

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask to place in the RECORD that I was on the floor of the House when the gavel was gavelled on the last vote, and I would like to indicate on two preceding votes that if I was present, on H. Res. 233, I would have voted "yea." On final passage of H.R. 1185, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, due to a scheduling conflict, I was unable to be on the floor of the House of Representatives during the last series of votes on May 4, 2005. If I had been, I would have cast a "yes" vote on H.R. 1185, Final Passage of the Federal Deposit Insurance Reform Act of 2005, and a "yes" vote on H. Res. 233, Recognizing the 60th Anniversary of Victory in Europe (V-E) Day.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit this statement for the RECORD and regret that I could not be present today, Wednesday May 4, 2005 to vote on rollcall vote Nos. 153, 154, 155, 156, 157 and 158 due to a family medical emergency.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 153 on the motion to recommit H.R. 366 to the Committee on Education and the Workforce;

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 154 on final passage of H.R. 366—The Vocational and Technical Education for the Future Act;

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 155 on H. Con. Res. 127—Calling on the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria to transfer Charles Ghankay Taylor, former President of the Republic of Liberia, to the Special Court for Sierra Leone to be tried for war crimes, crimes against humanity, and other serious violations of international humanitarian law;

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 156 on H. Res. 195—Recognizing the 60th anniversary of Victory in Europe (VE) Day and the Liberation of Western Bohemia;

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 157 on H.R. 1185—Federal Deposit Insurance Reform Act; and,

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 158 on H. Res. 233—Recognizing the 60th anniversary of Victory in Europe (V-E) Day during World War II.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN-GROSSMENT OF H.R. 1185, FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 2005

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the bill, H.R. 1185, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, and cross-references and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

BUSH ADMINISTRATION IS LETTING OUR TROOPS DOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, May 1, marked the 2-year anniversary of President Bush's aircraft carrier news event in which he declared "Mission Accomplished" in Iraq. Two years later, our troops are still facing a strong insurgency that shows no sign of slowing down.

Our troops are doing valiant work, but that sadly is not always enough. I will include for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a New York Times investigative report from April 25 titled, "Bloodied Marines Sound Off About Want for Armor and Men." The article should be required reading for every Member of this House, as well as the high-ranking military and civilian personnel at the Department of Defense.

Times reporter Michael Moss interviewed Marines from Company E who served a 6-month stint in Iraq last year. During that time, Company E endured the highest casualty rate of any marine company in the war. According to the Times, "More than one-third of the unit's 185 troops were killed or wounded during that time."

Several months after the beginning of the war as Congress was debating its first emergency supplemental, we were all alerted to the fact that our troops did not have the equipment they needed to adequately do their job and to protect themselves from extreme harm or death. We heard they did not have the body armor they needed, nor did the Humvees come with the necessary protective steel armor to protect them from being easy targets of insurgents.

□ 1615

The situation became so dire for our troops that one brave National Guardsman last year asked Secretary Rumsfeld when the troops would have the protective gear they had already been promised. Secretary Rumsfeld could not give the Guardsman an adequate response at the time. As the press began to question the Bush administration about this outrageous neglect of our troops, President Bush came out and stated, "The concerns expressed are being addressed, and that is we ex-

pect our troops to have the best possible equipment and I have told many families I met with, 'We're doing everything we possibly can to protect your loved ones in a mission which is vital and important.'"

The New York Times report clearly shows that the Bush administration has not done enough to protect our troops. As the House prepares to vote tomorrow on another \$82 billion supplemental to fund the war, bringing the total cost to \$300 billion, it is hard to believe that the Bush administration, particularly Defense Secretary Rumsfeld, has not made protecting our troops in Iraq a main priority.

Mr. Speaker, we have now lost more than 1,600 troops in Iraq, but the Defense Department has no idea how many of these troops have died because they did not receive the proper supplies from the leaders that sent them into harm's way. Would you believe that we do not have those numbers because the Defense Department chooses only to list casualties as "killed in combat"?

However, the New York Times story gives a grim report on how the lack of protection affected Company 13. According to the Times, "The biggest danger the men faced came in traveling to and from camp; 13 of the 21 men who were killed had been riding in Humvees that failed to deflect bullets or bombs." I repeat, 13 of 21, or almost two-thirds of the men, were killed as a direct result of them not having access to armed Humvees. Again, this is last year. This is not 2 years ago at the beginning of the war.

Mr. Speaker, where is the Bush administration, particularly Secretary Rumsfeld, spending the billions of dollars this Congress has given them? The Pentagon says it will not have every Humvee suitably armed until the end of this year. That is simply unacceptable. Our brave troops should not have to wait another 8 months to have the proper protection they need to do their job. Sergeant James King, a member of Company E who lost one of his legs when he was blown out of a Humvee, said it best to the New York Times: "As Marines, we are always taught that we do more with less and get the job done no matter what it takes."

You would expect nothing less from our troops. They have not let us down. But, unfortunately, our troops have clearly been let down by the Bush administration.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 25, 2005]

BLOODIED MARINES SOUND OFF ABOUT WANT OF ARMOR AND MEN

(By MICHAEL MOSS)

CORRECTION APPENDED

A chart on April 25 with an article about a company of marines who fought in Iraq misstated the type of munition that the armor installed on their Humvees is capable of withstanding. It is a four-pound land mine, not a 155-millimeter howitzer round.

CORRECTED BY THE NEW YORK TIMES WED
MAY 04 2005

On May 29, 2004, a station wagon that Iraqi insurgents had packed with C-4 explosives