on current and cumulative cost obligations for the wars as well as one-year and five-year estimates. In the normal budget process, the Pentagon would have to provide those figures.

Incorporating war costs in the regular budget, Congress would no longer be able to compartmentalize, treating those expenditures as an aberration while going about business as usual elsewhere. Those expenditures are no aberration, and it's not business as usual.

''BLUSTER BACKFIRES''

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 2006

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, anyone who doubts the wisdom of the constitutional requirement that important officials be confirmed by the Senate before taking up their jobs should ponder the disastrous example of John Bolton, whom the Senate declined to confirm as Ambassador to the U.N., and who received a recess appointment from President Bush. His tenure has been disastrous, leading to a diminution of American influence and a failure to accomplish legitimate American goals.

Like many other Americans, I greatly regretted the fact that Deputy Secretary General Mark Malloch Brown recently gave a speech strongly critical of America's role regarding the U.N., but my regret was aimed not at Mr. Brown for giving the speech, but at the Bush administration, and specifically Ambassador Bolton, for actions that led to the speech. As a Member of Congress, I am troubled by the fact that I have to agree with the substance of a speech so sharply critical of our Government, but I believe that Mr. Brown did us a service in speaking out, because it may alert my colleagues in Congress and the American people in general of the need to press for a change in the disastrous policies that Ambassador Bolton pursues in the President's name.

In the Washington Post on Monday, June 12, Sebastian Mallaby wrote a thoughtful and persuasive piece about the Bolton record. Because the current situation regarding our representation of the U.N. does so much damage to legitimate American interests, Sebastian Mallaby's column is particularly welcome and I hope will be strongly considered by President Bush, Secretary Rice, and other policy makers in this administration. It is also very important for those of us in Congress to understand his points and I ask that his column be printed here.

[From the Washington Post, June 12, 2006]

AT THE U.N., BLUSTER BACKFIRES

(By Sebastian Mallaby)

Last month President Bush issued a rare apology. ''Saying 'Bring it on,' kind of tough talk, you know, that sent the wrong signal,'' he confessed. ''I think in certain parts of the world it was misinterpreted.''

Well done, Mr. President, you've understood that bluster can backfire. Now how about sharing this insight with your ambassador to the United Nations?

John R. Bolton, the ambassador in question, has a rich history of losing friends and failing to influence people. He was notorious, even before arriving at the United Nations last year, for having said that 10 stories of the U.N. headquarters could be demolished without much loss; he had described the United States as the sun around which lesser nations rotate—mere ''asteroids,'' he'd branded them. Perhaps not surprisingly, the Senate refused to confirm Bolton as U.N. ambassador. ''Arrogant,'' ''bullying,'' and ''the poster child of what someone in the diplomatic corps should not be,'' Sen. George Voinovich called him.

Bush sent Bolton anyway, bypassing the Senate by appointing him during a congressional recess. It soon turned out that dismissing foreign ambassadors as asteroid dwellers was merely a warm-up. As soon as Bolton got to New York, he blew up the preparatory negotiations for a gathering of heads of state, insisting that the other 190 members of the world body immediately agree to hundreds of changes in the summit document.

If Bolton had picked a fight on a worthwhile issue, this might have been justified. But one of the chief aims of his edits was to eliminate all mention of the anti-poverty Millennium Development Goals, even though these targets for reducing child mortality and so on are inoffensive. After a week of Bolton-induced bureaucratic battles, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice weighed in, explaining that the administration actually had nothing against the development goals. When the summit convened, Bush himself had to declare during his speech that he supported the targets that his ambassador had repudiated.

Bolton's next triumph was to demand U.N. reform, or rather to pretend to do so. An effort to create a credible human rights council was underway, but Bolton skipped nearly all of the 30 or so negotiating sessions. Then, when the negotiators produced a blueprint for the new council, Bolton declared it unacceptable, leaving furious American allies to wonder why he hadn't weighed in earlier to secure a better outcome. ''The job now is to get clarity on what the U.S. wants,'' the British ambassador said icily. But what Bolton really wanted was quite clear: to allow the negotiations to falter and then to condemn whatever they produced, throwing red meat to his U.N.-hating allies on the right of the Republican Party.

Next, Bolton blundered into U.N. management reform, an issue that may soon precipitate a crisis. The top U.N. officials, led by Secretary General Kofi Annan, had laid out a menu of radical changes, designed to eliminate useless conferences and reports and to move staff to departments that most needed them. Bolton added his own brand of bluster to this plan: If poor countries carried on resisting management reforms, rich countries would stop paying for the organization. The deadline for agreeing on reform is the end of this month, but no breakthrough is in sight. Officials are wondering what to do if U.N. checks start bouncing.

Not many reformers at the United Nations believe that the budget threat achieved anything. To the contrary, Bolton has so poisoned the atmosphere that the cause of management renewal is viewed by many developing countries as an American plot. And if Bolton carries through on his threat to cut off money for the United Nations, the United States will be more isolated than ever. Refusing to fund U.N. officials who are planning for a peacekeeping mission in Darfur is not a winning strategy.

Last week the U.N. deputy secretary general, a pro-American Briton named Mark Malloch Brown, went public with his Bolton frustrations. He pointed out that the United Nations serves many American objectives, from deploying peacekeepers to helping with Iraq's elections. Given this cooperation, the powers that be in Washington should stick up for the United Nations rather than threatening to blow it up. They should not be passive in the face of ''unchecked U.N.-bashing and stereotyping.''

This merely stated the obvious. If you doubt that U.N.-bashing and stereotyping goes on, ask yourself what gallery Bolton is playing to—or check out the latest cover of the National Rifle Association magazine, which features a wolf with U.N. logos in its eyeballs. But Malloch Brown's speech didn't seem obvious to Bolton. ''This is the worst mistake by a senior U.N. official that I have seen,'' he thundered in response. ''Even though the target of the speech was the United States, the victim, I fear, will be the United Nations.''

Which would suit Bolton and his allies perfectly. But it should not suit Bush, at least not now that he's grasped that bluster can backfire. Arriving at the U.N. summit last September, a different Bush greeted the secretary general and gestured at Bolton; ''has the place blown up since he's been here?'' he demanded, teasingly. Well, it's now time for the new Bush to acknowledge that Bolton's tactics aren't funny. The United States needs an ambassador who can work with the United Nations. Right now, it doesn't have one.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 2006

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, June 12, 2006, I was unavoidably detained due to a prior obligation.

I request that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 251: ''yes'' on agreeing to H. Res. 804; rollcall No. 252: ''yes'' on agreeing to H. Res. 794; rollcall No. 253: ''yes'' on agreeing to H. Res. 608; rollcall No. 254: ''yes'' on agreeing to H. Con. Res. 338; rollcall No. 255: ''no'' on agreeing to the previous question during consideration of H. Res. 857.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL DONALD P. LAUZON ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE UNITED STATES ARMY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 13, 2006

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my dear friend LTC Donald P. Lauzon as he retires from a distinguished career in the U.S. Army and as the Commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the Detroit District.

Born in Rhode Island and earning his Bachelor of Science from Rhode Island College, LTC Lauzon was commissioned into the Army in 1986. He served bravely overseas in Bosnia, in Iraq, and as the Company Executive Officer of the 547th Combat Engineer Battalion in Germany. Before arriving in Detroit, LTC Lauzon served as Chief of the Department of Military Training, National Geospatial and Intelligence Agency at Fort Belvoir in Virginia. His military awards and decorations include the Bronze Star, the National Defense