

I want to finish on the note that medical research funded by the National Institutes is also being cut, and we were number one in medical research. The time is now. Get rid of the sequester and help the American people.

BUREAUCRATIC CODESPEAK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let's say I take one of my 10 grandkids, Barrett Houston, to a basketball game he is playing in. He gets hit in the face with a basketball, so we go to the doctor to see if his nose is broken. The doctor asks Barrett Houston this question: Is this the first time you've been hit in the face with a basketball, the second time, or do you have a habit of being hit in the face by a basketball? Barrett says, I don't know. Doctor says, I've got to know because, you see, I've got this codebook here, and the law requires that I make sure I put in the codebook the way you were hurt by the basketball and how many times because there are five codes for being hit in the face by a basketball. And let's say he doesn't know. Well, the doctor has to be accurate in how he diagnoses being hit in the face by the basketball or the doctor's in trouble.

Let's say I take another one of my grandsons, Jackson, to go hunting, but he happens to get assaulted by a wild turkey. We go to the doctor, and the doctor says, Hey, I've got to know exactly how you were hurt by that turkey because there is a code for being assaulted by a turkey for the first time. There is a code for being assaulted by the turkey a second time. There is a different code for being pecked by a turkey rather than being bitten by a turkey. There are nine codes. The doctor must get the right code or he is in violation of the law about being assaulted by that turkey. It seems nine codes for a turkey assault is a bit silly.

□ 1010

Right now, Mr. Speaker, there are 18,000 of these codes. Doctors must be accurate when they fill out the diagnosis of a patient who comes and sees them.

Stay with me, Mr. Speaker.

Soon, there will be 140,000 of these medical codes that doctors must get right or they're in trouble by the Federal Government. The new code system is called ICD-10. For example, you're injured at a chicken coop; that's code number Y9272. You are injured at an art gallery, you fall down; that's Y92250. There are even three new codes for being injured when you walk into a lamppost. You walk into a lamppost for the first time, that's one code; you walk into a lamppost for the second time, that's a different code; you walk into a lamppost habitually, that is even a different code. And the doctor

must get it right, because he's in violation of Federal regulators if he doesn't get it right.

The doctors I've talked to say this is an expensive distraction from treating patients. Well, no kidding. It's red tape, it's bureaucracy, and this is what happens when clueless Big Government here in Washington starts telling people out in the workplace—doctors and patients—what they must do. And when the government intrudes into our lives with more regulations, the government continues to make things more complicated. It finds problems in every solution.

Doctors are really in the business of helping the sick and the injured and saving lives. Do they really have the time and money to translate a complicated 140,000-codebook when they diagnose everything that happens? But they don't have a choice. If they miscode, they do not get paid. Even more so, they face the threat of being fined by the Federal Government.

There's more. To set up this new 140,000-code philosophy, it's going to cost an average single practitioner doctor \$80,000. Now, isn't that lovely? If it's a practice of 5 to 10 people, that's going to cost that practice \$250,000 to comply with Federal regulations, the new codebook.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, when regulators go to work every day down the street in one of these big office buildings, they sit around a big oak table, they pull out their lattes and their iPads and they ask the question to each other: "Who shall we regulate today?" They type out a few regulations and send it out to the fruited plain and the masses. They don't care about the cost or the effect or whether the regulations make any sense; they just do it anyway. And we have to deal with it.

These new codes are not going to make one sick person well, but yet doctors must comply with these new codes or the code police are going to punish them. Doctors want to take care of patients, but the Federal Government is forcing 140,000 complicated, unreasonable new codes on all of us that are hard to decipher. Maybe we should sequester these new codes. Where are those World War II code breakers when we need them most?

And that's just the way it is.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I welcome the President's budget submission, which will mark the first time since 2009 that the House, the Senate, and the President have all submitted budgets. It's an encouraging development, but the larger question is whether Congress can actually use the budgeting process to show how we will do business differently.

Despite the media sideshows about the artificial sequestration crisis, the major issues we have to address to fix the budget and our current deficit are spending on defense, health care, and the tax system itself.

Although the administration has started us down a path to manage Pentagon spending in the future, we have barely scratched the surface. There are too many unnecessary bases at home and abroad that should be phased down or closed. There's far too much invested in an antiquated nuclear arsenal that we haven't used in 68 years and contains many, many times more weapons than we would ever need for deterrence. The \$700 billion scheduled to be spent over the next 10 years must be reduced dramatically. We have yet to come to grips with the long-term costs of an all-volunteer Army and the right balance between reserve and regular forces. Until these fundamental issues are addressed, the challenges of the future are going to be difficult to face because we spend too much time and energy and money preparing for the conflicts of the past while we avoid hard budget reality.

Health care expenditures continue to be the greatest overall threat to the budget, but not because the United States doesn't spend enough money on health care. We spend more than anybody else in the world—twice as much as many countries. But even spending far more than anybody else, we're still not able to deliver quality health care for most Americans. Instead of fighting health care reform, we should be working together to accelerate that process so that we can reward value over volume of health care. If the Oregon model of health care that we are working on diligently to implement were applied on a national scale, it could save over \$1 trillion over the next 10 years—as much as was fought about in the battle over sequestration.

We must also reform the Tax Code, which is unfair, complex, and costly, with over \$160 billion just to administer it. I would suggest that we think about implementing a carbon tax, which has the potential of reducing the deficit and tax rates for individuals and business in a fair and comprehensive form. The carbon tax has the added benefit of being the most direct way to reduce the threat to the planet caused by extreme weather events promoted by carbon pollution.

It's very encouraging that the President's budget again speaks to infrastructure improvement and investment, but we need to be bolder and more comprehensive in our approach, especially at how we deal with funding rebuilding and renewing America. At a time when 17 States have stepped up to increase transportation funding, it's unacceptable that we pay for the highway trust fund with a gas tax that hasn't been increased since 1993 and is increasingly collecting less money as fuel efficiency improves.

The introduction of the President's budget is an important step forward. It

will hopefully spark an earnest, thoughtful, focused discussion about how we do business differently, how we pay for the needs of a growing and aging America, and how we can get more value for the investments we are already making, all while laying the foundation for a more prosperous future.

AFGHANISTAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. When I was home, like most Members, during the Easter break, I had the opportunity to read in the Raleigh, North Carolina, paper an article that just really took me backwards. The title of the article is: "Iran Is Victor in Post-War Iraq." The first paragraph says:

Ten years after the United States-led invasion to oust Iraqi President Saddam Hussein, the geopolitical winner of the war appears to be the common enemy: Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I think most of us in the House know that 25, 30 years ago, our Nation supported Saddam Hussein when he was fighting the Iranians. This is what frustrates the American people. We create a bad policy; we continue to support a bad policy. It makes no sense.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity to speak to the inspector general for the Iraq Project, and when I get the report, I would maybe like to share more information. Just for example, approximately \$11.7 billion in waste, fraud, and abuse. What makes this so ironic is that the Iranians are possibly becoming the beneficiaries of this money. The taxpayers now are spending money in Iraq that could possibly be going into the coffers of the Iranian people. I guess that makes sense to most of my colleagues, but it doesn't to me.

I encourage the American people to go to www.costofwar.com. If you can get it on the Internet, you need to see it. The American people need to understand what is happening in Afghanistan and Iraq. You will see a combined total of \$1.4 trillion, and it's a running total. It doesn't stop; it doesn't pause; it just keeps running. So there we go again. Poor Uncle Sam can't take care of his bills, but we're going to take care of these foreign countries. It makes no sense to me.

Mr. Speaker, a total of 6,656 American troops have died in the Iraq and Afghanistan wars, not to mention the thousands of civilian lives lost and the veterans who return home physically and mentally wounded. Whether it's in Iraq or Afghanistan, we cannot continue to spend money that we don't have and neglect the American people.

□ 1020

I hope the people of this country and my fellow colleagues share my outrage and my concern, because it would be almost a sin if we continue to spend

this money without any accountability or very little to speak of.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I visited a soldier from my district in North Carolina. He was at Walter Reed Hospital at Bethesda. His father called me 4 months ago and said, I really would appreciate if you would see my son. He's lost a leg. He's lost fingers. He's badly burned.

Mr. Speaker, it was humbling to go to Walter Reed yesterday and see this young corporal, but he is what makes America great. His attitude is excellent, not complaining about his injuries, and I just pray to God that we will realize that if we don't stop spending the money we don't have that young men and women like the corporal in the years to come will not get benefits because we will be financially broke. That will be a sin, and I hope it never happens.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will be back next week. I will have the inspector general's estimate on the cost to stay in Iraq for 2 more years, and I hope to have some figures I can leave and put in the RECORD, because it is time that we have a debate on our foreign policy right here in the House of Representatives. Maybe we will in May. I hope so.

With that, Mr. Speaker, as I always do, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, to please bless the families of our men and women in uniform, in His loving arms to hold the families who have given a child dying for freedom in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I ask God to bless the House and Senate, that we will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people today and God's people tomorrow.

I ask God to please bless the President, that he will do what is right in the eyes of God for God's people today and God's people tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, three times, God, please, God, please, God, please continue to bless America.

FOLEY CELEBRATES 30TH SEASON WITH BLACKHAWKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Chicago Blackhawks television announcer Pat Foley, who is celebrating his 30th season with the team. As the voice of the Blackhawks, Pat has come to define the Chicago hockey experience. In fact, it's impossible to imagine watching stars like Jonathan Toews or Pat Kane without his play-by-play running through your head.

The hockey bug bit Pat early in his life. As a child at bedtime he would hide his radio underneath his pillow from his parents, Rob and Mary, so he could listen to his broadcasting idol, Lloyd Pettit, a great in his own right, call Blackhawks games, but only the last two periods.

Much like the players, themselves, Pat worked his way up to the Stanley

Cup winning team, calling baseball and hockey games at his alma mater Michigan State before landing his first professional job with the Grand Rapids Owls of the International Hockey League. Pat joined the Hawks broadcast team in 1980 at just 25 years of age and has been a fan favorite ever since. The Glenview native has earned two Emmy Awards for his work and was inducted into the Chicagoland Sports Hall of Fame, joining broadcast legends Jack Brickhouse and Harry Caray. He's also been active in the local community helping numerous charities, and he recently joined me on the ice in a game with wounded warriors from the USA Warriors team.

For his hard work and dedication and for making some of the greatest moments in Blackhawks history even more memorable, I say thank you to Pat Foley. Lloyd Pettit would be proud. And, of course, go Hawks.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, in the midst of talking about immigration reform, which I think is something that we're going to be addressing very shortly and something we ought to address very shortly, I want to just come forward and share an experience I had over the last week.

I'm still a pilot in the Air National Guard. That's a job I've kept while I've been in the Congress and a job I hope to continue to keep. Part of what I did last week is I actually went and worked on the border with the Air National Guard. We do an ISR—intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance—looking for people that have crossed illegally into our country and, frankly, looking for drugs and things along that line. It was a unique trip for me, because most times when Congressmen go to the border, they actually probably would go in an official capacity as a U.S. Congressman. We've all experienced these trips. You see what the administration, frankly, wants you to see. So they take you somewhere like El Paso where there's a very effective fence in place.

But where they don't take you is a place called Mac Pump. Mac Pump is in McAllen, Texas, one of the areas that I worked in my capacity as an Air National Guard pilot, and it really was actually kind of disheartening what we would see. You'd see folks cross the Rio Grande, that would stand in the United States of America. As we would call Border Patrol to come and assess the situation, they would literally step back and put their ankles in the water and at that point they are unapprehendable. And they would stare, 5 feet away from U.S. Border Patrol, and maybe a hundred yards away then another group, knowing that our Border Patrol agent was tied up, would