of Boston sports folklore. It is next to Fisk's homer, Havlicek's steal, and Orr's flying goal. That day Bruin Hall-of-Famer Phil Esposito's No. 7 was retired and raised to the rafters of the old Boston Garden. Ray Bourque also wore No. 7 and most believed he was going to continue to wear his number for the remainder of his career.

That night, Ray touched generations of fans and nonfans by skating over to Esposito, removing his No. 7 jersey to hand it to a stunned Esposito and said, "This is yours, big fella. It never should have been mine." The Ray Bourque Cup was the one thing that was missing during his years in Boston that continued to elude him and his teammates. In fact, Ray had the most games played without winning a Stanley Cup—1,625. However, that distinction did not diminish him in the eyes of his fans or his teammates, the mates that were proud to call him captain. It only made them all want to give him one last opportunity to prevail. With that in mind, Boston gave Ray his leave and he set his sights on that final goal—to win a Stanley Cup—only this time he set out to do it with the Colorado Avalanche.

Even after Ray left the Bruins in the midst of the 2000 season in search of that goal, Boston fans never left him. His new Colorado team immediately recognized his value as a leader and they awarded the moniker of assistant captain upon his arrival. When he finally raised the cup over his head in triumph this past season, all of New England cheered for him. In fact, in an unprecedented show of support for another team's victory, over 15,000 Bourque and Boston fans joined in a celebration on Boston's City Hall Plaza when Ray brought home the Stanley Cup each of the last seven years that the Bruins were in the finals. Boston fans never left him.

Today we learned that Ray Bourque has laced up his skates as a professional in competition for the final time. He will retire and come home to Massachusetts to be with his wife, Christiane, and their three children, Melissa, Christopher, and Ryan. He will watch his eldest son, 15-year-old Christopher, as he plays hockey at a new school.

It is both fair and appropriate to say that for all of his children, as well as all young children, you could not have a better role model, not just in hockey but in life.

I have been privileged to share a number of charitable events with Ray Bourque. He is tireless in his contribution back to the community and in the leadership to help to build a better community.

If Ray's career were only measured in numbers, he would be an automatic Hall-of-Famer. But when you take the full measure of the man, he has shown to be one of those few athletes who transcend sports. He could have played a couple of years more. He could have made millions of more dollars. But he chose to go out on top and to return to his family. He felt his family had made enough sacrifices for him, and it was time for him to be there for them.

In Massachusetts, and fans everywhere, I think there is a special sense of gratitude for his success, for his happiness, and we are appreciative of all of his years with the Bruins and proud to have him back home in Massachusetts. We wish him and his family well.

SOUTH DAKOTA NATIONAL PEACE ESSAY CONTEST WINNER

Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. President, I am honored today to present to my colleagues in the Senate an essay by Austin Lamhers of Hermosa, SD. Austin is a student at St. Thomas More High School and he is the National Peace Essay Contest winner for South Dakota.

I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAILURE IN AFRICA

Imagine how horrible living in a third world country in a civil war would be. The people that are supposed to help allow death, famine and increased war. Death and war is precisely what has happened in this past decade in the warring countries of Somalia and Rwanda. Outsiders, such as the United Nations, can occasionally help in violent civil outbreaks but they are not consistent and rarely make the situation much better. Third parties should not interfere in civil conflicts unless they are well prepared, respond quickly, and benefit the country they are interfering in.

Drought and famine has been the reason for civil war in Somalia since 1969, but the most recent civil war erupted between rebel and governmental forces in 1991 (Fox 50). The rebel forces seized Mogadishu, the capital of Somalia, and forced President Siad Barre to flee the country (Pottle 12). The takeover which destroyed the economy also began a famine for about 4.5 million people who were faced with starvation, malnutrition, and related diseases (Johnston 5). The UN wanted to intervene under the United Nations Charter, but the UN can only act to stop the war between nations, not civil war within a single country (Pottle 26). Therefore, in December 1992 UN Secretary General Boutros-Ghali, passed Resolution 794 that permitted the UN to secure Somalia (Pottle 27).

Following Resolution 794 the UN began the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM) which monitored the new cease-fire between the rebels and the government forces while delivering humanitarian aid (Johnston 29). The cease-fire did not last long. Soon the sides were fighting again, but this time with UN peacekeepers caught in the middle (Benton 129). As the fighting grew worse the UN soon abandoned UNOSOM (Johnston 29). A U.S. led force; the Unified Task Force (UNTF) to make a safe environment for delivery of humanitarian aid replaced UNOSOM (Benton 133). In May 1993, UNOSOM II replaced UNTF; but only starvation was relieved, there was still governmental unrest (Benton 135).

The U.S. decided to leave Somalia when on October 3, 1993, a Somalia rebel group shot down a U.S. helicopter, killing eighteen American soldiers (Fox 19). The U.S. was evacuated by 1994, and by 1995 all UN forces had left (Fox 22).

After the abandonment by UN in 1995, the new police force created by the UN committed numerous human rights violations (Potter 17). Also bad weather, pests, and the UN ban on the export of livestock to the U.S. and Saudi Arabia have worsened the economic situation in Somalia (Johnston 56). The drop in economy in Somalia has caused lowered employment and increased starvation (Johnston 60).

The UN should not have intervened in Somalia but rather let Somalia deal with their own internal problems. While the UN was in Somalia, they made the war bigger and thus causing more starvation. After the UN was removed, the police force abused citizens, and their economy went crashing further down (Potter 30).

The United Nations should have learned from their mistakes in Rwanda. The UN ignored what had happened and tried to help the civil war in Rwanda during 1994. Rwanda's population is approximately 88% Hutu and 11% Tutsi. The two groups have had bad relations since that 15th century when the Hutus were forced to serve the Tutsis (Brown 51). Then the genocide began. First the Prime Minister and his ten bodyguards, then all Tutsi's and political moderates (Freeman 22). That same day the genocide began, first killing the Prime Minister and her ten bodyguards, then all Tutsi's and political moderates (Freeman 22). That same day the genocide began, first killing the Prime Minister and her ten bodyguards, then all Tutsi's and political moderates (Freeman 22). That same day the genocide began, first killing the Prime Minister and her ten bodyguards, then all Tutsi's and political moderates (Freeman 22). That same day the genocide began, first killing the Prime Minister and her ten bodyguards, then all Tutsi's and political moderates (Freeman 22). That same day the genocide began, first killing the Prime Minister and her ten bodyguards, then all Tutsi's and political moderates (Freeman 22). That same day the genocide began, first killing the Prime Minister and her ten bodyguards, then all Tutsi's and political moderates (Freeman 22).

The United Nations should have learned from their mistakes in Rwanda. The UN ignored what had happened and tried to help the civil war in Rwanda during 1994. Rwanda's population is approximately 88% Hutu and 11% Tutsi. The two groups have had bad relations since that 15th century.