crud in there about the $52 billion tax hike at a time when the economy certainly can't afford that, let's get the linkage out to admitting and saying we are defeated, we can't win, giving our enemies a victory, get all of that stuff out of there. No more linkages like that. No more tax hikes. Just a clean supplemental to give our troops the wherewithal to do what they need to succeed. That's the message we needed coming out of today. And that's why so many of us voted as we did. We voted for victory for our troops.

And I will never forget the words of Travis Buford's mother. Travis was killed over in Iraq. And as I stood near his coffin with his mother, it was an emotional time, and I said, ''Is there anything I can do?''

She gritted her teeth and she said, ''Tell the Congress to shut up and let the military do their job.''

That's what we need to do. Let the military have the wherewithal to succeed, as they can, without the linkages to failure so that we can keep our head held high and, what's more, perhaps go 7 more years without being attacked here.

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

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

FIVE REASONS WHY THE AIR FORCE'S DECISION TO AWARD AIRBUS A CONTRACT DOES NOT ADD UP

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, before I start, I want to express my honor for the gentleman from Colorado in the chair today, who did extraordinary work in leading the Congress to green building standards and the introduction of a bill today, and I appreciate his leadership on this. Thank you for leading on this issue.

I come to the floor today to address my concerns about this misbegotten decision by the U.S. Air Force to ignore great work by Americans with a consortium building the Boeing 767 aerial refueling tanker, in fact, sending American tax dollars and American jobs out to Europe. And I want to express the five reasons why this decision does not add up.

There is a particular odor about this decision. It needs to be revisited one way or another. We need to have an American tanker built by American workers to be fair to American service personnel and taxpayers both, and I want to go through the five reasons why this decision does not add up.

Reason number one: There is no sense on this green Earth why the American Government has sued the Airbus Corporation, asserting that they have violated international trade laws because they received illegal billion dollar subsidies, and at the same time another agency of the Federal Government, the Air Force, turns around and gives that same corporation that our own government has declared is acting illegally contrary to international and American law—turns around and gives them a $40 billion contract. It is most unfortunate that at least one person in the other Chamber specifically said that we can't take into consideration these subsidies. It is absolutely ludicrous for the American Government to sue this company in one court, saying they violated law, and then turn around and give them $40 billion. That's exactly what has happened here. It makes no sense. This does not add up.

Reason number two: Boeing has been building these tankers successfully, hundreds of tankers, without difficulty. And instead of going with a proven, tried and true American contractor, the Air Force has decided to accept the risk of a company that's never made an aerial tanker, building it in a way that it has never been built, in factories that do not exist, in multiple countries with a supply chain that has never been proven. We cannot and should not tolerate that risk of this risky decision.

Reason number three that this does not add up: It does not add up because all estimates have concluded that the Boeing 767 is 24 percent more fuel efficient overall, looking at all the emission statements, 24 percent more fuel efficient. Well, for anyone who has gone to the pump recently, let me suggest that it doesn't make sense to be buying a product that is a gas guzzler when we know that fuel prices are going only in one direction. A study performed by the Conklin & de Decker analyst company concluded that by going with Boeing instead of this Airbus monstrosity, we would save the American taxpayers $30 billion in fuel costs. At the same time when we're trying to wring efficiencies to deal with global warming and reduce fuel costs, this decision is buying the gas guzzler rather than the fuel-efficient aircraft. This does not add up.

Reason number four: The Air Force basically decided bigger is better. Bigger is not always better. They said they told Boeing and Airbus that they wanted a medium-size plane. Boeing provided them a medium-size plane. In the middle of this process, they decided they wanted a bigger airplane. Bigger is not always better, and I will tell you why. It's going to cost the American taxpayers over $2 billion to remodel all of these hangars all across America to try to fit this large airplane in. This is real money from real taxpayers that was not considered in the lifecycle costs. It does not add up.

And the fifth reason is lifecycle costs. The Air Force, what they did was they looked at original acquisition costs and downplayed the lifecycle costs associated with fuel costs, maintenance costs, hangar remodeling, and all the other things associated with these airplanes. When you make an acquisition for the American taxpayers, you need to look at the entire lifecycle costs, not just the upfront acquisition costs. It does not add up.

So here are five reasons that this Congress ought to get up on our hind legs and blow the whistle on this misbegotten decision. It doesn't add up. We need to change this decision.

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.)

MARRIAGE

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

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the California Supreme Court threw aside the voice and the express will of millions of California voters by overturning California's State law that banned same-sex marriage.

Effectively this ruling allows same-sex couples in our Nation's most populous State the right to marry and affords them all the privileges that go along with this sacred union. And I say that rulings like this are one of the reasons why the institution of marriage is crumbling before our very eyes. And I, for one, am very sad to see this happen.

The main issue is whether the status of marriage will be determined by judges or by the American people. I'm extremely concerned about how activists use the courts to legislate on something that has been settled in American law for more than 200 years. Furthermore, the people of California made it abundantly clear back in 2000 that they reject same-sex marriage.

Then comes along four judges who apparently believe that they're wiser than over 4½ million voters in their State. Proposition 22 got over 61 percent of the vote; yet it was dismissed by four lone dictators.

I condemn this ruling in the strongest possible way. I condemn it because the court is legislating from the bench. I condemn it because it is a reprehensible action that is not consistent with history or with common sense.

This lunacy is precisely the reason why a Federal constitutional amendment is needed to protect traditional marriage. This decision will undoubtedly become the platform for spreading this unfounded ruling across the Nation.

On the Federal stage, there's a constitutional remedy for Federal judges