

amendments in the Constitution are optional rather than mandatory.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, God bless Justices Antonin Scalia, Clarence Thomas. I didn't hear Justice Thomas ask questions. He normally doesn't. It is extraordinary to spend time with Justice Thomas. You find out rather quickly just how really brilliant he is.

□ 1615

He didn't need affirmative action to get him into Yale Law School—or Harvard, as he was accepted to, but at the time thought was too conservative.

Justice Scalia took on the Government's position. The Government's attorney stood up and basically said if a corporation is for profit, no matter how religiously convicted the holders of that are, they have no right to religious beliefs. Scalia took him on and said there has never been a case.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1459, ENSURING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE CREATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-385) on the resolution (H. Res. 524) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

THE PRICE IS WRONG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to address the House tonight on what is called the Defense Logistics Agency, something probably not many people have heard about. The DLA is like a big hardware store in the Department of Defense.

About 30 years ago, we heard horrific stories about wasteful spending of taxpayers' dollars being spent: \$436 on a hammer, \$7,600 on coffee makers, and \$640 for toilet seats. We all thought, Well, it has been taken care of. Well, not so fast.

I am showing you right now what is a plumbing elbow. At the local hardware store, this elbow sells for \$1.41. But the taxpayers of this country spent \$80 to a defense contractor that charged us that much money for this elbow.

How about a box of washers? At the local hardware store, we as individuals would pay something like \$1.22 for this box of washers. What did the taxpayers of this country pay a defense con-

tractor for a box of washers? How about \$196.50?

So that issue that was around some 30 years ago is still with us today. It is time for the House of Representatives and for the Armed Services Committee to hold a hearing on why it is that the Defense Logistics Agency, our hardware store that is responsible for putting together good pricing on spare parts, is being overturned and overlooked by defense contractors and persons within the Department of Defense who would rather go outside and pay triple, quadruple, 100 percent more, or 200 percent more.

We are going to play a game tonight on C-SPAN called "The Price Is Wrong," and see what we are talking about here. And if for 1 minute you think that we are talking about small potatoes, we are not talking about small potatoes. We are talking about a lot of money.

The Defense Department has so many excess spare parts, they have disposed of—thrown away—\$15 billion in excess parts and materials in just the last 3 years. There is about \$96 billion worth of spare parts inventory right now in the Defense hardware agency coffers.

So why would we ever go outside the internal hardware store to buy parts?

Well, some argue that it is faster or it is cheaper to go outside. Audits have revealed instances when the military had enough of certain parts that they would last 100 years—and they are still going outside of the Defense Logistics Agency. That is the equivalent of having spare parts that include horseshoes for a cavalry. If we were looking back in time today, that is 100 years of spare parts. The likelihood of these parts being used completely over 100 years is not so likely.

You might say, Well, maybe it is difficult for the Defense Department to figure out where their spare parts are and how much they are and how much they cost. Well, that is not correct. In fact, the Department of Defense has the resources and the databases to check the accuracy of these prices. The auditor found these overcharges by using the Department of Defense's own database. So this is no more than a click on a mouse to find out, one, whether the part is in stock and, two, how much it costs.

Well, let's start this game. The first game we are going to play is called "Flip Flop." It is a game where the numbers are scrambled.

I am going to start with the gate assembly in this picture here. This is what it looks like. It is a little bit larger than a quarter. Ramp gate roller assembly. It is used for the Chinook helicopters.

You can buy this at a local hardware store for about \$3.50, but because this is the military and we want the very best quality, the DLA sells this part for \$7.71.

So the question is, What did the Army pay for this gate assembly? Did they pay \$7.71 cents? No, they didn't pay that.

Did they pay \$77.01?

No, they didn't pay that either.

Did they pay \$771 for this little gate assembly part?

No.

For this ramp gate roller assembly they paid \$1,678.61.

That is obscene, and that shouldn't be happening in the Department of Defense or anywhere in the Federal Government. The taxpayers should not be ripped off in that manner.

In "The Price Is Wrong," taxpayers always lose because the Defense Department consistently pays too much, yet defense contractors consistently win.

So we are going to play the next game, which is "That's Too Much." See what happens again when the military thinks that they can get something faster and cheaper by not going to the Defense Logistics Agency, our in-house hardware store.

This is a bearing sleeve. Let's see what we paid for this. Did we pay \$6? That is what it would cost at our local defense hardware store. No, we didn't pay \$6.

Was \$86 too much to spend for that bearing sleeve?

No, \$86 wasn't too much.

How about \$286? Was that too much to pay?

No, that wasn't too much to pay either.

We paid \$2,286 for a bearing sleeve that cost \$6 at the Defense Department's Defense Logistics Agency.

So that is what we are dealing with here—a rip-off of the taxpayers.

The truth of the matter is that the Defense Department didn't just buy one of these bearing sleeves that we just bought one of here this evening. They bought 573 of these bearing sleeves—not for \$6, not for \$86, but for \$2,286. And let me do the math for you. That is \$1.3 million in overpayments for just these 573 bearing sleeves.

Next, we are going to talk about a spur gear for the Chinook helicopter. This is what it looks like. It is this tiny little thing smaller than a quarter. This is what is used in Chinook helicopters. We have lots of them in the DLA. But, again, they didn't want to go to the DLA, our hardware store, to actually purchase this.

They would have paid \$12.51 if they had gone to the hardware store within the Department. No, they didn't want to do that.

So was \$125 too much to pay for that spur gear?

No, that wasn't too much.

In fact, they were willing to pay \$644.75 for this little rubberized spur gear. It was 34 times the fair and reasonable price.

So, again, why are we doing something like this? Why are we allowing the taxpayer dollars to be flushed down the toilet by not paying what is the normal price for these spare parts?

The last part is a flush door ring. Look at this. This is a pen next to it so

you can see this is a pretty small part. It is smaller than a pen the contracting officer would have used to sign off on the price. The DLA sells this part for \$8.37.

Did we pay \$83.37 for this product?

No, we didn't pay \$83.37. That wasn't too much.

What we did pay, though, was \$284.46 for this flush ring—34 times the fair and reasonable price. For that price you could go to dinner, a movie, and rent a hotel room.

Which brings me, I guess, to our last game, "The Showcase Showdown" on "The Price Is Wrong." Much like "The Price Is Right," we have this final showcase and we are going to compare two packages and guess which one costs more.

The first showcase is two ramp gate roller assemblies. This was the very first thing that we showed you earlier. Here it is. This is the item that cost \$7.71.

So the question is, which costs more as a package, two ramp gate roller assemblies or a trip to Paris, France? It includes airfare and 4 nights in a four-star hotel for two adults. Which one do we think costs more?

Well, you have probably figured out that we in fact paid more for the ramp gate roller assembly, times two, than you would have paid for a trip to Paris France. The Army paid \$3,357.22 for these two parts, while the trip to Paris is only \$2,681.

So what are we doing here? How many more studies have to be done for us to make a serious attempt to clean up the spare parts issue in the Department of Defense?

Very recently—in fact, it just came out in February of this year—the inspector general for the Department of Defense put out this report entitled, "Air Force Lifecycle Management Center Could Not Identify Actual Costs of F-119 Engine Spare Parts Purchased From Pratt and Whitney."

Can it get any more embarrassing than that? Not only are we spending extraordinary sums of money on spare parts and not using the internal hardware agency that we have, but in an inspector general's report, the Air Force can't even figure out how much it paid for the initial spare parts.

So I would close, Mr. Speaker, by saying that we have a lot to do. The Army overpaid Boeing \$13 million recently, but the Pentagon only recovered \$2.6 million.

□ 1630

It included paying twice the fair and reasonable price for kits, overpaid \$16,000 for a structural support that should have only cost about \$1,300.

So, all right, we overpaid; they overcharged. What happened next? Well, after the IG exposed the rip-off that had occurred, what did we do? Was that defense contractor kicked out?

No, I am sorry to say that what happened was the Air Force gave this contractor a new contract to oversee the

supply chain contract. That is like giving the fox a contract to guard the chicken house.

I don't like playing this game any more than I think the taxpayers do; and it is not a game, it is truly a disaster, and it is one that we, as Members of the House of Representatives, have to clean up.

So I will continue to make the public aware of these kinds of overpayments until we fix the system. Stay tuned for the next show, "The Price Is Wrong."

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3771. An act to accelerate the income tax benefits for charitable cash contributions for the relief of victims of the Typhoon Haiyan in the Philippines.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 26, 2014, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5057. A letter from the Director, Joint Staff, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding a report on the construction requirements related to antiterrorism and force protection or urban training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5058. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semi-annual status report of the U.S. Chemical Demilitarization Program for March 2014; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5059. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter regarding recommendations to the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5060. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Community Services Block Grant Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2010; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

5061. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on gifts given by the United States to foreign individuals for Fiscal Year 2013, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2694(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5062. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's determination and certification under Section 490(b)(1)(A) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 relating to the top five exporting and importing countries of pseudoephedrine and

ephedrine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5063. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. Act 20-300, "Classroom Animal for Educational Purposes Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2014"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5064. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5065. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "Audit of the Administration of District Funds to the D.C. Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

5066. A letter from the Staff Director, Sentencing Commission, transmitting report on the compliance of the federal district courts with documentation submission requirements on sentencing, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994(w)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5067. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0687; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-118-AD; Amendment 39-17767; AD 2014-04-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5068. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0035; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-036-AD; Amendment 39-17734; AD 2014-02-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5069. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0547; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-028-AD; Amendment 39-17758; AD 2014-03-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5070. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turbohaft Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0381; Directorate Identifier 2013-NE-16-AD; Amendment 39-17764; AD 2014-04-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5071. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Central, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0017; Airspace Docket No. 13-AAL-1] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5072. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Brevig Mission, AK [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0078; Airspace Docket No. 12-AAL-1] received March 14, 2014, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5073. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class E Airspace; Leesburg, VA