

One is the military necessity for this plane; two and three are the ways we keep our air superiority, both by technology and the number of planes we have; and then finally, the priorities and what it says about this particular Nation.

Two years ago the military was unanimous when they came before our committees and said that we need 381 F-22s and that 250 put us at a moderate risk. Now today Secretary Gates will tell us we only need 187, not the 381 planes. One has to ask, what has changed? Has the threat this Nation faces changed? Or is it simply the political climate that may have changed? In the last 15 years, there have been 30 independent separate studies, all of which say the same thing: 243 is the minimum number of F-22s we need; and at that, our air superiority faces a moderate risk. Air Combat Command General Corley has written a letter saying he needs at least 243 planes, F-22s, and that his command was not consulted when the decision to cap at 187 was actually made. The Air National Guard General Wyatt has also written a letter to our colleagues in the Senate, saying he needs at least 243 to 250 F-22s. General Schwartz, Chief of the Air Force, has already publicly stated that 243 is the minimum we need; and when asked in front of our committee, Is 187, that particular number, a military decision of what we need or is it the political decision of what we can afford?, he simply said, It is what we think we can afford.

The bottom line is that nowhere has there been any study conducted to say that 187 is the correct number. In fact, that number has been contradicted. General Corley of Air Combat Command clearly said that with 187, the Air Combat Command could not fulfill its air force function. Is this a military decision? Does the military still want the F-22? And the answer is clearly, yes. Secretary Gates does not want the F-22. The 187 F-22s is a political, not a military, number; and the House, who has already voted to maintain the higher number should not back off in relationship to what the Senate has particularly done.

Let me go also to this concept of air superiority. The United States has had air superiority since the Korean War, and there are two aspects of that: technology as well as the numbers that we have. I hate to say this, but before I came to Congress, there were air games that the United States engaged in with the Air Force of India. We used F-15s. We didn't use everything at our disposal; but the only reason we won those air games is because of the ability of our pilots, not because we have the technology to do it. The technology level of the United States, as good as the 15 and the 16 airplanes are—which are 30 years old—is that we still have the same technology advantage as a third-world Air Force. The F-22 moves us forward in that technology debate. However, just having the tech-

nology doesn't work if you don't have the numbers. The Russians are already building their fifth generation, and they are scheduled to build about 600 of their next-generation fighters. They will only keep about 350 for themselves. You have to ask the logical question, What will they do with the others? They will sell them. And where will they go? The bidders right now are countries like Venezuela and Iran, countries that are not necessarily friends of ours, but countries that could become a problem with this new generation of fighter that they buy from the Russians.

We have been told that the F-35 is enough for what we need. However, the F-35 is not a replacement for the F-22. And the problem is, we won't even get an F-35 under the best of circumstances before the year 2014, and there is some indication that it may be the year 2016 before that takes place. We are in a situation where this administration clearly puts \$5 billion in programs like ACORN but doesn't want to put \$2 billion to continue the production of the F-22, vital to the defense of this particular country.

Is this plane expensive? Yes. Is this plane militarily required? Yes. Is it useless? No. Is it a Cold War element? Well, actually, almost everything we have is a Cold War element. We just simply try to improve them as time goes on. What we are dealing with now, Mr. Speaker, is simply the concept that we are dealing with what we need in the next 15 to 20 years. And in that particular situation, the F-22 is what we need for the future defense of this country.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2749, FOOD SAFETY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-235) on the resolution (H. Res. 691) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2749) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve the safety of food in the global market, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECOGNIZING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE ENACTMENT OF MEDICAID AND MEDICARE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as we continue with the debate surrounding health reform, I wish to take a moment to recognize the anniversary of the enactment of Medicare and Medicaid into law. Since July 30, 1965, when Lyndon Johnson signed the bill creating these fundamental health initiatives, these two programs have evolved

together to reliably meet the demands of aging and medically vulnerable Americans who may not have had access to medical attention otherwise. Medicare and Medicaid currently provide a lifeline to over 100 million Americans. In my district, I can attest that Medicare and Medicaid serve as an indispensable safety net for many constituents. The Seventh Congressional District of Illinois includes some of the most medically underserved communities in America. Census data show that 24 percent of families and 44 percent of children under 18 live below the poverty line. In fact, some communities on Chicago's west side experience infant mortality rates comparable with third-world countries. In the State of Illinois, 14 percent of all residents are enrolled in Medicare and 19 percent in Medicaid. Clearly these government health programs provide vital health care coverage to Illinoisians when almost one-fifth of the State is covered by Medicaid and one-sixth by Medicare. Indeed, Illinois' mothers and children are the biggest beneficiaries of Medicaid. This Federal program finances 40 percent of total births in Illinois and helps ensure that over 1 million children in Illinois receive access to affordable health care. It is this commitment to our citizens that drives Congress to work actively for comprehensive health reform. We must provide a public option within that reform. Further, we must continue to support and expand community health centers as outstanding deliverers of primary care. These providers are proven to reap solid benefits to our patients, communities, and State and local governments in terms of efficiency. For example, Medicaid beneficiaries relying on health centers for usual care were 19 percent less likely to use the emergency department than Medicaid beneficiaries using outpatient and office-based physicians for usual care. Overall, health centers save the health care system between \$9.9 billion and \$17.6 billion annually, a figure that will grow.

I acknowledge the tremendous step that Lyndon B. Johnson took 44 years ago when he signed the Medicare and Medicaid bills into law as titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act. We must continue to make use of these programs because they have served us well and will continue to do so.

□ 1815

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

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

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