

It would not have taken a rocket science" to add up the amount of exposure as the prescribed number of shots was increasing, one of the e-mails said.

While asserting that there was no proof of harm, the U.S. Public Health Service in July 1999 called on manufacturers to go mercury-free by switching to single-dose vials. Soon after, Merck introduced a mercury-free version of its hepatitis B vaccine, replacing the only thimerosal-containing vaccine it was still marketing at the time, a company spokesman said.

By 2002, thimerosal had been eliminated or reduced to trace levels in nearly all childhood vaccines. One exception is the pediatric flu vaccine made by Aventis and still sold mainly in multidose vials.

SMART SECURITY AND THE CASE FOR LEAVING IRAQ, PART 5

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, people around the world were greatly moved by the courage of millions of Iraqis who braved death to cast a ballot on January 30, Iraq's first democratic elections in over 50 years. The Iraqi elections, however, did not justify this destructive war, neither the lies used to sell it nor the incompetence with which it has been managed.

The elections will not bring back the 1,500 American soldiers who have been killed or heal the over-10,000 American troops who have been wounded, and they certainly cannot bring back the untold thousands of Iraqis who have lost their lives. These elections will not reimburse the American taxpayers nearly \$200 billion spent over the last 3 years, and the elections will not stop the vicious insurgency that is terrorizing Iraqi communities.

But the elections do demonstrate that Iraqis are prepared to manage their own affairs. That is why I believe that now is the time to develop and implement a plan to bring our soldiers home and end the U.S. military presence in Iraq absolutely as soon as possible.

Together with 27 cosponsors, I have introduced H. Con. Res. 35, calling for a plan to end this military mishap. Earlier today I wrote to the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, asking them to hold hearings on this matter.

The Bush administration spared no superlative in talking about the significance of the Iraqi elections. Such a momentous watershed event, however, would seem to demand a shift in our thinking about Iraq. But not for President Bush. He actually has become more emboldened by the election. He sees this as a mandate to keep our soldiers in Iraq as long as he wants. He and his surrogates are even engaging in

provocative saber-rattling in the direction of Iran.

The Iraq elections did not vindicate the doctrine of preemptive war, and they do not undo all the death and destruction that has occurred as a result. They demonstrated that the Iraqis can and should take control of their own destinies. Leaving will not be sufficient to defeat the insurgency, but staying absolutely will intensify it.

What is fueling the insurgency and what gave rise to it in the first place is our continued military presence in Iraq. Our troops, whom the administration assured us would be embraced as liberators, are the focal point of anti-American extremism, making them sitting ducks.

Let me be clear: I am not advocating a cut-and-run strategy. It would be irresponsible for the United States to abandon the Iraqi people. What we must do is play a role in facilitating their transition to stable democracy. We ought to work with Iraq's elected officials, the United Nations and the Arab League to create an international peacekeeping force that will keep Iraq secure. Much of the money we are spending on this military campaign should be diverted to infrastructure projects that will improve Iraqis' lives, such as road construction, new schools, water processing plants and more.

Up to this point, Iraq's economic development has been scandalously mismanaged by the Bush administration, as billions of dollars appropriated by Congress have not actually been put to work on the ground. All future investments must be made with the needs of Iraqis being paramount, not the United States Government contractors and not other war profiteers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe a focus on developmental and humanitarian aid in Iraq would be a model for a radically new approach to national security. We need what I call SMART security, which is a Sensible, Multilateral, American Response to Terrorism.

Instead of resorting to the military option and spending needlessly on weapons systems, the SMART security plan that I propose calls for building multilateral partnerships, partnerships that enable us to foil terrorists and stop weapons of mass destruction proliferation.

A SMART security plan would address the conditions that led to terrorism in the first place: poverty, hopelessness, despair. Instead of troops, we should send scientists, educators, urban planners and constitutional experts to the troubled regions of the world.

It is time, Mr. Speaker, for the United States to play the role of Iraq's ally and partner, not its occupier. It is time to give Iraq back to its own people. It is time to truly support our troops by beginning to bring them home. The first step is for the chair-

man and ranking member of the Committee on International Relations to hold hearings on this matter now.

The Iraqi elections, however, will never justify the destructive war, and it will never stand up to the lies that we heard to sell it.

SETTING BACK AMERICA'S DEFENSE

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, in Washington, officials commonly use studies and reports to legitimize various policies, and often the guidelines by which these studies are established can force a researcher into predetermined results. Traditionally, the Quadrennial Defense Review, or QDR, has been above this type of sincere process, as it is a serious exercise intended to produce a Pentagon strategic blueprint for defending our Nation from future threats. This year, however, I fear that the new QDR guidelines will overtly deemphasize conventional threats, which would result in long-term setbacks for our national defense.

I recognize the need to focus greater attention on the current asymmetric threat of terrorism and the need to drastically rein in Federal spending this year to decrease the budget deficit. However, it should not come at the expense of our ability to defeat well-established threats in the future.

Released on Monday, the Pentagon's 2006 budget would cut off the procurement of the F/A-22 Raptor after 2008. With these cuts, several high-tech sectors within our Nation's defense industrial base would be crippled, costing America good-paying jobs, future innovation and, most important, critical military capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, under the proposed budget, the Pentagon would buy just 179 F/A-22 Raptors, well short of the original 381 proposed by the Air Force. In exchange for nominal short-term savings, the move would significantly increase the cost of each aircraft at a time when production would otherwise be affordable through economy of scale. Investing nearly \$30 billion in research and development in the world's best fighter jet and then buying less than what the Air Force needs to guarantee future air dominance just does not make sense.

□ 1745

It is as if we discovered the cure for cancer and then we skimmed on the lifesaving drugs.

Remarkably, the proposed cuts appear to have been made against the advice of the war planners, because Pentagon bureaucrats are ignoring the Air Force wartime requirement of the 381 F/A-22s, a number that the Secretary