

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.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. GRAYSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HONORING OUR BORDER PATROL AGENTS

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, on the 23rd of this month, Rosalie Rosas watched her husband go off to work. She stayed at home with Robert, her son, 2, and Alesa, an 11-month-old baby, thinking that the next morning her husband, Agent Rosas, would be back at home with the family. Sadly, that wasn't to be.

Agent Rosas was in the Campo area of southern California serving a nation that he looked forward to serving for so long; a young man who had grown up in the Imperial Valley area, had served as a reservist, always looked forward to being a Border Patrol agent. While alone, he detected individuals crossing the border. Somewhere in the process of confronting the illegals crossing the border, Agent Rosas was murdered by those illegals.

Mr. Speaker, Agent Rosas' situation, and more importantly, the situation of Rosalie and the two children, is something that all Americans should remember, that there are Americans every day that are not only defending this country far, far away, but there are agents every day and every night that stand on the border, stand in ports of entry or throughout this country, standing up and defending this country from incursions from across the border and from foreign lands.

Agent Rosas died in the service of this country, was murdered in the service of this country, and Rosalie and the two kids will never be the same, and neither should this country.

Mr. Speaker, there are Border Patrol agents today that are in the sweltering heat of Yuma, Arizona, across the Texas frontier, that confront smugglers every day from New Mexico to San Diego. And they do not know which one of the individuals they are confronting, if it's just an innocent illegal who happens to not realize that you can't come into this country illegally anymore, somebody that may not mean harm but is being brought in by vicious, terrible smugglers who not only smuggle illegals, but smuggle drugs. That agent doesn't know if the person they're confronting is going to surrender or draw a firearm and kill him immediately.

Agent Rosas was shot in the head and killed. But he was able to wound one of his assailants, and the assailant later was detected as far up as northern California, and he was arrested there. With the cooperation of Mexican officials, we were able to apprehend individuals in Mexico.

But I think that more important than talking about the crime that was committed at our border—something that I think all Americans should have known was coming when we've seen the violence that has occurred on the other side of the border for far too long—Americans should have known this violence was going to cross over, while we continued to turn a blind eye to the illegal activity along our border, because it just wasn't politically proper to raise the issue that crime and violence is occurring along our frontier.

No, the thing that I would like to remember tonight is that Agent Rosas is just one of many that are out there in the terrible heat of the summer, the terrible cold of the winter, through rain and sleet and snow and whatever it takes to do their duty, and doing it in a nation that tends not to recognize their true service.

Mr. Speaker, we use the word "hero" a lot of times in this country and, sadly, we use it too often instead of using the word victim. But there is a big difference, Mr. Speaker, between a victim and a hero. A victim is someone who is at the wrong place at the wrong time and suffers for it. But a hero is someone who willfully puts themselves in harm's way at the wrong time and suffers for it. And I do not think we should, as a society, ever forget the difference between a victim and a hero.

Agent Rosas is a true hero, somebody who served this country. And we should all remember, as his services are held this week, that his services are in recognition of not only his sacrifice and his family's sacrifice, but of the sacrifice of men and women around this country that defend us along our borders.

I think it goes without saying that all of us in Congress want to send out our heartfelt sympathies to Rosalie and Rob and Alesa for their great loss and their great contribution by losing their father. I hope we all remember that there are fathers and mothers around this country that we ought to appreciate while they're alive and not just honor them when we lose them.

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

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. BACHMANN 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 Virginia (Mr. FORBES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FORBES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. PAUL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. OLSON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HEALTH CARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your recognizing us on a very interesting and important topic, something that I believe that anybody who pays much attention to what is happening in Washington, D.C., is quite aware of. That is the subject of health care, something that impacts every single American in our country, affects our budget, and affects our family members, and is something of great interest.

I would like to start tonight by just backing up, though, about 4 weeks or so to this very Chamber that we are meeting in, that we are talking in today. It was here, during a day that we were debating a bill that was called cap-and-tax, and it was the largest tax increase in the history of our country.

Now, what happened right before that was of interest because at 3 o'clock in the morning a 300-page amendment was passed to an 1,100-page bill. And as we were debating this bill on the floor, because of the speed with which the Democrats moved we didn't even have a copy of the bill on the floor. You are supposed to have a copy at least so in case somebody wants to check a fine point, they could read it.

Of course no one had read the 1,100-page bill. And certainly what was happening right behind me at the dais, we had good staff people hurriedly trying to put those 300 pages of amendments