

in line with a disturbing trend of Federal agency abuses of private property rights, whether it is the Forest Service's repeated attempts to leverage special use permits to forcibly acquire private water rights, or the EPA's determination to classify every ditch and puddle as a "water of the United States" to further insert itself into the everyday lives of ordinary, hard-working Americans.

Property rights and the integrity of contracts are at the very foundation of our economic system, yet too often Federal agencies casually cast these important considerations aside.

If the BLM is confident that it is making the right decision and is willing to defend it, then they should have no problem providing additional time for the public and other interested stakeholders to be able to comment on the proposed actions in the White River National Forest.

DO NOT LIFT SANCTIONS ON IRAN

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

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call on this administration to keep intact all existing sanctions on the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, Iran. Sanctions must remain, and closer scrutiny and more accountability by this administration on Iran's continuing illicit activity must occur. It is imperative for peace, security, and stability in the Middle East and across the globe that we do this.

Iran's conduct over the past few months and the lack of clear and exact leadership by this administration in response is cause for serious alarm. Iran has not changed its tone and conduct since the signing of the deal. In fact, they have doubled down on their unwillingness not to comply with international agreements, and they have created more danger and instability in the process.

Here is the central point why I am speaking on the House floor here today: Once we lift sanctions, we have even less leverage.

So let's look at how Iran has honored their commitments in the past few months and ask ourselves: Do we anticipate Iran will conduct itself in the months and years to come better or worse?

On October 10, Iran carried out a precision-guided ballistic missile test. This violates U.N. Security Council Resolution 1929 and 2231. Now that Iran is prohibited from such testing under the deal, what do they do? They send weapons to Bashar al-Assad on Russian cargo planes. This violates U.N. Resolution 1747. They did that in October.

On November 21, they carried out a medium-range ballistic missile test with capabilities to carry a nuclear warhead. They can't do that either.

Last month, they fired several unguided rockets 1,500 yards from two U.S. vessels.

Just a few days ago, they unveiled a new underground missile depot showing precision-guided missiles that have the capability to hold a nuclear warhead.

What has been the response of this administration? They notify us they will respond with sanctions against Iranian individuals and businesses linked to Iran's ballistic missile program.

What happened since they notified us of that? Nothing. They have walked it back.

Here is my fear, Mr. Speaker. We are forecasting to Iran that they have carte blanche to do as they wish. And once we lift the sanctions, we can expect more of that. Iran is not honoring its commitments, so nor should we.

We know the State Department classifies the deal not as a treaty, not as an executive agreement. It is not even a signed document. It is merely a political commitment. And it is clear Iran is not acting in good faith to our political commitment.

I signed correspondence to the administration requesting that the President "immediately void the deal and restore and/or continue all relevant sanctions on Iran that have been or will be relaxed under the JCPOA."

Let's not concern ourselves if Iran voices outrage or condemnation that we voided a political commitment on the basis that they feel they have somehow honored the deal because, number one, they violated U.N. resolutions since the deal was signed, the Iranian Parliament refuses to ratify the deal, and the Ayatollah forbids further negotiations with the U.S.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that Iran's U.N. violations clearly violate the spirit of our political commitment to them. Their conduct threatens our national security, it threatens the security of our allies, and it further erodes an already precarious and unstable environment in the Middle East.

Iran isn't honoring its commitments, so nor should we. Let's keep the sanctions in place. Do not lift them.

OBAMA'S EXECUTIVE ACTION ON GUNS

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to start my time by quoting directly the Second Amendment of our Constitution: "A well regulated militia, being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed."

Aren't those beautiful and resounding words? As a man who likes to keep it simple, I appreciate the Founding Fathers not only for their foresight to protect the right to bear arms, but also how plain and simple they made it.

The right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed upon.

Unfortunately, I think our Founding Fathers spoke too plainly for certain people and certain Presidents to understand. That President may always remind us that he taught constitutional law. Sadly, I have yet to encounter someone in that position who disregards the Constitution so regularly.

Not only does that President trample on the Second Amendment, but he would also trample on Article I, which, as you know, is the Congress and going through them to make laws. That President should have known that regulations regarding buying guns must come from legislation, not by an oral decree.

That President tried to legislate in the Senate several times, but his colleagues refused to do it, even though there was a majority. Now that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not in the majority in Congress, I am assuming that this administration is deciding to create their own regulations—the Constitution be damned—because, sadly, there are no checks and balances anymore.

We know even if Congress passes a bill to repeal any type of order that any President makes, it would still have to go to that individual for the bill to be signed. So what are the chances of putting together a bill that some Congress may have seen as an inappropriate action and then send it to the person that created that inappropriate action and expect him to sign it?

I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that has so disappointed the American people is the inability to have their Representatives voice their complaints and do their legislative responsibility with an out-of-control government. So each week, as the administration or a group is intent on disregarding the Constitution, people become numb. The American people become numb to these illegal actions.

I think it is time that we brought attention to some of these illegal actions that some Presidents in the past and some Presidents in the future may create. I think it is time that we bring these actions to the attention of the American people and let them know what our Founding Fathers had the intention to do originally, what they intended the Constitution to mean, and how it was interpreted by those very first legislators: President Washington, the Supreme Court, and others.

They took this document as a simple document. It was very plainly written and read. But, unfortunately, we have had Supreme Courts, Presidents, and legislative bodies that have tried to take these simple, basic words and turn them into something that they could use for their benefit, to try to change the way that this world works and how the laws they make are applied to our citizens.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are going to try to do as much as we can in the near future to try to bring this to the attention of the American people and the world, because I think our Constitution