

think were based on hate and is truly an unfair and discriminatory situation that occurred in the last 2 weeks.

CENSURING PRESIDENT BARACK OBAMA

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, the President has violated the boundaries of executive power. He has refused to enforce our immigration laws. He has opened the borders to Syrian migrants against the will of the American people. He has even changed the provisions of his own disastrous healthcare bill.

This week, the administration once again thumbed its nose at Congress and the American people by jeopardizing the gun rights of law-abiding citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are fed up. The American people continue to see the executive branch not only deciding which laws they choose to enforce, but changing and interpreting the laws as they see fit. The White House has become judge, jury, and executioner, in clear violation of the principles on which this Nation was founded.

Today I am introducing a resolution to censure President Barack Obama to serve as a clear rebuke and condemnation of the unconstitutional actions of this President. This is a bold measure, but is one that is necessary to preserve the very institution that we are all honored to serve: the United States Congress.

The Constitution requires that the President shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed. This President has failed to do so on numerous occasions.

The Constitution also requires the President to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. The President has failed to do so.

Not only is the President trying to do our job, but he has failed to do his.

His announced actions on gun control are just the latest example of blatant executive overreach by the President. Congress must fight back. I want to make it very clear. This is not about President Obama. This is about the actions of a President who has encroached too far on the powers of Congress.

Under the Constitution, Congress is an equal branch of government and should be treated as such. We cannot roll over on every executive overreach. We cannot wait to fight next time.

We cannot wait for the next President because it is not about this President or the next President. It is not about politics. It is about preserving the power of the legislative branch against this President and any future President who seeks to use egregious executive action at the expense of Congress.

A resolution of censure of the President has been used rarely, but is not without precedent. It is a way for Congress to fight back against executive overreach. Censuring the President will preserve for the historical and legal record that this Congress at this time disapproves of this President's executive overreach. It is time Congress fights back as an institution.

I urge my colleagues to live up to their oath of office, both Republican and Democrat, to support this resolution to censure the President and put the executive branch on notice that violating the separation of powers and using unconstitutional executive overreach will not be tolerated by Members of the United States Congress now or in the future.

WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST OIL AND GAS LEASES

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an ongoing environmental review process within my district that I firmly believe represents yet another in a long line of abuses of private property rights by the Federal Government and, more specifically, the land management agencies that oversee the majority of the land in the United States.

The outcome of this process will likely set a disturbing precedent under which the integrity of contracts that the Federal Government enters into with private parties is undermined.

The Bureau of Land Management is currently reviewing 65 existing oil and gas leases issued in White River National Forest beginning in 1993. This retroactive review was prompted by a 2007 decision on three of the leases by the Interior Board of Land Appeals in which the BLM was found to have not formally adopted a Forest Service environmental policy analysis that was utilized to make these leasing decisions—basically, what amounts to an administrative oversight.

It should be emphasized that there are extensive environmental reviews that did, in fact, take place and that the BLM played a significant role in that process. The agency argued as much to the Board of Land Appeals during the review.

The fault was simply that the BLM needed to sign on the dotted line, and the Board expressly made this option available to remedy the problem. However, instead of adopting that common-sense approach, the BLM succumbed to political pressure from the environmental extremists and determined to revisit every one of the leases issued since 1993.

The new proposal from the BLM deals with leases in one of two ways. It either imposes new, significantly restrictive stipulations that were not in place at the time of the original leases when they were acquired or it outright revokes the leases.

The Federal Government is acting as nothing more than a highway robber in this case and in many others, robbing citizens and businesses of property that they have bought and paid for, telling us that we should simply be grateful that there is someone looking out for our greater interests.

I highlight this particular process because, should the BLM follow through with certain of its proposed actions, it will set a precedent not only for oil and gas development, but for any lessee or permittee who, in entering into a contract in good faith with a Federal agency, may see their lease or permit threatened with retroactive revocation or severely restricted based on any flimsy pretext.

Many important industries rely on Federal leases and permits, including livestock grazing, recreation, and renewable energy; and no business can successfully operate if its license to do so no longer enjoys protections against arbitrary cancellations or changes, depending on the ideology of the current occupant of the White House.

Numerous stakeholders and local governments recognize that the BLM's final decision would have impacts far beyond those of the specific leases in question and undertook efforts to draft detailed and substantive feedback to the agency.

□ 1100

This is a very laborious and time-consuming process. Yet the BLM provided only the bare minimum public comment during this period required by law, and the agency's scheduled comment period overlapped with Thanksgiving, Christmas, and the New Year's Day holidays.

It also overlaps another environmental review comment period for the well-known Roan Plateau, which involves many of the same stakeholders and local governments and has been under review in some form since the late 1990s.

As such, several stakeholders and local governments, with the support of several members of Colorado's congressional delegation, requested a modest extension of the comment period. These extension requests are routinely granted by Federal agencies in recognition of the technical nature of these issues: interruptions due to Federal holidays and when there are several similar issues under simultaneous review.

Despite this, the requests in this instance were dismissed out of hand. One can only conclude that the BLM is afraid of the scrutiny that could result from them effectuating a government taking of property rights under the guise of rectifying an administrative error from over 20 years ago.

It is abundantly clear that the BLM intends to ramrod through a decision that will trample on lease owners' rights by canceling or altering leases to the point as to make them economically unviable. This is, unfortunately,