

laws he likes and he does not like. With this action, the President has invented a retroactive veto on all previous Presidents and all previous congressional acts.

It is ultimately ironic that the executive branch states that several lower courts have rejected the Defense of Marriage Act as unconstitutional, so they are accepting the lower court rulings over a higher court. In the past year, the health care law was ruled unconstitutional, but the Federal Government is pressing forward. The administration was instructed by the courts to lift the drilling moratorium in the gulf, but they stalled.

□ 1110

It is apparent that this administration is bent on placing its political preferences ahead of the courts, ahead of the legislative branch, and the majority of the American people.

Both parties need to understand the precedent that's being set by the President's choosing to not enforce the Defense of Marriage Act. My Democrat friends should imagine for a moment, what if when a Republican President takes the oath and he instructs HHS and all other agencies not to enforce ObamaCare, though it's the law of the land, because some lower court rejected it? They would be outraged, rightfully so, because currently it is the law of the land. A President cannot just unilaterally throw it aside.

Before this conversation is spun as a partisan issue, let me remind everyone, though, that the Defense of Marriage Act passed the House and the Senate by a wide bipartisan majority and was signed into law by a Democrat President. This is not only a slap in the face to our constitutional system; it is a slap to Republicans and Democrats who expressed the will of their districts and States on an issue that has been settled in law.

The people spoke through Congress, and one person, even a President, cannot undermine the will of the people. At least not in the America that I grew up in.

I do not think we will fully understand the implications of this action if we allow it to stand. We must not act partisan now and regret it later. This is not the way to deal with the gay marriage debate, for the President to just sweep it aside and say, "I will not enforce the law."

Many in this Chamber are well aware of my traditional view of marriage and my Biblical world view. I am unashamed of my personal faith in Jesus Christ. I believe that words have meaning, though, and that the meaning of marriage is the union of a man and a woman. The Defense of Marriage Act codified that definition in law, representing the belief of a majority of Americans.

This issue is well beyond faith, though, or a social issue or even a political issue. Marriage is now not only the center of a national debate, it's

now the center of a constitutional debate.

Weeks ago some members of the press suggested that Republicans would ignore the budget and focus on social issues. I find it ironic now that the President has submitted a budget that will raise the national debt to \$26 trillion, by his own numbers, and he has decided to change the national debate from fiscal issues to social issues and gay marriage.

As a Congress, we cannot demand of the executive branch, which is a co-equal branch of government. But I believe we must require the executive branch to fulfill its oath of office and constitutional requirement to faithfully execute the laws of the United States.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to attempts by the Republican Governor of Ohio to undermine collective bargaining for Ohio's public employees.

Ohio Senate bill 5 is a measure currently under consideration by the Ohio General Assembly that would strip State workers of collective bargaining rights. I firmly support the right of public employees to collectively negotiate. Who are we as a Nation when we tell our firefighters and our police officers and other public protectors that they should have no say in their working conditions? Does a teacher's experience or education have no economic value? Ohio's proposed legislation is less about fiscal responsibility than an overt political attack on public workers who speak with a collective voice.

As labor battles erupt in State capitals around the Nation, a majority of Americans say they oppose efforts to weaken the collective bargaining rights of public employee unions. According to the latest New York Times/CBS News poll, Americans are against cutting the pay or benefits of public workers to reduce State budget deficits.

We shouldn't forget, Mr. Speaker, the benefits that collective bargaining offers. For almost 28 years, collective bargaining has reduced labor strife, it has reduced the likelihood of strikes, improved training and productivity among public employees, created a sense of job security, and it is fair. It is fair to all working people.

The repeal of collective bargaining will do nothing to balance the budget. Nine percent of the State's budget is for State employees. So just as an example, if we fired every State employee in Ohio, it would save us only \$2 billion, leaving the State without vital services, and there would still be a \$6 billion deficit. Since this does not address the budget deficit, it is clear that anti-worker forces are using this to harm middle-income workers and to kill jobs.

I would like to share a observation with you that was from a former President of the United States, and I quote: "Republicans stand foursquare for the American home—but not for housing. They are strong for labor—but they are stronger for restricting labor's rights. They favor minimum wage—the smaller the minimum wage, the better. They endorse educational opportunity for all—but they won't spend money for teachers or for schools. They think modern medical care and hospitals are fine—for people who can afford them. That is the philosophy of the masters of the Republican Party."

These are the words of President Harry Truman, and they were spoken in 1948. These words ring as true today as they did in 1948. We have made too many advances over the past generations, and Americans should not be forced to choose between a job and their rights.

We cannot and should not return to the days when public workers had limited rights to bargain. The middle class was created and has been sustained by collective bargaining and other labor protections. The public sector is about working families. Rolling back these rights will hurt the middle-income wage earners of this country and will hurt America.

Ohio needs jobs, not a partisan victory. I urge members of the Ohio General Assembly to deliberate with care and avoid rushing to adopt a measure that weakens our middle class, weakens our State, and costs us jobs.

HIGH-SPEED RAIL FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise today as the ranking member on the Transportation Subcommittee on Railroads. I have been on this committee for over 19 years. I serve on Transportation because it's one of the most bipartisan committees in the House.

I have got to tell you I am very, very disappointed with Florida Governor Rick Scott. Last week, the Governor told Secretary of Transportation Ray LaHood that the State of Florida can do without the \$2.5 billion for Federal highway rail funding. That's \$2.5 billion, and 90 percent of the project is funded with Federal tax dollars. That's money that Floridians sent to Washington that we are sending back to Florida, gasoline tax money, not money from any foreign source, by the way.

In addition, it didn't just happen. We worked on it, bipartisan, for years. In fact, in 1980 Bob Graham appointed me to a committee to work on high-speed rail in Florida. Over 30 years we worked on it. And let me just tell you 90 percent of the funding would put over 60,000 Floridians to work. It's 90 percent of the funding. Is the other 10 percent there? Absolutely. The private