

Since 2002, over 89,000 military service-members have become U.S. citizens. Immigrants in the military and other agencies critical to our national security have served as translators, for example; and through their understanding of local communities and through their understanding of local customs, they have helped collect intelligence which better protects Americans, not only at home, but also abroad.

Unfortunately, today the House leadership said that they would not consider immigration reform this year, and, frankly, that is a real tragedy. They said they wouldn't even consider looking at the Senate bill as a starting point to negotiate.

H.R. 15, of which I am a cosponsor, has 190 other cosponsors and 25 or so Republicans who have vowed to support it, and thus, the votes are there to pass immigration reform.

In this time of excessive partisanship and excessive bickering, we have to find a way forward to do the right thing for our country, for our kids, and for our future. We have to figure out a way to succeed, even if we succeed sometimes in spite of ourselves.

Especially in today's political climate, so many of us here in the House, we repeatedly talk about our commitment to principles, our commitment to fighting for what we, as individual Members, believe in. But the reality is that, in a House with 435 people and with 100 Members of the Senate and an all-or-nothing attitude, many times it produces nothing, and that all-or-nothing attitude kills immigration reform. That all-or-nothing attitude produces nothing for children who have known no other home than the United States and are here through no fault of their own. It produces nothing of the estimated \$775 billion in revenue and \$125 billion in payroll from immigrant-owned businesses, and it produces nothing of the \$175 billion in deficit reduction in the first 10 years after immigration reform is enacted or another \$700 billion in deficit reduction in the 10 years after that.

Immigrants are so important to our country in so many ways. We say it all the time. We say it all the time. Ours is a Nation of immigrants. Immigration reform is critical to our economy, to our families, and, yes, even to our national security.

□ 1930

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative POLIS.

Earlier tonight when we started this hour, I made mention of how proud I am of my grandfather, who was an immigrant from Poland. He added, along with his military colleagues, to the muscle of the military might of this Nation, and together, they were able to help serve this Nation so as to proclaim victory in the war that was to

end all wars. But we know that that wasn't the case.

Nonetheless, with that contribution to this country behind him, he returned home. He returned to build a life. He returned to build a family. He returned to build a community. He returned, like all of our veterans, to build a Nation. Why would we want to stop this pathway to progress? Why would we want to stop this pathway to economic vitality? Why would we want to stop this pathway to citizenship?

You know, it is no wonder that so many from various perspectives have come forth, imploring us in this House, imploring the Republican leadership, to set an agenda that includes immigration reform. For everyone from the Chamber of Commerce to the Farm Bureau, from labor to the farm community to the working families of this Nation to so many of the businesses that have asked for sound immigration reform, let's not stand in the way of progress. We only ask the Republican majority in this House to set the tone, open to the discussion, because if it is brought to the floor, I am convinced that we will recognize, as Representatives, as leaders of this Nation, the true definition of this Nation, a land of immigrants.

With that, I yield back to Representative POLIS and thank him for leading us in this very important discussion here this evening.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) for his impassioned words.

Here in the spirit of Veterans Day week—of course we all honor our veterans every day of the year. This past Monday was Veterans Day. This week, in particular, we are honoring those who serve our Nation. I would like to share the stories of several immigrants who serve in our Armed Forces.

This is Augustus Maiyo, who serves in Colorado with the U.S. Army World Class Athlete Program at Fort Carson. I am proud to say that he won the Marine Corps Marathon last year and led the team to victory. He is a runner and has done remarkable times and ended up winning it. He was fortunate to get the run done right before Hurricane Sandy impacted our Nation. We are proud, of course. I want to thank Augustus Maiyo for his service and for being a role model for so many others.

One of the hats I wear in Congress is I cochair the U.S.-Nepal Caucus, and I am particularly proud to be able to share the story of Saral Shrestha, a Fort Bragg soldier from Katmandu, Nepal, who was selected as the 2012 Soldier of the Year. He came to the United States in 2007 from Nepal. He went to college in Nebraska, joined the Army in 2009, and was deployed in Afghanistan.

We should be proud of the contributions that our 2012 Soldier of the Year has made, himself an immigrant, an inspiration to all the men and women who serve, including those who were born in other nations.

As many of you know, the contest for Soldier of the Year is a very rigorous competition. Shrestha has been promoted to sergeant since he began the competition. We are particularly proud that the announcement was made during the Association of the United States Army annual meeting in Washington, D.C.

There were many others, Madam Speaker, that we would like to be able to share the stories of, who want to lay down their lives to defend our country and to serve with distinction but, under current law, are prevented from serving in the Armed Forces, even though under the deferred action program they are able to work, they are able to attend school in our country, and all that many of them ask is to be able to risk their lives to defend the country they love, the country they know, the United States of America. H.R. 15 and the Senate bill address this situation and would allow these brave young men and women to serve.

It is time, Madam Speaker. It is time to bring this bill forward. It is time to have a simple "yes" or "no" vote. It is what the American people are demanding. The American people are not demanding that we spend our precious hours and days debating asbestos reform. The American people are not demanding that we only work a dozen days before the end of the year here in Congress. The American people are demanding that we solve problems.

More than 70 percent of the American people support comprehensive immigration reform. It would improve the security of the Nation. It would honor the service of our veterans. It would secure our borders. It would reflect our values. It would improve our economy. It would reduce the deficit—and it would create jobs for Americans. What is not to like? Let's pass comprehensive immigration reform now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

DEFENDING ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, one thing becomes very clear from our study of history, and that is that things that nations do have consequences. Things we do individually have consequences, and things we do as a Nation have consequences. That is why some people remember that on May 30, 2010, there were six flotilla ships—and this is from the U.N. release, a report into last year's raid, how events unfolded, dated 2 September 2011.

It points out that on May 30, 2010, six flotilla ships leave Cyprus for Gaza in an attempt to break Israel's naval blockade. The Turkish cruise liner Mavi Marmara is chartered by Islamic charity IHH and carries 581 of the 700

flotilla activists. We know that didn't turn out so well. Israel did have a legitimate right to blockade the Gaza Strip to prevent more rockets, more munitions from being brought into the Gaza Strip that were being used to fire on, kill, and terrorize Israelis. Again, actions have consequences, and many remember the flotilla coming down and challenging the blockade, and there were people who were killed.

If you go back, here is an article. It is dated also May 30, 2010, which was a Sunday. But it points out—and this is an article from The Washington Times entitled, “Israel assails resolution on nuke weapons as ‘flawed,’” and it is talking about an agreement that President Obama was trying to get done, a nonproliferation agreement, and the article points out that on Friday, which was May 28, 2010:

A U.S. delegation in New York voted to endorse a consensus document ending the 2010 review conference for the Non-Proliferation Treaty that calls for a conference in 2012 to discuss a weapons of mass destruction-free zone in the Middle East.

The final document of the monthlong review conference calls on Israel to join the treaty, a move that would require Israel to disclose and then give up its undeclared nuclear arsenal.

This was viewed and discussed as being the first time in people's memory when the United States, by and through its administration—the Obama administration—had taken action that was very adverse to Israel and the international community, and particularly in the U.N. Normally we did not side with Israel's enemies.

One of the lessons that I was taught by history professors at Texas A&M is that when a nation's enemies see that nation's strongest ally pulling away, it is provocative. It often provokes action by that nation's enemies against it because they think their strongest ally is pulling away. Some saw that before the war in Korea. They thought that the United States might have North Korea beyond its “sphere of influence.” Those kinds of things, those words, these actions, these votes can be provocative.

So 2 days after the United States sides with Israel's enemies in demanding that Israel disclose its nuclear weapons, the flotilla launches to challenge the blockade. Isn't that amazing? It just happens to be right after this administration sides with Israel's enemies. Here comes a challenge to Israel's blockade that was just trying to save Israeli lives.

Well, the reason that it is important to point these things out now is, what is happening between the United States and Iran, as we leave Israel out of the equation—even though it is Israel that is considered to be the little Satan and we are considered the great Satan, and Israel is probably to be the first attacked, if there is an attack—they are certainly the most vulnerable. Yet we leave our former friend Israel out of the equation.

It brings to mind a number of things that have been happening during this

administration that have caused the vast majority of people in Israel, of Israeli citizens, to believe that this Obama administration is not concerned about Israel's best interests.

There are many who have been aware of Scripture, and it has often been a guide in our relations with Israel. It is really such an historically appropriate thing in this House of Representatives, especially if we were down the hall in the former House Chamber, now called Statuary Hall, where they used to hold church most Sundays during the 1800s. Up until the late 1800s, the largest church congregation was in the House of Representatives, and it was not considered to be violative of the Constitution because it didn't endorse a particular religion. It was considered non-denominational.

Scripture was read regularly, every week, down the hall. Thomas Jefferson had coined the phrase “separation of church and State” as being appropriate. He didn't find it offensive, that notion, and, in fact, at times would bring the Marine band to play hymns.

So it seems appropriate, when we talk about Israel, to talk about Israel's roots because in Genesis 12—and this is the King James version:

Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee;

And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great, and thou shalt be a blessing;

And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee, and in thee shall all families of the Earth be blessed.

So Abram went to the land of Canaan, which later became Israel, just as God had promised in these verses. So it was no accident that just minutes after Israel became a Nation, the United States, through its President, Harry Truman, became the first nation in the world to recognize what was prophesied throughout the Old Testament about Israel returning after its absence.

□ 1945

Israel returned and Harry Truman made sure we were the first Nation that recognized them as an independent nation. The U.N. had voted unanimously. Because of the Holocaust and over 6 million Jews being killed, they wanted to ensure that another Holocaust would never happen again. And that brought about Israel being re-established in part of the land they had possessed 3,000 years before.

This is an article from The Washington Post, David Ignatius:

Is Israel preparing to attack Iran? Because it is considered a betrayal of an ally to warn an ally's enemies that that ally may take self-defensive action to prevent being attacked. And the United States and Iran, including President Obama, has said repeatedly and has promised an American-Israeli gathering here at the Convention Center that he would never allow Iran to have nuclear weapons, that it is an existential threat to Israel. It certainly is.

So we have been hearing behind the scenes for a number of years that this

administration was telling Israeli leaders, Don't you dare attack Iran without our permission. We will take care of this. We won't let them have nuclear weapons; and yet it is not the United States that is first threatened. The great Satan, the United States, in the eyes of leaders in Iran—not the Iranian people, but Iranian leaders—would get around to attacking us. But first Israel is threatened.

So there was concern, obviously, here in Washington in the Obama administration that the reported threats to Israel not to defend themselves without our permission—even though no nation should ever need permission from another to defend itself—and even President Obama said this out here at the Convention Center to an American-Israeli group. Prime Minister Netanyahu reminded me of our President's words, and I went back and looked them up. Sure enough, he said:

Israel must defend itself by itself.

Our President said that. And yet if we are not going to help Israel defend itself, which is actually defending us as well, then shouldn't we avoid jeopardizing Israel's own self-defense?

Yet here is this article dated February 2, 2012. It says:

Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has a lot on his mind these days, from cutting the defense budget to managing the drawdown of U.S. forces in Afghanistan. But his biggest worry is the growing possibility that Israel will attack Iran over the next few months.

Panetta believes there is a strong likelihood that Israel will strike Iran in April, May, or June—before Iran enters what Israeli's described as a “zone of immunity” to commence building a nuclear bomb. Very soon, the Israelis fear, the Iranians will have stored enough enriched uranium in deep underground facilities to make a weapon—and only the United States could then stop them militarily.

That is a betrayal of our ally, Israel. That is a gross betrayal of our ally, Israel. We are supposed to be on the same side; and if Israel defends itself, it is defending us as well, whether we recognize it or not.

That was a betrayal of Israel to leak what this administration believed were their plans to defend itself. If we are not going to defend ourselves, for heaven's sake, at least allow Israel to do it without putting them more in jeopardy.

By leaking that, obviously, it was this administration saying to Israel, Well, you better not go when you were thinking you were going to go because they are going to be ready because we warned your enemy for you.

So we get to May and, obviously, the window that Israel may have been considering attacking had to pass because of the leak by our own administration to Israel's enemies, through The Washington Post. An intentional leak.

This is from March 29, 2012, “Israelis Suspect Obama Media Leaks to Prevent Strike on Iran,” by Alexander Marquardt from ABC News:

Two reports today about Iran's nuclear program and the possibility of an Israeli

military strike have analysts in Israel accusing the Obama administration of leaking information to pressure Israel not to bomb Iran and for Iran to reach a compromise in upcoming nuclear talks.

That is simply outrageous.

This article says, continuing that same article:

The first report in Foreign Policy quotes anonymous American officials saying that Israel has been given access to air bases by Iran's northern neighbor Azerbaijan from which Israel could launch air strikes or at least drones and search and rescue aircraft.

The article goes on:

It seems like a big campaign to prevent Israel from attacking, analyst Yoel Guzansky at the Institute for National Security Studies told ABC News. I think the Obama administration is really worried Jerusalem will attack—and attack soon. They're trying hard to prevent it in so many ways.

The Foreign Policy report by Mark Perry quotes an intelligence officer saying, We're watching what Iran does closely. But we're now watching what Israel is doing in Azerbaijan. And we're not happy about it.

Further down:

In recent weeks the Obama administration shifted from persuasion efforts vis-a-vis decisionmakers and Israel's public opinion to a practical, targeted assassination of potential Israeli operations in Iran, Ben-Yishai writes. The campaign's aims are fully operational: to make it more difficult for Israeli decisionmakers to order the Israeli defense forces to carry out a strike, and what's even graver, to erode the IDF's capacity to launch a strike with minimal casualties.

We are putting Israel's own forces at far greater risk for casualties. Is that something an ally does to a friend?

Some of us believe that the Bible is accurate. Certainly, so many prophecies have been fulfilled. And if that is true, this administration, unless they can find a verse that accurately says that those who betray Israel will be blessed, then this country is being dug in a deeper hole by this administration and its betrayals of Israel's trust and Israel's friendship.

This is from November 3, 2013, from TheBlaze, "Fury, Scandalous: Israel Conveys Bitter Protests to Obama Admin Over Reported White House Security Leak.

This says:

The Israeli government conveyed "bitter protests" to the White House this weekend over the Obama administration's reported leak of who was behind last week's air raid on a Syrian base near the port city of Latakia. Words being used by the media and officials speaking anonymously in Israel to describe what they perceive as a breach in trust on the part of the United States include fury, scandalous, baffled, unthinkable.

This administration continues to betray our friend, our ally, Israel.

Other things that have happened in the past were the comments made by President Obama to President Sarkozy in 2012 at a G-20 summit which were belittling Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, comments in 2011 that Israel should return to its 1967 borders that would have subjected it to relentless attacks and vulnerability. They were not helpful to our friend and ally.

The Obama administration's failure to condemn Palestinians building of illegal settlements, yet constantly criticizing Israeli housing plans for East Jerusalem; the Obama administration's decision to eradicate the missile defense programs that would have helped Israel as well as the United States; leaving Prime Minister Netanyahu in 2010 on for over an hour in the White House meeting room while President Obama dined with his family and refused to take a picture with him was not a friendly gesture.

Also, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton announced the Obama administration planned to send \$147 million to the West Bank and Hamas-run Gaza; President Obama stated that all his friends in Chicago were Jewish and says he was sometimes being accused of being a Jewish "puppet"; the Obama administration leak to The Washington Post of the time window in which Israel would take out Iran's nuclear program; the Obama administration leaked to the media that Israel was going to use the Azerbaijan airspace to take out Iran's nuclear program.

We placed immense pressure on Israel not to defend itself without the United States' permission. The Obama administration has never rejected or condemned the racist, hateful teachings about Jewish people going on in Palestinian schools in the Middle East and in some Muslim schools in the United States.

President Obama traveled to Turkey, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt and apologized to them on behalf of the United States. The Obama administration's support for the Muslim Brotherhood's rise to power in Egypt as well as throughout the Middle East, though the Muslim Brotherhood had never backed away from their demand for the nonexistence of Israel, the Obama administration continues to support the Muslim Brotherhood's return to power in Egypt, when Egypt is where the Muslim Brotherhood turned violent on Morsi's arrest because of his violation of the constitution that did not provide for impeachment, after the Egyptian people turned out in the millions to demand his removal.

It was not a coup, as the Christian Pope in Egypt told me. It was not a coup. This was a people rising up and demanding removal, and yet this administration now has cut off support because Egypt does not want the group, the Muslim Brotherhood, that was killing Christians, burning churches, terrorizing the nation, we want them back in charge—this administration does.

It is an outrage.

Though the Syrian leader Assad has been ruthless in killing and abusing his people, has not been helpful to Israel to the extent the Egyptian leader Mubarak was, this administration has not done anything but put Israel in more jeopardy by its actions in Syria.

So we have not been terribly helpful to our friend Israel. And it doesn't

sound like we are actually blessing Israel. It sounds like we are cursing Israel, belittling its leaders, marginalizing its efforts to defend itself, which also enures to our benefit.

My oath of office is to this country. When I was in the Army for 4 years, my oath was to this country. My allegiance continues to this country, and I believe that being Israel's friend is helpful to this country; and that is why I so strongly support being a friend to Israel.

And even if you took the Bible completely out, you took out most anything except just looking at the Middle East and who believes in the value of life like we do here in the United States, who believes more in democratic actions like we do in the United States, then Israel should certainly be our friend.

But what this administration is doing with Iran is foolhardy. It is foolhardy. And thank God for France. They didn't wave a white flag of surrender. They said, This is a terrible deal. And thank goodness they slowed it down, because this administration thinks they just knew and everything they try will work perfectly. Hello, ObamaCare.

□ 2000

It doesn't work any better when they try to mess with our friendships and reward our enemies and hurt our friends.

So, in the few minutes that are remaining, Madam Speaker, I would like to reference back to the New York Times article by Barry James, October 21, 1994, during the Clinton administration.

The director of the International Atomic Energy Agency expressed skepticism Thursday about the U.S.-North Korean nuclear agreement, saying it could delay inspections by the agency.

Officials at the agency, some U.S. Republican Senators and politicians in South Korea criticized the accord, saying they feared Pyongyang had bought itself a further 5 years of secrecy, thus concealing whether it has reprocessed enough plutonium to build one or more nuclear weapons.

The energy agency says it needs to inspect two nuclear waste dumps to be able to answer the question. North Korea has never conceded the existence of the dumps. "It would be in the interests of all concerned that a prolonged delay be avoided," said the agency director, Hans Blix; but, he added, "We are better off" with the agreement than with none at all. "We have to worry about how much they have squirreled away," an agency official said. "Blix thinks 5 years is a long time to have to wait for our inspectors to gain access to the facilities we need to see, including the two facilities the North Koreans have never declared."

Yet, under the agreement that the Clinton administration reached, North Korea agreed to place in storage the fuel removed last spring from a 5-megawatt graphite reactor containing enough plutonium for four or five nuclear bombs. U.S. Republican Senators protested in a letter to President Bill Clinton that this reversed longstanding U.S. policy because it allowed the North Koreans to hang onto their spent fuel rods and would delay for several years the inspection of suspect sites.

The accord “shows it is always possible to get an agreement when you give enough away,” said Senator Bob Dole of Kansas . . . The deal also has been heavily criticized in South Korea. Many people there see it as a diplomatic triumph for Pyongyang, which failed to dispel doubts about its nuclear intentions.

As part of the pact, which will be signed in Geneva on Friday, the United States will head an international consortium to provide North Korea with an interim supply of fuel to overcome its chronic energy shortage and, eventually, two 1,000-megawatt light-water reactors. In exchange, North Korea will abandon its existing nuclear facilities and renounce any plans to build nuclear weapons.

Gee, doesn't that sound familiar? This administration is repeating the same mistakes of Madeleine Albright and Bill Clinton as President. They are running to Iran, which can not be trusted, which has lied repeatedly just like North Korea did.

And how did the Clinton deal work out? Yes, they took the nuclear facilities we provided them, but they didn't stand good behind their promise not to develop nuclear weapons. They developed them and we helped them.

Now this administration wants to do the same thing with Iran? We are still paying for the mistakes of the Clinton administration with North Korea's helping them get more nuclear power—and now this administration wants to do that with Iran? That is a huge mistake.

We need to help our friend Israel, to stop betraying them, to help our friends, to stop rewarding our enemies, because the consequences to this Nation will be dire if we don't turn this around.

Madam Speaker, it is my prayer—it is my hope—that this administration will turn from its stupid ways. The arrogance that existed before ObamaCare kicked in surely should have come down a notch so that they can realize maybe we are making a mistake in dealing with bloodthirsty people in Iran as well.

This country's future is at stake. That ought to be enough to make this administration slow down and realize they are about to make another huge mistake that we will pay for for generations if they don't stop. Iran will certainly not stop just as North Korea did not. They had gotten help from North Korea. They learned the lesson from North Korea. It is time this administration learned a lesson from our mistake and from the mistake of the Clinton administration and Madeleine Albright.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

THE PRICE IS WRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 30 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, everyone has heard about “The Price is

Right,” but on C-SPAN tonight, we are going to play “The Price is Wrong.” Before doing so, I want to put this in perspective.

A number of years ago, we were all aghast as taxpayers—even here as Members of Congress—when we found out that in the Department of Defense we were spending \$436 on a hammer, that we spent \$7,600 on a coffee urn, and that—oh, yes—we spent \$640 on a toilet seat. Talk about flushing money down a toilet—we were doing it—but that fleecing that we thought had ended has actually continued.

Since 2010, the inspector general of the Department of Defense has found that we are spending more than \$430 million over what we should be paying for spare parts—thousands of spare parts. So we are paying much more than the fair or reasonable price for these parts. What the military should do when it needs parts is go to what is called the Defense Logistics Agency, DLA—it is sort of like the defense hardware store—but sometimes they think it is cheaper and, maybe, faster if they go to a defense contractor and ask for those parts.

These audits also showed that the certain parts we have in such volume will last us 100 years. That is like having spare parts like, let's say, horseshoes dating back to World War I, and they are sitting around the defense hardware store today—more than 100 years' worth of certain spare parts. You might think maybe this is a little complicated, but it is really not complicated. The auditors go to the Department of Defense databases, and they can tell immediately, with just a click, whether or not these spare parts are in stock and how much they will be charged for those spare parts.

So let's play our very first game of “The Price is Wrong.”

This is a ramp gate roller assembly. It is about the size of a quarter. This particular assembly sells for \$7.71 in the defense hardware store. The auditors suggested—maybe because this is, in fact, for a Chinook helicopter—that it could be even a little bit more. What did the personnel within the Department of Defense pay for this little assembly? It wasn't \$7.71. Was it perhaps \$77.10? No, it wasn't \$77.10. Was it \$771? No, it wasn't \$771. We paid for this \$7.71 part \$1,678.61.

The price is wrong, and the Department of Defense has got to clean up its act.

Let's move on to yet another game that we can play. It is called “That's Too Much.”

I am going to show you another part. This is a bearing sleeve, and you are going to tell me whether or not you think the price is too much. At the local hardware store, this would sell for \$6. Again, this is for a Chinook helicopter. The inspector general says maybe, for this sophisticated helicopter, it would cost \$10 for this part. So, what did we pay for this part? Did we pay \$86? No, we didn't pay \$86. Did

we pay \$286? No, we didn't pay \$286. We paid \$2,286 for this little part. Now, we didn't just buy one part. We bought 573 of these parts, of this little bearing sleeve, and it cost us \$1.3 million.

All right. If you haven't enjoyed playing this game so far, we have one more game to play tonight. This game is the finale. It is called the “Showcase Showdown.” This is when we compare two packages and see which one costs more.

Our first items here are two simple ramp gate roller assemblies. Now, which is more expensive—these two ramp gate roller assemblies or a trip to Paris, France, for two, including airfare and hotel for four nights? Which is more expensive? If you guessed the trip to Paris, France, you would be wrong because a trip to Paris, France, if you go on one of the local Web sites, would cost \$2,681, and we paid—or, I should say, the Army paid—\$3,357 for these two ramp gate roller assemblies.

The Pentagon is playing games with taxpayer dollars, and let me tell you that this is just the tip of the iceberg. The worst part of this game is that it is rigged. The contractors always win, and the taxpayers always lose.

The inspector general found that the Army overpaid one defense contractor \$13 million but that the Pentagon only recovered \$2.6 million. Now get this: it is discovered that one defense contractor overcharged us \$13 million for a number of parts, and then after it was exposed, they didn't even refund us what they should have. They only paid us back \$2.6 million. It included paying twice the fair and reasonable price for kits and overpaying by \$16,000 for a structural support that should have cost only \$1,300.

Now, this bearing sleeve that I just showed you that was over \$2,200, let's put it in kind of simple terms.

If we went into a local cafe and ordered the blue light special and the menu said it was \$2,200, we would walk right out, and they would be laughed out of our community—but no, that doesn't happen in the military. As for that defense contractor who overcharged us and then didn't even pay us back what they had overcharged us—get this—the Air Force has just signed on the dotted line a contract with this defense contractor to do the following: to manage the supply chain. It is almost laughable that the defense contractor who ripped us off now has another contract to manage the supply chain.

Those are all of the games we have for tonight. Thank you for playing. We will see you next time on “The Price is Wrong.”

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CULBERSON (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of illness.