United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 2022 No. 58

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, April 4, 2022, at 3 p.m.

House of Representatives

FRIDAY, APRIL 1, 2022

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 1, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ED PERLMUTTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Lord, You are gracious and righteous. You, O God, our God, are full of compassion. Hear our voices this morning. O Lord, hear our cries for Your mercy. May we call on You this day and every day as long as we live.

Today, we lay before You the deliberations of this past week and ask Your blessing. Where we have fallen short, we pray that You, in Your generosity, would weave our failings into the marvelous tapestry of Your grace plan, that despite our inadequacies and missteps, Your will would be revealed.

We pray Your blessings over our accomplishments. Advance them in accordance with Your will that the good we intended would align with Your intent and reflect Your grand design.

And, as the week comes to a close, we pray You grant our lawmakers respite from their labor, refreshment with family and friends, that upon their return next week, they would be rejuvenated in their service to You and to this country.

In hope for Your favor and in the strength of Your merciful name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. LEE of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignations of the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. FORTENBERRY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VELA), the whole number of the House is 430.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

INSULIN COSTS TOO MUCH FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Insulin Now Act is a just act.

This personal affliction of diabetes affects millions of families every day. The price of insulin is too much for hardworking American families, and the Affordable Insulin Now Act is something that is going to bring life to individuals and opportunity for families.

My father died from diabetes 10 days before our son Cristian was born. I hoped and prayed that he would live long enough so I could present him to his grandfather, but that didn't happen. That is what this affliction does. It robs time. It robs the life out of people, and that doesn't need to happen.

For $35 a month—no, not hundreds of dollars—this act will help relieve families.

I thank Representatives CRAIG, KILDEE, and MCBATH for introducing this bill.

Printed on recycled paper.

RECOGNIZING SAINT MARYS AREA MIDDLE SCHOOL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Saint Marys Area Middle School in Saint Marys, Pennsylvania.

On March 17, students and staff participated in the Mini-THON. This is a smaller service of Penn State University's THON.

Throughout the day, students participated in various activities to raise money for the Four Diamonds fund to assist children and families in their battle with cancer.

One of the many ways students raised funds was through the ''duct tape your principal'' challenge. This brought in over $900. Dom Surra, the assistant principal, was duct-taped to the gymnasium wall.

Due to the tremendous support from students, staff, and the community, Saint Marys Area Middle School raised more than $12,237.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating the students and staff for this tremendous achievement for such a righteous cause.

REMEMBERING DON YOUNG

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this past week, we celebrated the life of Don Young, the dean of the House with 49 years here representing the State of Alaska. He was a Republican. But before he was a Republican, he was an American. He wanted this House to work and this House to work together.

Don Young voted for the bipartisan infrastructure bill because he knew infrastructure, roads, airports, river ports, and trains made this country move and made business happen.

I hope we will not forget Don Young, not just because of his oversized and loveable personality and the warmth that he exuded to all of us, but for the fact that he was bipartisan and wanted this House to work.

There is a motto up there, above the Speaker's lectern, that says: Get something done while you are here that is memorable and important.

Look at that and remember Don Young.

BIDEN'S ANTI-AMERICAN ENERGY AGENDA

(Mr. KELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, the latest Gallup poll shows most Americans are concerned about the cost and availability of energy now more than at any time in the last decade, and for good reason.

Thanks to President Biden's anti-American energy agenda, we are all paying more for the fuel necessary to fill our cars, heat our homes, and run our businesses.

One short year ago, I warned: If the President's destructive actions toward America's domestic energy production during his first week in office are any indication of where our energy policy is headed over the next 4 years, our Nation is on a dangerous path.

Today, that warning has come true. This destruction is entirely self-inflicted, and it is entirely avoidable.

To solve the energy crisis and deliver relief for the American people, President Biden must remove the ban on new drilling, reopen the Keystone pipeline, and unleash American energy dominance.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN JAMES T. BELLEW

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Captain James T. Bellew.

Captain Bellew was tragically killed in a helicopter crash at Hunter Army Airfield in Savannah, Georgia, earlier this week, on March 30.

He was a native of Charlottesville, Virginia, and entered the United States Army in 2017 as a medical service officer. In 2019, he became an aeromedical evacuation officer, and in 2020, he was assigned to the 3rd Infantry Division.

This sudden and tragic loss has dealt a heavy blow to the brigade, division, community, and his family.

During his service, Captain Bellew had successfully evacuated critically ill COVID–19 patients to better care across the country and was the top platoon leader in his company. He was decorated with the Army Achievement Medal, National Defense Service Medal, and the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, among other accolades.

Captain Bellew was a hero in its truest sense, and he will never be forgotten.

May God bless his family, friends, and fellow servicemembers, and may God bless our troops.

BIDEN BUDGET DELIBERATELY WORSENS CRISES

(Mr. SMITH of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, Democrat policies have created multiple crises: the highest spike in prices in 40 years, gas prices over $4 a gallon, a violent crime crisis, school closures that have drastically harmed our children, and so many other items.

President Biden's budget, which was released this week, deliberately makes every crisis American families are facing that much worse.

With $73 trillion in spending, Biden doubles down on his delusion that spending more will cause inflation to go down when Americans are facing a $5,200 inflation tax this year.

Biden's budget charges Americans another $2.5 trillion in taxes, upward of $4 trillion if you count the build back broke agenda, which he tries to put in the budget as being free.

American families can't afford what this budget is costing.

KETANJI BROWN JACKSON SHOULD NOT BE CONFIRMED

(Mr. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in objection to Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson's appointment to the Supreme Court. She is an activist, not a constitutionalist.

Repeatedly, she has reduced sentences for convicted child sex torturers and pornographers. One example, for an individual who deserved 10 years, she gave only 3 months of a sentence.

She was in favor of an extended buffer zone around abortion clinics in Massachusetts, which is a blatant attempt to limit the free speech rights of peaceful protesters who stand for life.

In her confirmation hearings, she would not even define the word ''woman,'' which is an indication of potential future attacks on religious liberties, among other things.

Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson would ensure a radical leftwing agenda on the Supreme Court for decades to come.

America deserves better. America deserves a constitutional Justice on the Supreme Court.

I urge my Senators from Georgia and other Senators to vote ''no'' on her confirmation.

MARIJUANA OPPORTUNITY REINVESTMENT AND EXPUNGEMENT ACT

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1017, I call up the bill (H.R. 3617) to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–37, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 117–285, is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3617

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act'' or the ''MORE Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) The communities that have been most harmed by cannabis prohibition are benefiting the least from the legal marijuana marketplace.

(2) A legacy of racial and ethnic injustices, compounded by the disproportionate collateral consequences of 80 years of cannabis prohibition enforcement, now limits participation in the industry.

(3) 37 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands have adopted laws allowing legal access to cannabis, and 15 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and Guam have adopted laws legalizing cannabis for adult recreational use.

(4) A total of 47 States have reformed their laws pertaining to cannabis despite the Schedule I status of marijuana and its Federal criminalization.

(5) Legal cannabis sales totaled $20,000,000,000 in 2020 and are projected to reach $40,500,000,000 by 2025.

(6) According to the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), enforcing cannabis prohibition laws costs taxpayers approximately $3.6 billion a year.

(7) The continued enforcement of cannabis prohibition laws results in over 600,000 arrests annually, disproportionately impacting people of color who are almost 4 times more likely to be arrested for cannabis possession than their White counterparts, despite equal rates of use across populations.

(8) People of color have been historically targeted by discriminatory sentencing practices resulting in Black men receiving drug sentences that are 13.1 percent longer than sentences imposed for White men and Latinos being nearly 6.5 times more likely to receive a Federal sentence for cannabis possession than non-Hispanic Whites.

(9) In 2013, simple cannabis possession was the fourth most common cause of deportation for any offense and the most common cause of deportation for drug law violations.

(10) Fewer than one-fifth of cannabis business owners identify as minorities and only approximately 4 percent are black.

(11) Applicants for cannabis licenses are limited by numerous laws, regulations, and exorbitant permit applications, licensing fees, and costs in these States, which can require more than $700,000.

(12) Historically disproportionate arrest and conviction rates make it particularly difficult for people of color to enter the legal cannabis marketplace, as most States bar these individuals from participating.

(13) Federal law severely limits access to loans and capital for cannabis businesses, disproportionately impacting minority small business owners.

(14) Some States and municipalities have taken proactive steps to mitigate inequalities in the legal cannabis marketplace and ensure equal participation in the industry.

SEC. 3. DECRIMINALIZATION OF CANNABIS.

(a) CANNABIS REMOVED FROM SCHEDULE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.—

(1) REMOVAL IN STATUTE.—Subsection (c) of schedule I of section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812) is amended—

(A) by striking ''(10) Marihuana.''; and

(B) by striking ''(17) Tetrahydrocannabinols, except for tetrahydrocannabinols in hemp (as defined under section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946).''.

(2) REMOVAL FROM SCHEDULE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall finalize a rulemaking under section 201(a)(2) removing marihuana and tetrahydrocannabinols from the schedules of controlled substances. For the purposes of the Controlled Substances Act, marihuana and tetrahydrocannabinols shall each be deemed to be a drug or other substance that does not meet the requirements for inclusion in any schedule. A rulemaking under this paragraph shall be considered to have taken effect as of the date of enactment of this Act for purposes of any offense committed, case pending, conviction entered, and, in the case of a juvenile, any offense committed, case pending, and adjudication of juvenile delinquency entered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES ACT.—The Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 102(44) (21 U.S.C. 802(44)), by striking ''marihuana,'';

(2) in section 401(b) (21 U.S.C. 841(b))—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (vi), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon;

(II) by striking clause (vii); and

(III) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (vii);

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (vi), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon;

(II) by striking clause (vii); and

(III) by redesignating clause (viii) as clause (vii);

(iii) in subparagraph (C), in the first sentence, by striking ''subparagraphs (A), (B), and (D)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (A) and (B)'';

(iv) by striking subparagraph (D);

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (E) as subparagraph (D); and

(vi) in subparagraph (D)(i), as so redesignated, by striking ''subparagraphs (C) and (D)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (C)'';

(B) by striking paragraph (4); and

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively;

(3) in section 402(c)(2)(B) (21 U.S.C. 842(c)(2)(B)), by striking '', marihuana,'';

(4) in section 403(d)(1) (21 U.S.C. 843(d)(1)), by striking '', marihuana,'';

(5) in section 418(a) (21 U.S.C. 859(a)), by striking the last sentence;

(6) in section 419(a) (21 U.S.C. 860(a)), by striking the last sentence;

(7) in section 422(d) (21 U.S.C. 863(d))—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''marijuana,''; and

(B) in paragraph (5), by striking '', such as a marihuana cigarette,''; and

(8) in section 516(d) (21 U.S.C. 886(d)), by striking ''section 401(b)(6)'' each place the term appears and inserting ''section 401(b)(5)''.

(c) OTHER CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM DRUG CONTROL ACT OF 1986.—The National Forest System Drug Control Act of 1986 (16 U.S.C. 559b et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 15002(a) (16 U.S.C. 559b(a)) by striking ''marijuana and other'';

(B) in section 15003(2) (16 U.S.C. 559c(2)) by striking ''marijuana and other''; and

(C) in section 15004(2) (16 U.S.C. 559d(2)) by striking ''marijuana and other''.

(2) INTERCEPTION OF COMMUNICATIONS.—Section 2516 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subsection (1)(e), by striking ''marihuana,''; and

(B) in subsection (2) by striking ''marihuana''.

(3) FMCSA PROVISIONS.—

(A) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 31301(5) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''section 31306,'' and inserting ''sections 31306, 31306a, and subsections (b) and (c) of section 31310,''.

(B) DEFINITION.—Section 31306(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking ''means any substance'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(A) any substance''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and

''(B) any substance not covered under subparagraph (A) that was a substance under such section as of December 1, 2018, and specified by the Secretary of Transportation.''.

(C) DISQUALIFICATIONS.—Section 31310(b) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) In this subsection and subsection (c), the term 'controlled substance' has the meaning given such term in section 31306(a).''.

(4) FAA PROVISIONS.—Section 45101 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''means any substance'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(A) any substance''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and

''(B) any substance not covered under subparagraph (A) that was a substance under such section as of December 1, 2018, and specified by the Secretary of Transportation.''.

(5) FRA PROVISIONS.—Section 20140(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''means any substance'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(A) any substance''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and

''(B) any substance not covered under subparagraph (A) that was a substance under such section as of December 1, 2018, and specified by the Secretary of Transportation.''.

(6) FTA PROVISIONS.—Section 5331(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''means any substance'' and inserting the following: ''means—

''(A) any substance''; and

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and

''(B) any substance not covered under subparagraph (A) that was a substance under such section as of December 1, 2018, and whose use the Secretary of Transportation decides has a risk to transportation safety.''.

(d) RETROACTIVITY.—The amendments made by this section to the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) are retroactive and shall apply to any offense committed, case pending, conviction entered, and, in the case of a juvenile, any offense committed, case pending, or adjudication of juvenile delinquency entered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) EFFECT ON OTHER LAW.—Nothing in this subtitle shall affect or modify—

(1) the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.);

(2) section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262); or

(3) the authority of the Commissioner of Food and Drugs and the Secretary of Health and Human Services—

(A) under—

(i) the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S. 301 et seq.); or

(ii) section 351 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262); or

(B) to promulgate Federal regulations and guidelines that relate to products containing cannabis or cannabis-derived compounds under the Act described in subparagraph (A)(i) or the section described in subparagraph (A)(ii).

(f) PUBLIC MEETINGS.—Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall hold not less than one public meeting to address the regulation, safety, manufacturing,

product quality, marketing, labeling, and sale of products containing cannabis or cannabis-derived compounds.

(g) SPECIAL RULE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEE TESTING.—Section 503 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1987 (5 U.S.C. 7301 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) MARIJUANA.—

''(1) CONTINUED TESTING.—Notwithstanding the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act and the amendments made thereby, the Secretary of Health and Human Services may continue to include marijuana for purposes of drug testing of Federal employees subject to this section, Executive Order 12564, or other applicable Federal laws and orders.

''(2) DEFINITION.—The term 'marijuana' has the meaning given to the term 'marihuana' in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 6 U.S.C. 802) on the day before the date of enactment of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act.''.

(h) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section may not be construed to abridge the authority of the Secretary of Transportation, or the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, to regulate and screen for the use of a controlled substance.

(2) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''controlled substance'' means—

(A) any substance covered under section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) on the day before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) any substance not covered under subparagraph (A) that was a substance covered under section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802) on December 1, 2018, and specified by the Secretary of Transportation.

SEC. 4. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA OF CANNABIS BUSINESS OWNERS AND EMPLOYEES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Bureau of Labor Statistics shall regularly compile, maintain, and make public data on the demographics of—

(1) individuals who are business owners in the cannabis industry; and

(2) individuals who are employed in the cannabis industry.

(b) DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.—The data collected under subsection (a) shall include data regarding—

(1) age;
(2) certifications and licenses;
(3) disability status;
(4) educational attainment;
(5) family and marital status;
(6) nativity;
(7) race and Hispanic ethnicity;
(8) school enrollment;
(9) veteran status; and
(10) sex.

(c) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The name, address, and other identifying information of individuals employed in the cannabis industry shall be kept confidential by the Bureau and not be made available to the public.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CANNABIS.—The term ''cannabis'' means either marijuana or cannabis as defined under the State law authorizing the sale or use of cannabis in which the individual or entity is located.

(2) CANNABIS INDUSTRY.—The term ''cannabis industry'' means an individual or entity that is licensed or permitted under a State or local law to engage in commercial cannabis-related activity.

(3) OWNER.—The term ''owner'' means an individual or entity that is defined as an owner under the State or local law where the individual or business is licensed or permitted.

SEC. 5. CREATION OF OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND AND IMPOSITION OF TAXES WITH RESPECT TO CANNABIS PRODUCTS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND.—Subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 9512. ESTABLISHMENT OF OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND.

''(a) CREATION OF TRUST FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the 'Opportunity Trust Fund' (referred to in this section as the 'Trust Fund'), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to such fund as provided in this section or section 9602(b).

''(b) TRANSFERS TO TRUST FUND.—There are hereby appropriated to the Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the net revenues received in the Treasury from the taxes imposed under chapter 56.

''(c) EXPENDITURES.—Amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available, without further appropriation, only as follows:

''(1) 50 percent to the Attorney General to carry out section 3052(a) of part OO of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

''(2) 10 percent to the Attorney General to carry out section 3052(b) of part OO of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

''(3) 20 percent to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to carry out section 6(b)(1) of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act.

''(4) 20 percent to the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to carry out section 6(b)(2) of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act.''.

(b) CANNABIS REVENUE AND REGULATION ACT.—Subtitle E of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

''CHAPTER 56—CANNABIS PRODUCTS

''SUBCHAPTER A. TAX ON CANNABIS PRODUCTS

''SUBCHAPTER B. OCCUPATIONAL TAX

''SUBCHAPTER C. BOND AND PERMITS

''SUBCHAPTER D. OPERATIONS

''SUBCHAPTER E. PENALTIES

''Subchapter A—Tax on Cannabis Products

''Sec. 5901. Imposition of tax.
''Sec. 5902. Definitions.
''Sec. 5903. Liability and method of payment.
''Sec. 5904. Exemption from tax; transfers in bond.
''Sec. 5905. Credit, refund, or drawback of tax.

''SEC. 5901. IMPOSITION OF TAX.

''(a) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—There is hereby imposed on any cannabis product produced in or imported into the United States a tax equal to—

''(1) for any such product removed during the first 5 calendar years ending after the date on which this chapter becomes effective, the applicable percentage of such product's removal price, and

''(2) for any product removed during any calendar year after the calendar years described in paragraph (1), the applicable equivalent amount.

''(b) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1), the applicable percentage shall be determined as follows:

''(1) For any cannabis product removed during the first 2 calendar years ending after the date on which this chapter becomes effective, 5 percent.

''(2) For any cannabis product removed during the calendar year after the last calendar year to which paragraph (1) applies, 6 percent.

''(3) For any cannabis product removed during the calendar year after the calendar year to which paragraph (2) applies, 7 percent.

''(4) For any cannabis product removed during the calendar year after the calendar year to which paragraph (3) applies, 8 percent.

''(c) APPLICABLE EQUIVALENT AMOUNT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the term 'applicable equivalent amount' means, with respect to any cannabis product removed during any calendar year, an amount equal to—

''(A) in the case of any cannabis product not described in subparagraph (B), the product of the applicable rate per ounce multiplied by the number of ounces of such product (and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of an ounce of such product), and

''(B) in the case of any THC-measurable cannabis product, the product of the applicable rate per gram multiplied by the number of grams of tetrahydrocannabinol in such product (and a proportionate tax at the like rate on all fractional parts of a gram of tetrahydrocannabinol in such product).

''(2) APPLICABLE RATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the term 'applicable rate per ounce' means, with respect to any cannabis product removed during any calendar year, 8 percent of the prevailing sales price of cannabis flowers sold in the United States during the 12-month period ending one calendar quarter before such calendar year, expressed on a per ounce basis, as determined by the Secretary.

''(B) THC-MEASURABLE CANNABIS PRODUCTS.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), the term 'applicable rate per gram' means, with respect to any cannabis product removed during any calendar year, 8 percent of the prevailing sales price of tetrahydrocannabinol sold in the United States during the 12-month period ending one calendar quarter before such calendar year, expressed on a per gram basis, as determined by the Secretary.

''(d) TIME OF ATTACHMENT ON CANNABIS PRODUCTS.—The tax under this section shall attach to any cannabis product as soon as such product is in existence as such, whether it be subsequently separated or transferred into any other substance, either in the process of original production or by any subsequent process.

''SEC. 5902. DEFINITIONS.

''(a) DEFINITIONS RELATED TO CANNABIS PRODUCTS.—For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) CANNABIS PRODUCT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term 'cannabis product' means any article which contains (or consists of) cannabis.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term 'cannabis product' shall not include an FDA-approved article or industrial hemp.

''(C) FDA-APPROVED ARTICLE.—The term 'FDA-approved article' means any article if the producer or importer thereof demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Health and Human Services that such article is—

''(i) a drug—

''(I) that is approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, or

''(II) for which an investigational use exemption has been authorized under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act or under section 351(a) of the Public Health Service Act, or

''(ii) a combination product (as described in section 503(g) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act), the constituent parts of which were approved or cleared under section 505, 510(k), or 515 of such Act.

''(D) INDUSTRIAL HEMP.—The term 'industrial hemp' means the plant Cannabis sativa L. and any part of such plant, whether growing or not, with a delta-9 tetrahydrocannabinol concentration of not more than 0.3 percent on a dry weight basis.

''(2) THC-MEASURABLE CANNABIS PRODUCT.—The term 'THC-measurable cannabis product' means any cannabis product—

''(A) with respect to which the Secretary has made a determination that the amount of tetrahydrocannabinol in such product can be measured with a high degree of accuracy, or

''(B) which is not cannabis flower and the concentration of tetrahydrocannabinol in which

is significantly higher than the average such concentration in cannabis flower.

''(3) CANNABIS.—The term 'cannabis' has the meaning given such term under section 102(16) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802(16)).

''(b) DEFINITIONS RELATED TO CANNABIS ENTERPRISES.—For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) CANNABIS ENTERPRISE.—The term 'cannabis enterprise' means a producer, importer, or export warehouse proprietor.

''(2) PRODUCER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'producer' means any person who plants, cultivates, harvests, grows, manufactures, produces, compounds, converts, processes, prepares, or packages any cannabis product.

''(B) PERSONAL USE EXCEPTION.—Subject to regulation prescribed by the Secretary, the term 'producer' shall not include any individual otherwise described in subparagraph (A) if the only cannabis product described in such subparagraph with respect to such individual is for personal or family use and not for sale.

''(3) IMPORTER.—The term 'importer' means any person who—

''(A) is in the United States and to whom non-tax-paid cannabis products, produced in a foreign country or a possession of the United States, are shipped or consigned,

''(B) removes cannabis products for sale or consumption in the United States from a customs bonded warehouse, or

''(C) smuggles or otherwise unlawfully brings any cannabis product into the United States.

''(4) EXPORT WAREHOUSE PROPRIETOR.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'export warehouse proprietor' means any person who operates an export warehouse.

''(B) EXPORT WAREHOUSE.—The term 'export warehouse' means a bonded internal revenue warehouse for the storage of cannabis products, upon which the internal revenue tax has not been paid—

''(i) for subsequent shipment to a foreign country or a possession of the United States, or

''(ii) for consumption beyond the jurisdiction of the internal revenue laws of the United States.

''(5) CANNABIS PRODUCTION FACILITY.—The term 'cannabis production facility' means an establishment which is qualified under subchapter C to perform any operation for which such qualification is required under such subchapter.

''(c) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) PRODUCE.—The term 'produce' includes any activity described in subsection (b)(2)(A).

''(2) REMOVAL; REMOVE.—The terms 'removal' or 'remove' means—

''(A) the transfer of cannabis products from the premises of a producer (or the transfer of such products from the bonded premises of a producer to a non-bonded premises of such producer),

''(B) release of such products from customs custody, or

''(C) smuggling or other unlawful importation of such products into the United States.

''(3) REMOVAL PRICE.—The term 'removal price' means—

''(A) except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the price for which the cannabis product is sold in the sale which occurs in connection with the removal of such product,

''(B) in the case of any such sale which is described in section 5903(c), the price determined under such section, and

''(C) if there is no sale which occurs in connection with such removal, the price which would be determined under section 5903(c) if such product were sold at a price which cannot be determined.

"SEC. 5903. LIABILITY AND METHOD OF PAYMENT.

''(a) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—

''(1) ORIGINAL LIABILITY.—The producer or importer of any cannabis product shall be liable for the taxes imposed thereon by section 5901.

''(2) TRANSFER OF LIABILITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—When cannabis products are transferred, without payment of tax, pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of section 5904—

''(i) except as provided in clause (ii), the transferee shall become liable for the tax upon receipt by the transferee of such articles, and the transferor shall thereupon be relieved of their liability for such tax, and

''(ii) in the case of cannabis products which are released in bond from customs custody for transfer to the bonded premises of a producer, the transferee shall become liable for the tax on such articles upon release from customs custody, and the importer shall thereupon be relieved of their liability for such tax.

''(B) RETURNED TO BOND.—All provisions of this chapter applicable to cannabis products in bond shall be applicable to such articles returned to bond upon withdrawal from the market or returned to bond after previous removal for a tax-exempt purpose.

''(b) METHOD OF PAYMENT OF TAX.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) TAXES PAID ON BASIS OF RETURN.—The taxes imposed by section 5901 shall be paid on the basis of return. The Secretary shall, by regulations, prescribe the period or the event to be covered by such return and the information to be furnished on such return.

''(B) APPLICATION TO TRANSFEREES.—In the case of any transfer to which subsection (a)(2)(A) applies, the tax under section 5901 on the transferee shall (if not otherwise relieved by reason of a subsequent transfer to which such subsection applies) be imposed with respect to the removal of the cannabis product from the bonded premises of the transferee.

''(C) POSTPONEMENT.—Any postponement under this subsection of the payment of taxes determined at the time of removal shall be conditioned upon the filing of such additional bonds, and upon compliance with such requirements, as the Secretary may prescribe for the protection of the revenue. The Secretary may, by regulations, require payment of tax on the basis of a return prior to removal of the cannabis products where a person defaults in the postponed payment of tax on the basis of a return under this subsection or regulations prescribed thereunder.

''(D) ADMINISTRATION AND PENALTIES.—All administrative and penalty provisions of this title, insofar as applicable, shall apply to any tax imposed by section 5901.

''(2) TIME FOR PAYMENT OF TAXES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, in the case of taxes on cannabis products removed during any semimonthly period under bond for deferred payment of tax, the last day for payment of such taxes shall be the 14th day after the last day of such semimonthly period.

''(B) IMPORTED ARTICLES.—In the case of cannabis products which are imported into the United States, the following provisions shall apply:

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The last day for payment of tax shall be the 14th day after the last day of the semimonthly period during which the article is entered into the customs territory of the United States.

''(ii) SPECIAL RULE FOR ENTRY OF WAREHOUSING.—Except as provided in clause (iv), in the case of an entry for warehousing, the last day for payment of tax shall not be later than the 14th day after the last day of the semimonthly period during which the article is removed from the first such warehouse.

''(iii) FOREIGN TRADE ZONES.—Except as provided in clause (iv) and in regulations prescribed by the Secretary, articles brought into a foreign trade zone shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be treated for purposes of this subsection as if such zone were a single customs warehouse.

''(iv) EXCEPTION FOR ARTICLES DESTINED FOR EXPORT.—Clauses (ii) and (iii) shall not apply to any article which is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary to be destined for export.

''(C) CANNABIS PRODUCTS BROUGHT INTO THE UNITED STATES FROM PUERTO RICO.—In the case of cannabis products which are brought into the United States from Puerto Rico and subject to tax under section 7652, the last day for payment of tax shall be the 14th day after the last day of the semimonthly period during which the article is brought into the United States.

''(D) SPECIAL RULE WHERE DUE DATE FALLS ON SATURDAY, SUNDAY, OR HOLIDAY.—Notwithstanding section 7503, if, but for this subparagraph, the due date under this paragraph would fall on a Saturday, Sunday, or a legal holiday (as defined in section 7503), such due date shall be the immediately preceding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or such a holiday.

''(E) SPECIAL RULE FOR UNLAWFULLY PRODUCED CANNABIS PRODUCTS.—In the case of any cannabis products produced in the United States at any place other than the premises of a producer that has filed the bond and obtained the permit required under this chapter, tax shall be due and payable immediately upon production.

''(3) PAYMENT BY ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER.—Any person who in any 12-month period, ending December 31, was liable for a gross amount equal to or exceeding $5,000,000 in taxes imposed on cannabis products by section 5901 (or section 7652) shall pay such taxes during the succeeding calendar year by electronic fund transfer (as defined in section 5061(e)(2)) to a Federal Reserve Bank. Rules similar to the rules of section 5061(e)(3) shall apply to the $5,000,000 amount specified in the preceding sentence.

''(c) DETERMINATION OF PRICE.—

''(1) CONSTRUCTIVE SALE PRICE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If an article is sold directly to consumers, sold on consignment, or sold (otherwise than through an arm's length transaction) at less than the fair market price, or if the price for which the article sold cannot be determined, the tax under section 5901(a) shall be computed on the price for which such articles are sold, in the ordinary course of trade, by producers thereof, as determined by the Secretary.

''(B) ARM'S LENGTH.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a sale is considered to be made under circumstances otherwise than at arm's length if—

''(I) the parties are members of the same controlled group, whether or not such control is actually exercised to influence the sale price,

''(II) the parties are members of a family, as defined in section 267(c)(4), or

''(III) the sale is made pursuant to special arrangements between a producer and a purchaser.

''(ii) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The term 'controlled group' has the meaning given to such term by subsection (a) of section 1563, except that 'more than 50 percent' shall be substituted for 'at least 80 percent' each place it appears in such subsection.

''(II) CONTROLLED GROUPS WHICH INCLUDE NONINCORPORATED PERSONS.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, principles similar to the principles of subclause (I) shall apply to a group of persons under common control where one or more of such persons is not a corporation.

''(2) CONTAINERS, PACKING AND TRANSPORTATION CHARGES.—In determining, for the purposes of this chapter, the price for which an article is sold, there shall be included any charge for coverings and containers of whatever nature, and any charge incident to placing the article in condition packed ready for shipment, but there shall be excluded the amount of tax imposed by this chapter, whether or not stated as a separate charge. A transportation, delivery, insurance, installation, or other charge (not required by the preceding sentence to be included) shall be excluded from the price only if the amount thereof is established to the satisfaction of the Secretary in accordance with regulations.

''(3) DETERMINATION OF APPLICABLE EQUIVALENT AMOUNTS.—Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply for purposes of section 5901(c) only to the extent that the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(d) PARTIAL PAYMENTS AND INSTALLMENT ACCOUNTS.—

''(1) PARTIAL PAYMENTS.—In the case of—

''(A) a contract for the sale of an article wherein it is provided that the price shall be paid by installments and title to the article sold does not pass until a future date notwithstanding partial payment by installments,

''(B) a conditional sale, or

''(C) a chattel mortgage arrangement wherein it is provided that the sales price shall be paid in installments,

there shall be paid upon each payment with respect to the article a percentage of such payment equal to the rate of tax in effect on the date such payment is due.

''(2) SALES OF INSTALLMENT ACCOUNTS.—If installment accounts, with respect to payments on which tax is being computed as provided in paragraph (1), are sold or otherwise disposed of, then paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to any subsequent payments on such accounts (other than subsequent payments on returned accounts with respect to which credit or refund is allowable by reason of section 6416(b)(5)), but instead—

''(A) there shall be paid an amount equal to the difference between—

''(i) the tax previously paid on the payments on such installment accounts, and

''(ii) the total tax which would be payable if such installment accounts had not been sold or otherwise disposed of (computed as provided in paragraph (1)), except that

''(B) if any such sale is pursuant to the order of, or subject to the approval of, a court of competent jurisdiction in a bankruptcy or insolvency proceeding, the amount computed under subparagraph (A) shall not exceed the sum of the amounts computed by multiplying—

''(i) the proportionate share of the amount for which such accounts are sold which is allocable to each unpaid installment payment, by

''(ii) the rate of tax under this chapter in effect on the date such unpaid installment payment is or was due.

The sum of the amounts payable under this subsection in respect of the sale of any article shall not exceed the total tax.

''SEC. 5904. EXEMPTION FROM TAX; TRANSFERS IN BOND.

''(a) EXEMPTION FROM TAX.—Cannabis products on which the internal revenue tax has not been paid or determined may, subject to such regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe, be withdrawn from the bonded premises of any producer in approved containers free of tax and not for resale for use—

''(1) exclusively in scientific research by a laboratory,

''(2) by a proprietor of a cannabis production facility in research, development, or testing (other than consumer testing or other market analysis) of processes, systems, materials, or equipment, relating to cannabis or cannabis operations, under such limitations and conditions as to quantities, use, and accountability as the Secretary may by regulations require for the protection of the revenue, or

''(3) by the United States or any governmental agency thereof, any State, any political subdivision of a State, or the District of Columbia, for nonconsumption purposes.

''(b) CANNABIS PRODUCTS TRANSFERRED OR REMOVED IN BOND FROM DOMESTIC FACTORIES AND EXPORT WAREHOUSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to such regulations and under such bonds as the Secretary shall prescribe, a producer or export warehouse proprietor may transfer cannabis products, without payment of tax, to the bonded premises of another producer or export warehouse proprietor, or remove such articles, without payment of tax, for shipment to a foreign country or a possession of the United States, or for consumption beyond the jurisdiction of the internal revenue laws of the United States.

''(2) LABELING.—Cannabis products may not be transferred or removed under this subsection unless such products bear such marks, labels, or notices as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe.

''(c) CANNABIS PRODUCTS RELEASED IN BOND FROM CUSTOMS CUSTODY.—Cannabis products imported or brought into the United States may be released from customs custody, without payment of tax, for delivery to a producer or export warehouse proprietor if such articles are not put up in packages, in accordance with such regulations and under such bond as the Secretary shall prescribe.

''(d) CANNABIS PRODUCTS EXPORTED AND RETURNED.—Cannabis products classifiable under item 9801.00.10 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (relating to duty on certain articles previously exported and returned), as in effect on the date of the enactment of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act, may be released from customs custody, without payment of that part of the duty attributable to the internal revenue tax for delivery to the original producer of such cannabis products or to the export warehouse proprietor authorized by such producer to receive such products, in accordance with such regulations and under such bond as the Secretary shall prescribe. Upon such release such products shall be subject to this chapter as if they had not been exported or otherwise removed from internal revenue bond.

''SEC. 5905. CREDIT, REFUND, OR DRAWBACK OF TAX.

''(a) CREDIT OR REFUND.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Credit or refund of any tax imposed by this chapter or section 7652 shall be allowed or made (without interest) to the cannabis enterprise on proof satisfactory to the Secretary that the claimant cannabis enterprise has paid the tax on—

''(A) cannabis products withdrawn from the market by the claimant, or

''(B) such products lost (otherwise than by theft) or destroyed, by fire, casualty, or act of God, while in the possession or ownership of the claimant.

''(2) CANNABIS PRODUCTS LOST OR DESTROYED IN BOND.—

''(A) EXTENT OF LOSS ALLOWANCE.—No tax shall be collected in respect of cannabis products lost or destroyed while in bond, except that such tax shall be collected—

''(i) in the case of loss by theft, unless the Secretary finds that the theft occurred without connivance, collusion, fraud, or negligence on the part of the proprietor of the cannabis production facility, owner, consignor, consignee, bailee, or carrier, or their employees or agents,

''(ii) in the case of voluntary destruction, unless such destruction is carried out as provided in paragraph (3), and

''(iii) in the case of an unexplained shortage of cannabis products.

''(B) PROOF OF LOSS.—In any case in which cannabis products are lost or destroyed, whether by theft or otherwise, the Secretary may require the proprietor of a cannabis production facility or other person liable for the tax to file a claim for relief from the tax and submit proof as to the cause of such loss. In every case where it appears that the loss was by theft, the burden shall be upon the proprietor of the cannabis production facility or other person responsible for the tax under section 5901 to establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary that such loss did not occur as the result of connivance, collusion, fraud, or negligence on the part of the proprietor of the cannabis production facility, owner, consignor, consignee, bailee, or carrier, or their employees or agents.

''(C) REFUND OF TAX.—In any case where the tax would not be collectible by virtue of subparagraph (A), but such tax has been paid, the Secretary shall refund such tax.

''(D) LIMITATIONS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (E), no tax shall be abated, remitted, credited, or refunded under this paragraph where the loss occurred after the tax was determined. The abatement, remission, credit, or refund of taxes provided for by subparagraphs (A) and (C) in the case of loss of cannabis products by theft shall only be allowed to the extent that the claimant is not indemnified against or recompensed in respect of the tax for such loss.

''(E) APPLICABILITY.—The provisions of this paragraph shall extend to and apply in respect of cannabis products lost after the tax was determined and before completion of the physical removal of the cannabis products from the bonded premises.

''(3) VOLUNTARY DESTRUCTION.—The proprietor of a cannabis production facility or other persons liable for the tax imposed by this chapter or by section 7652 with respect to any cannabis product in bond may voluntarily destroy such products, but only if such destruction is under such supervision and under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe.

''(4) LIMITATION.—Any claim for credit or refund of tax under this subsection shall be filed within 6 months after the date of the withdrawal from the market, loss, or destruction of the products to which the claim relates, and shall be in such form and contain such information as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe.

''(b) DRAWBACK OF TAX.—There shall be an allowance of drawback of tax paid on cannabis products, when shipped from the United States, in accordance with such regulations and upon the filing of such bond as the Secretary shall prescribe.

''Subchapter B—Occupational Tax

''Sec. 5911. Imposition and rate of tax.
''Sec. 5912. Payment of tax.
''Sec. 5913. Provisions relating to liability for occupational taxes.
''Sec. 5914. Application to State laws.

''SEC. 5911. IMPOSITION AND RATE OF TAX.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person engaged in business as a producer or an export warehouse proprietor shall pay a tax of $1,000 per year (referred to in this subchapter as an 'occupational tax') in respect of each premises at which such business is carried on.

''(b) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO REGISTER.—Any person engaged in business as a producer or an export warehouse proprietor who willfully fails to pay the occupation tax shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both, for each such offense.

''SEC. 5912. PAYMENT OF TAX.

''(a) CONDITION PRECEDENT TO CARRYING ON BUSINESS.—No person shall be engaged in or carry on any trade or business subject to the occupational tax until such person has paid such tax.

''(b) COMPUTATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The occupational tax shall be imposed—

''(A) as of on the first day of July in each year, or

''(B) on commencing any trade or business on which such tax is imposed.

''(2) PERIOD.—In the case of a tax imposed under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1), the occupational tax shall be reckoned for 1 year, and in the case of subparagraph (B) of such paragraph, it shall be reckoned proportionately, from the first day of the month in which the liability to such tax commenced, to and including the 30th day of June following.

''(c) METHOD OF PAYMENT.—

''(1) PAYMENT BY RETURN.—The occupational tax shall be paid on the basis of a return under such regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

''(2) STAMP DENOTING PAYMENT OF TAX.—After receiving a properly executed return and remittance of any occupational tax, the Secretary

shall issue to the taxpayer an appropriate stamp as a receipt denoting payment of the tax. This paragraph shall not apply in the case of a return covering liability for a past period.

"SEC. 5913. PROVISIONS RELATING TO LIABILITY FOR OCCUPATIONAL TAXES.

''(a) PARTNERS.—Any number of persons doing business in partnership at any one place shall be required to pay a single occupational tax.

''(b) DIFFERENT BUSINESSES OF SAME OWNERSHIP AND LOCATION.—Whenever more than one of the pursuits or occupations described in this subchapter are carried on in the same place by the same person at the same time, except as otherwise provided in this subchapter, the occupational tax shall be paid for each according to the rates severally prescribed.

''(c) BUSINESSES IN MORE THAN ONE LOCATION.—

''(1) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—The payment of the occupational tax shall not exempt from an additional occupational tax the person carrying on a trade or business in any other place than that stated in the records of the Internal Revenue Service.

''(2) STORAGE.—Nothing contained in paragraph (1) shall require imposition of an occupational tax for the storage of cannabis products at a location other than the place where such products are sold or offered for sale.

''(3) PLACE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term 'place' means the entire office, plant or area of the business in any one location under the same proprietorship.

''(B) DIVISIONS.—For purposes of this paragraph, any passageways, streets, highways, rail crossings, waterways, or partitions dividing the premises shall not be deemed sufficient separation to require an additional occupational tax, if the various divisions are otherwise contiguous.

''(d) DEATH OR CHANGE OF LOCATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the person who has paid the occupational tax for the carrying on of any business at any place, any person described in paragraph (2) may secure the right to carry on, without incurring any additional occupational tax, the same business at the same place for the remainder of the taxable period for which the occupational tax was paid.

''(2) ELIGIBLE PERSONS.—The persons described in this paragraph are the following:

''(A) The surviving spouse or child, or executor or administrator or other legal representative, of a deceased taxpayer.

''(B) A husband or wife succeeding to the business of his or her living spouse.

''(C) A receiver or trustee in bankruptcy, or an assignee for benefit of creditors.

''(D) The partner or partners remaining after death or withdrawal of a member of a partnership.

''(3) CHANGE OF LOCATION.—When any person moves to any place other than the place for which occupational tax was paid for the carrying on of any business, such person may secure the right to carry on, without incurring additional occupational tax, the same business at the new location for the remainder of the taxable period for which the occupational tax was paid. To secure the right to carry on the business without incurring additional occupational tax, the successor, or the person relocating their business, must register the succession or relocation with the Secretary in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

''(e) FEDERAL AGENCIES OR INSTRUMENTALITIES.—Any tax imposed by this subchapter shall apply to any agency or instrumentality of the United States unless such agency or instrumentality is granted by statute a specific exemption from such tax.

"SEC. 5914. APPLICATION TO STATE LAWS.

''The payment of any tax imposed by this subchapter for carrying on any trade or business shall not be held to—

''(1) exempt any person from any penalty or punishment provided by the laws of any State for carrying on such trade or business within such State, or in any manner to authorize the commencement or continuance of such trade or business contrary to the laws of such State or in places prohibited by municipal law, or

''(2) prohibit any State from placing a duty or tax on the same trade or business, for State or other purposes.

"Subchapter C—Bond and Permits

''Sec. 5921. Establishment and bond.
''Sec. 5922. Application for permit.
''Sec. 5923. Permit.

"SEC. 5921. ESTABLISHMENT AND BOND.

''(a) PROHIBITION ON PRODUCTION OUTSIDE OF BONDED CANNABIS PRODUCTION FACILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as authorized by the Secretary or on the bonded premises of a cannabis production facility duly authorized to produce cannabis products according to law, no cannabis product may planted, cultivated, harvested, grown, manufactured, produced, compounded, converted, processed, prepared, or packaged in any building or on any premises.

''(2) AUTHORIZED PRODUCERS ONLY.—No person other than a producer which has filed the bond required under subsection (b) and received a permit described in section 5923 may produce any cannabis product.

''(3) PERSONAL USE EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply with respect the activities of an individual who is not treated as a producer by reason of section 5902(b)(2)(B).

''(b) BOND.—

''(1) WHEN REQUIRED.—Every person, before commencing business as a producer or an export warehouse proprietor, shall file such bond, conditioned upon compliance with this chapter and regulations issued thereunder, in such form, amount, and manner as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. A new or additional bond may be required whenever the Secretary considers such action necessary for the protection of the revenue.

''(2) APPROVAL OR DISAPPROVAL.—No person shall engage in such business until he receives notice of approval of such bond. A bond may be disapproved, upon notice to the principal on the bond, if the Secretary determines that the bond is not adequate to protect the revenue.

''(3) CANCELLATION.—Any bond filed hereunder may be canceled, upon notice to the principal on the bond, whenever the Secretary determines that the bond no longer adequately protects the revenue.

"SEC. 5922. APPLICATION FOR PERMIT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Every person, before commencing business as a cannabis enterprise, and at such other time as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, shall make application for the permit provided for in section 5923. The application shall be in such form as the Secretary shall prescribe and shall set forth, truthfully and accurately, the information called for on the form. Such application may be rejected and the permit denied if the Secretary, after notice and opportunity for hearing, finds that—

''(1) the premises on which it is proposed to conduct the cannabis enterprise will not be adequate to protect the revenue after commencing operations, or

''(2) such person (including, in the case of a corporation, any officer, director, or principal stockholder and, in the case of a partnership, any partner) has failed to disclose any material information required or made any materially false statement in the application therefor.

"SEC. 5923. PERMIT.

''(a) ISSUANCE.—A person shall not engage in business as a cannabis enterprise without a permit to engage in such business. Such permit, conditioned upon compliance with this chapter and regulations issued thereunder, shall be issued in such form and in such manner as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe. A new permit may be required at such other time as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.

''(b) SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION.—

''(1) SHOW CAUSE HEARING.—If the Secretary has reason to believe that any person holding a permit—

''(A) has not in good faith complied with this chapter, or with any other provision of this title involving intent to defraud,

''(B) has violated the conditions of such permit,

''(C) has failed to disclose any material information required or made any material false statement in the application for such permit, or

''(D) has failed to maintain their premises in such manner as to protect the revenue,

the Secretary shall issue an order, stating the facts charged, citing such person to show cause why their permit should not be suspended or revoked.

''(2) ACTION FOLLOWING HEARING.—If, after hearing, the Secretary finds that such person has not shown cause why their permit should not be suspended or revoked, such permit shall be suspended for such period as the Secretary deems proper or shall be revoked.

''(c) INFORMATION REPORTING.—The Secretary may require—

''(1) information reporting by any person issued a permit under this section, and

''(2) information reporting by such other persons as the Secretary deems necessary to carry out this chapter.

''(d) INSPECTION OR DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.—For rules relating to inspection and disclosure of returns and return information, see section 6103(o).

"Subchapter D—Operations

''Sec. 5931. Inventories, reports, and records.
''Sec. 5932. Packaging and labeling.
''Sec. 5933. Purchase, receipt, possession, or sale of cannabis products after removal.
''Sec. 5934. Restrictions relating to marks, labels, notices, and packages.
''Sec. 5935. Restriction on importation of previously exported cannabis products.

"SEC. 5931. INVENTORIES, REPORTS, AND RECORDS.

''Every cannabis enterprise shall—

''(1) make a true and accurate inventory at the time of commencing business, at the time of concluding business, and at such other times, in such manner and form, and to include such items, as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, with such inventories to be subject to verification by any internal revenue officer,

''(2) make reports containing such information, in such form, at such times, and for such periods as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, and

''(3) keep such records in such manner as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, with such records to be available for inspection by any internal revenue officer during business hours.

"SEC. 5932. PACKAGING AND LABELING.

''(a) PACKAGES.—All cannabis products shall, before removal, be put up in such packages as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.

''(b) MARKS, LABELS, AND NOTICES.—Every package of cannabis products shall, before removal, bear the marks, labels, and notices if any, that the Secretary by regulation prescribes.

''(c) LOTTERY FEATURES.—No certificate, coupon, or other device purporting to be or to represent a ticket, chance, share, or an interest in, or dependent on, the event of a lottery shall be contained in, attached to, or stamped, marked, written, or printed on any package of cannabis products.

''(d) INDECENT OR IMMORAL MATERIAL PROHIBITED.—No indecent or immoral picture, print, or representation shall be contained in, attached to, or stamped, marked, written, or printed on any package of cannabis products.

''(e) EXCEPTIONS.—Subject to regulations prescribed by the Secretary, cannabis products may be exempted from subsections (a) and (b) if such products are—

''(1) for experimental purposes, or

''(2) transferred to the bonded premises of another producer or export warehouse proprietor or released in bond from customs custody for delivery to a producer.

''SEC. 5933. PURCHASE, RECEIPT, POSSESSION, OR SALE OF CANNABIS PRODUCTS AFTER REMOVAL.

''(a) RESTRICTION.—No person shall—

''(1) with intent to defraud the United States, purchase, receive, possess, offer for sale, or sell or otherwise dispose of, after removal, any cannabis products—

''(A) upon which the tax has not been paid or determined in the manner and at the time prescribed by this chapter or regulations thereunder, or

''(B) which, after removal without payment of tax pursuant to section 5904(a), have been diverted from the applicable purpose or use specified in that section,

''(2) with intent to defraud the United States, purchase, receive, possess, offer for sale, or sell or otherwise dispose of, after removal, any cannabis products which are not put up in packages as required under section 5932 or which are put up in packages not bearing the marks, labels, and notices, as required under such section, or

''(3) otherwise than with intent to defraud the United States, purchase, receive, possess, offer for sale, or sell or otherwise dispose of, after removal, any cannabis products which are not put up in packages as required under section 5932 or which are put up in packages not bearing the marks, labels, and notices, as required under such section.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (3) of subsection (a) shall not prevent the sale or delivery of cannabis products directly to consumers from proper packages, nor apply to such articles when so sold or delivered.

''(c) LIABILITY TO TAX.—Any person who possesses cannabis products in violation of paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (a) shall be liable for a tax equal to the tax on such articles.

''SEC. 5934. RESTRICTIONS RELATING TO MARKS, LABELS, NOTICES, AND PACKAGES.

''No person shall, with intent to defraud the United States, destroy, obliterate, or detach any mark, label, or notice prescribed or authorized, by this chapter or regulations thereunder, to appear on, or be affixed to, any package of cannabis products before such package is emptied.

''SEC. 5935. RESTRICTION ON IMPORTATION OF PREVIOUSLY EXPORTED CANNABIS PRODUCTS.

''(a) EXPORT LABELED CANNABIS PRODUCTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Cannabis products produced in the United States and labeled for exportation under this chapter—

''(A) may be transferred to or removed from the premises of a producer or an export warehouse proprietor only if such articles are being transferred or removed without tax in accordance with section 5904,

''(B) may be imported or brought into the United States, after their exportation, only if such articles either are eligible to be released from customs custody with the partial duty exemption provided in section 5904(d) or are returned to the original producer of such article as provided in section 5904(c), and

''(C) may not be sold or held for sale for domestic consumption in the United States unless such articles are removed from their export packaging and repackaged by the original producer into new packaging that does not contain an export label.

''(2) ALTERATIONS BY PERSONS OTHER THAN ORIGINAL PRODUCER.—This section shall apply to articles labeled for export even if the packaging or the appearance of such packaging to the consumer of such articles has been modified or altered by a person other than the original producer so as to remove or conceal or attempt to remove or conceal (including by the placement of a sticker over) any export label.

''(3) EXPORTS INCLUDE SHIPMENTS TO PUERTO RICO.—For purposes of this section, section 5904(d), section 5941, and such other provisions as the Secretary may specify by regulations, references to exportation shall be treated as including a reference to shipment to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

''(b) EXPORT LABEL.—For purposes of this section, an article is labeled for export or contains an export label if it bears the mark, label, or notice required under section 5904(b).

''Subchapter E—Penalties

''Sec. 5941. Civil penalties.

''Sec. 5942. Criminal penalties.

''SEC. 5941. CIVIL PENALTIES.

''(a) OMITTING THINGS REQUIRED OR DOING THINGS FORBIDDEN.—Whoever willfully omits, neglects, or refuses to comply with any duty imposed upon them by this chapter, or to do, or cause to be done, any of the things required by this chapter, or does anything prohibited by this chapter, shall in addition to any other penalty provided in this title, be liable to a penalty of $10,000, to be recovered, with costs of suit, in a civil action, except where a penalty under subsection (b) or (c) or under section 6651 or 6653 or part II of subchapter A of chapter 68 may be collected from such person by assessment.

''(b) FAILURE TO PAY TAX.—Whoever fails to pay any tax imposed by this chapter at the time prescribed by law or regulations, shall, in addition to any other penalty provided in this title, be liable to a penalty of 10 percent of the tax due but unpaid.

''(c) SALE OF CANNABIS OR CANNABIS PRODUCTS FOR EXPORT.—

''(1) Every person who sells, relands, or receives within the jurisdiction of the United States any cannabis products which have been labeled or shipped for exportation under this chapter,

''(2) every person who sells or receives such relanded cannabis products, and

''(3) every person who aids or abets in such selling, relanding, or receiving,

shall, in addition to the tax and any other penalty provided in this title, be liable for a penalty equal to the greater of $10,000 or 10 times the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter. All cannabis products relanded within the jurisdiction of the United States shall be forfeited to the United States and destroyed. All vessels, vehicles, and aircraft used in such relanding or in removing such cannabis products from the place where relanded, shall be forfeited to the United States.

''(d) APPLICABILITY OF SECTION 6665.—The penalties imposed by subsections (b) and (c) shall be assessed, collected, and paid in the same manner as taxes, as provided in section 6665(a).

''(e) CROSS REFERENCES.—For penalty for failure to make deposits or for overstatement of deposits, see section 6656.

''SEC. 5942. CRIMINAL PENALTIES.

''(a) FRAUDULENT OFFENSES.—Whoever, with intent to defraud the United States—

''(1) engages in business as a cannabis enterprise without filing the application and obtaining the permit where required by this chapter or regulations thereunder,

''(2) fails to keep or make any record, return, report, or inventory, or keeps or makes any false or fraudulent record, return, report, or inventory, required by this chapter or regulations thereunder,

''(3) refuses to pay any tax imposed by this chapter, or attempts in any manner to evade or defeat the tax or the payment thereof,

''(4) sells or otherwise transfers, contrary to this chapter or regulations thereunder, any cannabis products subject to tax under this chapter, or

''(5) purchases, receives, or possesses, with intent to redistribute or resell, any cannabis product—

''(A) upon which the tax has not been paid or determined in the manner and at the time prescribed by this chapter or regulations thereunder, or

''(B) which, without payment of tax pursuant to section 5904, have been diverted from the applicable purpose or use specified in that section,

shall, for each such offense, be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than 5 years, or both.

''(b) LIABILITY TO TAX.—Any person who possesses cannabis products in violation of subsection (a) shall be liable for a tax equal to the tax on such articles.''.

(c) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary's delegate, shall—

(1) conduct a study concerning the characteristics of the cannabis industry, including the number of persons operating cannabis enterprises at each level of such industry, the volume of sales, the amount of tax collected each year, and the areas of evasion, and

(2) submit to Congress recommendations to improve the regulation of the industry and the administration of the related tax.

(d) ANNUAL REPORTS REGARDING DETERMINATION OF APPLICABLE RATES.—Not later than 6 months before the beginning of each calendar year to which section 5901(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this section) applies, the Secretary of the Treasury, or the Secretary's delegate, shall make publicly available a detailed description of the methodology which the Secretary anticipates using to determine the applicable rate per ounce and the applicable rate per gram which will apply for such calendar year under section 5901(c)(2) of such Code.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 6103(o)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and firearms'' and inserting ''firearms, and cannabis products''.

(2) The table of chapters for subtitle E of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''CHAPTER 56. CANNABIS PRODUCTS''.

(3) The table of sections for subchapter A of chapter 98 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 9512. Establishment of Opportunity Trust Fund.''.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to removals, and applications for permits under section 5922 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by subsection (b)), after 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND PROGRAMS.

(a) CANNABIS JUSTICE OFFICE; COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) CANNABIS JUSTICE OFFICE.—Part A of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 109 the following:

''SEC. 110. CANNABIS JUSTICE OFFICE.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Office of Justice Programs a Cannabis Justice Office.

''(b) DIRECTOR.—The Cannabis Justice Office shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs. The Director shall report to the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs. The Director

shall award grants and may enter into compacts, cooperative agreements, and contracts on behalf of the Cannabis Justice Office. The Director may not engage in any employment other than that of serving as the Director, nor may the Director hold any office in, or act in any capacity for, any organization, agency, or institution with which the Office makes any contract or other arrangement.

''(c) EMPLOYEES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall employ as many full-time employees as are needed to carry out the duties and functions of the Cannabis Justice Office under subsection (d). Such employees shall be exclusively assigned to the Cannabis Justice Office.

''(2) INITIAL HIRES.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this section, the Director shall—

''(A) hire no less than one-third of the total number of employees of the Cannabis Justice Office; and

''(B) no more than one-half of the employees assigned to the Cannabis Justice Office by term appointment that may after 2 years be converted to career appointment.

''(3) LEGAL COUNSEL.—At least one employee hired for the Cannabis Justice Office shall serve as legal counsel to the Director and shall provide counsel to the Cannabis Justice Office.

''(d) DUTIES AND FUNCTIONS.—The Cannabis Justice Office is authorized to—

''(1) administer the Community Reinvestment Grant Program; and

''(2) perform such other functions as the Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Justice Programs may delegate, that are consistent with the statutory obligations of this section.''.

(2) COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT GRANT PROGRAM.—Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART PP—COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT GRANT PROGRAM

''SEC. 3056. AUTHORIZATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Cannabis Justice Office shall establish and carry out a grant program, known as the 'Community Reinvestment Grant Program', to provide eligible entities with funds to administer services for individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, including—

''(1) job training;

''(2) reentry services;

''(3) legal aid for civil and criminal cases, including expungement of cannabis convictions;

''(4) literacy programs;

''(5) youth recreation or mentoring programs; and

''(6) health education programs.

''(b) SUBSTANCE USE DISORDER SERVICES.—The Director, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall provide eligible entities with funds to administer substance use disorder services for individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs or connect patients with substance use disorder services. Also eligible for such services are individuals who have been arrested for or convicted of the sale, possession, use, manufacture, or cultivation of a controlled substance other than cannabis (except for a conviction involving distribution to a minor).

''SEC. 3057. FUNDING FROM OPPORTUNITY TRUST FUND.

''The Director shall carry out the program under this part using funds made available under section 9512(c)(1) and (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

''SEC. 3058. DEFINITIONS.

''In this part:

''(1) The term 'cannabis conviction' means a conviction, or adjudication of juvenile delinquency, for a cannabis offense (as such term is defined in section 13 of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act).

''(2) The term 'eligible entity' means a nonprofit organization, as defined in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code, that is representative of a community or a significant segment of a community with experience in providing relevant services to individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs in that community.

''(3) The term 'individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs' has the meaning given that term in section 6 of the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act.''.

(b) CANNABIS RESTORATIVE OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM; EQUITABLE LICENSING GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) CANNABIS RESTORATIVE OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall establish and carry out a program, to be known as the ''Cannabis Restorative Opportunity Program'', to provide loans and technical assistance under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) to assist small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals that operate in eligible States or localities.

(2) EQUITABLE LICENSING GRANT PROGRAM.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall establish and carry out a grant program, to be known as the ''Equitable Licensing Grant Program'', to provide any eligible State or locality funds to develop and implement equitable cannabis licensing programs that minimize barriers to cannabis licensing and employment for individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, provided that each grantee includes in its cannabis licensing program at least four of the following elements:

(A) A waiver of cannabis license application fees for individuals who report an income below 250 percent of the Federal Poverty Level for at least 5 of the past 10 years and who are first-time applicants for a cannabis license.

(B) A prohibition on the denial of a cannabis license based on a conviction for a cannabis offense that took place prior to State legalization of cannabis or the date of enactment of this Act, as appropriate.

(C) A prohibition on restrictions for licensing relating to criminal convictions except with respect to a criminal conviction related to owning and operating a business.

(D) A prohibition on cannabis license holders engaging in suspicionless cannabis drug testing of their prospective or current employees, except with respect to drug testing for safety-sensitive positions required under part 40 of title 49, Code of Federal Regulations.

(E) The establishment of a cannabis licensing board that is reflective of the racial, ethnic, economic, and gender composition of the eligible State or locality, to serve as an oversight body of the equitable licensing program.

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ELIGIBLE STATE OR LOCALITY.—The term ''eligible State or locality'' means a State or locality that has taken steps to—

(i) create an automatic process, at no cost to the individual, for the expungement, destruction, or sealing of criminal records for cannabis offenses; and

(ii) eliminate violations or other penalties for persons under parole, probation, pre-trial, or other State or local criminal supervision for a cannabis offense.

(B) INDIVIDUAL ADVERSELY IMPACTED BY THE WAR ON DRUGS.—The term ''individual adversely impacted by the War on Drugs'' means an individual—

(i) who reports an income below 250 percent of the Federal Poverty Level for at least 5 of the past 10 years; and

(ii) who has been arrested for or convicted of the sale, possession, use, manufacture, or cultivation of cannabis (except for a conviction involving distribution to a minor), or whose parent, sibling, spouse, or child has been arrested for or convicted of such an offense.

(C) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN OWNED AND CONTROLLED BY SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED INDIVIDUALS.—The term ''small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals'' has the meaning given in section 8(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)).

(D) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, any territory or possession of the United States, and any Indian Tribe (as defined in section 201 of Public Law 90–294 (25 U.S.C. 1301) (commonly known as the ''Indian Civil Rights Act of 1968'')).

(c) STUDY ON PROGRAMS.—

(1) GAO STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall conduct an annual study on the individuals and entities receiving assistance under the Cannabis Restorative Opportunity and Equitable Licensing Programs. This study shall include the types of assistance by state, and a description of the efforts by the Small Business Administration to increase access to capital for cannabis-related small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, individuals adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, as well as the racial, ethnic, economic and gender composition of the eligible State or locality.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report on the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1) to—

(A) the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives;

(B) the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives; and

(D) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate.

SEC. 7. AVAILABILITY OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) DEFINITIONS RELATING TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(gg) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—In this Act:

''(1) CANNABIS.—The term 'cannabis'—

''(A) means—

''(i) all parts of the plant Cannabis sativa L., whether growing or not;

''(ii) the seeds thereof;

''(iii) the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and

''(iv) every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds or resin; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) hemp, as defined in section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946;

''(ii) the mature stalks of such plant, fiber produced from such stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of such plant, any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination; or

''(iii) any drug product approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, or biological product licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

''(2) CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESS.—The term 'cannabis-related legitimate business' means a manufacturer, producer, or any person or company that is a small business concern and that—

''(A) engages in any activity described in subparagraph (B) pursuant to a law established by a State or a political subdivision of a State, as

determined by such State or political subdivision; and

''(B) participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products.

''(3) SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term 'service provider'—

''(A) means a business, organization, or other person that—

''(i) sells goods or services to a cannabis-related legitimate business; or

''(ii) provides any business services, including the sale or lease of real or any other property, legal or other licensed services, or any other ancillary service, relating to cannabis; and

''(B) does not include a business, organization, or other person that participates in any business or organized activity that involves handling cannabis or cannabis products, including cultivating, producing, manufacturing, selling, transporting, displaying, dispensing, distributing, or purchasing cannabis or cannabis products.''.

(b) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.—Section 21(c) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) SERVICES FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—A small business development center may not decline to provide services to an otherwise eligible small business concern under this section solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.''.

(c) WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTERS.—Section 29 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(p) SERVICES FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—A women's business center may not decline to provide services to an otherwise eligible small business concern under this section solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.''.

(d) SCORE.—Section 8(b)(1)(B) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(b)(1)(B)) is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''The head of the SCORE program established under this subparagraph may not decline to provide services to an otherwise eligible small business concern solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.''.

(e) VETERAN BUSINESS OUTREACH CENTERS.—Section 32 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657b) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) SERVICES FOR CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—A Veteran Business Outreach Center may not decline to provide services to an otherwise eligible small business concern under this section solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.''.

(f) SECTION 7(a) LOANS.—Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(38) LOANS TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Administrator may not decline to provide a guarantee for a loan under this subsection, and a lender may not decline to make a loan under this subsection, to an otherwise eligible small business concern solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.''.

(g) DISASTER LOANS.—Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (15) the following new paragraph:

''(16) ASSISTANCE TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Administrator may not decline to provide assistance under this subsection to an otherwise eligible small business concern solely because such concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.''.

(h) MICROLOANS.—Section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(14) ASSISTANCE TO CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—The Administrator may not decline to make a loan or a grant under this subsection, and an eligible intermediary may not decline to provide assistance under this subsection to an otherwise eligible borrower, eligible intermediary, or eligible nonprofit entity (as applicable) solely because such borrower, intermediary, or nonprofit entity is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider.''.

(i) SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT COMPANY DEBENTURES TO FINANCE CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.—Part A of title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 681 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 321. DEBENTURES TO FINANCE CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.

''(a) GUARANTEES.—The Administrator may not decline to purchase or guarantee a debenture made under this title to an otherwise eligible small business investment company solely because such small business investment company provides financing to an entity that is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider (as defined in section 7(a)(38) of the Small Business Act).

''(b) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—A small business investment company may not decline to provide assistance under this title to an otherwise eligible small business concern solely because such small business concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider (as defined in section 7(a)(38) of the Small Business Act).''.

(j) STATE OR LOCAL DEVELOPMENT COMPANY LOANS.—Title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 511. LOANS TO FINANCE CANNABIS-RELATED LEGITIMATE BUSINESSES AND SERVICE PROVIDERS.

''(a) LOANS AND LOAN GUARANTEES.—The Administrator may not decline to make or provide a guarantee for a loan under this title to an otherwise eligible qualified State or local development company solely because such qualified State or local development company provides financing to an entity that is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider (as defined in section 7(a)(38) of the Small Business Act).

''(b) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—A qualified State or local development company may not decline to provide assistance under this title to an otherwise eligible small business concern solely because such small business concern is a cannabis-related legitimate business or service provider (as defined in section 7(a)(38) of the Small Business Act).''.

SEC. 8. NO DISCRIMINATION IN THE PROVISION OF A FEDERAL PUBLIC BENEFIT ON THE BASIS OF CANNABIS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person may be denied any Federal public benefit (as such term is defined in section 401(c) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1611(c))) on the basis of any use or possession of cannabis, or on the basis of a conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency for a cannabis offense, by that person.

(b) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—Federal agencies may not use past or present cannabis or marijuana use as criteria for granting, denying, or rescinding a security clearance.

SEC. 9. NO ADVERSE EFFECT FOR PURPOSES OF THE IMMIGRATION LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of the immigration laws (as such term is defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act), cannabis may not be considered a controlled substance, and an alien may not be denied any benefit or protection under the immigration laws based on any event, including conduct, a finding, an admission, addiction or abuse, an arrest, a juvenile adjudication, or a conviction, relating to the possession or use of cannabis that is no longer prohibited pursuant to this Act or an amendment made by this Act, regardless of whether the event occurred before, on, or after the effective date of this Act.

(b) CANNABIS DEFINED.—The term ''cannabis''—

(1) means all parts of the plant Cannabis sativa L., whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds or resin; and

(2) does not include—

(A) hemp, as defined in section 297A of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946;

(B) the mature stalks of such plant, fiber produced from such stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of such plant, any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination; or

(C) any drug product approved under section 505 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, or biological product licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT.—The Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 212(h), by striking ''and subparagraph (A)(i)(II) of such subsection insofar as it relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana'';

(2) in section 237(a)(2)(B)(i), by striking ''other than a single offense involving possession for one's own use of 30 grams or less of marijuana'';

(3) in section 101(f)(3), by striking ''(except as such paragraph relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marihuana)'';

(4) in section 244(c)(2)(A)(iii)(II) by striking ''except for so much of such paragraph as relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana'';

(5) in section 245(h)(2)(B) by striking ''(except for so much of such paragraph as related to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marijuana)'';

(6) in section 210(c)(2)(B)(ii)(III) by striking '', except for so much of such paragraph as relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marihuana''; and

(7) in section 245A(d)(2)(B)(ii)(II) by striking '', except for so much of such paragraph as relates to a single offense of simple possession of 30 grams or less of marihuana''.

SEC. 10. RESENTENCING AND EXPUNGEMENT.

(a) EXPUNGEMENT OF NON-VIOLENT FEDERAL CANNABIS OFFENSE CONVICTIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS NOT UNDER A CRIMINAL JUSTICE SENTENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, each Federal district shall conduct a comprehensive review and issue an order expunging each conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency for a non-violent Federal cannabis offense entered by each Federal court in the district before the date of enactment of this Act and on or after May 1, 1971. Each Federal court shall also issue an order expunging any arrests associated with each expunged conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency.

(2) NOTIFICATION.—To the extent practicable, each Federal district shall notify each individual whose arrest, conviction, or adjudication

of delinquency has been expunged pursuant to this subsection that their arrest, conviction, or adjudication of juvenile delinquency has been expunged, and the effect of such expungement.

(3) RIGHT TO PETITION COURT FOR EXPUNGEMENT.—At any point after the date of enactment of this Act, any individual with a prior conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency for a non-violent Federal cannabis offense, who is not under a criminal justice sentence, may file a motion for expungement. If the expungement of such a conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency is required pursuant to this Act, the court shall expunge the conviction or adjudication, and any associated arrests. If the individual is indigent, counsel shall be appointed to represent the individual in any proceedings under this subsection.

(4) SEALED RECORD.—The court shall seal all records related to a conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency that has been expunged under this subsection. Such records may only be made available by further order of the court.

(b) SENTENCING REVIEW FOR INDIVIDUALS UNDER A CRIMINAL JUSTICE SENTENCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For any individual who is under a criminal justice sentence for a non-violent Federal cannabis offense, the court that imposed the sentence shall, on motion of the individual, the Director of the Bureau of Prisons, the attorney for the Government, or the court, conduct a sentencing review hearing. If the individual is indigent, counsel shall be appointed to represent the individual in any sentencing review proceedings under this subsection.

(2) POTENTIAL REDUCED RESENTENCING.—After a sentencing hearing under paragraph (1), a court shall—

(A) expunge each conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency for a non-violent Federal cannabis offense entered by the court before the date of enactment of this Act, and any associated arrest;

(B) vacate the existing sentence or disposition of juvenile delinquency and, if applicable, impose any remaining sentence or disposition of juvenile delinquency on the individual as if this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, were in effect at the time the offense was committed; and

(C) order that all records related to a conviction or adjudication of juvenile delinquency that has been expunged or a sentence or disposition of juvenile delinquency that has been vacated under this Act be sealed and only be made available by further order of the court.

(c) EFFECT OF EXPUNGEMENT.—An individual who has had an arrest, a conviction, or juvenile delinquency adjudication expunged under this section—

(1) may treat the arrest, conviction, or adjudication as if it never occurred; and

(2) shall be immune from any civil or criminal penalties related to perjury, false swearing, or false statements, for a failure to disclose such arrest, conviction, or adjudication.

(d) EXCEPTION.—An individual who at sentencing received an aggravating role adjustment pursuant to United States Sentencing Guideline 3B1.1(a) in relation to a Federal cannabis offense conviction shall not be eligible for expungement of that Federal cannabis offense conviction under this section.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''Federal cannabis offense'' means an offense that is no longer punishable pursuant to this Act or the amendments made under this Act.

(2) The term ''expunge'' means, with respect to an arrest, a conviction, or a juvenile delinquency adjudication, the removal of the record of such arrest, conviction, or adjudication from each official index or public record.

(3) The term ''under a criminal justice sentence'' means, with respect to an individual, that the individual is serving a term of probation, parole, supervised release, imprisonment, official detention, pre-release custody, or work release, pursuant to a sentence or disposition of juvenile delinquency imposed on or after the effective date of the Controlled Substances Act (May 1, 1971).

(f) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall conduct a demographic study of individuals convicted of a Federal cannabis offense. Such study shall include information about the age, race, ethnicity, sex, and gender identity of those individuals, the type of community such users dwell in, and such other demographic information as the Comptroller General determines should be included.

(g) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to Congress the results of the study conducted under subsection (f).

SEC. 11. REFERENCES IN EXISTING LAW TO MARIJUANA OR MARIHUANA.

Wherever, in the statutes of the United States or in the rulings, regulations, or interpretations of various administrative bureaus and agencies of the United States—

(1) there appears or may appear the term ''marihuana'' or ''marijuana'', that term shall be struck and the term ''cannabis'' shall be inserted; and

(2) there appears or may appear the term ''Marihuana'' or ''Marijuana'', that term shall be struck and the term ''Cannabis'' shall be inserted.

SEC. 12. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act, or any application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of this Act and the amendments made by this Act to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

SEC. 13. CANNABIS OFFENSE DEFINED.

For purposes of this Act, the term ''cannabis offense'' means a criminal offense related to cannabis—

(1) that, under Federal law, is no longer punishable pursuant to this Act or the amendments made under this Act; or

(2) that, under State law, is no longer an offense or that was designated a lesser offense or for which the penalty was reduced under State law pursuant to or following the adoption of a State law authorizing the sale or use of cannabis.

SEC. 14. RULEMAKING.

Unless otherwise provided in this Act, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Justice, and the Small Business Administration shall issue or amend any rules, standard operating procedures, and other legal or policy guidance necessary to carry out implementation of this Act. After the 1-year period, any publicly issued sub-regulatory guidance, including any compliance guides, manuals, advisories and notices, may not be issued without 60-day notice to appropriate congressional committees. Notice shall include a description and justification for additional guidance.

SEC. 15. SOCIETAL IMPACT OF MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION STUDY.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall, not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, provide to Congress a study that addresses the societal impact of the legalization of recreational cannabis by States, including—

(1) sick days reported to employers;

(2) workers compensations claims;

(3) tax revenue remitted to States resulting from legal marijuana sales;

(4) changes in government spending related to enforcement actions and court proceedings;

(5) Federal welfare assistance applications;

(6) rate of arrests related to methamphetamine possession;

(7) hospitalization rates related to methamphetamine and narcotics use;

(8) uses of marijuana and its byproducts for medical purposes;

(9) uses of marijuana and its byproducts for purposes relating to the health, including the mental health, of veterans;

(10) arrest rates of individuals driving under the influence or driving while intoxicated by marijuana;

(11) traffic-related deaths and injuries where the driver is impaired by marijuana;

(12) arrest of minors for marijuana-related charges;

(13) violent crime rates;

(14) school suspensions, expulsions, and law enforcement referrals that are marijuana-related;

(15) high school dropout rates;

(16) changes in district-wide and State-wide standardized test scores;

(17) marijuana-related hospital admissions and poison control calls;

(18) marijuana-related juvenile admittances into substance rehabilitation facilities and mental health clinics;

(19) diversion of marijuana into neighboring States and drug seizures in neighboring States;

(20) marijuana plants grown on public lands in contravention to Federal and State laws; and

(21) court filings under a State's organized crime statutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3617.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3617, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act, or the MORE Act, is long-overdue legislation that would reverse decades of failed Federal policies based on the criminalization of marijuana. It would also take steps to address the heavy toll these policies have taken across the country, particularly among communities of color.

□ 0915

For far too long, we have treated marijuana as a criminal justice problem, instead of as a matter of personal choice and public health. Whatever one's views are on the use of marijuana for recreational or medicinal use, the policy of arrests, prosecution, and incarceration at the Federal level has proven both unwise and unjust.

That is why the MORE Act would set a new path forward and would begin to correct some of the injustices of the last 50 years. The bill decriminalizes

marijuana at the Federal level by removing it from the Controlled Substances Act. This change applies retroactively to prior and pending convictions. It does not, however, undermine the ability of States to apply their criminal laws to marijuana or to legalize and regulate it as they see fit.

The bill also eliminates barriers to medical research, allows the VA to recommend medical marijuana to veterans living with PTSD, and it allows financial institutions to service the marijuana industry. It provides for expungement or resentencing of certain Federal marijuana arrests and convictions and supports expungement programs at the State and local levels.

In addition, the bill authorizes a sales tax on marijuana sales and directs those revenues to an Opportunity Trust Fund to support communities harmed by the war on drugs. It also establishes a wide range of grant programs to support equal access to the benefits of decriminalization.

When it comes to our immigration laws, the bill prospectively and retroactively ensures that marijuana will not be considered a controlled substance, directly mirroring the protection and relief under the criminal justice provisions of the bill. This protects individuals from the collateral consequences for marijuana activity and ensures that immigrants can participate in their State's legal cannabis industry.

In recent years, 36 States and the District of Columbia have legalized medical cannabis. Nineteen States and the District of Columbia have legalized cannabis for adult recreational use.

If States are the laboratories of democracy, it is long past time for the Federal Government to recognize that legalization has been a resounding success and that the conflict with Federal law has become untenable.

While I am proud to be the sponsor of this legislation, there are many people who are responsible for getting us to this point today. I want to thank them for their efforts.

This includes Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, the mother of this movement, and Congressman BLUMENAUER, whose dogged persistence was critical to moving this legislation forward. Congressman COHEN has also been a long-time champion and an important voice in the movement for reform, as has Congresswoman JACKSON LEE, who helped shepherd this legislation to the floor.

I also want to thank Chairman NEAL, who has been a critical partner in drafting the revenue provisions in this bill and in helping move this legislation to the floor, as well as Chairman MCGOVERN, who structured a good debate on this bill.

Finally, Speaker PELOSI, Whip CLYBURN, and Chairman JEFFRIES have all been steadfast in their support of this legislation, and I want to particularly thank Majority Leader HOYER for everything he has done to bring this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, criminal penalties for marijuana offenses, and the resulting collateral consequences, are unjust and harmful to our society. The MORE Act comprehensively addresses these injustices, and I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there is a war raging in Ukraine, killing thousands and thousands of innocent people.

Gasoline, diesel, and grocery prices are through the roof.

For all practical purposes, we don't have a southern border anymore, so hundreds of thousands of immigrants continue to flood into the United States, and the situation there is about to get much worse.

Rampant inflation is making short work of the hard-earned money of all Americans, but the main priority for the Democrats this week isn't Ukraine, skyrocketing gasoline prices, 8 percent inflation, or the border crisis. No. Instead, it is marijuana.

It has been obvious for years that at some point, marijuana was going to be formally legalized. What is deeply and truly disturbing, however, about this bill is its failure to address the clear consequences of legalization—such as what this drug does to children, to drivers on our highways, to the mental health of up to 30 percent of those adults who choose to use marijuana, to communities inundated with hundreds, if not thousands, of foreign cartel-operated, unlicensed, and out-of-control marijuana growers, and finally, to those who actually try to produce cannabis, marijuana, legally.

Let's take a closer look at Oregon, my State, to see what really happens when marijuana is legalized without careful and necessary thought.

The picture behind me is a hoop house. It is about 100-feet long and 50-feet wide. At current retail, it will produce about $6 million worth of marijuana a year.

The next picture is a picture of a grow consisting of 30 to 40 hoop houses. By the way, these are all in my district in southern Oregon. And if each of these hoop houses is in full production, 40 hoop houses would generate $240 million, at retail, of marijuana each year.

To put this in perspective, there are currently 180 grows like this in Jackson County, Oregon, alone, many of which are illegal. Hundreds upon hundreds of hoop houses.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a video taken from a helicopter of approximately 180 grows in Jackson County be entered into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair can't entertain that request.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I will move on.

These operations are, in large part, unlicensed, uncontrolled, unregulated, operated on stolen water, ignoring building codes, ignoring land use laws, ignoring labor laws, and importing thousands upon thousands of immigrants to work in squalor and in fear.

Why? Because the Federal Government has refused to help the overwhelmed local law enforcement officers meet the huge challenge these cartels present.

In fact, months ago, I directly asked Attorney General Garland and again, several weeks ago, for his assistance in getting the FBI, Homeland Security, and the DEA to help us in southern Oregon, and I have heard nothing, absolutely nothing, back from him.

This is why it is essential that any bill dealing with legalization include significant money for law enforcement. We are certainly not getting any help from the Attorney General.

This picture behind me is what the living conditions are like for the immigrants working for the cartels.

We are experiencing one of the worst droughts in the history of the western United States. Water is gold in my district. Cartels are stealing water and using it to grow marijuana.

Water regulators in southern Oregon have been threatened with death by cartel members when they have tried to stop water theft. Here is a picture of some of the stolen water.

When the crop is harvested, hoop houses are abandoned, the migrant laborers disappear, and the mess is left for someone else to clean up. Here is what that looks like.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the record the Politico article labeled ''. . . Why Legal Weed Didn't Kill Oregon's Black Market,'' dated January 14, 2022.

''TALK ABOUT CLUSTERF---': WHY LEGAL WEED DIDN'T KILL OREGON'S BLACK MARKET

Cave Junction, Ore.—The first unlicensed cannabis grow popped up near Gary Longnecker's remote Southern Oregon home seven years ago. Now there are six farms surrounding the densely-forested property. ''Last night I woke up at 12:30 with gunshots. [Then again] this morning, seven o'clock,'' Longnecker said as he and I walked his land in November. ''That's them intimidating all of us neighbors to keep out of their face.'' A Vietnam veteran and former firefighter, Longnecker retired to the woods of southern Oregon almost 30 years ago to get some peace and quiet, but that's not exactly what he's found. Historically a logging community, the residents of the Illinois Valley near Cave Junction are still drastically outnumbered by trees—and they prefer it that way. In most places, you could yell at the top of your lungs from your front door without another soul hearing. Many people in the county own a gun, and typically aim them at deer or bears—not their neighbors. But since the cannabis farmers moved in (none of whom appear to be licensed based on state records), Longnecker says he's had bullets whiz by his head when working outside, and regularly hears gunshots in the middle of the night. Trash and toilet paper are littered around the thin wire fence that separates his forested land from each cannabis farm. As Longnecker gave me a tour of his property, a few people could be seen moving around on the property through the scattered pine trees and partially-deconstructed hoop houses. Longnecker's partner called out to them in broken Spanish, since she believed

most of the workers were Hispanic. No one answered. A few moments later, shots rang out. ''So that's called intimidation,'' Longnecker said as we hurried away. It's a word that I heard often when I spoke with residents about their marijuana-growing neighbors. Over the last two years, there's been such an influx of outlaw farmers that southern Oregon now rivals California's notorious Emerald Triangle as a national center of illegal weed cultivation. Even though marijuana cultivation has been legal in Oregon since 2014, Jackson County Sheriff Nate Sickler says there could be up to 1,000 illegal operations in a region of more than 4,000 square miles. The Oregon Liquor and Cannabis Commission, which oversees the state's $1.2 billion legal cannabis industry, estimates the number of illicit operations is double that. Local law enforcement officials believe that people from every U.S. state and as many as 20 countries have purchased property in Jackson or Josephine counties. Cartels roll in and offer long-time residents as much as a million dollars in cash for their property, and hoop houses follow soon after the sale is complete. Residents have become accustomed to hearing Bulgarian, Chinese, Russian and even Hebrew spoken at the grocery store. ''Two weeks ago, we took down a Bulgarian operation and in the same week an Argentinian operation,'' said Josephine County Sheriff Dave Daniel, adding that they've also recently dealt with Chinese- and Mexican-run oufits. ''A lot of these organizations, before the legal market came into effect, would grow in the forest lands—they'd be up in the hills,'' explained Obie Strickler, a licensed cannabis grower in Josephine County. ''Now they're . . . right out in the open.'' What is happening in the woods of the southern Oregon represents one of the most confounding paradoxes of the legalized marijuana movement: States with some of the largest legal markets are also dealing with rampant illegal production—and the problem is getting worse. Oklahoma, where licenses to cultivate medical marijuana are some of the easiest to get in the nation, has conducted more than five dozen raids on illicit grows since last April. In California, meanwhile, most of the state continues to purchase cannabis from unlicensed sources—straining legal operators already struggling with the state's high taxes and fees. It wasn't supposed to be this way. One of the underlying promises for legalizing cannabis was that legalization would make the illegal drug trade, with all its attendant problems of violent crime and money laundering, disappear. But 25 years into the legalization movement, as 36 states have adopted some form of legalized marijuana, the black market is booming across the country. Legal states such as Oregon and California—which have been supplying the nation for nigh on 60 years—are still furnishing the majority of America's illegal weed.

Oregon's weed is some of the cheapest in the nation, and Oregonians predominantly purchase weed from licensed dispensaries. Economist Beau Whitney estimates that 80–85 percent of the state's demand is met by the legal market. But most of the illicit weed grown in southern Oregon is leaving the state, heading to places where legal weed is still not available for purchase 'such as New York or Pennsylvania—or where the legal price is still very high, like Chicago and Los Angeles. In Illinois, which legalized medical marijuana in 2013, only about a third of the demand for cannabis is satisfied by legal dispensaries, according to Whitney. Differences in tax rate and regulations plays the major role in differences from state to state, Whitney explains. Unlicensed growers aren't paying any fees or taxes, and they can afford to keep their prices at least 20 percent lower than legal weed—the benchmark Whitney says is the difference in consumers purchasing legal versus illegal products.

''It all comes down to economics,'' said Whitney. ''If you reduce the price, then there's no, or little, or less, incentive [for consumers] to participate in [the] illicit market because you're getting the price that you want . . . that's the tipping point.'' The macro-economics of the marijuana market are small consolation to residents of Oregon, who say they are caught in a regulatory gap between state law, which fully legalized cannabis in 2014, and federal law, which still considers cannabis to be as illegal as heroin. The one exception in federal law is for hemp, a low-THC cannabis plant which looks virtually identical to the naked eye. Officials say that some of Oregon's illegal farms are masquerading as hemp producers to escape federal oversight. There are just more than 1,000 licensed marijuana and hemp farms in Jackson and Josephine counties, but a recent test of the region's hemp farms found that more than half were illegally growing marijuana—not the low-THC hemp. ''[They] easily danced into the hemp program and got administrative protection,'' said Oregon Liquor and Cannabis Commission Executive Director Steve Marks. ''They inundated that program.'' On top of that, there could be a thousand or more unlicensed grows that never bothered with a hemp license. The impact of the booming illegal trade is being felt by overburdened law enforcement that can't keep up with the illegal operations that seem to sprout with abandon, but it is also exhausting the patience of residents who were key to making Oregon one of the first states to legalize medical marijuana in the late 1990s. ''The danger of what's going on and the fear and worry folks in southern Oregon are feeling about their safety cannot be overstated,'' Sen. Ron Wyden (D–Ore.), the influential chairman of the Finance Committee, told POLITICO in December. ''And it's all the more reason why federal cannabis prohibition is just not working.'' Nicole Rensenbrink, a 62-year-old social worker, travels daily along a curving two-lane road that weaves between groves of tall trees and dozens of farms before finally passing the local high school. Along her seven-minute commute to work, she passes 14 marijuana cultivation or processing sites. She's not an expert, but she can tell that many of them are illegal by the lack of proper signs and the number of hoop houses that exceed the legal limits. But it's the unforeseen consequences—the damage to the environment, not to mention a general fear for her safety—that most troubles her. ''I and my husband both voted for cannabis legalization. I'm liberal, [an] old hippie type. I don't want people to go to jail for smoking pot or dealing a little weed.'' Rensenbrink said. ''But I regret it. At this point, I really regret it. People have grown marijuana illegally in southern Oregon for at least half a century. It was easy to conceal illicit activity in private woods and national forests when the nearest human could easily be a few miles away. But there's nothing hidden about what's going on now. The Red Mountain Golf Course, a 24-acre plot of land just outside Grants Pass, the county seat, sold for just over half a million dollars in June 2021. Three months later, Josephine County Sheriffs and Oregon State Troopers raided the former golf course and seized more than 4,000 marijuana plants and arrested two people on charges of felony marijuana manufacture. It wasn't an isolated incident. Around the same time, law enforcement seized 380 pounds of processed marijuana stuffed in a car abandoned at the scene of a crash. Cops also seized 7,600 marijuana and hemp plants, 5,000 pounds of processed marijuana and $210,000 in cash from two grow operations just outside Cave Junction. Two men were arrested and held for unlawful manufacture of a marijuana item and other charges. While these eyepopping figures draw headlines, the raids are just a cost of doing business for the cartels, according to law enforcement officials. Many buy or lease six or seven properties, knowing that some might get shut down by the police. Like any smart entrepreneurs, the cartels budget for those losses. ''They know that the resources for law enforcement and our ability to combat this issue [are such that] they can overwhelm us,'' Daniel said. The proliferation of unlicensed cannabis farms is scaring local residents and scarring the landscape. Personal wells have run dry and rivers have been illegally diverted. Piles of trash litter abandoned grow sites. Locals report having knives pulled on them, and growers showing up on their porches with guns to make demands about local water use. Multiple women say they've been followed long distances by strange vehicles. Locals regularly end conversations with an ominous warning: ''Be careful.'' Debbie, who retired from the Napa County Sheriff's Department in California, has little faith in Josephine County's law enforcement. Debbie, who requested her last name not be used for fear of reprisal from the drug dealers, says that officers didn't show up when ten gun shots whizzed past her husband's head while he was sitting on the porch, or when the neighbor's pit bulls chased her from the mailbox back up to her own home. When Debbie reported her neighbors to the sheriff's department, they asked her to photograph the license plates of the growers next door, but she was spotted taking pictures.

''[The growers] stalked me and chased me all the way down Placer Road,'' she said.

The problem has gotten so bad that residents and local officials have called for the Oregon National Guard to be called in. Democratic Gov. Kate Brown hasn't taken that step yet, but in December she called a special session in which lawmakers approved $25 million to address Oregon's illicit grows. $20 million of that funding is designated for law enforcement to increase staff and resources, while $5 million is dedicated for oversight of water use and water theft. Earlier in the year, the legislature passed a bill, sponsored by Republican state Rep. Lily Morgan, that increased penalties for growing cannabis illegally and gave state regulators the authority to investigate hemp growers. Jackson County Sheriff Nate Sickler says the tougher rules for hemp cultivation and the money lawmakers funneled to local enforcement efforts are an excellent start.

''If we're able to get our positions funded, I really think we can make a significant impact [on] illegal marijuana,'' said Sickler. ''Are they going to go away? It's probably never going to happen.'' The illicit market isn't just a law enforcement problem, however; it's actually having an effect on the environmental health of the region.

Chris Hall has spent months surveilling cannabis farms in Josephine County's Illinois River Valley from the air. The community organizer with the Illinois Valley Soil & Water Conservation District is compiling a map of illicit grows checked against state licensing information.

On a weekday afternoon in November, Hall explored the debris-filled Q Bar X Ranch site, taking photographs for his records. In August, it took about 250 law enforcement officers—called in from state and federal agencies—to raid the ranch. Officials seized 200,000 marijuana plants and found more than 130 workers at the site, according to the Josephine County Sheriff's department. At the main site, a new fence with ''no trespassing'' signs warned off curious visitors.

Behind that fence were the ruins of a massive cannabis operation: multiple white hoop houses, now in tatters; ramshackle buildings where workers likely lived; PVC pipes, tarps, buckets, and empty containers of fertilizer and pesticides.

Down the road, the second site was in an even greater state of disarray. Huge gashes had been cut into the earth, and a crevice was filled with bottles of fertilizer and pesticides. The banks of a stream were laden with what seemed like the contents of an entire convenience store snack and soda section. ''You want to talk about clusterf---, here it is,'' Hall said, shaking his head as he saw that the creek bisecting the grow site was lined with plastic. ''The [creek] bed is the most sensitive natural habitat that we have,'' Hall said. ''To line it with plastic, particularly black plastic, is to kill everything underneath it.'' Hall was hired because the soil and water district was inundated with complaints from local residents about the negative impacts on their water sources. The $5 million that Morgan's bill recently allocated for water-resource issues is meant to address this problem.

Reclaiming land and waterways after illicit growing occurs, though, is an expensive and complex undertaking. A U.S. House member proposed allocating $25 million in last year's federal budget for shuttering and reclaiming grow sites on national forest land, though it was removed from the final bill. Even if that funding eventually gets approved, it could only be used to target a small sliver of the illicit grows in Josephine and Jackson counties, since most are on private property.

''If this was going on [closer to Eugene or Portland], you better believe the state of Oregon would stomp this out in a hot second,'' Hall said—but added that many of the region's residents are famously resistant to government intervention, especially from the state capitol four hours north. ''You know, sometimes you get what you asked for. . . . [Southern Oregonians] have been telling [the state government] to leave you alone, so we're gonna just leave you alone.''

There are as many suggested solutions to southern Oregon's weed problem as there are factors creating it. Some say tweaks to federal and state hemp regulations—and more money for law enforcement—will get the illicit grows under control. Others argue that only federal decriminalization will solve the problem, because it would reduce the market for illicit weed.

Anti-legalization advocates, meanwhile, point to Oregon's woes as proof that legalization doesn't live up to its promise of eliminating the illicit market.

''Legalization exacerbates the issue of illicit growing operations because it increases the demand for the product,'' Kevin Sabet told POLITICO. ''With more users emerging throughout the state, more sellers—both legal and illegal—begin working to match the supply. The state has done little to curb demand because it has little incentive to do so.''

On the last point, John Hudak of the Brookings Institute says that the rampant illicit operations in Oregon aren't likely to be replicated in more densely-populated states like Connecticut or Rhode Island. ''I don't think there's a direct connection between legalization and this situation happening,'' said Hudak, an expert on cannabis policy who also volunteers as part of the Coalition for Cannabis Policy, Education, and Regulation—a think tank funded in part by Molson Coors and Constellation Brands (which owns Corona). Constellation Brands has already entered the cannabis beverage market. ''There's sort of geographic aspects to why it thrives in certain states,'' Hudak added. ''This is more likely to happen on a large scale in larger states with rural spaces than it would be in smaller, urban states.'' Instead, Hudak argues that the illicit market will continue to thrive in legal states as long as cannabis remains federally illegal. It isn't clear when full legalization could happen, though—if ever. A federal decriminalization bill proposed in 2021 by Wyden, Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer and Sen. Cory Booker (D–NJ) has only been seen by the general public in draft form, and it isn't clear when it will be formally introduced in Congress. The draft version of that decriminalization bill would levy high taxes against the cannabis industry, which Whitney, the economist, argues would push prices higher and give illicit growers continued market access.

Cautionary tales like Oregon's won't move the federal needle, either, Hudak cautions. The lawmakers who understand the impact of the federal-state cannabis policy gap, he says, are the ones who already support legalization. Moreover, there have already been many other stories about the problems created by the policy gap—such as the impact siloed markets have on the environment or the inability of cannabis farmers and store owners to get reliable insurance to cover looters or forest fires—and federal policy has remained the same.

The problem, cannabis advocates say, is not that legalization has failed. Rather it's that the country hasn't legalized enough. Until many more states—and the federal government—decide to legalize cannabis, those advocates say, the illicit weed problem is going to continue, even in legal states. The patchwork of still-illegal states—including some of the country's most populous—creates tootempting a market for illicit growers.

''We don't have a [moonshine] business in the country . . . that is challenging Budweiser or Grey Goose,'' Hudak said. ''Alcohol is widespread legal. And until we get on that same page with cannabis, this is going to be a continuing problem.''

The OLCC's Marks, though, argues that blanket legalization won't solve all of the problems because hemp and marijuana will still be regulated separately at the federal level—hemp through the Department of Agriculture and marijuana through the FDA or the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau.

''Frankly, the federal government has plenty of responsibility and accountability for the regulation of legal hemp and THC,'' Marks said. ''Making regulators bifurcate the plan under an old federal definition of marijuana and a newer one of hemp is creating unaccountability, craziness and a bad market.'' Oregon tweaked its hemp rules this year to make THC testing more enforceable. Meanwhile, the 2023 farm bill is up for discussion in Washington, D.C. this year, but there has not been much chatter on Capitol Hill about making hemp oversight more stringent.

Economist Beau Whitney argues that focusing on hemp regulations is a misplaced solution because many cartels don't bother to hide behind hemp licenses.

''They're focusing in on small hemp farmers instead of the real problem, which is international cartels,'' Whitney said. ''Until there's some way in which to have a coordinated enforcement against the illicit cartels, this is going to perpetuate.''

While experts and lawmakers in Salem and Washington, D.C. go back and forth over the solutions, southern Oregonians will continue to live with the impact of divergent cannabis laws. ''The people in Salem and the people in Grants Pass don't understand that we're living under this intimidation,'' Gary Longnecker said, talking about the Oregon state capital and his county's seat of government. ''To sit here and be ignored by the people who are supposed to represent you, not even get a staff member to call you back, is so, so frustrating,'' he said. He's glad that Oregon's legislature adopted tougher rules for hemp growers, but doesn't think it's nearly enough to solve the problem. ''You can't just keep throwing a little bit of money out [here], because . . . it's like whack a mole. Take this one out, and four more pop up over here.''

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely essential that any bill legalizing marijuana include significant funding for law enforcement which will be absolutely and predictably necessary to control the cartels that will flood into the farming areas such as southern Oregon.

Simply setting up a penalty, as this bill does, for failing to register will not work without the concurrent means of enforcement. Do not let the defunding-the-police thinking that currently is in this bill lead the Nation into the same ecological human and social disaster we now face in Oregon.

The bill fails to address impairment. It fails to address the ever-increasing potency of the drug. It fails to address the age at which marijuana could be legally used.

It fails to address the impact the bill's 5 percent and quickly rising to 8 percent gross receipts tax, when added to the State and local taxes, will have in driving the black market sources of marijuana. The Federal tax, when added in, will make legal marijuana almost 30 percent more expensive than that which is on the black market.

The bill fails to correctly clarify the differences between marijuana and hemp. This is essential if the hemp market is to be protected from the policies and regulations associated with marijuana.

This bill is the wrong approach.

We should be addressing the crises created by the Biden administration, not passing an incomplete, inadequate, and damaging to our children and communities stimulus marijuana bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I would command the attention of the gentleman to the sections of the bill that deal with all the different problems he raised.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a member of the committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for my time.

I rise in support of the MORE Act which would finally reform how we deal with marijuana laws and how we should. Mr. BENTZ said we should put more money into law enforcement. That is the opposite of what we should do.

Decriminalizing means cops spend less time busting people for marijuana possession and more time looking for people committing violent crime. That is a better use of law enforcement time.

Maurice Hinchey and Sam Farr on this side of the aisle knew it when they were here. They sponsored bills, as did Don Young and Dana Rohrabacher on the other side of the aisle, because it was a Libertarian freedom issue.

It is no secret the war on drugs failed. Harry Anslinger started it in the 1930s, and he vilified Hispanic Americans and said this was a way to get them.

Then Richard Nixon even had a commission that said we should decriminalize marijuana but then decided, because of Ehrlichman and Haldeman, that, no, the Nixon strategy was better designed at going after marijuana because Blacks and hippies who protested the war were his opponents, and we needed to go after them.

So they turned it around, they never legalized it as the commission said they should, and they made the war on drugs worse. It then went on and on.

Marijuana is less dangerous than alcohol. People do not smoke marijuana and beat up their wives or get angry and beat up others or drive their cars in wildly dangerous conditions at fast speeds and kill others.

Congress has been out of step on this issue. It is called cultural lag. We are finally coming around to rescheduling it from Schedule I where it is in a class with heroin and methamphetamines, which is absurd. We should have research.

We must deschedule marijuana. We must decriminalize it at the Federal level. Now is the time to do some remedies to our Federal marijuana laws. This is an historic time.

I thank Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, and the others who have championed this bill, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and let's move forward and do the right thing.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention that I have read the bill very carefully, and there is nothing in the bill allocating money to law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD).

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for yielding.

Our country continues to suffer under the many crises created by the Biden administration and Democrat policies; you know, the border crisis, the crime crisis, the inflation crisis, the energy crisis. And yet, the priority of this Congress now turns to expanding access to addictive, behavior-altering, recreational drugs at a time when our country is also experiencing increased addiction, depression, and suicide.

What is worse, we want to target those individuals and communities who are historically most impacted by the harm of illegal drugs and provide Federal funding to help enable criminals to open and operate now legal drug businesses.

We have rising violent crime in Democrat-run cities across the country. More drug use won't help that.

We had 100,000 Americans die of overdoses last year, the leading cause of death in Americans ages 18 to 45. More drug use won't help that.

Our government, schools, and our education systems are failing us. More drug use won't help that.

But, in fact, this legislation has no prohibitions on edible forms of marijuana, flavored vape products, or other efforts to target, specifically, teens and young people.

Meanwhile, we have surrendered operational control of our southern border to the Mexican crime cartels, and we have got fentanyl and other dangerous drugs streaming into our country at historic levels because of this President's open border policies.

Of course, what is his solution? Let's end Title 42 which is predicted to increase the daily crossings from the current 7,000 a day to as much as 18,000 a day. That is over half a million a month.

How might this impact the illegal drug trade across our country? Law enforcement tells me that legalizing marijuana will force the criminal element to redouble their efforts into hard, more dangerous drugs to replace the profit that has been lost from marijuana.

You can also look at the States that have already legalized it, and you can see the increased addiction, dependency, and homelessness that this has cost. We should be ashamed of ourselves for this legislation, and I oppose this bill.

□ 0930

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), the distinguished chairman of the Democratic Caucus.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership, as well as all of my colleagues who have worked on the MORE Act.

Richard Nixon began the failed war on drugs a little over 50 years ago, in 1971. At the time, there were less than 300,000 Americans incarcerated in this country. Today, there are 2.3 million, disproportionately Black and Latino. Many of those individuals who have been incarcerated are there because of nonviolent drug offenses, often marijuana possession and use.

The United States of America incarcerates more people than any other country in the world, including per capita China and Russia combined. That is a stain on our democracy.

We have an overcriminalization problem in America. We have a mass incarceration problem in America. We have a prison industrial complex in America. It doesn't advance public safety, and it hurts economic development. It has ruined individuals, ruined lives, ruined families, and ruined communities, particularly in communities of color.

It is time to end the Federal cannabis prohibition. It is time to deschedule it. It is time to decriminalize marijuana. It is time to invest in communities in a way that makes sense, both from a public safety standpoint as well as a fairness, equity, and justice standpoint. It is time to pass the MORE Act.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention that there is about $400 million that would have been raised last year under this bill had this tax been in place, and none of that money goes to public safety. It goes to rebuild community space but not public safety.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, how is it that we here in Congress, in the face of all the domestic and international crises that we are facing right now, that we are here talking about decriminalizing and descheduling marijuana?

Now, we are all going to go home this weekend, and what are our constituents going to be talking about? They are going to be talking about the price of gas. They are going to be talking about the price of food. They are going to be talking about the price that they have to pay to heat their homes.

They are going to turn on the TV. What are they going to see? They are going to see in real time Ukrainians being bombed by Russia, fleeing for their lives.

And what are we doing here in Congress? Talking about marijuana? You have got to be kidding me.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, I am a pharmacist. I know addiction. I know and I have studied addiction. I can tell you, marijuana is nothing more than a gateway drug. It leads to other harder drugs. Don't try to justify this by saying, Oh, alcohol is a drug and it is legalized. That is not what we do. That makes no sense whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, we had a hearing in the Energy and Commerce Committee. We had 10 parents before us whose children had died due to opioid addiction. Not 8 out of 10, not 9 out of 10, but 10 out of 10 of those parents said they smoked marijuana to begin with; 10 out of 10. It is a gateway drug that leads to harder drugs.

This is not a Republican-Democrat situation here. This is an American problem. You know that we had 100,000 Americans die of overdose last year.

Mr. Speaker this is misguided. This is wrong. This is not what we should be discussing.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the MORE Act, legislation that takes an important step in rectifying some of the harm caused by the failed war on drugs.

The enforcement of marijuana laws has been a major driver of mass incarceration in the United States. Hundreds of thousands of people are arrested each year for marijuana-related charges, very often just possession.

This has, in turn, led to our Federal prison system operating at 103 percent of capacity, and too many of these offenders are serving time for nonviolent drug-related crimes.

A drug-related conviction, even for possession, can be devastating for the rest of a person's life, making it difficult or even impossible to vote, get a job, be approved for a loan, or even qualify for a government program. As we know, these consequences have had massively disproportionate impact on communities of color, as Chairman JEFFRIES just mentioned.

This current system, frankly, doesn't work. It doesn't make any sense—not for community safety, not for the functioning of an effective prison system, and not for successful rehabilitation.

By removing marijuana from the Federal controlled substances list, allowing for the expungement of marijuana offenses, and providing support to communities most impacted by the failed war on drugs, the MORE Act is a long overdue step in restoring justice and reversing the harms caused by the war on drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman NADLER for his extraordinary leadership on this issue. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation and to support it here today. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting ''yes'' in reversing the gross injustice that the war on drugs has produced and bring sensible policy back into place.

I again want to end by thanking everyone who has worked on this for so many years, but particularly our chairman for his passionate and strong leadership.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is great to be here. I got a kick out of the gentleman from Tennessee showing his age. He is talking about pot when it was 2 percent THC. He is thinking pot is still this drug where people get goofy and they eat Cheetos and nacho cheese Doritos.

He is not talking about the 99 percent THC pot that is being sold in some of these States where they have legalized recreational pot. I think that is really fun and anachronistic; very good to go back and think about how things were in the late 1960s, early 1970s.

Let's talk about a Mother Jones article that I have before me where they are analyzing the use of pot, and they are talking about, hey, look, this is what happens, you start seeing paranoia and psychosis come in. They are referring to New Zealand studies, long-term longitudinal studies about the dangers of pot.

That is interesting. We are not going to even talk about that because we don't have time to talk about that because we are focusing here on descheduling marijuana. What that does is that incentivizes marijuana use and distribution.

But this bill is also reckless in its approach. It provides no limits on or requirements to clearly identify the potency of marijuana or its extracts or concentrates. In 1995, for instance, the THC concentration was about 4 percent on average. Today, it goes between 20 and 99 percent.

It also doesn't deal with what the Surgeon General says needs to be the case, that the minimum age limit should be age 25. This doesn't get into any age limit. It doesn't cover that, yet that is what the Surgeon General says.

In fact, the Surgeon General's advisory says the human brain continues to develop from birth into the mid 20s, vulnerable to the effects of addictive substances, I don't know, like marijuana. In fact, it goes on to say frequent marijuana use during adolescence is associated with changes in the areas of the brain involving attention, memory, decision-making, and motivation.

Adolescent marijuana use is associated with declines in IQ, school performance and attendance, and life satisfaction, increased rates of suicide attempts.

You know what this bill does? It is a lot of fun, folks. What it does is, it says you can distribute this, under Federal law anyway, you can distribute this to an 11-year-old kid. The 11-year-old kid is going to have marijuana, be able to use it. You can't do anything to them here for that, that is for sure.

What it does do is it creates a tax crime. It creates a tax crime. You get rid of your marijuana crime, it creates some tax crimes. We all know how great the Tax Code is for ease of use and understanding.

Section 3 of the bill removes marijuana from the schedule of the Controlled Substances Act. It would no longer be a Federal crime to possess or sell marijuana, including to 11 year olds. Section 5, however, puts it into the Tax Code.

I think there is another fun aspect here. It talks about 600,000 arrests annually yet, the reality is that is for State and local crimes. In fact, there were 1,100 marijuana convictions in 2020 under Federal law. You know what those convictions were? Those were for transport and distribution. Now you are not going to be able to get to anybody for that.

Let's talk about how well this has worked in the L.A. Times pieces that talk about this. The L.A. Times does a massive exposé. What do they find out? They say Prop 64 was going to solve all these problems, solve the problems. Instead what you have are thousands of illegal grow dispensaries. Why? Because they have a Byzantine code like what these guys are setting up here today. So you have a crisis in L.A. County, San Bernardino County and also in Riverside County.

Those grow farms use forced labor, as Mr. BENTZ so eloquently talked about, the Oregon grow farms. These are being run in southern California by the cartels, who originate in Mexico, Ukraine, Russia, Bulgaria, and China. Yeah, that is what you are going to do, you are going to Federalize this. Well done. This is a piece of garbage. I oppose this legislation.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the lead sponsor, Chairman NADLER, for problem solving, along with Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Congresswoman LEE, and all of those who galvanized all of us. I was pleased to be able to lead this through the Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security Subcommittee.

The war on drugs simply failed, and I am glad that one interpretation that has just been evidenced by my good friend on the other side of the aisle will have little weight and little basis because what we are doing here is solving a problem.

Let me just indicate from the Health Affairs Culture of Health, a Black person is still nearly four times more likely to be arrested for cannabis possession than a White person.

To summarize this bill, it deals with Federal decriminalization, taxation, and expungement. It does not stop the DA, the Department of Justice, the FBI or anyone else from doing their job. The bill would remove cannabis from the list or schedule of federally controlled substances.

This means that, going forward, individuals can no longer be prosecuted federally for marijuana offenses. This does not mean that marijuana would now be legal throughout the United States. The bill would simply remove the Federal Government from the business of prosecuting marijuana cases, which would leave the question of legality to individual States. Forty-seven States already have some form of legal use of marijuana.

Let me share, my friends, the points that they are going to make. The bill was designed to help individuals who have been caught up in the criminal justice system for possessing more small amounts of marijuana for personal use. It was not designed to help drug traffickers.

By the way, the President has given over a billion dollars to Ukraine as one of the steadfast leaders and has galvanized NATO and our allies, and not one of us needs to challenge the President or any one of us in our fight to help Ukraine.

Let me make it very clear about crime. Read the President's budget. He has a massive piece in there to reduce crime. It is everywhere, including rural America, where Republicans say they are, but I don't look at it that way. It is Americans, we stand together. This bill is about America.

The expungement provisions are limited to nonviolent marijuana possession convictions that have loaded up our Federal prisons. If an individual has other criminal convictions in addition to a covered nonviolent offense,

marijuana offense, the bill already includes a stated exemption for drug kingpins, meaning anyone who received an increased sentence for being a leader or organizer of drug trafficking will not qualify for expungement.

Once this bill is passed, it would enable individuals to possess and use marijuana for personal use. Marijuana will be regulated as a commodity, but let me tell you what else will happen. We will be able to research, the scientists will be able to study what is happening to our young people, our juveniles if that is the case. We have a definitive position in there about helping those who may become addicted. We do not overlook those who might as well be using it, so let us go forward with this bill. I ask support for the bill.

This bill was designed to help individuals who have been caught up in the criminal justice system for possessing small amounts of marijuana for personal use. It was not designed to help drug traffickers.

The expungement provisions are limited to nonviolent marijuana possession convictions only. If an individual has other criminal convictions in addition to a covered nonviolent marijuana offense, those other convictions will not be expunged. The bill already includes a stated exemption for "drug kingpins," meaning anyone who received an increased sentence for being a leader or organizer of drug trafficking will not qualify for an expungement.

Once passed, this bill would enable individuals to possess and use marijuana for a personal use. Marijuana will be a regulated commodity like alcohol and the transportation, distribution, or selling of marijuana without complying with federal regulations will continue to be illegal. For example, an individual will not be able to transport marijuana across the border without complying with import regulations and appropriate tax requirements.

The bill already includes a requirement that a study be conducted to understand the societal impacts of decriminalizing marijuana, including the impact on juveniles, education, transportation, veterans, employment, and many others.

Because marijuana will now be considered a commodity or good to be sold and purchased, like alcohol and even cigarettes, the MORE Act preserves the FDA's ability to issue regulations to address the regulation, safety, manufacturing, product quality, marketing, labeling, and sale of products containing cannabis or cannabis derived compounds.

Cannabis will be regulated along the same lines as alcohol and cigarettes, which have age requirements for consumption, sale, and purchase.

Regulation of cannabis protects children and minors because the black market and street dealers are not required to ask for the age or ID of their customers, unlike permitted and regulated sellers.

Driving while impaired is illegal in the United States. The MORE Act does not change this fact.

Impaired driving occurs when someone operates a vehicle while impaired by a substance like marijuana, or any other drug, including prescribed and over-the-counter medicines, or alcohol. Law enforcement officers are trained to detect impairment of drivers by substances other than alcohol through field sobriety tests.

Many states have supported the establishment of Drug Recognition and Classification programs within their State and local police, and the training of special Drug Recognition Experts, which are law enforcement officers trained to identify drug-impaired driving using a 12-step, standardized evaluation that includes behavioral tests and physical assessments to determine impairment among seven categories of drug classification.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO).

□ 0945

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Our country is facing a national security crisis, an energy crisis, a border crisis, and an economic crisis, but here we are, voting on cannabis legislation.

How is this helping our constituents who are paying sky-high prices at the gas pump? How does this strengthen our military and help secure America? How does this address Biden's record-breaking surge of illegal immigrants at our southern border? How does this help us to leave a stronger, safer, more secure America for our children and our children's children?

Simple answer: It doesn't.

We are here today to vote to get America high.

In States with legalized marijuana, there are more marijuana-related emergency room visits and hospitalizations than any other category.

Patients in a study using marijuana to treat pain, anxiety, and depression failed to report improved symptoms, and the continued use of marijuana brought risk of addiction known as cannabis abuse disorder.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse found that about 30 percent of marijuana users have some form of use disorder. In Colorado, the Speaker's home State and the leading State for legalizing marijuana, there was a 25 percent increase in CUD among 12- to 17-year-olds.

These are our children. Allowing children, who don't know how to rationalize long-term effects of drugs, to use a gateway drug for recreational or medicinal purposes is reckless, negligent, careless, and irresponsible.

The MORE Act does not responsibly end Federal prohibition of cannabis. The MORE Act does not end the war on drugs. All it does is poison our children and weaken our society.

This flawed legislation is not time sensitive, does not require consideration this week, and should not take priority over the various serious issues our country currently faces.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and put our children first, not the dope dealers.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).

Mr. CORREA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the MORE Act.

This legislation is a very simple but very important piece of legislation. It does three basic things.

Number one, it legalizes cannabis by removing it from the Controlled Substance Act. Number two, it establishes a process to expunge cannabis-related convictions. Number three, it taxes cannabis.

Mr. Speaker, it is time.

Thirty-seven States in our Nation have already legalized cannabis. Even Canada has legalized cannabis, and other nations around the world are legalizing cannabis. Even the Israelis are selling cannabis-related medicine.

It is time, Mr. Speaker.

But this is just the start. Cannabis farmers can't enroll in crop insurance. They can't receive the official organic designation. They can't access USDA programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is well beyond time. Please vote for this legislation. Vote for common sense. Let's vote for the MORE Act.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In response to this bill helping farmers, I just want to say it does not. What it does is it puts a tax on top of their product. When added to the Oregon tax, it would be almost 30 percent. That does not encourage farmers to raise the crop because they can't compete against the black market. There has to be far more thought given to what will be an 8 percent additional cost.

By the way, it is a gross receipts tax. It is on top of the gross receipts, not that net profit that you are supposed to get.

Secondly, the bill, as written, fails to distinguish between hemp and marijuana. This must be done if the folks in each space are going to grow properly.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Chairman NADLER, ranking members, this is an important piece of legislation. How do I know that? Because the people have told us that.

Every time they have had the opportunity to vote in America, they have voted to do this. They know that filling our prisons and creating criminal records for people who use marijuana—and knowing full well that if they are people of color, the possibilities of adverse consequences are geometrically greater.

I tell my colleagues, I am tired of hearing this argument that, "Oh, my goodness, we are doing this. We ought to be doing something else."

We are all working on issues of great concern not only to us but to the global community: on the war in Ukraine; on the criminal activities that Putin is subjecting us to; on inflation, a critical problem for all of our people. We are working on that. We are having trouble getting some legislation in the Senate

that will bring down inflation and bring down costs for the American people—not on our side of the aisle.

So, when I hear this argument, ''Oh, we ought to be doing this. We ought to be doing that. We ought to be doing the other,'' this is an important, fair piece of legislation, fair for the American people.

I thank Chairman NADLER. I thank the Judiciary Committee. I thank Members on my side of the aisle. I thank BARBARA LEE, who is walking down the aisle right now, who has worked so hard on this.

Why did she work so hard on it? Because she knows the extraordinary unfairness of the application of existing laws. You don't have to argue that. Just look at the statistics, and you find that to be the case.

Chairman NADLER has long been a champion of decriminalizing marijuana and addressing the systemic injustices and inequities resulting from the war on drugs. I was a supporter of the war on drugs. I have been here a long time.

The gentleman who spoke about this as a gateway drug, it is not a gateway drug. I have been convinced of that.

Marijuana has been legalized in 19 States. That is 40 percent of our States, save one, and the District of Columbia. Medical marijuana is legal in 36 States. This is not out of the ordinary. This is what the American people tell us they think is the appropriate thing to do.

Now, for some in this House, those who are treated with inequality, particularly in this area, you are on your own. Make it out for yourself. We are not going to address it because we have other issues.

Of course, we have other issues, and we pass bills on those—unfortunately, not with much support from the other side of the aisle.

Despite the changes in State laws and social norms around the usage of marijuana, its use remains illegal under Federal law. The gentleman who is presiding over the House today comes from a State that has said that is not good policy. Now, that is not some wacko coastal State. It is Colorado.

Despite changes in State laws and social norms, as I have said, its use remains illegal under Federal law, often resulting in devastating consequences. Hear me, my colleagues: devastating consequences for Black, Latino, and Native communities.

Now, I am not any of those. I would tell you, when I was in college in the 1800s, it was alcohol. We were not the generation of drugs; it was alcohol. It devastated the lives of literally hundreds of thousands of young people. But nobody cried out to make it illegal. They tried that, of course, in the twenties.

According to the Center for American Progress, Black Americans are four times more likely than White Americans to be arrested for marijuana possession, even though they use it at similar rates.

The gentleman who spoke asked why we are dealing with this. For the same reason our Founders said that we believe in equality, that all men—and they surely would add women today—are created equal and ought to be treated fairly and equally. Four times more convictions and prosecutions for people of color—that is why we are dealing with this, because it is unfair in America.

Those criminal records can haunt people of color and impact the trajectory of their lives and careers indefinitely. I regret that there are some Members of our Congress who apparently think that is not worthy of attention.

It can result in difficulty in finding employment, difficulty in finding housing, denial of access to government benefits, denial of financial aid at colleges and universities, and denial of the right to vote. That is why we are dealing with this, because the adverse consequences to people are substantial and negative, and negative not only for them but for our country.

The legislation before us would remove marijuana from the list of scheduled substances under the Controlled Substances Act, allowing our police departments—which we want to fund, by the way, so get off that line that we want to defund the police—allow our police departments to focus on serious crimes. The legislation before us would remove marijuana from that list.

The bill already, by the way, includes a requirement that a study will be conducted to understand the societal impacts of decriminalizing marijuana, including the impact on juveniles, education, transportation, veterans, employment, and many others.

This bill also expunges the records of individuals convicted of nonviolent—let me repeat that—nonviolent cannabis offenses and provides resources for job training, reentry services, and youth recreation and mentoring programs.

Now, if you take the position that all of these people are on their own and want no help from us or get no help from us, then perhaps you don't care.

This bill also addresses the disproportionate economic impact of the war on drugs by providing access to small-business grants, opening up the legal marketplace to communities that have been largely excluded.

This bill is a matter of justice and equal opportunity. It is about addressing systemic inequities and reforming our criminal justice system so that Americans and America can become a better, stronger, more fair, and more just America.

That is why we are spending time on this bill today.

I thank my friend one more time, Chairman NADLER, for his leadership on this bill. I also thank Mr. NEAL for helping us get this bill to the floor. I also thank BARBARA LEE, my dear friend.

BARBARA LEE and I have been working for some years now on how to lift people out of poverty into the middle class. We talk a lot about the middle class, and the way you grow the middle class is to let people who aren't in it in it so they can contribute to making a better, stronger America.

□ 1000

This bill will help that because it will take the stigma away from four times as many people of color being stigmatized by our laws.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, support this bill. The people of Mississippi supported this bill when they went to the polls and voted—not on this bill, that is not accurate—but on the decriminalization of marijuana, because they knew that it was neither necessary to be criminalized, and they knew the adverse impacts.

I don't ask you to support something the people of California did or the people of New York, or even Maryland, but think about supporting the people of Mississippi, who voted on a policy that would make a fair and more just America.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to mention that it was noted that we never asked the people if they would support legalization of marijuana. That is not correct. North Dakota Measure 3 failed. Missouri Proposition C to legalize marijuana failed. Ohio Issue 3 failed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a motion to recommit on behalf of members of our communities who have tragically lost their lives to substance use disorder, SUD.

Prior to the COVID–19 public health emergency, our country faced a different kind of enemy that knew no bounds. This Chamber was once united in the battle against addiction. And I was proud of the legislative work we did to address this crisis most recently through the SUPPORT Act. Unfortunately, all the progress we made seemed to evaporate with the onset of the pandemic and the resulting lockdowns, mandates, social isolation, and fear of an invisible enemy.

Recently, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention announced that 105,752 Americans died from drug overdoses from October 2020 to October 2021.

Let me repeat that: 105,752 Americans died from drug overdoses in one year's time.

Many of these deaths can be directly attributed to fentanyl, which is now the leading cause of death in Americans aged 18 to 45. Down at our southern border, Customs and Border Protection are confiscating record amounts of fentanyl coming across the Mexican border.

The CBP seized over 11,201 pounds of fentanyl from October 2020 to September 2021, which is a 41 percent increase from the year before. That is

enough fentanyl to kill 2.5 billion people, or the entire U.S. population, seven times over.

To address this crisis, I introduced the HALT Fentanyl Act with my friend, the gentleman from the Ninth District of Virginia. This legislation will permanently schedule fentanyl-related substances as schedule I and enable researchers to continue to study schedule I substances for possible medical benefits. We must do everything we can to save lives, and I implore my colleagues to support this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, if we adopt the motion to recommit, I will instruct the Committee on the Judiciary to consider my amendment to H.R. 3617, to permanently place fentanyl-related substances in schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation because it is long overdue for our Federal laws to catch up with the legal reality in almost every State in the Union, and because Federal reform must place restorative justice as the top priority.

I thank Speaker PELOSI, Chairman NADLER, and my fellow chairs for once again bringing this legislation to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, voters in States like New York have led the way in changing their cannabis laws, emphasizing restorative justice for our most marginalized communities. This bill takes a meaningful approach to undo the wrongs of the failed war on drugs by removing cannabis as a schedule I drug and encouraging States to expunge low-level possession records.

Importantly, the MORE Act also helps entrepreneurs access affordable capital to start a legitimate business, which too often is a barrier to entrepreneurship for people of color regardless of industry.

As chair of the Committee on Small Business, I am proud the MORE Act includes measures my colleagues and I championed to ensure SBA programs, like the flagship 7(a) Loan Program, the disaster loan program, and Small Business Development Center resources, are available to legitimate cannabis businesses. The MORE Act is the best proposal to ensure communities disproportionately impacted by the prohibition of cannabis are best positioned to profit from its legalization.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes.''

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Record crime, record inflation, record gas prices, record number of illegal immigrants crossing our southern border.

And what are Democrats doing today? Legalizing drugs; legalizing drugs and using American tax dollars to kick-start and prop up the marijuana industry. Wow. Such a deal for the American people. Every major urban area has increased crime, and Democrats are legalizing drugs and propping up the marijuana industry.

Mr. Speaker, 40-year high inflation. It hasn't been this high since 1982. We have some Members not even born then. Record inflation, and Democrats are focusing on legalizing drugs and kick-starting the marijuana industry.

Record gas prices, $6 gas in California; $4 gas everywhere else, and Democrats are legalizing drugs and helping the marijuana industry.

And, of course, 2 million illegal immigrants crossed our southern border in the last 14 months, and Democrats are legalizing drugs and helping the cannabis industry.

Oh, and by the way, we could be focused on this issue: We have a Justice Department that is treating parents as domestic terrorists, spying on moms and dads who simply show up at school board meetings. We know that is going on, putting a threat tag label on parents, this designation, this label, on moms and dads simply standing up for their kids. And Democrats are focused on legalizing drugs and helping the cannabis industry.

The Democrat majority leader said, Why are we dealing with this today? You know why they are dealing with this today? Because they can't deal with the real problems facing the American people. The left won't let them. You think the left is going to let them do what needs to be done to bring down gas prices?

We sat in a hearing a few months ago. One of our Democrat colleagues in that hearing—we had the CEO of the oil and gas company—he went down the line and said, Will you pledge today to decrease production? They want less oil and gas. Literally, he went down the list. I said, What do you want, $8 gas? And the truth is, they do.

The left will not let the Democrats do what needs to be done to the help the inflation problem, the energy problem, the illegal immigration problem on our southern border. So what do they do? They legalize drugs.

Wow. Wow. This is wrong, and everybody knows it. Let's focus on the thing that matters for—as the majority leader said—for middle-class families who are having to drive to work, pick their kids up at school, take their kids to Little League practice, spending four and five bucks a gallon to get them there and back. Let's focus on the things that matter.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, this bill will greatly reduce crime by redefining as not crimes things that are now considered crimes. And by releasing people in jail who should not be in jail, it will produce justice and it will reduce the expenses to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), who has been such a great champion in the fight for this legislation.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3617, the MORE Act.

I thank Speaker PELOSI, Leader HOYER, and Chairman NEAL. And let me just thank Chairman NADLER for his persistence, his perseverance, and really hanging in there and bringing this to the floor, because he knows what the issues are, and he knows how important this is to repair the damage of the lives of so many people.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank Congressman BLUMENAUER, my partner on so many issues and, of course, our Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PERLMUTTER, who is in the Chair today, and everyone who has helped to bring this to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, my condolences today are with the family of our colleague, the late Representative Don Young, a champion on this issue. I honor his memory today as the founding member and co-chair of the Cannabis Caucus, who voted for the MORE Act the first time it came to the floor.

Also, let me thank our advocates for educating the public on this issue, which, of course, helped our Members of Congress learn more about the importance of this, that this is also a racial justice bill. It is the product of the work of so many for a long time.

Mr. Speaker, of course, I salute our staff, Amy, Julie, Samira, Gregory, Kayla—so many staff. As a former staff member, look, I know how this was done, so I thank our staff for really doing the heavy lifting on this.

Mr. Speaker, the MORE Act, yes, it includes my legislation, the Marijuana Justice Act, and the REFER Act, which is the first marijuana racial justice bill introduced in Congress many years ago. This bill would end Federal prohibition and decriminalize cannabis by removing it from the list of the Controlled Substances Act. That is what the MORE Act does.

Make no mistake, yes, it is a racial justice bill. According to the ACLU, Black Americans are nearly four times more likely to be arrested for cannabis-related crimes than White Americans, despite equal rates of use. These arrests can have a detrimental impact on a person's quality of life and can lead to difficulty finding employment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, it is a multibillion-dollar industry also that brings tax revenue of billions to our States. Over 950 are people arrested daily for marijuana-related offenses. This is truly unjust. So we must end this failed policy of marijuana prohibition, which has led to the shattering of so many lives, primarily Black and Brown people. And yes, that is extremely important.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to repair the damage. It is time to provide equal justice for those who have been unduly incarcerated. Public opinion supports this.

In fact, over 50 years ago, the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse, or the Shafer Commission, formally recommended to Congress this be done. We are doing it today.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), another great champion of this legislation.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman for his courtesy and his leadership, and all the people that my friend, BARBARA LEE, just acknowledged.

Mr. Speaker, a century ago, we were in the midst of a prohibition against alcohol. And the problems that my dear friend from Oregon highlighted in terms of the prohibition against cannabis, I agree with him about the horrific situation in southern Oregon, and I look forward to working with him to try and remediate it. But the solution is to be found in this legislation.

The problem of the cartels, the illegal activity, the black market, is a result of the fact that the Federal Government does not have its act together. People across the country have acted to take it into their own hands and, as a result, we have a piecemeal approach.

Mr. Speaker, 48 States have some form of legalization. What Chairman NADLER and the committee has done is provide a framework to be able to harness the forces, to be able to do the research so we can deal with impairment. The Federal Government interferes with that now. We have an opportunity to solve the horrific problem of lack of access to banking services, which makes dispensaries across the country sitting ducks.

It adds to expenses for minorities. It adds to the problems of law enforcement. We face a situation now of great racial injustice in this country that the legislation faces.

□ 1015

We have an opportunity to unlock untold benefits for more medical research and be able to channel the efforts into a legal matter, to be able to have a taxing system federally, and to be able to strengthen the legal cannabis market so that the profits flow to the people who should do it rather than the cartels and the corner drug dealers that are still cutting corners.

My friend is right about the problems in southern Oregon, but he is wrong about the solution. The MORE Act is a solution to provide the framework, provide the research, redirect the resources to be able to solve the problem that has been created by the failed prohibition on cannabis.

This is historic legislation, in part, because we will send this to the Senate where there is a different mindset for the leadership. We have opened the opportunity to solve these problems. I urge us to take advantage of it and move forward.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to my friend and former law school classmate, Representative BLUMENAUER—he was a few years ahead of me—I just want to draw attention to the bill, page 15, where it calls out the expenditures. It says: The amounts in the trust fund shall be available, without further appropriation, only as follows. And then it reflects section 3052(a) part 00 of the Omnibus Crime Control Safe Streets Act of 1968, which I dug out and read through three times, looking unsuccessfully for an allocation of money to local law enforcement agencies, such as the ones in southern Oregon. It is not there. That money is going for very limited and very narrow purposes.

How much money? Well, if this 8 percent tax had been applied to the amount of marijuana sold last year in the United States, the total is $400 million. That is not the total sold; it is the total tax, $400 million, half of which would go to this narrow piece of work. I am not saying it is unimportant, but narrow.

There is 50 percent called out here, then 10 percent, then 25 percent, but none to police. What I am trying to say is, yes, you have taken this up—do it right. Get it right. And you have a whole bunch of work that needs to be done to get this bill right.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the MORE Act and I applaud my colleagues, Chairman NADLER and BARBARA LEE, for their leadership on this critical legislation.

For years, public support for marijuana legalization has surged. Thirty-seven States have voted to legalize marijuana. It is past time that Congress answers the call for marijuana justice.

This sweeping legislation would finally decriminalize cannabis at the Federal level by removing it from the Controlled Substance Act. The law would apply this retroactively to prior and pending convictions that have disproportionately harmed communities of color.

The MORE Act would also help those whose convictions are overturned through the Opportunity Trust Fund that would provide job training, reentry assistance, legal aid, and healthcare.

If we are serious about criminal justice, we need to get rid of the antiquated cannabis laws. The MORE Act would do just that. I hope my colleagues will join me in voting on this long overdue bill.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say again, I went down to southern Oregon and I asked the law enforcement folks what we needed to do to try to head off the cartels which are generating this huge sum of money for themselves. What could we do? And the answer was, law enforcement. If you don't have force, you can't control the cartels.

To get law enforcement it requires people and that requires money and this bill doesn't allocate any for that purpose. Since we know this bill is going to drive up the cost of legal marijuana, thus driving more people into the black market, why isn't there more money for law enforcement? Why isn't there any money for law enforcement?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. I thank Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. Speaker, I rise because I see this as a bill that will benefit some of the least, the last, and the lost; people who have been denied access to housing, denied access to loans, denied access to things that we need to succeed in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I plan to support it. I ask that my colleagues support it because it is tough being a Black man with a criminal record in the United States of America. This bill will help a lot of Black men have opportunities that they have been denied.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the COVID pandemic has produced a rise in drug abuse, violent crime, and other indicators of collective trauma. These are pressing issues that urgently need resources devoted to them. We must stop wasting precious resources on marijuana offenses.

Law enforcement simply cannot afford to chase small-time pot offenders while violent and random crime continues to be on the rise nationwide. The ACLU reports States are wasting billions annually enforcing cannabis laws. This is money, time, and effort better spent on investing in true community safety.

Further, Americans overwhelmingly want marijuana reform and 91 percent report that they believe that it should

be legalized. Congress is long overdue in marijuana reform and decriminalizing this substance, but we have a long journey ahead to achieve social justice and criminal justice reform.

The war on marijuana is a costly relic of the past. Let's vote ''yes'' today so we can build a safer and more equitable tomorrow.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to assure everyone that the police in Oregon are not chasing those who are using marijuana. Oregon legalized marijuana. What we are having trouble with are the consequences of that legalization. That is what I am trying to bring to the attention of folks today that if we are going to legalize on a national scale then, for goodness' sake, don't make the mistakes we made in Oregon, get it right.

Put into the bill appropriate funding for law enforcement. By the way, we should put in a lot of other things that I previously mentioned. One of the things that absolutely has to be there is funding for local police because this bill is going to drive up the demand for marijuana and up the cartels across the United States. It is bad and local law enforcement can't take care of it.

The assertion that the FBI and Homeland Security and DEA are going to do so is incorrect. I know because I have asked. We have nothing from the Attorney General helping us in that space. So what I am saying is, if you are going to do this, get it right.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. BENTZ refers to the cartels. Of course there are cartels. Of course they are making money because they have a monopoly of supply of a substance that has a great demand. If you pass this bill then those cartels will no longer have a monopoly and law enforcement expenses will go down because they will not have to enforce the marijuana laws and the marijuana prohibition laws. Nor will they have to fight the cartels, which won't be there anymore because their monopoly of supply will have been eliminated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN).

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and I thank everyone that my colleague, BARBARA LEE, acknowledged earlier.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the MORE Act and on behalf of the countless families that have been disrupted and destroyed by our Nation's failed drug policies and the devastating war on drugs.

As a result of the war on drugs, the United States has a higher rate of incarceration than such human rights-abusing governments as Russia, Belarus, and Iran. It also wastes more money than any other country locking up its citizens for personal drug use.

Racial justice and cannabis decriminalization are inextricably intertwined, and the former cannot be achieved without the latter. By decriminalizing cannabis, we can reverse the trend of over-incarceration and get one step closer to dismantling the systemic racism so pervasive in our criminal justice system.

The MORE Act is an important step in rewriting our future, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will advise the managers that Mr. NADLER has 2¾ minutes and Mr. BENTZ has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention in response to the assertion that once this bill passes, if it does, that suddenly the cartels will disappear. Sadly, that is not going to be true. That is because legal marijuana will be 30 percent more expensive than that which is raised on the black market. That is why one has to be aware when one puts this kind of additional cost into this bill, 8 percent on a gross basis, that people need to understand the difference between net profit and gross.

What is going to happen is the cartels will have a 30 percent benefit advantage over privately raised marijuana. What I am trying to say is: Get this bill right. This isn't my thinking. This is people who looked into this extremely carefully and those that are trying to do this legally. I am saying this bill is incorrectly crafted on that level and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership, but I also want to recognize Representative BLUMENAUER for his decades of work on this issue.

The MORE Act is the most comprehensive marijuana reform bill in Congress, and it is rooted in social justice. The criminalization of marijuana and this Nation's failed war on drugs has devastated our communities of color. It has led to over-policing, mass incarceration, and the destruction of families. This critical legislation takes steps to undo these harms.

Today, I urge my colleagues to vote for criminal justice reform, to vote for an equitable marijuana industry, and to vote for beginning to repair the harms caused by decades of racist marijuana criminalization and enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues today to vote ''yes'' on the MORE Act.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of multiple items:

First, a policy statement from the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry on Marijuana Legalization.

Second, Facts for Families from the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry on Marijuana and Teens.

Third, the Insurance Information Institute report on marijuana and impaired driving.

Fourth, an article from verywellhealth.com titled, ''Is Marijuana Addictive?'' by Ashley Olivine, Ph.D.

Fifth, an NBC News article titled, ''Legalized marijuana linked to a sharp rise in car crashes.''

Sixth, the Denver Post article titled, ''Are you high? The science of testing for marijuana impairment is hazy, and evolving.''

Seventh, a Bloomberg article titled, ''U.S. Grapples With How to Gauge Just How High Cannabis Users Are.''

[From the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry]

MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION

The American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry (AACAP) advocates for careful consideration of potential immediate and downstream effects of marijuana policy changes on children and adolescents. Marijuana legalization, even if restricted to adults, may be associated with (a) decreased adolescent perception of marijuana's harmful effects, (b) increased marijuana use among parents and caretakers, and (c) increased adolescent access to marijuana, all of which reliably predict increased rates of adolescent marijuana use and associated problems. Marijuana use during pregnancy, occurring at increasing rates, raises additional concerns regarding future infant, child, and adolescent development.

AACAP is aware that, among hundreds of chemical constituents, marijuana contains select individual compounds that, if safely administered in reliable doses, may potentially convey therapeutic effects for specific conditions in specific populations. Advocacy regarding potential cannabinoid therapeutics, alongside social justice, public policy, and economic concerns, have contributed to marijuana policy changes. Amid these factors, AACAP remains focused on concerns regarding adolescent marijuana use.

Adolescents are especially vulnerable to marijuana's many known adverse effects. One in six adolescent marijuana users develops cannabis use disorder, a well characterized syndrome involving tolerance, withdrawal, and continued use despite significant associated impairments. Selective breeding has increased marijuana's addictive potency and potential harm to adolescents. Heavy use during adolescence is associated with increased incidence and worsened course of psychotic, mood, anxiety, and substance use disorders. Furthermore, marijuana's deleterious effects on adolescent cognition, behavior, and brain development may have immediate and long-term implications, including increased risk of motor vehicle accidents, sexual victimization, academic failure, lasting decline in intelligence measures, psychopathology, addiction, and psychosocial and occupational impairment.

Marijuana-related policy changes, including legalization, may have significant unintended consequences for children and adolescents. AACAP supports (a) initiatives to increase awareness of marijuana's harmful effects on adolescents, (b) improved access to evidence-based treatment for adolescents with marijuana-related problems, and (c) careful monitoring of the effects of marijuana-related policy changes on child and adolescent mental health. Finally, AACAP strongly advocates for the involvement of

the medical and research community in these critical and highly impactful policy-related discussions.

MARIJUANA AND TEENS

Many teenagers try marijuana and some use it regularly. Teenage marijuana use is at its highest level in 30 years, and today's teens are more likely to use marijuana than tobacco. Many states allow recreational use of marijuana in adults ages 21 and over. Recreational marijuana use by children and teenagers is not legal in anywhere in the United States. Today's marijuana plants are grown differently than in the past and can contain two to three times more tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), the ingredient that makes people high. The ingredient of the marijuana plant thought to have most medical benefits, cannabidiol (CBD), has not increased and remains at about 1 percent.

There are many ways people can use marijuana. This can make it harder for parents to watch for use in their child. These include:

Smoking the dried plant (buds and flowers) in a rolled cigarette (joint), pipe, or bong

Smoking liquid or wax marijuana in an electronic cigarette, also known as vaping

Eating ''edibles'' which are baked goods and candies containing marijuana products

Drinking beverages containing marijuana products

Using oils and tinctures that can be applied to the skin

Other names used to describe marijuana include weed, pot, spliffs, or the name of the strain of the plant. There are also synthetic (man-made) marijuana-like drugs such as ''K2'' and ''Spice.'' These drugs are different from marijuana and are more dangerous. Additionally, the products being sold in dispensaries currently are not subject to Food and Drug Administration standards and are not purely isolated cannabinoids; they are therefore not reliable in their potency/concentration of CBD or THC, or the inclusion of other ingredients.

PARENTS AND PREVENTION

Parents can help their children learn about the harmful effects of marijuana use. Talking to your children about marijuana at an early age can help them make better choices and may prevent them from developing a problem with marijuana use later. Begin talking with your child in an honest and open way when they are in late elementary and early middle school. Youth are less likely to try marijuana if they can ask parents for help and know exactly how their parents feel about drug use.

Tips on discussing marijuana with your child:

Ask what they have heard about using marijuana. Listen carefully, pay attention, and try not to interrupt. Avoid making negative or angry comments.

Offer your child facts about the risks and consequences of smoking marijuana.

Ask your child to give examples of the effects of marijuana. This will help you make sure that your child understands what you talked about.

If you choose to talk to your child about your own experiences with drugs, be honest about why you used and the pressures that contributed to your use. Be careful not to minimize the dangers of marijuana or other drugs, and be open about any negative experiences you may have had. Given how much stronger marijuana is today, its effect on your child would likely be much different than what you experienced.

Explain that research tells us that the brain continues to mature into the 20s. While it is developing, there is greater risk of harm from marijuana use.

Sometimes parents may suspect that their child is already using marijuana. The following are common signs of marijuana use:

Acting very silly and out of character for no reason

Using new words and phrases like ''sparking up,'' ''420,'' ''dabbing,'' and ''shatter''

Having increased irritability

Losing interest in and motivation to do usual activities

Spending time with peers that use marijuana

Having trouble remembering things that just happened

Carrying pipes, lighters, vape pens, or rolling papers

Coming home with red eyes and/or urges to eat outside of usual mealtimes

Stealing money or having money that cannot be accounted for

EFFECTS OF MARIJUANA

Many teenagers believe that marijuana is safer than alcohol or other drugs. When talking about marijuana with your child, it is helpful to know the myths and the facts. For example, teenagers may say, ''it is harmless because it is natural,'' ''it is not addictive,'' or ''it does not affect my thinking or my grades.''

However, research shows that marijuana can cause serious problems with learning, feelings, and health.

Short-term use of marijuana can lead to:

School difficulties

Problems with memory and concentration

Increased aggression

Car accidents

Use of other drugs or alcohol

Risky sexual behaviors

Worsening of underlying mental health conditions including mood changes and suicidal thinking

Increased risk of psychosis

Interference with prescribed medication

Regular use of marijuana can lead to significant problems including Cannabis Use Disorder. Signs that your child has developed Cannabis Use Disorder include using marijuana more often than intended, having cravings, or when using interferes with other activities. If someone with Cannabis Use Disorder stops using suddenly, they may suffer withdrawal symptoms that, while not dangerous, can cause irritability, anxiety, and changes in mood, sleep, and appetite.

Long-term use of marijuana can lead to:

Cannabis Use Disorder

The same breathing problems as smoking cigarettes (coughing, wheezing, trouble with physical activity, and lung cancer)

Decreased motivation or interest which can lead to decline in academic or occupational performance

Lower intelligence

Mental health problems, such as schizophrenia, depression, anxiety, anger, irritability, moodiness, and risk of suicide

MEDICAL MARIJUANA

Some teens justify use of marijuana because it is used for medical purposes. Marijuana use with a prescription for a medical reason is called ''medical marijuana.'' Laws for medical marijuana are rapidly changing and are different from state to state. In some states, children of any age can get medical marijuana if they have a ''qualifying medical condition.'' There is very limited research supporting use of medical marijuana in children or teens for most conditions. In most states that allow medical marijuana, the marijuana is not regulated and therefore is not checked for ingredients, purity, strength or safety. There is no evidence that medical marijuana is any safer than other marijuana.

CANNABIDIOL (CBD)

Many parents have questions about CBD and how it may be helpful for their child. There is ongoing research on the use of CBD-containing products for conditions such as epilepsy, PTSD, Tourette's disorder, pain, and other diagnoses. For now, the use of CBD is only FDA-approved in children for specific forms of epilepsy and in adults for chemotherapy induced nausea and vomiting. At this time, there is not enough evidence to recommend CBD for other uses, in children and adolescents including the treatment of autism and other developmental disorders. The approved CBD requires a prescription. Many stores sell CBD products. However, there are no safety and quality requirements for non-prescription CBD. They may have harmful additives or interfere with prescription medication. If you are considering using CBD for your child, please discuss this with their physician prior to starting to prevent harmful effects.

CONCLUSION

Marijuana use in teens can lead to long-term consequences. Teens rarely think they will end up with problems related to marijuana use, so it is important to begin talking about the risks with your child early and continue this discussion over time. Talking with your child about marijuana can help delay the age of first use and help protect their brain. If your child is already using marijuana, try asking questions in an open and curious way as your teen will talk more freely if not feeling judged. If you have concerns about your child's drug use, talk with your child's pediatrician or a qualified mental health professional.

[From the Insurance Information Institute, June 24, 2021]

BACKGROUND ON: MARIJUANA AND IMPAIRED DRIVING

OVERVIEW

More states are passing legislation permitting medical and/or recreational marijuana use, which raises concerns about users driving under the influence of marijuana. This piece will discuss:

Marijuana consumption and characteristics of marijuana impairment; Marijuana legalization's impact on auto accidents; Difficulties related to measuring user impairment; and Insurance impacts.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Marijuana is a type of hemp plant of the species Cannabis sativa L., part of the genus Cannabis L. Unlike industrial hemp, however, marijuana contains appreciable arnounts of delta-9-tetrahydrocannabinol (THC), a psychoactive cannabinoid—it's the active chemical that induces user intoxication. The plant also contains several other, non-psychoactive cannabinoids such as ''cannabidiol'' (CBD).

There is evidence that cannabis has been consumed for thousands of years, often for medicinal purposes. The plant was used as a patent medicine in the U.S. since at least 1850, when the United States Pharmacopoeia described the plant for the first time. Cannabis was first regulated under federal law under the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937.

Marijuana was subsequently subjected to countrywide prohibition under the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 (CSA), which established a schedule for substances regulated under federal law. Marijuana is currently a Schedule I drug under the CSA, which defines Schedule I drugs as substances that have ''no currently accepted medical use in the United States, a lack of accepted safety for use under medical supervision, and a high potential for abuse.'' Other substances under Schedule I include heroin, LSD, and peyote.

Despite the treatment of marijuana under federal law, in 1996 California became the first state in the U.S. to pass legislation permitting a medical marijuana program. By

April 2021, 36 states and the District of Columbia have passed legislation permitting so-called ''comprehensive'' medical marijuana programs, which typically allow qualifying patients to access marijuana and marijuana-related products.

Since 2012, 18 states and the District of Columbia have passed legislation permitting anyone over the age of 21 to possess and use marijuana, subject to certain limitations. Most of those states also have or are developing regulations for a commercial market to support recreational marijuana sales.

MARIJUANA IMPAIRMENT

The THC in marijuana plants causes intoxication in a user. (THC levels in other hemp plants are typically so low that they cannot induce intoxication.)

Effects of marijuana consumption can vary. Marijuana can affect users differently, depending on a variety of factors, including user tolerance. Common experiences intoxicated include feelings of euphoria and relaxation; some may also experience heightened sensory perceptions and altered perceptions of time.

Marijuana cannot cause overdose, but can potentially cause temporary psychosis. There are no documented instances of an adult dying from an overdose of marijuana alone. However in rare instances a user may experience a psychotic reaction to the drug or high levels of anxiety—in some cases, these side effects could lead a user to seek medical treatment. Such negative effects are often experienced after consuming edible marijuana products, which are often more potent and take longer to induce intoxication.

Method of consumption alters impairment profile. Several factors influence intoxication onset, intensity, and duration, including method of consumption, type of marijuana product consumed, product potency, and user characteristics.

Marijuana and related products can be consumed in several ways, including inhalation (either by smoking or vaporizing) of dried plant matter or concentrates (such as hashish or kief), oral ingestion (edibles, capsules, infusible oils), sublingual ingestion (lozenges), or topical application (lotions, salves, oils).

Smoking often causes almost immediate intoxication, with impairment typically lasting 2 to 4 hours. Intoxication onset is more delayed for other methods, sometimes up to two hours for edibles—and impairment may last much longer.

Product potency is dependent on THC levels. Potency varies considerably across marijuana products and can influence the degree of impairment. Smokable marijuana plant matter can range anywhere from 8 percent to 30 percent THC, whereas high-quality hash oil up to 80 percent THC. There is evidence that marijuana products have become more potent over time.

User characteristics will also influence impairment. For example, chronic users may experience less acute impairment than nonchronic users.

MARIJUANA AND IMPAIRED DRIVING

Marijuana intoxication can cause impaired driving, thereby increasing the risks of accidents. Marijuana legalization is associated with an increase in impaired driving.

Marijuana impairment degrades cognition and motor skills. Marijuana alters a user's perception. As such, most studies agree that marijuana use results in impaired coordination, memory, associative learning, attention, cognitive flexibility, and reaction time. Driving ability is thereby degraded to some degree—but by how much remains a matter of study and is subject to several factors, including the level of impairment and user characteristics.

For example, there is some evidence that user impairment may also result in limited ''compensatory defensive'' driving, in which a user drives more carefully to compensate for a degradation in motor functioning—but this may only mitigate degradation for some skills and may not apply to non-chronic users.

Marijuana impairment increases the risk of accidents. Nonetheless, the evidence suggests that acute impairment increases the risk of traffic accidents—though the magnitude of the increased risk is still a matter of study and can vary widely, depending on the study.

One literature review found evidence that 20 to 30 percent of crashes involving marijuana occurred because of the marijuana use. (This compares to roughly 85 percent of crashes involving alcohol that occurred because of alcohol use.) The review estimated that the crash risk increased 22 percent while under the influence of marijuana, controlling for concurrent alcohol use.

Another review found that someone driving under the influence of marijuana is 1.65 times more likely to be culpable in a fatal accident.

The greater the impairment, the worse the driving abilities. As noted above, level of impairment can influence the degree to which driving ability degrades. Indeed, there is evidence that the more impaired the driver, the worse their driving abilities.

Mixing marijuana and alcohol produces additive effects. There is evidence that mixing marijuana and alcohol increases impairment greater than the net effects of each individual substance. There also may exist the possibility for alcohol to increase THC levels. Potential compensatory defensive driving is nullified when a user mixes alcohol and marijuana.

The number of crash rates could increase after legalization. Researchers at the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) and the Highway Loss Data Institute (HLDI) since 2014 have been examining how legalization has affected crash rates and insurance claims, and evidence is emerging that crash rates go up when states legalize recreational use and retail sales of marijuana. The most recent of these studies released in June 2021 by the IIHS, shows that injury and fatal crash rates in California, Colorado, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington jumped in the months following relaxation of marijuana laws in each state. The five states experienced a 6 percent increase in injury crash rates and a 4 percent increase in fatal crash rates, compared with other Western states where recreational marijuana use was illegal during the study period.

However, only the increase in injury crash rates was statistically significant. These findings are consistent with a 2018 IIHS study of police-reported crashes, most of which did not involve injuries or fatalities. This study found that legalization of retail sales in Colorado, Oregon andWashington was associated with a 5 percent higher crash rate compared with the neighboring control states.

Fatal crashes involving drivers who tested positive for THC have increased. Some studies indicate that more people with ''detectible'' levels of THC in their bloodstreams were involved in fatal accidents after legalization. However, as discussed below, the mere presence of THC does not necessarily indicate marijuana impairment. Furthermore, regarding fatal crash rates overall, at least one study found no significant annual changes in crash fatality rates forColorado and Washington when compared to 8 control states.

A 2020 study by the AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety shows that the percentage of drivers in Washington involved in fatal crashes who tested positive for marijuana increased 100 percent after the state made the drug legal for recreational use. The study considered the presence of detectable THC in the blood of fatal-crash-involved drIvers. In general, the presence of detectable THC in blood suggests, but does not conclusively prove, that a person has recently used cannabis.

Collision claim frequency appears to have increased. Insurance records show an increase in claims under collision coverage, which pays for damage to an at-fault, insured driver's own vehicle, according to HLDI's latest analysis, The legalization of retail sales in Colorado, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington was associated with a 4 percent increase in collision claim frequency compared with the other Western states from 2012 to 2019. The 4 percent decline is down slightly from the 6 percent increase HLDI identified in a previous study, which covered 2012 to 2018.

Higher risk demographics also have higher rates of marijuana-impaired driving. Younger drivers are at greater risk of traffic accidents than older drivers. Younger male drivers are at high risk of traffic accidents. Early evidence suggests that younger male drivers are most likely to drive under the influence of marijuana.

Use of recreational marijuana impairs driving even when the driver is not high. A study published in the journal Drug and Alcohol Dependence suggests that chronic, heavy use of recreational marijuana impairs driving skills even when the driver is not high. The researchers used a driving simulator to evaluate the potential impact of cannabis use on driving performance. The study concluded that driving impairment was significantly worse among the study participants who began using marijuana regularly before age 16. The study, by researchers at Harvard Medical School's McLean Hospital, found that cannabis users hit more pedestrians, exceeded the speed limit more often, and drove through more red lights compared with non-users. At the time of the study, the marijuana users had not used for at least 12 hours and were not intoxicated.

DETERMINING INTOXICATION: ''THC PERSISTENCE''

A key issue raised in many studies examining the effects of marijuana-impaired driving and its risks is ''THC persistence.'' Unlike alcohol, THC levels in a user's body may not be an accurate indication of impairment.

Compared with marijuana, determining alcohol intoxication is relatively straightforward. The human body processes alcohol at a rate that allows blood alcohol concentration (BAC) to closely correlate with intoxication, making it an effective and accurate benchmark for measuring impairment.

[Feb. 17, 2022]

IS MARIJUANA ADDICTIVE?

(By Ashley Olivine, Ph.D., MPH)

(Medically reviewed by Isaac O. Opole, MD, PhD)

In light of the legalization of marijuana, many people have wondered about the substance, its safety, and whether it's addictive. Marijuana—also called weed, cannabis, and other names—is a species of plant that is used as a medical and recreational drug.

People can become addicted to marijuana. While it is possible to try and use the substance without becoming addicted, that is not the case for everyone. There are risks of use, even medicinally, and addiction is one of them.

Like any drug used medicinally, the potential risks of use are weighed against the potential benefits when deciding what should

and should not be tried. Learn more about marijuana addiction, risk factors, effects on the brain, and more.

IS MARIJUANA ADDICTIVE?

While some people can try and use marijuana without becoming addicted, it can also be addictive for some people. Marijuana use disorder, also known as cannabis use disorder, is when the use of marijuana negatively impacts a person's health or life but they continue to use it anyway.

Although the numbers are not entirely known, it is estimated that 6.3 percent of adults have experienced marijuana use disorder, and that percentage is increasing. As many as 30 percent of people who use marijuana may experience marijuana use disorder. Marijuana use can also be associated with addiction and dependency.

ADDICTION VS. DEPENDENCY

Addiction and dependency are two terms that are often used interchangeably. There are differences between the two.

Addiction happens when a person uses a substance such as alcohol, marijuana, or another drug in excess. It is usually marked by a change in behavior, where the person becomes consistently focused on using that substance regardless of potential negative outcomes. Addiction can be physical, psychological, or both at the same time.

Substance dependence, also called chemical dependence, is when a person experiences physical dependence on a substance but is not addicted to it. One example is when a person who has taken a prescription medication for a long time stops taking that medication and experiences physical or mental withdrawal symptoms. Dependence symptoms can be cognitive, behavioral, and physical. Dependence presents as a pattern. A person first uses a substance such as marijuana repeatedly. After regular use over time, they build a tolerance, where the effects of the substance are not noticed as much or at all. The person experiences symptoms when they stop using the substance, which makes them feel the need to use it again.

SYMPTOMS OF CANNABIS USE DISORDER

Cannabis use disorder, or marijuana use disorder, is when a person continues to use the substance even though they experience negative health or life effects from use. Symptoms include excessive focus on marijuana use; ignoring school, work, or relationships; other problems caused by marijuana use such as an inability to resist cravings; and more. These can range from mild to severe depending on the person.

SYMPTOMS MAY INCLUDE

Changes in sleep, appetite, or mood.

Cravings to use marijuana.

Decreased control of marijuana use.

Decreased fulfillment of responsibilities.

Decline in school, work, or athletic performance.

Headache, abdominal pain, chills, or sweating when not using.

Needing to use more to get the same effect.

Negative feelings associated with use.

Overuse of marijuana and using more than intended.

Risk-taking behaviors.

Social withdrawal related to marijuana use.

RISK FACTORS

One of the biggest risk factors of marijuana addiction may be age. People are up to seven times as likely to experience marijuana use disorder when they start using before the age of 18. Additionally, men are twice as likely as women to experience marijuana use disorder.

OTHER RISK FACTORS INCLUDE

Family history of substance use disorder.

Friends and peers who use marijuana.

Adverse childhood experiences such as sexual abuse.

Use of cigarettes.

Teenage Drug Addiction: A Complete Guide.

Effect on the Brain.

Marijuana use has a negative impact on the brain. THC, which stands for tetrahydrocannabinol, is the part of the cannabis plant that causes the mental effect. THC can cause changes to the brain that impact the structure and ability to function, including learning, memory, cognitive ability, and behavior—including future substance use. This is an increased concern for younger people exposed to THC, including babies during pregnancy.

The use of marijuana has also been found to be connected with lower IQ scores, compromised memory and cognitive ability, and decreased performance on tests. The negative effects of use appear to be more of an issue for those who use more often and over a longer period of time. However, research is limited and the details of the negative effects on the brain are not fully understood.

IS RECREATIONAL MARIJUANA TO BLAME?

The negative effects of marijuana are not limited to recreational marijuana. Medicinal marijuana use comes with risks too. Like other medicinal treatments for medical conditions, medicinal marijuana can have negative effects even though it is used to treat medical conditions.

Additionally, over 80 percent of people who use medicinal marijuana also use it recreationally. This can lead to more use and an increased risk of marijuana use disorder.

Medicinal Use of Marijuana.

Medicinal marijuana is used to treat and manage a variety of medical concerns, including physical and mental health challenges. Despite the risks, studies of medicinal marijuana use have shown effectiveness. Nearly 90 percent of people who use medicinal marijuana claim that it helps them to manage their disease and symptoms, and many find that they are able to decrease their use of other medications.

THE DEBATE OVER THE LEGALIZATION OF MARIJUANA FOR MEDICAL USE

Conditions commonly treated with medical marijuana include:

Alzheimer's disease, Amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, (ALS), Anxiety, Cancer chemotherapy side effects, Crohn's disease, Depression, Glaucoma, HIV/AIDS, Inflammation, Multiple sclerosis muscle symptoms, Nausea and vomiting, Pain, Post-traumatic stress disorder or PTSD, Seizures and epilepsy, Marijuana Addiction Criteria.

The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Health Disorders, 5th edition (DSM–5) classifies the diagnostic criteria for cannabis use disorder. Use of the substance must be associated with impairment or distress. Diagnosis of this condition requires at least two of the 11 criteria within one year.

CANNABIS USE DISORDER DSM–5 CRITERIA

More use than intended.

Unable to decrease use despite desire or effort.

Excessive time spent on activities related to use, including getting access and recovering.

Urges or cravings.

Work, school, or home obligations not fulfilled due to use.

A problem of social or interpersonal problems associated with use and continued use.

Withdrawal from social, work, or recreational activities due to use despite importance.

Physically hazardous use.

Knowingly experiencing problems associated with use and continued use.

Tolerance, defined by either needing more to get the effect or decreased effect with the same amount.

Withdrawal, defined by either DSM–5 cannabis withdrawal symptoms or use of a substance to address symptoms of withdrawal.

HELP FOR CANNABIS USE DISORDER

Cannabis use disorder is treatable. This condition can be diagnosed by a healthcare professional such as a medical doctor or psychologist. Treatment methods include psychotherapy (talk therapy) and medications. More specifically, motivational interviewing, contingency management, and cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT) may be used. Medications to control cravings may be used alongside nonmedicinal interventions.

SUBSTANCE USE HELPLINE

If you or a loved one are struggling with substance use or addiction, contact the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) National Helpline for information on support and treatment facilities in your area.

For more mental health resources, see our National Helpline Database.

[From NBC News, Oct. 18, 2018]

LEGALIZED MARIJUANA LINKED TO A SHARP RISE IN CAR CRASHES

(By Paul A. Eisenstein)

There has been an increase by up to 6 percent in the number of highway crashes in four of the states where the recreational use of marijuana has been legalized, according to a pair of new studies.

The new reports do not prove there's a direct risk caused by the use of marijuana among motorists, but they raise caution flags, especially since there is no easy way to test drivers to be sure if they are, in fact, under the influence of THC, the active ingredient in marijuana, said David Harkey, president of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety's Highway Loss Data Institute.

''It's certainly early in the game,'' Harkey told NBC News. But, he warned, ''We're seeing a trend in the wrong direction.''

There are now 30 states that have legalized the use of marijuana for medical purposes, with Oklahoma the most recent to join the list. Nine states and the District of Columbia now have legalized recreational use. With a Gallup poll showing 64 percent public support, more states are set to follow, including Michigan, where recreational use is on the November ballot.

Since the legalization wave began, safety and health experts have been trying to measure the potential influence on highway safety, though the results so far have been inconsistent and, in some cases, contradictory.

But this is the second year in a row where the IIHS found a troubling trend. A year ago, the non-profit group looked at three states, Colorado, Oregon, and Washington. This year, it added Nevada to the list. Harkey said the IIHS also looked at highway crash data in surrounding states to try to control for factors like weather and the economy.

The studies looked at police reports and insurance claims, finding crashes rose between 5.2 percent and 6 percent in states with legalized recreational marijuana compared to neighboring states where such use remained illegal.

The IIHS also conducted a street-side study of marijuana use and found something Harkey said he saw as particularly concerning. While those under the influence of alcohol tend to either be driving alone or with other adults, about 14 percent of those confirmed to be using pot had a child in their vehicle. That reflects the fact, he added, that marijuana use isn't confined to evenings and other times when adults are more likely to drink—and abuse—alcohol.

What is unclear is whether that reflects the increasing use of recreational pot or the consumption of medical marijuana to deal with issues like pain or glaucoma, something a patient may time to need.

Harkey cautioned there are limits to what the studies show. There is a ''correlation,'' reflecting the fact that crashes rose once pot became legal, but that is not the same as ''causation,'' he added, meaning other, unseen factors could be at work.

That could help explain why earlier studies have often conflicted over the effects of marijuana on highway safety. One, released by the University of Colorado in 2014, showed a surge in fatalities involving stoned drivers. But a study conducted by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration in Virginia a year later found no clear increase in risk.

Part of the problem is that it is difficult to accurately measure how pot impacts drivers. ''Many studies, using a variety of methods, have attempted to estimate the risk of driving after use of marijuana,'' a NHTSA report advised Congress last year. ''While useful in identifying how marijuana affects the performance of driving tasks, experimental and observational studies do not lend themselves to predicting real-world crash risk.''

Police have a particularly difficult challenge because of the way marijuana works in the body. Blood alcohol levels provide a direct correlation showing how much a motorist has had to drink, with those levels dropping rapidly as someone sobers up. But while THC levels spike after smoking weed or eating a consumable, the psychoactive ingredient remains in the body for weeks, long after it has stopped having any impact.

With so many more states set to permit the use of the drug, Harkey said regulators, law enforcement, and medical authorities need to address ''the challenge'' and come up with better ways of determining when a driver might be operating under the influence of marijuana.

[From the Denver Post, Aug. 25, 2017]

ARE YOU HIGH? THE SCIENCE OF TESTING FOR MARIJUANA IMPAIRMENT IS HAZY, AND EVOLVING. LAWMAKERS, POLICE, PROSECUTORS GRAPPLE WITH HOW TO DEFINE MARIJUANA IMPAIRMENT.

(By David Migoya)

There was a time when marijuana was illegal everywhere and testing for it was as easy as could be.

It didn't matter the level of cannabinoids found in a person's body. If it was there, they were breaking the law.

It's different now.

The tests have changed from depositing a urine sample into a cup to drawing blood or offering oral fluids. Also different is the particular type of cannabinoid—the chemical compound that reacts in the brain—detected by any of those tests.

The evolving science of testing for marijuana, and the lack of consensus over how to measure impairment, is a defining feature of the drug. It separates marijuana from alcohol and creates challenges for lawmakers, police and prosecutors, not to mention users.

The issue is critical as the state moves forward in determining how to handle driving under the influence of pot. A Denver Post investigation found that the numbers of drivers in fatal crashes testing positive for marijuana—though not necessarily high—is rising sharply, and coroners are finding higher levels of potency in their tests.

The cannabinoid most widely tested for in the past—known as carboxy THC—is actually an inactive metabolite that only indicates prior marijuana use, sometimes as long as a month ago. In time, other metabolites of THC—short for tetrahydrocannabinal, the psychoactive ingredient in marijuana—were found to be better indicators of recent use and, some say, impairment.

''Urine testing was established many years ago, and, at the time, a test was developed to look for carboxy THC since it's what's there in the highest amount,'' said Sarah Urfer, president and owner of ChemaTox, a Boulder lab that handles DUI screening for about three quarters of the law enforcement agencies in Colorado. ''Nobody thought it mattered what you were looking for . . . . Early on, scientists didn't know for sure which of the cannabinoids were responsible for impairment. They'd measure carboxy and try to correlate it to impairment.''

But THC is not the same as alcohol. It reacts differently in the body, it metabolizes differently and its impairing impact is different. Unlike the 0.08 blood-alcohol level that's widely accepted as indicative of drunken driving, establishing a credible level for THC has been elusive.

It is generally accepted that two standard drinks—about 1/2 ounce of alcohol—in an hour will raise someone's blood-alcohol level to 0.05, approaching the legal limit. One drink is a 12–ounce beer, a 1.5–ounce shot of distilled spirit, or a 6–ounce glass of wine.

For pot, the differences are striking since it depends on the manner ingested—smoked, edible, concentrate—and how much. A Johns Hopkins University study from 1995 found that four puffs of smokable marijuana with 1.75 percent THC content translates to 57 nanograms per milliliter, and 10 puffs as much as 99 ng/mL. The National Highway Traffic Safety Administration says levels of 100–200 ng/mL are ''routinely encountered'' after smoking but quickly dissipate. Concentrate levels for vapor ingestion are typically higher, as well as for edibles, although the rate of distribution into the blood varies considerably.

FEDS QUESTION TESTS

NHTSA last month acknowledged these gray areas in a report to Congress that not only called into question the reliability of tests to find THC but also noted the problem with determining whether a driver is too stoned to be behind the wheel.

In fact, the NHTSA report notes that even though ''research has demonstrated the potential of marijuana to impair driving-related skills,'' it lays out a number of other studies that show pot might not be as bad as the better-understood effects of alcohol on driving.

''Many studies, using a variety of methods, have attempted to estimate the risk of driving after use of marijuana,'' the NHTSA report noted. ''While useful in identifying how marijuana affects the performance of driving tasks, experimental and observational studies do not lend themselves to predicting real-world crash risk.''

Finding THC isn't so difficult. Making any kind of universally accepted determination from the results, however, seems to freeze the legal world in its tracks.

''Testing for THC in whole blood isn't actually that hard,'' Urfer said. ''Where the issue comes is with interpretation and roadside testing.''

Some widely cited studies have offered differing information about the impact of marijuana on driving. And not all sides agree which studies are right and which are not.

In 2012, a medical study published in Clinical Chemistry journal found ''cannabis smoking increases lane weaving and impaired cognitive functions,'' and that certain THC concentration levels ''are associated with substantial driving impairment, particularly in occasional smokers.''

Then came a University of Colorado study—released in 2014, the year recreational sales of the drug were launched in the state—that found the proportion of drivers involved in fatal crashes who tested positive for marijuana use had risen to 10 percent in 2011, up from 5.9 percent in 2009.

But in 2015, NHTSA released a study it conducted in Virginia that concluded marijuana users had the same chance of crashing as sober drivers. At nearly the same time, the Washington Traffic Safety Commission said it believed marijuana doubles the risk of being in a fatal crash.

Where experts say impairment becomes most noted and is most alarming to law enforcement because of its prevalence is the use of alcohol with marijuana, apparently heightening the effects of each.

In Colorado last year, nearly 36 percent of all drivers involved in fatal crashes who tested positive for marijuana use also had consumed alcohol, according to the Colorado Department of Transportation.

''We're in the infancy with this, and it's very much an unknown since we don't have the data.'' Greenwood Village Police Chief John Jackson said. ''We spent 25 or 30 years figuring out where we were are with alcohol, and finally got to breathalyzers. There is no field test for marijuana yet. You will not convince those who believe it's safer that it's not. It becomes so emotional to the point of irrational.''

DIFFERING APPROACHES

Colorado has established that a THC level of 5 ng/mL is enough to charge someone with DUI. Unlike alcohol, where a reading of 0.08 is enough to convict someone of drunken driving—known as per se evidence that a driver is impaired—THC levels are only considered as ''permissible inference'' of impairment.

That means that despite the level of Delta–9 THC found in a driver's blood, a Colorado jury or judge decides whether the driver was impaired or not.

Washington and Montana, unlike Colorado, treat the same 5 ng/mL level of THC as if it were alcohol, where no other proof of impairment is needed to convict a driver charged with DUI. However, 12 states—including Arizona and Utah—have zero-tolerance policies, so any detectable amount of THC can lead to a conviction.

In its recent report to Congress, NHTSA questioned the THC levels states use to charge someone with impaired driving, calling them ''artificial.''

''A number of states have set a THC limit . . . indicating that if a suspect's THC concentration is above that level, . . . then the suspect is to be considered impaired,'' the agency said in its report. ''This per se limit appears to have been based on something other than scientific evidence.''

Urfer agreed.

''Permissible inference is a government-derived number that was part of the discussion around legalization.'' said Urfer, who spoke before the committees that prepared for Amendment 64, the voter initiative that legalized recreational marijuana use in Colorado. ''I've always said 5 (ng/mL) was a bad number.''

That's because of how THC works its way through a person's system, Urfer said, noting that if a single number had to be used, then using none at all makes the best sense ''since it's already illegal to drive when under the influence of a drug.''

''Impairment drops off over the next two to four hours,'' she said of marijuana use. ''The levels of THC drop off astronomically fast. But that drop-off in blood is distributing into the brain and the muscles of the body. And impairment comes from the brain.''

That means blood levels of THC are probably far lower at the time a test is done than

at the time of a crash or other traffic infraction. Yet, the THC is still in the driver's system—just not in their blood. That's led lawyers and others to contend that someone isn't actually impaired if their THC level is below 5 ng/mL.

''The public is misinterpreting the statement that you can't tell if someone's high because of the THC level,'' Urfer said. ''You can't directly correlate a number to impairment. The blood level for THC does not represent the same as alcohol does.''

THC levels hit their peak nearly instantaneously at the time someone uses marijuana and dissipate very quickly. What's detected in the blood is typically much lower than it had been at the time of use, especially when a sample is taken long after a crash occurs.

''The level in the blood is dropping, but the level in the brain is not,'' Urfer said. ''The high is caused by the level in the brain, not in the blood. And no one has published a study that says it's safe to drive high.''

As expected, there has been strong pushback from the marijuana industry, which says the only thing understood about THC levels is that very little is understood.

''There needs to be better understanding about what constitutes impairment,'' said Kristi Kelly, executive director of the Marijuana Industry Group, a Colorado trade organization. ''The science on cannabis metabolism doesn't support the legal 5 ng/mL limit in Colorado, which can be present for days and weeks after consumption.''

Roadside testing could be improving, with the advent of a saliva test that could bring more immediate and reliable information about the level of active THC in a person's system. The Colorado State Patrol has been using it in preliminary tests to determine its reliability.

''The inference is that at or above 5 (ng/ml.), you're high, but there should be no inference that below 5 you're sober,'' Urfer said. ''But people genuinely believe they can use an impairing substance, feel high and still think they can be safe to drive. They rationalize: 'Marijuana is legal. Why can't I drive on it?' They say it all the time. It's odd.''

[From Bloomberg News, Jan. 24, 2022]

U.S. GRAPPLES WITH HOW TO GAUGE JUST HOW HIGH CANNABIS USERS ARE

(By Tiffany Kary)

IMPAIRMENT TESTS ARE BECOMING BIG BUSINESS

''Walk a straight line'' isn't going to cut it anymore as police and employers grapple with growing use of marijuana.

Earlier this month, a study in a peer-reviewed journal became the latest sign that there's a paradigm shift going on in the nascent business of detecting impairment levels. The article, which appeared Neuropsychopharmacology, showed that an imaging technique can detect cannabis impairment with 76% accuracy. That's better than the 68% accuracy of field tests that employ traditional law enforcement protocols such as walking a straight line and examining a subject's pupils.

The technique, called functional near-infrared spectroscopy, measures changes in the prefrontal cortex of the brain. It shows that impaired brains look different than non-impaired brains in a way that doesn't necessarily correlate with the amount of THC in a person's system. THC detection in saliva or on the breath has so far been the main focus of tests. The study was carried out on 169 people at Massachusetts General Hospital, which is part of Harvard Medical School.

The study is a big deal for the cannabis industry, since the lack of a clear test to gauge intoxication has become a stumbling block for federal legalization. Though links between marijuana and accidents have been hard to draw due to factors such as the frequent mixing of alcohol with drugs, the study estimates that THC, which is the psychoactive ingredient in cannabis, at least doubles the risk of fatal motor vehicle crashes.

The research arm of the U.S. Department of Justice has acknowledged that field sobriety tests and THC levels are unreliable measures of marijuana intoxication. Methods like the ''one-leg stand'' and ''walk 11d turn'' weren't affected by marijuana highs, and some people had poor functions even when their THC levels were low.

STATES' EFFORTS

States have forged ahead nevertheless. According to New Frontier Data, at least five opted protocols that set a legal limit for driving based on the level of THC in the body. That has sparked a lot of interest in tests that can actually measure that level—a scientific challenge unto itself.

''Everybody wants a cannabis breathalyzer—something like what we have for alcohol where you breathe into a device and it tells a THC level and whether that means you're impaired or not,'' said Jodi Gilman, an associate professor in psychiatry at Harvard Medical School and lead author of the imaging study. ''But that's not how it works for cannabis, we need a new paradigm.''

Companies have been trying to crack the stoned-test for a while. Hound Labs, which makes a marijuana breathalyzer, said in September it had raised $20 million to scale its product. Cannabix Technologies, Inc. recently reported it had made headway creating a more portable device, while Lifeloc Techtologies Inc. said it was finalizing the platform for a rapid marijuana breathalyzer that could be used for roadside testing.

There are concerns, however, that tests based on THC levels may be unfair to those their system but aren't actually impaired. This can be the case for some who consumed cannabis days ago, or with frequent users who've built up a tolerance—who may use it for medical reasons.

''You wouldn't want to penalize that person,'' Gilman told me. ''What this technology will do is differentiate impaired from not-impaired, which is different than distinguishing cannabis from no-cannabis.''

IMPAIRMENT APP

One company that uses a similar approach is Cambridge, Massachusetts-based Impairment Science, which has an app called Druid to measure response times and motor skills through a series of tests on a screen. The methods let the app gauge impairment, regardless of whether the cause was alcohol, marijuana, or something else. The company aims to raise as much as $1.2 million in seed funding, according to Chief Executive Officer Robert Schiller.

Druid is being pitched to construction companies, and Impairment Science recently struck a deal with Anheuser-Busch InBev SA's Grupo Modelo, which will promote the app in an effort to reduce drunk driving in the Mexican state of Zacatecas. Schiller said the company plans to announce more corporate partnerships in the near future.

Still, there are no easy solutions. Druid's app requires that people take the test more that once in order to gauge impairment compared to a baseline score. The company is researching a product where tests could be one-offs, which would appeal to law enforcement.

The method used by Gilman also has its limitations. It relies on an imaging device from NirX Medical Technologies, which still costs around $40,000.

For better or worse, the techniques used by Gilman's study and Druid's app will also pick up forms of impairment that arise from issues other than marijuana, such as fatigue, illness or chronic medical conditions. That could be a good thing for public safety—especially at a time where perception-altering drugs like psilocybin are on the rise, and other drugs like opiates also create risks in driving and high-risk industries—but it could create other problems.

It's not hard to envision a future where people could be taken aside and wired up for a quick scan that checks their brain for telltale signs of impairment. Then comes the real work: Employers, insurers and police will have to figure out what to do with the information.

NUMBER OF THE WEEK

The number of U.S. states that have zero-tolerance laws prohibiting driving with any amount of THC or its metabolites in the body, according to New Frontier Data.

QUOTE OF THE WEEK

''Cannabis definitely impacts areas of the brain that affect decision making and impulse control. And that's very much what driving is,'' said Rebecca Siegel, a clinical psychiatrist and author of the book ''The Brain on Cannabis: What You Should Know About Recreational and Medical Marijuana.''

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

Eleusis, a health-care company focused on using psychedelic drugs as medicines, is going public through a merger with a blank-check firm.

Thailand plans to remove marijuana from its list of controlled substances, paving the way to decriminalization.

Mississippi could be the next state to put a cannabis law on the books.

A New Hampshire court found that a worker who was fired after he told his employer he started using cannabis when his doctor prescribed it for PTSD may have a viable claim under state disability bias law.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, the MORE Act is a historic piece of legislation, no question about it. It removes criminal convictions for marijuana use that have stigmatized the lives of thousands of individuals in our country, particularly those of color. In addition, tragically, our veterans have been denied access to medical marijuana for treatment of pain management and also post-traumatic stress syndrome after they have offered their lives and put their lives in danger for us.

Supported by public vote, Nevada legalized medical marijuana in 2001, decriminalized marijuana use in 2017, and has shown that regulating marijuana works. Most of the other States have done the same, so it is time for the Nation to follow suit.

□ 1030

With the passage of the MORE Act, the marijuana industry can become a key element of growing and diversifying our economy, creating more good jobs, and putting more folks back to work as we recover from the pandemic.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the bill.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3617, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act of 2021, or the MORE Act of 2021.

I am pleased to support this long-overdue measure and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the MORE Act, which is an important step in our continuing efforts to reform the criminal justice system, and I commend our Chairman for introducing this bill once again.

To summarize, the provisions of the MORE Act fall into three main categories—federal decriminalization, taxation, and expungement.

First, the bill would remove marijuana, or cannabis, from the list—or schedule—of Federally controlled substances. This means that, going forward, individuals could no longer be prosecuted, federally, for marijuana offenses. This does not mean that marijuana would now be legal throughout the United States—the bill would simply remove the Federal government from the business of prosecuting marijuana cases and would leave the question of legality to the individual States.

Those states choosing to decriminalize can do so, without ongoing interference from the Federal government, and those states that choose to continue to make marijuana illegal can continue to do so, as well.

Second, the bill would establish a taxation structure to collect a sales tax on marijuana, which, over the course of five years would increase from five to eight percent. The funds collected from this tax would be used to establish a trust fund to reinvest in communities ravaged by the War on Drugs, particularly communities of color.

The trust fund would be used for rehabilitation and reentry programs in the Department of Justice and for programs in the Small Business Administration to ensure that participants in the burgeoning marijuana market are diverse and provide opportunities for entrepreneurship in communities that have been adversely impacted by the War on Drugs.

Finally, the bill would expunge and seal Federal marijuana arrests and convictions and resentence offenders, as appropriate—a much-needed measure of this bill to attempt to undo some of the damage done to black and brown communities by decades of unjust enforcement.

Thousands of men and women have suffered needlessly from the federal criminalization of marijuana, particularly in communities of color, and have borne the burden of collateral consequences that have damaged our society across generations, such as the denial of affordable housing, educational opportunities, and employment.

The laws enacted for the purpose of perpetuating the "War on Drugs" have led America to imprison more people than any other country.

Expunging and sealing the arrest and conviction records of people affected by the cannabis laws would remove barriers that helped create a permanent second-class status for millions of Americans.

Our outdated federal laws and policies unwisely require scarce law enforcement resources to be expended on cannabis offenses while conflicting with many states' laws regarding cannabis.

Cannabis does not fit the definition of a Schedule One drug and federal law must be updated to reflect this reality—just as most states have already begun to do.

Public support for legalization has surged.

Thirty-seven states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Guam have adopted laws allowing legal access to cannabis. And eighteen states, the District of Columbia, and the Northern Mariana Islands have adopted laws for legalizing cannabis for adult recreational use.

A total of 47 States have reformed their laws in one form or another pertaining to cannabis, despite its continued Federal criminalization.

The State legal-cannabis industry already employs almost a quarter of a million people, and the federal government needs to get out of the way of state-level decision making.

We need to open the door to research, therapeutic treatment for veterans, better banking and tax laws, and we need to help fuel economic growth within the industry.

We need to do all of this without continuing to spend federal resources on criminalization and unjust incarceration for marijuana offenses. Congress needs to pass the MORE Act.

That is why I support passage of this bill today and ask my colleagues to do so, as well.

I thank our Chairman JERRY NADLER, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, and Congressman EARL BLUMENAUER for their commitment to this potentially life-changing bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD Health Affairs' "Culture of Health," which shows the importance of cannabis liberalization policy, and a letter from all of these individuals, religious groups, and the Center for American Progress.

[From HealthAffairs, July 2021]

CANNABIS LIBERALIZATION IN THE US: THE POLICY LANDSCAPE

The cannabis—or marijuana—policy landscape has shifted rapidly in past decades, with increasing numbers of states decriminalizing cannabis possession and legalizing its medical and recreational uses. Yet under federal law, cannabis remains prohibited because of the potential for drug misuse and negative health consequences. This disconnect between federal and state law has allowed a for-profit commercial industry to flourish in many states, absent consistent regulation to ensure product safety. Increasing cannabis accessibility in the states thus raises important public health concerns while expanding certain therapeutic opportunities. A second Health Affairs Health Policy Brief accompanying this one explores the health effects of cannabis legalization. It is also important to understand the framework of policies governing legal cannabis markets, as each policy category likely has differential impacts on health benefits and harms associated with canna-bis use and inconsistencies across jurisdictions have important population health implications.

FEDERAL CANNABIS POLICY

The US federal government began taxing cannabis production and sales by enacting the Marihuana Tax Act of 1937 only after most states had prohibited the substance. In 1970, this law was replaced by the Controlled Substances Act, which designates marijuana as a Schedule I substance considered to have high abuse potential and no accepted medical use. Under federal law, the production, sale. possession. and distribution of cannabis can carry fines and prison time.

During the Obama administration, the federal government relaxed its enforcement of cannabis-related crimes. In a series of executive actions, culminating in the 2013 Cole memorandum, the Department of Justice deprioritized prosecution of federal cannabis crimes in states where these activities were legal and robustly regulated. First passed in 2014, the Rohrabacher-Farr Amendment prohibited the use of federal funds to prosecute medical cannabis-related activities permissible under state law.

Other recent federal actions have further facilitated access to cannabis plant derivatives. although these differ from the botanical products and simple extracts that tend to dominate state cannabis markets. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved several synthetic tetrahydrocannabinol (THC) products in 1985 and 2016. each of which was placed on a higher controlled substance schedule than cannabis. The 2018 Farm Bill legalized hemp, a substance extracted from the cannabis plant that contains only 0.3 percent THC. Also in 2018. the Drug Enforcement Administration designated FDA-approved cannabis-derived cannabidiol (CBD) products containing no more than 0.1 percent THC as Schedule V substances.

Under this authority, the FDA approved the first CBD product, Epidiolex, to treat childhood seizures.

EVOLUTION OF THE STATE POLICY LANDSCAPE

Public support for the legalization of cannabis use in the US rose from 12 percent to 66 percent between 1969 and 2019. Concurrently, states liberalized their approaches to cannabis markets. Four central policy categories have evolved: prohibition, decriminalization, medical legalization, and recreational (also known as adult use) legalization. Decriminalization regimes were generally adopted first (in the 1970s–1980s, with a resurgence in the 2010s). Decriminalization laws were later complemented by medical legalization or replaced by recreational legalization. Exhibit 1 shows the current status of these four policies, and exhibit 2 depicts state adoption of legalization policies for medical and recreational cannabis since 1996.

Prohibition

States began prohibiting cannabis cultivation, distribution, and possession in the early twentieth century. By 1937, every state had some form of cannabis legislation, often motivated by concerns (largely unsubstantiated by scientific evidence at the time) that cannabis products were psychologically addictive, produced insanity, and motivated crime. Although liberalization policies have largely replaced prohibitions, two states—Idaho and Kansas—still ban cannabis in all forms and assign criminal penalties for the possession of even small amounts. Another ten states permit the use of "low-THC, high-CBD" products but maintain prohibitions and criminal penalties for all other cannabis activities (included in the "prohibition" category in exhibit 1).

Decriminalization

Decriminalization is the repeal of criminal penalties associated with cannabis possession for personal use and casual exchange (that is, not sales). "Depenalization" policies that lower these penalties without removing them do not qualify as decriminalization regimes. Decriminalization also differs from the nonenforcement policies adopted in several US cities, where enforcement of low-level cannabis-involved offenses is deprioritized. Decriminalization falls short

of legalization because it still prohibits and criminally penalizes cannabis cultivation, production, and sales and maintains civil penalties for possessing cannabis. Since the 1970s, states have increasingly adopted decriminalization policies. By 2020, sixteen states had such a policy (exhibit 1). The laws vary along several dimensions, including the levels of civil fines, penalties for repeat offenses, and threshold amounts of cannabis that are exempt from criminal penalties.

Medical Cannabis Legalization

Medical cannabis laws typically permit patients with ''qualifying conditions'' certified by a medical professional to purchase cannabis at dispensaries operating within the state. Medical cannabis laws differ from low-THC and high-CBD laws, which only legalize the supply and use of cannabis products with low THC content. The most common qualifying condition for which medical users can be certified is chronic pain, although states regularly add conditions to their lists. Since California passed the first medical cannabis law in 1996, the number of jurisdictions adopting such programs has grown steadily (exhibit 2). Today, more than two-thirds of Americans live in one of the thirty-six states and four territories that have approved medical cannabis use (exhibit 1).

The first medical cannabis laws passed (1996–2000) were vague and defined medical use broadly. Although laws passed between 2000 and 2009 offered more regulatory guidance over the legal supply chain, laws passed or modified in more recent years (2009–17) feature more comprehensive regulatory programs that prioritize product safety. Still, the vast majority of participants in medical cannabis programs are in what are considered ''nonmedicalized programs,'' which lack components consistent with evidence-based medicine and pharmaceutical regulation (for example, testing and labeling) and are largely divorced from medical practice. Ways in which current laws differ from each other include the qualifying conditions approved, channels of access {dispensaries, collective versus home cultivation, and so on), registration card renewal requirements, and use by patients from other states.

Recreational Cannabis Legalization

Recreational cannabis laws remove the criminal and civil penalties associated with supply or possession of the substance by adults ages twenty-one and older. These laws typically allow individuals to grow four to six cannabis plants and limit possession and purchase to one to two ounces; most also impose at least a 10 percent retail excise tax on sales. Most states with recreational laws prohibit the use of cannabis while operating a motor vehicle, although four states have specific per se THC limits while driving.

Legalization of recreational use is a relatively new phenomenon. In 2012, Colorado and Washington were the first jurisdictions globally to allow adult cultivation and possession of cannabis. In 2020, fifteen states and Washington, DC, had laws that legalize adult cannabis supply and possession in some form (exhibit 1), resulting in more than one-third of the US population having legal access to the substance. With the exception of Illinois and Vermont, all laws passed through 2020 have advanced via ballot measures rather than through the legislature.

States have choices in their recreational cannabis regulatory regimes. Most states have opted for a commercial model, wherein private industry is allowed to produce, supply, and sell cannabis subject to regulation at the state and sometimes local levels. Washington, D.C., uniquely does not allow for commercial production or retail sale but, rather, permits only small amounts of cannabis for personal possession, use, and cultivation. Although Vermont originally prohibited commercial sale, the state authorized the establishment of a commercial retail market in October 2020. Factors that can vary within commercial regimes include how producers and suppliers are regulated, the types of products that may be distributed, taxes, prices, marketing restrictions, and ways in which products can be used or personally cultivated.

States that enacted recreational legalization laws saw declines in adult cannabis-related arrests, although racial disparities in those arrests persist. Some cannabis policies, including the 2021 New Mexico, New York, and Virginia legalization initiatives, incorporate reforms to address harms experienced by communities disproportionately affected by cannabis criminalization. Some laws include provisions to expunge or pardon cannabis-related minor offenses Other states have initiated programs to increase minority participation in the legal market. Some jurisdictions have earmarked tax revenue generated from cannabis sales to support socioeconomically disadvantaged communities.

POLICY CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

Limited national regulation of cannabis, the persistent divide between national and state policy, and the growth of state cannabis markets present numerous challenges for population health, in part because the safety of many cannabis products is uncertain and varies from state to state. A dearth of federal regulation around cannabis products has resulted in an unevenly regulated for-profit industry that generates high profits and maintains substantial control over marketing, promotion, and products supplied.

Cannabis's Schedule I designation under federal law poses additional challenges. It hinders the research into the safety and adverse effects of cannabis-based products that would be required for FDA approval. It also restricts cannabis supplied for clinical trials to that which comes from federal sources, which fails to reflect the potency and type of products actually marketed in the states, although the Drug Enforcement Administration is poised to approve several manufacturers' applications to cultivate marijuana for research needs. Institutions for higher education may be reluctant to allow cannabis to be used in research on their campuses for fear of losing federal funding. Cannabis consumers remain uncertain over the stability of their supply chain and risks that they may be prosecuted under federal law or become ineligible for federal benefits. Finally, cannabis cultivators and distributors face barriers accessing financial services, given that the banking industry is subject to federal laws, resulting in an inability to design investment and growth strategies that could enhance the legitimacy of the industry and safety of the products.

The lack of comprehensive, consistent oversight of cannabis products and the disconnect between federal and state policy suggest a number of important considerations for policy makers.

Enhanced Federal Oversight of Product Safety and Development

Several options exist to improve federal oversight of cannabis markets and products and to better align national and state policies. Modifying cannabis's classification in the Controlled Substances Act would facilitate enhanced product safety research at the federal and state levels, relax consumer and industry fears of criminal prosecution, and facilitate legitimate financial transactions for cannabis companies. It also would provide federal policy makers with additional regulatory controls, such as premarketing approval, which is currently unavailable for substances designated as Schedule I, and would acknowledge cannabis's medical benefits This modification could be accomplished by amending the Controlled Substances Act to remove cannabis from Schedule I and moving it to a higher schedule; descheduling cannabis altogether, but having it meet the threshold for FDA oversight, similar to nicotine and tobacco products; or creating a new schedule for cannabis that distinguishes it from other Schedule I substances. The Medical Marijuana Research Act recently approved by the US House of Representatives promotes cannabis research by allowing scientists to access cannabis from state-level dispensaries. Federal policy makers could also further facilitate state regulation of cannabis supply by passing legislation that restricts federal prosecutorial interference with state cannabis markets.

Notwithstanding the above changes, the FDA already possesses some regulatory powers to enhance the safety of cannabis products. Under the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 and Section 351 of the Public Health Service Act as affirmed in the 2018 Farm Bill, the FDA can regulate cannabis-containing and cannabis-derived compounds. Under this authority, the FDA has taken particular interest in overseeing the science and safety of CBD products. Of concern are health claims made by some cannabis product manufacturers and the introduction of foods containing THC or CBD into interstate commerce—both of which are areas under FDA jurisdiction. The agency could take more aggressive action than issuing warning letters to questionable (CBD-related commercial practices and could extend the rigor of its investigations into THC products. For example, it could limit the allowable THC content, which is concerningly high in many cannabis products and is capable of inducing dependence or cannabis use disorder.

State Strategies for Overseeing Cannabis Product Safety

Without changes in the federal regulatory architecture or enhanced FDA oversight, states that move forward with legalization must carefully consider how to safely oversee cannabis markets.

Medical and recreational legalization have encouraged a proliferation of product forms. Data from early recreationally legalized states suggest that although the flower of the plant still accounts for the largest proportion of the market, heterogeneous extracts for inhalation are the fastest-growing market segment. Cannabis products vary not only in form but also in the potency of THC, CBD, and other cannabinoids, as well as in the types and amounts of pesticides and other impurities. Cannabis food and drink products pose unique regulatory challenges. The health risks associated with edibles, including for minors, likely result from minimal consistency across products relating to potency, inaccurate labeling, and the fact that many edibles contain multiple servings of the advised THC dose. Further, users may fail to appreciate the delayed effects of ingestion compared with inhalation.

State legalization provides an opportunity for enhanced regulatory oversight that can improve the safety of legal cannabis products and limit the health risks and other risks associated with the illegal marketplace. Policy makers can consider ways to align legal cannabis markets with public health strategies gleaned from tobacco and alcohol, such as minimizing youth advertising exposure, restricting sale and marketing locations, and requiring childproof packaging. Frameworks could also consider medical and recreational legalization regimes that adopt safety standards, for instance, by limiting the concentration of THC

in products to levels not associated with dependence.

Standards for Medical Training

Despite the increasing prevalence of cannabis use in states with and without legalization, many physicians do not receive training on the potential health benefits and harms of medical and recreational cannabis. To address this gap, states could mandate that state-licensed physicians complete continuing medical education credits on medical cannabis use before certifying patients for medical cannabis registration. Medical schools and residency programs could also design coursework on the biochemical effects, clinical relevance, and legal evolution of cannabis policy. These education activities could be regularly updated with emerging evidence on the health effects of cannabis. Outreach could extend to patients and the public to inform them of the evidence-based therapeutic uses of cannabis. All such training would be better informed by enhanced research, as discussed above.

Considerations for Criminal Justice and Racial Equity

As cannabis liberalization progresses throughout the country, states must address the collateral consequences of cannabis-related criminal justice contact. Although states with legalization and, to a lesser degree, decriminalization regimes have experienced overall declines in arrests for cannabis across racial groups, disparities in arrests across races remain notable. Although cannabis-related arrests decreased by 18 percent during the past decade, a Black person is still nearly four times more likely to be arrested for cannabis possession than a White person.

Cannabis policy reforms that aim to address criminal justice and social disparities warrant consideration. Cumbersome and expensive expungement processes, significant entry obstacles associated with the legal market, and declines in price that in turn reduce funds earmarked for community programs threaten initiatives that address harms produced by cannabis criminalization. As states begin to implement social equity measures, they should carefully assess which communities have been disproportionately harmed by cannabis prohibition; how to encourage equitable, sustainable participation in the cannabis industry—including training and business support; and how earmarked cannabis revenue will be disseminated to equity-enhancing initiatives.

CONCLUSION

Cannabis policy liberalization provides opportunities for therapeutic benefit but also presents the potential for health harms, the full consequences of which remain unknown, given the nascency of the research and inconsistency in findings (see the accompanying Health Affairs Health Policy Brief) For policy makers considering reforms, policy choices extend beyond blunt categories of prohibition, decriminalization, medical legalization, and recreational legalization and involve decisions related to the panoply of regulatory provisions that govern legal and illegal cannabis. The specifics of how to implement and enforce cannabis policy and regulation are important to health, and researchers should endeavor to evaluate these nuances as well as the broader policy categories. Some states have included within their legalization initiatives provisions requiring policy evaluation. For example, Washington State earmarked cannabis tax revenue to fund a continuous cannabis research program. Other states, including Vermont and New York, reviewed the potential impacts of regulating a recreational cannabis supply chain before policy reform. More efforts such as these will help to unpack the independent and comparative health harms and benefits of various cannabis policy regimes and regulatory approaches.

MARCH 1, 2022.

Speaker NANCY PELOSI,
Washington, DC.
House Majority Leader STENY HOYER,
Washington, DC.
Re Bring the MORE Act to the House Floor for a Vote

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MAJORITY LEADER HOYER: We, the undersigned criminal justice, civil rights, drug policy, labor and advocacy organizations who make up the Marijuana Justice Coalition, write today to urge you to swiftly bring to the House floor the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement (MORE) Act of 2021 (H.R. 3617). This legislation would end federal marijuana prohibition, address the collateral consequences of federal marijuana criminalization, and take steps to ensure the legal marketplace is diverse and inclusive.

This historic legislation first passed the House in December of 2020 with a bipartisan vote of 228–164 but was not considered by the Senate prior to the close of the 116th Congress. Given that nearly every minute one person in this country is arrested for a minor marijuana crime, the public deserves to know if members of the 117th Congress stand on the side of justice and against the outdated and cruel policy of prohibition and criminalization of marijuana.

Mass criminalization and over-enforcement of drug law violations have devastated the social and economic fabrics of entire communities, while also tearing apart the lives of millions of individuals and families. And while Black, Latino, and Indigenous people have carried the brunt of marijuana criminalization, they have been shut out of the regulated marijuana marketplace due to these very same criminal records in addition to financial barriers to entry.

The MORE Act seeks to solve these problems through a comprehensive approach. The bill would declassify marijuana as a controlled substance under federal law, expunge marijuana convictions, and reduce marijuana sentences. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the MORE Act would have reduced time served by 73,000 person-years, over the 2021–2030 period, among existing and future incarcerated individuals. The bill, after solving the industry's 280E tax issue, would also place a minor initial five percent federal excise tax on marijuana sales at the manufacturer level in order to fund services in communities adversely impacted by drug prohibition and to build up Small Business Administration programming to support a more diverse and inclusive marketplace with local ownership.

The previous House vote on the MORE Act came on the heels of an election where five states—Montana, Arizona, South Dakota, Mississippi, and New Jersey—had marijuana reform on the ballot and each voted to loosen their marijuana laws. Since then, even more states have chosen to reform their marijuana laws. More recently, Connecticut, New York, New Mexico, and Virginia passed marijuana legalization bills rooted in social justice bringing the total number of states that have legalized adult-use of marijuana to 18, in addition to the District of Columbia, while 37 states and the District of Columbia have legalized medical marijuana, most recently Mississippi earlier this year.

A recent Pew Research poll shows that a record number of U.S. adults—91 percent—now support marijuana legalization for medical or adult use, a policy that is only achievable by removing the substance from the Controlled Substances Act as the MORE Act does. In short, the resounding shift in favor of marijuana reform demonstrates what we have been saying: marijuana justice is a winning issue and it is long past time for the federal government to catch up.

The time to end federal prohibition is long overdue. We urge you bring the MORE Act to the House floor in March. For more information or to address any questions you may have, please contact Maritza Perez, Director of the Office of National Affairs of the Drug Policy Alliance and convener of the Marijuana Justice Coalition.

Sincerely,

American Civil Liberties Union; The BOWL PAC; Center for American Progress; The Center for Law and Social Policy (CLASP); Clergy for a New Drug Policy; Doctors for Cannabis Regulation; Drug Policy Alliance; Human Rights Watch; Immigrant Defense Project; Immigrant Legal Resource Center JustLeadershipUSA; Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law; The Leadership Conference on Civil & Human Rights; Minorities for Medical Marijuana, Inc.; MoveOn; National Immigration Project of the National Lawyers Guild; National Organization for the Reform of Marijuana Laws; National Urban League; Students for Sensible Drug Policy; United Food and Commercial Workers International Union; Veterans Cannabis Coalition.

Mr. BENTZ. I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, as I mentioned previously, fails to appropriately fund the police in all the States that will be facing the challenges that we face in Oregon.

This is not a question of money. The bill, as drawn, will be raising literally billions of dollars at 8 percent tax over the next how many years—billions. Somehow, some of that money has to make its way into law enforcement.

Without law enforcement, Mr. Speaker, you will see situations like we have in southern Oregon replicated across the Nation, regardless of the optimistic thought that somehow the cartels no longer have the monopoly and, therefore, will go away. That is not going to be the case as long as there is a higher price. In many cases, it is going to be a much higher price for legally produced marijuana.

The bill fails to address impairment. My friends, many of them in the law enforcement space, including my brother, a former county sheriff, have said this is a huge problem where we don't know when people are driving impaired. Studies are ongoing.

Why are we broadening this problem when we don't know how to charge those who are driving under the influence?

Of course, as we have heard, it fails to address the ever-increasing potency of the drug. It fails to address the age at which marijuana can be legally used.

What is that about? We know this drug adversely affects particularly young men's brain development all the

way up to age 26, yet this bill says nothing about it.

It fails to address the differences between marijuana and hemp. Some would say, well, that is such a small issue. It is a huge issue. It is a huge issue, and it needs to be addressed.

This bill is the proper vehicle to address these issues. I see that there are some amendments being brought which perhaps will at least go partially in that direction. But the bill itself and the legalization are premature, given the nature of those amendments.

This is an untimely and incomplete bill. Its greatest failure is in not recognizing and addressing the damage the drug will do to our kids and our communities.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a ''no'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, last Congress, the House voted, on a bipartisan basis, to address this issue. Unfortunately, the Senate failed to act, so I am pleased that we are moving forward again today.

Over the past two decades, public support for legalizing marijuana has surged. States have led the way and continue to lead the way on marijuana reform, but our Federal laws have not kept pace with the obvious need for change. It is time for the Federal Government to catch up, to do what is right.

The MORE Act would treat marijuana as a public health issue rather than a criminal matter and would begin to rectify the heavy toll that criminalization has taken, particularly on communities of color and low-income communities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the MORE Act, and urge my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—to support this important and comprehensive cannabis reform legislation. It tackles inequities and historic criminalization associated with cannabis.

The MORE Act will begin the long-overdue effort to undo the damage to families and communities across our nation that has been caused by misguided and ineffective federal drug polices related to cannabis. It will finally establish a safe and well-regulated interstate marketplace for cannabis.

It is vitally important that at the federal level we finally recognize and invite this economic engine of job creation into the mainstream of our economy and workforce development. The vast majority of Americans support this long overdue change, and voters in many states including my home state of California have already taken action to legalize cannabis at the state level. It is time that we end this senseless and impactful disconnect between state and federal law.

I also want to bring my colleagues' attention to one outstanding issue as this legislation moves forward. California's farmers are among the most productive and innovative in the world. Not surprisingly, that is the case with our cannabis farmers too, including those in my congressional district. Unfortunately, cannabis farmers are in the same legal limbo as everyone else in the industry because there are grey areas in the law that need to be resolved: they can't enroll in crop insurance programs, they can't receive an official ''organic'' designation, and they can't access USDA programs and support. Yet cannabis cultivation is not significantly different from farming strawberries, wine grapes, cut flowers, vegetables, and other crops grown in my district and state. I am hopeful that as we work with the Senate on comprehensive cannabis reform, we can provide clear statutory direction to bring USDA into this conversation as well and eliminate this remaining area of ambiguity for the farmers in my state.

Once again, I urge a yes vote on this bill.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise safety concerns that remain unaddressed in H.R. 3617, the Marijuana Reinvestment and Expungement Act—known as the MORE Act. I believe there are serious safety concerns to be addressed prior to this chamber advancing this legislation.

According to recent data, the safety impacts of cannabis legalization for adult recreational use should not be ignored.

A 2020 AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety study analyzed the impacts of legal adult recreational use of cannabis in Washington state. The AAA study concluded that the proportion of fatal-crash-involved drivers who were THC-positive approximately doubled from the level observed before the law went into effect.

Moreover, a series of studies conducted by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety (IIHS) found that crash rates increased in some of my neighboring states and others after they legalized marijuana. California, Colorado, Nevada, and Oregon, specifically, were the subjects of the IIHS evaluation.

Marijuana use impacts the psycho-motor skills of the people who use it, often resulting in slowed responses. As seen by these earlier data, this impacts how we drive, overall safety on our roadways, and may have other safety impacts as we relax the laws around cannabis. I have serious safety concerns, and I would like to see these issues addressed more directly before I can consider supporting such legislation. To this end, I am developing my own legislation to look at this issue in workplaces to ensure safe, impairment free operations, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to see it enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Each further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117–285 shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before the question is put thereon, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOTTHEIMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 117–285.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 16. STUDY ON MARIJUANA IMPAIRMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall conduct a study on technologies and methods that law enforcement may use to determine whether a driver is impaired by marijuana.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall be carried out by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, in consultation with any other agency the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000 to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today about an amendment that I think is critically important to this legislation. It addresses a topic that I am concerned about, and I know many are as well, to make sure that law enforcement has the tools they need to ensure that our roads are safe and that when they pull someone over for whatever purpose, they are able to actually have the tools they need to assess the situation.

My amendment would make sure the Secretary of Transportation can conduct a study on technology and methods that law enforcement can use to determine whether a driver is impaired by marijuana. The study will give the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration the resources they need to conduct this study.

I think it is important and will make this legislation even stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, this amendment would authorize $10 million to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to conduct a study on how certain technologies can help law enforcement officers detect whether a driver is impaired by marijuana.

Impaired driving is a serious issue that takes thousands of lives every year. Unfortunately, the Democrats only want to address this problem after they create it. Legalizing marijuana will undoubtedly lead to more drivers being impaired by marijuana.

Democrats want to legalize marijuana and then provide law enforcement with a study on how they might be able to detect drivers impaired by

marijuana. Why wouldn't we start with giving law enforcement the resources they need?

This doesn't make any sense, and the lack of support for law enforcement from Democrats in this bill shouldn't surprise us. Nowhere in this bill is there any funding for law enforcement related to marijuana. Let's fix the existing problems before making more.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his thoughtful amendment, and I thank him for helping to further enhance this bill.

For clarity's sake, let me be very clear. This bill decriminalizes possession on the Federal level. All State laws and all State law enforcement are able to do their job. But let me remind you, Mr. Speaker, the President has put in an enormous amount of money for reducing crime in his budget.

This legislation is extremely important for those of us who recognize the key responsibilities on the Nation's highways. That is a Federal responsibility, and the gentleman has offered an important amendment to give $10 million to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to find the technology to enhance safety on highways.

The bill also includes a requirement that a study should be conducted to understand the societal impacts of decriminalizing marijuana, including the impact on juveniles, education, transportation, veterans, employment, and many others.

The gentleman's amendment, Mr. GOTTHEIMER's, enhances this bill and makes it a direct response to the concerns that Americans may have.

Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment and the underlying bill, and I thank the gentleman for clarifying this important responsibility.

Mr. BENTZ. I am prepared to close, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to reinforce what Ms. JACKSON LEE said, the importance of making sure we invest in safety, which is always my top priority, and making sure that law enforcement has the tools they need.

We invest in law enforcement and ensure we have their backs. They take care of us every single day. I stand by law enforcement, and we will make sure they have the resources they need. This legislation helps in that effort to protect our families and our roads.

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

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. LAMB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 117–285.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 16. WORKPLACE IMPACT OF MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION STUDY.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health shall—

(1) conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the impact of the legalization of recreational cannabis by States on the workplace; and

(2) develop best practices for use by employers that are transitioning their policies related to the use of recreational cannabis, prioritizing the development of best practices for employers engaged in Federal infrastructure projects, transportation, public safety, and national security.

Add at the end of the bill the following:

SEC. 17. SCHOOL IMPACT OF MARIJUANA LEGALIZATION STUDY.

Not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Education shall—

(1) conduct a study and submit to Congress a report on the impact of the legalization of recreational cannabis by States on schools and school-aged children; and

(2) develop best practices for use by educators and administrators to protect school-aged children from any negative impacts of such legalization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to Congress, I was a Federal prosecutor in my hometown of Pittsburgh, and the biggest law enforcement challenges that we had then, and really still have today, are opioids and gun violence. Marijuana just didn't register in terms of the risks that it posed to people on a day-to-day basis compared to those two things.

Yet, because of the way the Federal criminal laws are written and the way that cannabis is placed in schedule I, it is very easy for a marijuana offense to actually get someone a worse sentence than an opioid offense like overprescribing Oxycontin, selling fentanyl, or a firearms offense like possession of a firearm or shooting at someone. Our Federal laws are out of place.

It is in the spirit of wanting to make sure that our law enforcement priorities are focused on the most serious crimes and the most violent crimes that I can support the removal of cannabis from schedule I.

This bill came up once before in the previous Congress under a closed rule in which there were not opportunities for amendment, so I want to thank the leadership and the chairman this time around for allowing Members under an open rule to make some amendments.

While I do support the removal of cannabis from schedule I, I think, as we have heard in the debate today, there are many questions about what happens the day after that and are we being careful enough to ensure that the public gets the best possible balance of the benefits of taxing and regulating cannabis while still protecting children and making sure that we have safe and efficient workplaces.

The amendment that I am offering here today aims to answer a couple of questions. Essential workers—firefighters, people who operate heavy equipment on infrastructure projects, people who work in public safety and national security—what are we willing to tolerate as far as those workers on the job site potentially with cannabis in their system?

We need to know how to test for it. We need to know what the rules are to keep people safe on that job site and, most importantly, keep the public safe so these people can continue working.

The same question for schools: What are the best practices for schools in a world where cannabis is no longer in schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act; in a world where cannabis could be in corner stores that children walk past on their way home; in a world where school bus drivers or teachers may be legally authorized to use cannabis in their off time?

All we are trying to do is answer these questions.

There are some who see problems with a change in the law. They see challenges, and they shrink from them. They say: Let's keep the status quo the same. Let's not tackle problems.

What we are trying to do here is do the public one better than that.

There is an ironclad case for removing cannabis from schedule I and focusing our law enforcement priorities where they should be, but we have to take steps to make sure that we do this in a careful, cautious, and correct manner.

That is what my amendment offers, Mr. Speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1045

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the proposed amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This amendment is a great example of how Democrats legislate: Make a bunch of drastic changes and then consider the consequences.

The amendment calls for two studies to be conducted, after the enactment of the bill, to evaluate how State legislation on marijuana has impacted those States.

The first study will be conducted by the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health on the impact of State legalization of recreational marijuana on the workplace. The second study will be conducted by the Department of Education on the impact of legalization to schools and school-aged children.

The amendment also requires the Department of Education to develop best practices for educators and administrators to protect children from negative impacts.

This amendment recognizes the fact that the majority is blindly leading us down the path of marijuana legalization. The information to be provided by these studies would better serve this body and the children of America if we had it before legalization.

Last year, the percentage of American employees testing positive for drugs hit a two-decade high. This jump was driven by an increase in positive marijuana tests.

This amendment is merely window dressing on a bad and incomplete bill. Rather than tackle the actual problem of marijuana abuse at the workplace, which could have disastrous consequences, Democrats simply want to study the issue.

This amendment is a tacit admission that they know this bill is flawed, and it is a ploy by the majority to say they addressed one of the flaws.

I fear the information that the studies will reveal may come too late for many if this bill were to become law.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Oregon has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is incredulous when good ideas come to the floor that should draw bipartisan support—one cannot look, in the old country, they say, a gift horse in the mouth.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for recognizing that what we do in Washington, what we do for the people of this Nation, is to make sure we give them good facts. It will be good facts if his amendment is assessing a very important place in our lives, the workplace, or another very important place in our lives, schools.

This legislation, as I indicated, the underlying legislation just decriminalizes possession. It gives people another lifeline. It takes the criminalization away from this mounting incarceration of people of color.

I support the gentleman's amendment and say it is reasonable and good law. Let us support that amendment and the underlying bill.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMB. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address one point from my colleague from Oregon's side of the debate.

Today, after the passage of this bill—hopefully, with my amendment—we will be sending a letter to both departments addressed by this amendment to ask them to begin these studies right away. I agree that it is important that the public needs this information and knowledge. Employers, workplaces, and schools need it as quickly as possible.

What I am not sure our colleagues on the other side really realize at this moment is that people are already using cannabis. It is very common in all segments of society and all people with all different types of jobs. The place that the public has been left in is an overly harsh criminal penalty, with very little specific guidance to workplaces, employers, and schools of what they are supposed to do in this new world.

What many of them do is react as harshly as possible, matching the criminal sanction of our Federal Government. They do drug tests and have strict bans, basically, on this substance that many Americans feel is actually safe and part of the lifestyle that they want to live.

Our study will allow a better answer than that. In a world where people are going to be using this drug, this substance, and where it is, in fact, much less harsh than prescription drugs that are regulated lower on the scale than that, we need to get the answer out there to these workplaces and schools as quickly as possible. That is all that we are aiming to do here.

We are making policy for the real world with this amendment, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to mention that I agree there has to be the proper determination of when you are impaired after you have used marijuana. I made that argument in my discussion of the bill.

The issue is one of timing. It is not just impairment. There are many other things in the bill that need to be addressed that aren't.

In this rush to legalize, what we have is a lot of assuming, as was just suggested, that everybody is already using it, so why bother? Well, a lot of people are. But after it becomes federally legalized, more will be using it. Thus, the danger level will increase.

We can't sit here and say there are no consequences of legalization. By that, I mean the same number of people using it. The questions become: When are we going to do this? Why wasn't it done earlier? Why wasn't it done yet? One of the reasons is that it is really hard to make this determination.

What I am saying is, it is a matter of timing. But it is not just this issue; there are many others.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 117–285.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 78, after line 20 insert the following:

(c) REVIEW AND REASSESSMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, each Federal agency shall review and reassess each decision, made on or after May 1, 1971, to deny or rescind the security clearance of an individual described.

(2) REASON FOR DENIAL.—A review and reassessment conducted under paragraph (1) shall not use past or present cannabis or marijuana use as a reason to deny or rescind a security clearance.

(3) NOTICE.—A Federal agency conducting a review and reassessment under paragraph (1) shall notify each individual described of such review and reassessment and provide such individual an opportunity to decline the review and reassessment. As applicable, an individual described shall be notified of the outcome of any review and reassessment conducted as soon as practicable.

(4) INDIVIDUAL DESCRIBED.—In this subsection, the term ''individual described'' means any individual who has had a security clearance denied or rescinded for past or present cannabis or marijuana use.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud today to stand for this legislation with the party of democracy and freedom for the people, rather than the party of Big Brother and failed drug authoritarianism.

Do you know that 150 million Americans have used marijuana? Half of the country. That is just the people who are being honest about it. Half of the country has used marijuana, but you can still be denied a security clearance and government employment for having once used marijuana. That is plainly stupid, wrong, and unfair.

We are disqualifying tens of millions of qualified and excellent job applicants for Federal Government employment, our fellow citizens, our constituents. In Democratic districts and Republican districts, we are disqualifying those people from being Federal Government employees solely because they have used marijuana.

My amendment is one that every Member of the House should support. It says that Americans should not be denied a security clearance simply because they have used marijuana.

The longer I spend time in Congress, Mr. Speaker, the more I realize that in America, change comes from the States. It comes from the people. That is how we got child labor laws. That is how we got women's suffrage. That is how we got direct election of U.S. Senators, and now, so too with our draconian, obsolete, and failed marijuana laws.

Look at what is happening out in America. Eighteen States, plus Washington, D.C., have now passed laws allowing adult use of marijuana. In other words, they have accepted the antiprohibition principle that is in our Constitution. It is not that alcohol is so great for everybody in every circumstance, or marijuana is so great for everybody in every circumstance. It is that criminal prohibition and criminalization of large parts of our own population don't work.

It is legal in 18 States. In 27 States, it has been decriminalized. In a majority of the States, it is no longer criminal. In 36 States, the vast majority of America, more than two-thirds of the States, medical use of marijuana has been approved. In other words, it is legal in the vast majority of States of the country to use marijuana for medicinal purposes.

What a massive outbreak of common sense in America against the GOP's failed authoritarian war on marijuana that depends on paranoid tropes from the 1970s. It is like they saw ''Reefer Madness'' in middle school and never got over it.

I concede our party is not for the kind of cocaine-fueled orgies that a freshman Republican Representative bragged about this week, but we do understand that their marijuana prohibition laws don't work for our people.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, we can all agree that we should not be denying our constituents the opportunity to serve in Federal office by denying them a security clearance simply because they have used marijuana.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is April Fools' Day, so maybe this is a joke.

This amendment would require Federal agencies to review every decision to rescind or deny a security clearance since 1971 to determine if it was based on marijuana usage. Then, the agency would have to track down every person who was denied a clearance due to marijuana use. The agency would then let them know that the decision will be reassessed unless the person objects.

This is crazy. It creates a huge burden on Federal agencies for what? Even if this bill were to become law, the denial of these security clearances was based on a person's willful violation of a law at the time.

When agencies are assessing whether these people should have access to national security sensitive information, the consideration isn't whether the person uses marijuana. It is whether the person is willing to undermine the rule of law.

If they can't follow this Nation's laws, then we can't expect them to follow the processes to protect our most sensitive information.

Further, this amendment reaches back more than 50 years. How many of these people still need, want, or are even eligible for security clearances?

No one gets a security clearance just because you want one. You can't just walk up off the street and apply for it. You need to be employed with the Federal Government or a government contractor, and your employer must need you to have access to the information.

Very few people who were denied a security clearance in 1980 are still employed in or even qualify for positions that would require security clearances. Some of the people we are talking about may be retirees in their eighties or nineties. Many of them may have representative payees who are their children or grandchildren. Why would we want to expose the fact that their father, mother, grandfather, or grandmother was a marijuana abuser?

The gentleman from Maryland wants the Federal Government to re-create the security clearance backlog that the Trump administration just cleared up for unneeded reviews and to resurface private information. This amendment makes little sense.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think the distinguished gentleman seems to concede the general principle that we should not be denying the opportunity of Federal employment to half of the country because they have used marijuana before.

So, his argument seems to be: We have denied so many people that this would be an imposition on Federal bureaucrats to go back and tell people when they have been wronged in the past simply by telling the truth and saying that they have once used marijuana.

In fact, most of these agencies don't even require that there was any kind of criminal prosecution or conviction. They ask you, ''Have you used marijuana?'' If people say, ''Yes, I used it once in college,'' or whatever, they can't get a job. That makes no sense. We are doing that to our constituents.

Yes, let's go back and see how many people we have denied the opportunity of Federal employment to because they have used marijuana, which is lawful in most of the country now, either on a medicinal basis or on a recreational basis for adult consenting individuals who decide that is a decision they want to make.

Let's grow up as a country about this, and let's stop discriminating against our own people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I just point out that I didn't concede anything that I recognize. If you thought I did, please rethink it.

I want to point out that the security clearance isn't just for Federal employees. It is for private contractors and people seeking security clearances. All I am saying is, one can refer to our ''bureaucrats'' as though they don't have other things to do. They do lots of very important things. I would suggest this falls pretty low on that list.

It is an interesting amendment, but I urge opposition.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for pointing out that my amendment would apply not only to people who have sought public employment in the past and been denied because they have been honest enough to admit that they have once used marijuana but to private contractors. We are denying people the opportunity to do business with the government if they tell the truth about that.

I am urging all of my colleagues, wherever you are in terms of your particular State, let's stop discriminating.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1100

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1017, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GOTTHEIMER of New Jersey;

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. LAMB of Pennsylvania;

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. RASKIN of Maryland.

Motion to Recommit on H.R. 3617, if offered; and

Passage of H.R. 3617, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GOTTHEIMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 1, printed in part B of House Report 117–285 offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 172, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

YEAS—243

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bucshon
Butterfield
Calvert
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gimenez
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hartzler
Hayes
Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan
Salazar
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stauber
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Valadao
Van Duyne
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wagner
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—172

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Hill
Hinson
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lowenthal
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Nehls
Norman
Ocasio-Cortez
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Pocan
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smucker
Spartz
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Tiffany
Timmons
Tlaib
Turner
Van Drew
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—14

Arrington
Boebert
Budd
Bustos
Cheney
Davis, Rodney
Foster
Gonzalez (OH)
Hollingsworth
Jacobs (CA)
Johnson (LA)
Kinzinger
Smith (NE)
Thompson (PA)

□ 1133

Mr. LOWENTHAL changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Ms. MATSUI and Messrs. FERGUSON and RUTHERFORD changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 103.

Mr. FOSTER. Madam Speaker, on April 1, 2022, I missed one recorded vote. I would like to indicate how I would have voted had I been present. On rollcall No. 103, I would have voted "yea."

Stated against:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 103.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Armstrong (Reschenthaler)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Correa)
Bass (Blunt Rochester)
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)
Bowman (Evans)
Brooks (Fleischmann)
Brown (OH) (Beyer)
Cawthorn (Gaetz)
Clarke (NY) (Velázquez)
Comer (Fleischmann)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Cuellar (Pappas)
Curtis (Moore (UT))
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Espaillat (Correa)
Frankel, Lois (Wasserman Schultz)
Garciá (IL) (Takano)
Garcia (TX) (Gomez)
Gimenez (Diaz-Balart)
Green (TN) (Fleischmann)
Harder (CA) (Gomez)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Johnson (TX) (Beyer)
Joyce (OH) (Garbarino)
Kahele (Takano)
Katko (Garbarino)
Kelly (IL) (Blunt Rochester)
Kind (Beyer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Beyer)
LaMalfa (Palazzo)
Lawson (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)
Long (Fleischmann)
Luetkemeyer (Meuser)
Mace (Timmons)
Manning (Beyer)
McClain (Fitzgerald)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Rouzer)
Meng (Kuster)
Newman (Beyer)
Owens (Moore (UT))
Panetta (Gomez)
Price (NC) (Connolly)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Roybal-Allard (Wasserman Schultz)
Ryan (Kaptur)
Salazar (Steube)
Sánchez (Gomez)
Scott, David (Correa)
Sessions (Babin)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Steel (Obernolte)
Stewart (Moore (UT))
Strickland (Takano)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Carter (TX))

Thompson (MS) (Evans)
Trone (Beyer)
Waltz (Mast)
Wilson (FL) (Evans)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF OFFICER WILLIAM F. EVANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEAL). The Chair asks all those present in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, to please rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of Officer William F. Evans, son of Massachusetts, United States Capitol Police Officer, who was killed in the line of duty defending our Capitol on April 2, 2021.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. LAMB

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 2, printed in part B of House Report 117–285, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LAMB).

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 189, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 104]

YEAS—234

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Griffith
Grijalva
Grothman
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Joyce (OH)
Kahele
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (CA)
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newhouse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—189

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Norman
Owens
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Pocan
Posey
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Budd
Bustos
Cheney
Gonzalez (OH)
Johnson (LA)
Kinzinger

□ 1148

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Armstrong (Reschenthaler)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Correa)
Bass (Blunt Rochester)
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)
Bowman (Evans)
Brooks (Fleischmann)
Brown (OH) (Beyer)
Cawthorn (Gaetz)
Clarke (NY) (Velázquez)
Cooper (Correa)
Comer (Fleischmann)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Cuellar (Pappas)
Curtis (Moore (UT))
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Donalds (Cammack)
Espaillat (Correa)
Ferguson (Kustoff)
Frankel, Lois (Wasserman Schultz)
García (IL) (Takano)
Garcia (TX) (Gomez)
Gimenez (Diaz-Balart)
Green (TN) (Fleischmann)
Harder (CA) (Gomez)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Johnson (TX) (Beyer)
Joyce (OH) (Garbarino)
Kahele (Takano)
Katko (Garbarino)
Kelly (IL) (Blunt Rochester)
Kind (Beyer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Beyer)
LaMalfa (Palazzo)
Lawson (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)
Long (Fleischmann)
Luetkemeyer (Meuser)
Mace (Timmons)
Manning (Beyer)
McClain (Fitzgerald)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Rouzer)
Meng (Kuster)
Newman (Beyer)
Owens (Moore (UT))
Panetta (Gomez)
Price (NC) (Connolly)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Roybal-Allard (Wasserman Schultz)
Ryan (Kaptur)
Salazar (Steube)
Sánchez (Gomez)
Scott, David (Correa)
Sessions (Babin)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Steel (Obernolte)
Stewart (Moore (UT))
Strickland (Takano)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Carter (TX))
Thompson (MS) (Evans)
Trone (Beyer)
Waltz (Mast)
Wilson (FL) (Evans)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RASKIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. LEE of California). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 3, printed in part B of House Report 117–285, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 214, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 105]

YEAS—209

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist

Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Mace
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—214

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Case
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Demings
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lee (NV)
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Malinowski
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
O'Halleran
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Panetta
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Slotkin
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Wexton
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—6

Budd
Bustos
Cheney
Gonzalez (OH)
Johnson (LA)
Kinzinger

□ 1200

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Armstrong (Reschenthaler)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Correa)
Bass (Blunt Rochester)
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)
Bowman (Evans)
Brooks (Fleischmann)
Brown (OH) (Beyer)
Cawthorn (Gaetz)
Clarke (NY) (Velázquez)
Cooper (Correa)
Comer (Fleischmann)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Cuellar (Pappas)
Curtis (Moore (UT))
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Donalds (Cammack)
Espaillat (Correa)
Ferguson (Kustoff)
Frankel, Lois (Wasserman Schultz)
García (IL) (Takano)
Garcia (TX) (Gomez)
Gimenez (Diaz-Balart)
Green (TN) (Fleischmann)
Harder (CA) (Gomez)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Johnson (TX) (Beyer)
Joyce (OH) (Garbarino)
Kahele (Takano)
Katko (Garbarino)
Kelly (IL) (Blunt Rochester)
Kind (Beyer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Beyer)
LaMalfa (Palazzo)
Lawson (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)
Long (Fleischmann)
Luetkemeyer (Meuser)
Mace (Timmons)
Manning (Beyer)
McClain (Fitzgerald)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Rouzer)
Meng (Kuster)
Newman (Beyer)
Owens (Moore (UT))
Panetta (Gomez)
Price (NC) (Connolly)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Roybal-Allard (Wasserman Schultz)
Ryan (Kaptur)
Salazar (Steube)
Sánchez (Gomez)
Scott, David (Correa)
Sessions (Babin)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Steel (Obernolte)
Stewart (Moore (UT))
Strickland (Takano)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Carter (TX))
Thompson (MS) (Evans)
Trone (Beyer)
Waltz (Mast)
Wilson (FL) (Evans)
Wilson (SC)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Latta moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3617 to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The material previously referred to by Mr. LATTA is as follows:

At the end of the Rules Committee Print, add the following (and make such conforming changes as may be necessary):

TITLE II—HALT ALL LETHAL TRAFFICKING OF FENTANYL

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Halt All Lethal Trafficking of Fentanyl Act'' or the ''HALT Fentanyl Act''.

SEC. 202. CLASS SCHEDULING OF FENTANYL-RELATED SUBSTANCES.

Section 202(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 812(c)) is amended by adding at the end of schedule I the following:

''(e)(1) Unless specifically exempted or unless listed in another schedule, any material, compound, mixture, or preparation which contains any quantity of a fentanyl-related substance, or which contains the salts, isomers, and salts of isomers of a fentanyl-related substance whenever the existence of such salts, isomers, and salts of isomers is possible within the specific chemical designation.

''(2) For purposes of paragraph (1), except as provided in paragraph (3), the term 'fentanyl-related substance' means any substance that is structurally related to fentanyl by 1 or more of the following modifications:

''(A) By replacement of the phenyl portion of the phenethyl group by any monocycle, whether or not further substituted in or on the monocycle.

''(B) By substitution in or on the phenethyl group with alkyl, alkenyl, alkoxyl, hydroxyl, halo, haloalkyl, amino, or nitro groups.

''(C) By substitution in or on the piperidine ring with alkyl, alkenyl, alkoxyl, ester, ether, hydroxyl, halo, haloalkyl, amino, or nitro groups.

''(D) By replacement of the aniline ring with any aromatic monocycle whether or not further substituted in or on the aromatic monocycle.

''(E) By replacement of the N–propionyl group with another acyl group.

''(3) A substance that satisfies the definition of the term 'fentanyl-related substance' in paragraph (2) shall nonetheless not be treated as a fentanyl-related substance subject to this schedule if the substance—

''(A) is controlled by action of the Attorney General under section 201; or

''(B) is otherwise expressly listed in a schedule other than this schedule.

''(4)(A) The Attorney General may by order publish in the Federal Register a list of substances that satisfy the definition of the term 'fentanyl-related substance' in paragraph (2).

''(B) The absence of a substance from a list published under subparagraph (A) does not negate the control status of the substance under this schedule if the substance satisfies the definition of the term 'fentanyl-related substance' in paragraph (2).''.

SEC. 203. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS RELATED TO RESEARCH.

(a) ALTERNATIVE REGISTRATION PROCESS FOR SCHEDULE I RESEARCH.—Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(1) SPECIAL PROVISIONS FOR PRACTITIONERS CONDUCTING CERTAIN RESEARCH WITH SCHEDULE I CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (f), a practitioner may conduct research described in paragraph (2) of this subsection with 1 or more schedule I substances in accordance with subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (3) of this subsection.

''(2) RESEARCH SUBJECT TO EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.—Research described in this paragraph is research that—

''(A) is with respect to a drug that is the subject of an investigational use exemption under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; or

''(B) is—

''(i) conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services or the Department of Veterans Affairs; or

''(ii) funded partly or entirely by a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction from the Department of Health and Human Services or the Department of Veterans Affairs.

''(3) EXPEDITED PROCEDURES.—

''(A) RESEARCHER WITH A CURRENT SCHEDULE I OR II RESEARCH REGISTRATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a practitioner is registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in schedule I or II, the practitioner may conduct research under this subsection on and after the date that is 30 days after the date on which the practitioner sends a notice to the Attorney General containing the following information, with respect to each substance with which the practitioner will conduct the research:

''(I) The chemical name of the substance.

''(II) The quantity of the substance to be used in the research.

''(III) Demonstration that the research is in the category described in paragraph (2), which demonstration may be satisfied—

''(aa) in the case of a grant, contract, cooperative agreement, or other transaction, or intramural research project, by identifying the sponsoring agency and supplying the number of the grant, contract, cooperative agreement, other transaction, or project; or

''(bb) in the case of an application under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, by supplying the application number and the sponsor of record on the application.

''(IV) Demonstration that the researcher is authorized to conduct research with respect to the substance under the laws of the State in which the research will take place.

''(ii) VERIFICATION OF INFORMATION BY HHS OR VA.—Upon request from the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services or the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, as appropriate, shall verify information submitted by an applicant under clause (i)(III).

''(B) RESEARCHER WITHOUT A CURRENT SCHEDULE I OR II RESEARCH REGISTRATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a practitioner is not registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in schedule I or II, the practitioner may send a notice to the Attorney General containing the information listed in subparagraph (A)(i), with respect to each substance with which the practitioner will conduct the research.

''(ii) ATTORNEY GENERAL ACTION.—The Attorney General shall—

''(I) treat notice received under clause (i) as a sufficient application for a research registration; and

''(II) not later than 45 days of receiving such a notice that contains all information required under subparagraph (A)(i)—

''(aa) register the applicant; or

''(bb) serve an order to show cause upon the applicant in accordance with section 304(c).

''(4) ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS.—The Attorney General shall provide a means to permit a practitioner to submit a notification under paragraph (3) electronically.

''(5) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS.—A practitioner conducting research with a schedule I substance under this subsection may only possess the amounts of schedule I substance identified in—

''(A) the notification to the Attorney General under paragraph (3); or

''(B) a supplemental notification that the practitioner may send if the practitioner needs additional amounts for the research, which supplemental notification shall include—

''(i) the name of the practitioner;

''(ii) the additional quantity needed of the substance; and

''(iii) an attestation that the research to be conducted with the substance is consistent with the scope of the research that was the subject of the notification under paragraph (3).

''(6) IMPORTATION AND EXPORTATION REQUIREMENTS NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this subsection alters the requirements of part A of title III, regarding the importation and exportation of controlled substances.''.

(b) SEPARATE REGISTRATIONS NOT REQUIRED FOR ADDITIONAL RESEARCHER IN SAME INSTITUTION.—Section 302(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(4) An agent or employee of a research institution that is conducting research with a controlled substance if—

''(A) the agent or employee is acting within the scope of the professional practice of the agent or employee;

''(B) another agent or employee of the institution is registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in the same schedule;

''(C) the researcher who is so registered—

''(i) informs the Attorney General of the name, position title, and employing institution of the agent or employee who is not separately registered;

''(ii) authorizes that agent or employee to perform research under the registration of the registered researcher; and

''(iii) affirms that any act taken by that agent or employee involving a controlled substance shall be attributable to the registered researcher, as if the researcher had directly committed the act, for purposes of any proceeding under section 304(a) to suspend or revoke the registration of the registered researcher; and

''(D) the Attorney General does not, within 30 days of receiving the information, authorization, and affirmation described in subparagraph (C), refuse, for a reason listed in section 304(a), to allow the agent or employee to possess the substance without a separate registration.''.

(c) SINGLE REGISTRATION FOR RELATED RESEARCH SITES.—Section 302(e) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(A) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), a person registered to conduct research with a controlled substance under section 303(f) may conduct the research under a single registration if—

''(i) the research occurs exclusively on sites all of which are—

''(I) within the same city or county; and

''(II) under the control of the same institution, organization, or agency; and

''(ii) before commencing the research, the researcher notifies the Attorney General of each site where—

''(I) the research will be conducted; or

''(II) the controlled substance will be stored or administered.

''(B) A site described in subparagraph (A) shall be included in a registration described in that subparagraph only if the researcher has notified the Attorney General of the site—

''(i) in the application for the registration; or

''(ii) before the research is conducted, or before the controlled substance is stored or administered, at the site.

''(C) The Attorney General may, in consultation with the Secretary, issue regulations addressing, with respect to research sites described in subparagraph (A)—

''(i) the manner in which controlled substances may be delivered to the research sites;

''(ii) the storage and security of controlled substances at the research sites;

''(iii) the maintenance of records for the research sites; and

''(iv) any other matters necessary to ensure effective controls against diversion at the research sites.''.

(d) NEW INSPECTION NOT REQUIRED IN CERTAIN SITUATIONS.—Section 302(f) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(f) The'' and inserting ''(f)(1) The''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2)(A) If a person is registered to conduct research with a controlled substance and applies for a registration, or for a modification of a registration, to conduct research with a second controlled substance that is in the same schedule as the first controlled substance, or is in a schedule with a higher numerical designation than the schedule of the first controlled substance, a new inspection by the Attorney General of the registered location is not required.

''(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall prohibit the Attorney General from conducting an inspection that the Attorney General determines necessary to ensure that a registrant maintains effective controls against diversion.''.

(e) CONTINUATION OF RESEARCH ON SUBSTANCES NEWLY ADDED TO SCHEDULE I.—Section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) CONTINUATION OF RESEARCH ON SUBSTANCES NEWLY ADDED TO SCHEDULE I.—If a person is conducting research on a substance when the substance is added to schedule I, and the person is already registered to conduct research with a controlled substance in schedule I—

''(1) not later than 90 days after the scheduling of the newly scheduled substance, the person shall submit a completed application for registration or modification of existing registration, to conduct research on the substance, in accordance with regulations issued by the Attorney General for purposes of this paragraph;

''(2) the person may, notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), continue to conduct the research on the substance until—

''(A) the person withdraws the application described in paragraph (1) of this subsection; or

''(B) the Attorney General serves on the person an order to show cause proposing the denial of the application under section 304(c);

''(3) if the Attorney General serves an order to show cause as described in paragraph (2)(B) and the person requests a hearing, the hearing shall be held on an expedited basis and not later than 45 days after the request is made, except that the hearing may be held at a later time if so requested by the person; and

''(4) if the person sends a copy of the application described in paragraph (1) to a manufacturer or distributor of the substance, receipt of the copy by the manufacturer or distributor shall constitute sufficient evidence that the person is authorized to receive the substance.''.

(f) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURING ACTIVITIES AS COINCIDENT TO RESEARCH.—Section 302 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 822), as amended by subsection (e), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN MANUFACTURING ACTIVITIES AS COINCIDENT TO RESEARCH.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), a person who is registered to perform research on a controlled substance may perform manufacturing activities with small quantities of that substance, including activities described in paragraph (2), without being required to obtain a manufacturing registration, if—

''(A) the activities are performed for the purpose of the research; and

''(B) the activities and the quantities of the substance involved in the activities are stated in—

''(i) a notification submitted to the Attorney General under section 303(l);

''(ii) a research protocol filed with an application for registration approval under section 303(f); or

''(iii) a notification to the Attorney General that includes—

''(I) the name of the registrant; and

''(II) an attestation that the research to be conducted with the small quantities of manufactured substance is consistent with the scope of the research that is the basis for the registration.

''(2) ACTIVITIES INCLUDED.—Activities permitted under paragraph (1) include—

''(A) processing the substance to create extracts, tinctures, oils, solutions, derivatives, or other forms of the substance consistent with—

''(i) the information provided as part of a notification submitted to the Attorney General under section 303(l); or

''(ii) a research protocol filed with an application for registration approval under section 303(f); and

''(B) dosage form development studies performed for the purpose of requesting an investigational new drug exemption under section 505(i) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(i)).

''(3) EXCEPTION REGARDING MARIHUANA.—The authority under paragraph (1) to manufacture substances does not include the authority to grow marihuana.''.

(g) TRANSPARENCY REGARDING SPECIAL PROCEDURES.—Section 303 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 823), as amended by subsection (a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) TRANSPARENCY REGARDING SPECIAL PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Attorney General determines, with respect to a controlled substance, that an application by a practitioner to conduct research with the substance should be considered under a process, or subject to criteria, different from the process or criteria applicable to applications to conduct research with other controlled substances in the same schedule, the Attorney General shall make public, including by posting on the website of the Drug Enforcement Administration—

''(A) the identities of all substances for which such determinations have been made;

''(B) the process and criteria that shall be applied to applications to conduct research with those substances; and

''(C) how the process and criteria described in subparagraph (B) differ from the process and criteria applicable to applications to conduct research with other controlled substances in the same schedule.

''(2) TIMING OF POSTING.—The Attorney General shall make information described in paragraph (1) public upon making a determination described in that paragraph, regardless of whether a practitioner has submitted such an application at that time.''.

SEC. 204. RULEMAKING.

(a) INTERIM FINAL RULES.—The Attorney General—

(1) shall, not later than 1 year of the date of enactment of this title, issue rules to implement this title and the amendments made by this title; and

(2) may issue the rules under paragraph (1) as interim final rules.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR FINAL RULE.—

(1) EFFECTIVENESS OF INTERIM FINAL RULES.—A rule issued by the Attorney General as an interim final rule under subsection (a) shall become immediately effective as an interim final rule without requiring the Attorney General to demonstrate good cause therefor, notwithstanding subparagraph (B) of section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) OPPORTUNITY FOR COMMENT AND HEARING.—An interim final rule issued under subsection (a) shall give interested persons the opportunity to comment and to request a hearing.

(3) FINAL RULE.—After the conclusion of such proceedings, the Attorney General shall issue a final rule to implement this title and the amendments made by this title in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 202, nays 220, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 106]

YEAS—202

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

NAYS—220

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger

Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Budd
Bustos
Cheney
Gonzalez (OH)
Johnson (LA)
Kinzinger
Zeldin

□ 1215

Mr. BROWN of Maryland changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Armstrong (Reschenthaler)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Correa)
Bass (Blunt Rochester)
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)
Bowman (Evans)
Brooks (Fleischmann)
Brown (OH) (Beyer)
Cawthorn (Gaetz)
Clarke (NY) (Velázquez)
Cooper (Correa)
Comer (Fleischmann)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Cuellar (Pappas)
Curtis (Moore (UT))
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Donalds (Cammack)
Espaillat (Correa)
Ferguson (Kustoff)
Frankel, Lois (Wasserman Schultz)
García (IL) (Takano)
Garcia (TX) (Gomez)
Gimenez (Diaz-Balart)
Green (TN) (Fleischmann)
Harder (CA) (Gomez)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Johnson (TX) (Beyer)
Joyce (OH) (Garbarino)
Kahele (Takano)
Katko (Garbarino)
Kelly (IL) (Blunt Rochester)
Kind (Beyer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Beyer)
LaMalfa (Palazzo)
Lawson (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)
Long (Fleischmann)
Luetkemeyer (Meuser)
Mace (Timmons)
Manning (Beyer)
McClain (Fitzgerald)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Rouzer)
Meng (Kuster)
Newman (Beyer)
Owens (Moore (UT))
Panetta (Gomez)
Price (NC) (Connolly)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Roybal-Allard (Wasserman Schultz)
Ryan (Kaptur)
Salazar (Steube)
Sánchez (Gomez)
Scott, David (Correa)
Sessions (Babin)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Steel (Obernolte)
Stewart (Moore (UT))
Strickland (Takano)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Carter (TX))
Thompson (MS) (Evans)
Trone (Beyer)
Waltz (Mast)
Wilson (FL) (Evans)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BENTZ. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 220, nays 204, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 107]

YEAS—220

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brown (MD)
Brown (OH)
Brownley
Bush
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-McCormick
Chu
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez, Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Mast
Matsui
McBath
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—204

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Foxx
Franklin, C. Scott
Fulcher
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Obernolte
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pappas
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Posey
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

NOT VOTING—5

Budd
Bustos
Cheney
Johnson (LA)
Zeldin

□ 1231

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. CHENEY. Madam Speaker, I missed all votes on 4/1 due to illness. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall No. 103, ''nay'' on rollcall No. 104, ''nay'' on rollcall No. 105, ''yea'' on rollcall No. 106, and ''nay'' on rollcall No. 107.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BUDD. Madam Speaker, I was unable to attend votes in D.C. due to an important constituent event. Had I been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on rollcall No. 103, ''nay'' on rollcall No. 104, ''nay'' on rollcall No. 105, ''yea'' on rollcall No. 106, and ''nay'' on rollcall No. 107.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Armstrong (Reschenthaler)
Baird (Walorski)
Barragán (Correa)
Bass (Blunt Rochester)
Bilirakis (Fleischmann)
Bowman (Evans)
Brooks (Fleischmann)
Brown (OH) (Beyer)
Cawthorn (Gaetz)
Clarke (NY) (Velázquez)
Cooper (Correa)
Comer (Fleischmann)
Crist (Wasserman Schultz)
Cuellar (Pappas)
Curtis (Moore (UT))
Davis, Danny K. (Gomez)
DeGette (Blunt Rochester)
Deutch (Rice (NY))
Donalds (Cammack)
Espaillat (Correa)
Ferguson (Kustoff)
Frankel, Lois (Wasserman Schultz)
García (IL) (Takano)
Garcia (TX) (Gomez)
Gimenez (Diaz-Balart)
Gonzalez (OH) (Balderson)
Green (TN) (Fleischmann)
Harder (CA) (Gomez)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Johnson (TX) (Beyer)
Joyce (OH) (Garbarino)
Kahele (Takano)
Katko

(Garbarino)
Kelly (IL) (Blunt Rochester)
Kind (Beyer)
Kinzinger (Meijer)
Kirkpatrick (Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi (Beyer)
LaMalfa (Palazzo)
Lawson (FL) (Wasserman Schultz)
Long (Fleischmann)
Luetkemeyer (Meuser)
Mace (Timmons)
Manning (Beyer)
McClain (Fitzgerald)
McEachin (Wexton)
McHenry (Rouzer)
Meng (Kuster)
Newman (Beyer)
Owens (Moore (UT))
Panetta (Gomez)
Price (NC) (Connolly)
Rice (SC) (Meijer)
Roybal-Allard (Wasserman Schultz)
Ryan (Kaptur)
Salazar (Steube)
Sánchez (Gomez)
Scott, David (Correa)
Sessions (Babin)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Steel (Obernolte)
Stewart (Moore (UT))
Strickland (Takano)
Suozzi (Beyer)
Taylor (Carter (TX))
Thompson (MS) (Evans)
Trone (Beyer)
Waltz (Mast)
Wilson (FL) (Evans)
Wilson (SC) (Timmons)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the Republican whip from Louisiana, for yielding.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m., Madam Speaker, for morning-hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday and Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

The House will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business today.

The House will consider a resolution from the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the U.S. Capitol recommending the House ask the Justice Department to charge Peter Navarro and Dan Scavino, Jr., with criminal contempt of Congress for refusing to testify about their actions and knowledge relating to the violent effort to prevent the certification of the 2020 election.

Additionally, Madam Speaker, the House may consider legislation related to the COVID–19 pandemic. Additional legislative items are possible.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, as we look at the schedule for next week, obviously, there are a lot of concerns about the continuing rising price of gasoline that we have been seeing for the last year and a half. President Biden talked about some things that he will do.

In regard to some of the long-term fixes to lower gas prices that have been filed, I know I have mentioned them to the majority leader in the past. H.R. 6858 is one of the bills that would address some of the real impediments to getting more oil and gas production here in the United States. There are a number of other bills, including six different bills that were filed by the Natural Resources Committee recently, that would address some of the other specific challenges that are holding back the ability for America to produce more oil and gas.

I would ask the gentleman if we could get those bills on the calendar so that we can move to actually address the problems that are holding back American oil and gas production, thus leading to higher prices.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that question, and I have been thinking about that because he asks that regularly.

I particularly have been thinking about that question in the context of the fact that we have so much available acreage on which to produce oil and gas currently permitted. When I say a number, we are talking about literally millions of acres.

Madam Speaker, there are 9,000 unused, approved permits right now. There are 26 million acres of public land available right now. There are 11 million acres of Federal waters available. That is 37 million acres in total.

In addition to that, 80 million acres in the Gulf were put up for auction last fall, 2021, under President Biden, which was the largest lease sale in U.S. history. Unfortunately, the private sector bought only 1.7 acres out of 80 million.

Frankly, it appears to be that no matter what we pass, no matter how many permits we make available, there is not an appetite in the private sector for producing more.

I say that in the context of the producers. To their credit, they are claiming victory. They are claiming victory at the extraordinary profits that they have gotten. They are buying back stocks. They are paying large dividends. But they are not producing more product.

Now, it may well be that they think the price is pretty high, and they are making a good profit and don't need to do anything more. But the gentleman's questions, Madam Speaker, continually imply that there is some impediment to producing more product.

Of course, the United States is the largest producer of oil and natural gas in the world, and we have increased very substantially over the past few years in production.

I say to the gentleman the committees are looking at the bills the gentleman refers to. But in terms of production, the United States is producing 18.61 billion barrels per day, which is 20 percent of the world's production.

The President announced, just the other day, the release of a million barrels per day from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. That is going to be 180 million barrels over the next 6 months.

In fact, when he did that, I don't know whether it had direct impact, but as the gentleman knows, the price on the global market has come down. I think it came down $7 in the last month or $7 in the last week.

The administration is clearly making some substantial policy changes, one of which is use it or lose it. I said there were 9,000 permitted, ready to go, ready to drill, right now, today.

The President has said, in his policies: We have given all these permits. If you are not going to use these permits, then you are either going to pay a fee or give them back, and we are going ask other people who want to produce more product.

You would think in the capitalist system which we have, which I strongly, strongly support, that given the price of oil being so high, people would look for more product, unless they want to limit the availability of product and, therefore, keep the price even higher.

I don't know which is the option there, but I will tell the gentleman that the President has activated the Defense Production Act, looking for critical materials, not just oil, but lithium, nickel, cobalt, graphite, manganese, for all sorts of things that we need. The President has taken very, very strong steps.

In addition to that, which is very important, Madam Speaker, what we have done is passed legislation which will, in the relatively near term—not tomorrow, not next week, not next month—make us less and less reliant on overseas suppliers of energy that clearly have shown themselves to be not reliable and clearly have been seen to be people who want to create a monopoly, a cartel, so that they can keep prices unusually high and, of course, in the process continue to assault the environment and damage the climate of this global community, which will have an extraordinary cost.

In answer to the gentleman's question, the committees are looking at those bills that you mentioned. I will mention to them again looking at those bills.

Very frankly, any implication that we are not producing more product because there is some constraint by the Federal Government on production is simply not accurate, Madam Speaker. Again, 9,000 leases; 37 million acres available—26 million on public lands—permitted, ready to go, and they have not been drilled on.

The President is saying: If you don't drill, if you are not going to produce more product—we want more product. We need more product in the short term. If you don't want to produce it, then we are going to give those leases to somebody else.

□ 1245

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, a number of problems with the way that the President's plan was described is that that is not what the President has done. The President has worked aggressively through many of his Federal agencies to, in fact, block the production of oil and gas.

And let me bring you back to candidate Barack Obama. There are a

number of specific examples I am going to give the gentleman because the gentleman gave a number of specific examples that just don't comply with the facts, starting with the 9,000 leases, the thousands of acres that I know the——

Mr. HOYER. Millions, millions.

Mr. SCALISE. President has talked about and others have talked about that, frankly, don't tell the picture of what the President is also doing to ensure that you cannot develop on those lands. You cannot develop with those 9,000 leases.

And I will go back to candidate Joe Biden. This is what Joe Biden said when he was a candidate for President. ''No more drilling on Federal lands. No more drilling, including offshore. No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period. It ends.''

That was Joe Biden as a candidate. The problem is he continued to take steps to carry through on that, starting with the 9,000 leases. If you have a lease to drill, it sounds really good until you realize that you still have to go through other steps to develop that. First of all, in some cases, you may actually go test wells, and you find out that they are not producing.

Thousands, by the way, of those in the 9,000 are not producing wells, meaning they are dry holes. There is no oil. Now, I don't know if you are going to fine a company because they are not drilling in an area where there is no oil, but maybe that is what the President is talking about, or maybe he doesn't understand the process of drilling for oil.

So then you go to some of the other areas, and I will give you section 1002 of ANWR, as an example. There needs to be seismic development where you go and test to see where the oil is.

We have a lot of advanced technology where, in the past, they might drill even more dry holes. Today, you can actually go and develop through seismic technology to know pretty well where the oil is, where the biggest reserves are, and then that is where you go and drill.

And so the Federal agencies are blocking the ability to do seismic activity, so you can't find out what is under the ground. So great. You have got a permit. You can't find out the seismic because the Biden administration is blocking it, so you can't make the multibillion-dollar investment because you don't know what is under the ground where.

In other countries, they allow that to happen. These companies are making investments, by the way. They are just not making the investment in America because they can't get cooperation from the regulating agencies because the regulating agencies don't want them to drill. Because, again, President Joe Biden as a candidate said, ''There will be no more drilling. . . . No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period. It ends.'' And then he directed his agencies to do it.

Another example that has been brought up just the other day, less than a week ago. Again, we are talking about prices hovering in the $100 range. Raiding, in the short term, the Strategic Petroleum Reserve actually makes our country less safe because the Strategic Petroleum Reserve is there to be a safety net. If there is a national crisis somewhere, you can rely on the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to get you through the next few weeks while you are working on a supply chain issue. That is not what is going on. The President is just raiding the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to try to cover up for his failed policy.

And so if you look at what he just did the other day, President Biden's Securities and Exchange Commission just put out a whole new set of rules and regulations to make it hard, not just for oil and gas companies, but any other company to use fossil fuels.

Again, he has talked about this publicly. He wants to move away from fossil fuels. The problem is, he is telling his regulatory agencies to go make it incredibly difficult and more expensive to use fossil fuels. In his budget just earlier this week, he proposed $45 billion in new taxes on oil and gas in America.

Now, I know he has been, in the past, begging Putin to produce more. He is begging Venezuela, other dictators, Iran, to produce more oil. He is not proposing to raise their taxes. He is proposing to raise the tax on oil and gas produced in the American to the tune of $45 billion in his budget he just released Monday.

That would mean higher gas prices. But what it also does is it tells the oil and gas companies, don't drill in America because that is what President Biden as candidate said, No more drilling, period. It ends.

Then the SEC continued to do other things; this ESG movement where they are trying to get the big oil and gas companies to not drill for oil. So you are an oil and gas company, you are Exxon, and they are pushing to try to get those companies to separate into two different entities so that they can cut off financing for oil and gas development projects. They are doing it right now.

We have got a number of bills to fix this. And as the gentleman talks about, we want to do these things. We want to open it up. Except if you are saying on one hand, I am going to build this road, and I don't know why you are not driving down the road. But on the other hand, you have got people barricading the road, and then you say, look, nobody's using the road, so why even bother. You know, fine them for not using the road. And then you go look at the on-ramp, and you find out that they have put 10 barricades in front of the on-ramp so you can't get on the road.

That is what President Biden has done to oil and gas drilling in America. He has actually failed to comply with the law on the requirements that he conduct lease sales that he has not conducted which the law requires him to do. There are actually lawsuits that we have won in court, and he continues to obfuscate those laws.

So there is a bill called the Restore Onshore Energy Production Act. It immediately resumes oil and gas lease sales and requires quarterly lease sales in each State with an oil and gas program. That is something the President should be doing if he wanted to actually lower the cost of gasoline and produce in America, he would be doing, but he won't do it. So this bill would require him to do it. I would love us to bring that bill up.

And, again, if the gentleman says, Hey, why don't we produce on those 9,000 leases? This would actually help the ones that aren't dry holes where companies are trying to find out how they can go and drill, but they are being blocked by President Biden's different regulatory agencies. This would remove some of those roadblocks.

The Strategy to Secure Offshore Energy Act would actually require the publication of the 5-year plan for offshore oil and gas lease sales and require timelines for developing subsequent leasing plans. That is supposed to be done under law. The President's not doing it. This would require he do it.

The Energy Permitting Certainty Act requires the Department of the Interior to process applications for permits to drill under a valid lease, regardless of any unrelated civil actions where some of these groups use other laws like the Endangered Species Act to block drilling, again, saying there are leases. Why aren't you using them?

President Biden is saying, We are going to fine you for not using them as he is using his other agencies to stop them from using the leases.

You have got EPA over here and the Department of the Interior over there. You have got the SEC over there, all putting up roadblocks to the roadway, and then the President says, Look, there are no cars on the road. We are going to fine you for not using the road.

Well, how about you take the roadblocks off the on-ramp so that you can actually get on the road and drill? President Biden is trying to have it both ways. He is trying to appease the people who he promised, I am going to shut down drilling. Unfortunately, he is doing that. But then he is going and telling the public, I want them to drill. And in fact, I am going to fine them if they don't drill, while he is stopping them from drilling.

Again, other bills that we have to fix these problems that President Biden is putting up as roadblocks: The Securing American Energy and Investing in Reliancy Act requires the Department of the Interior to conduct all remaining offshore oil and gas leases in the current leasing plan and issue the leases, one, as a result of Lease Sale 257; additional impediments he has put

in front of people that have already followed the rules, but he is still not letting them actually go do what they want to do.

They want to drill in America, and he is forcing them out of America. That is why he is begging foreign countries when he, himself, can remove the roadblocks that he put in place to stop drilling in America.

And there are more bills. There are a number of other bills. We will be happy to go over each of them with you.

But what we are saying is, there are very specific things President Biden has done to impede the ability for us to drill in America.

There are companies all across the country that know how to drill and can't drill in America. And instead of the President trying to use taglines and divert and talk about Putin and everybody else, when he is the one that is giving Putin leverage by shutting America off—and, again, this isn't accidental. He, as a candidate, said, ''No more drilling on Federal lands. No more drilling, including offshore. No ability for the gas industry to continue to drill, period. It ends.''

Unfortunately, it has ended, and we are trying to get it started up again by reversing the very things Joe Biden did to stop it. And we are asking for help here on this floor to address these very specific problems.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Well, I am not surprised that the gentleman, and many of the bills that he refers to, want to undermine the regulation to protect the health and welfare of the American people which those are designed to do, and most of which I think, you know, the gentleman's side of the aisle did not support or enforce when they were in charge of the Presidency.

Madam Speaker, all of that rhetoric about the President doesn't want to do this, doesn't want to do this, 80 million acres. 1.7 million acres bid on. If, in fact, people were looking for additional ways and means to produce at a price that is historic, they would do so. And he dismisses, Madam Speaker, the 9,000 leases that exist. Now, maybe——

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, for correction, that is not what I did. I actually went through how those 9,000 leases are being blocked by the President from being utilized properly.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, yes. If, in fact, that was the reason for nonproduction, we all would have heard of the fact when we are not producing, and the stock market would have heard about that, and the companies would be lamenting the fact that they are not producing more.

In fact, when you read their reports, they are indicating we are making very high profits. We are not putting money into production at this point in time, and we are buying back stocks, and we are paying high dividends.

I do not criticize them for making what is a business decision. That business decision, however, has had an adverse effect. Why? Because we are not moving quickly enough to not be reliant on fossil fuels which the President, in his remarks, wants to get to.

We have a disagreement between our parties, Madam Speaker, on that issue. Drill, baby, drill. That has been the mantra forever. And it was 73 degrees yesterday. And our planet is hurting.

The trees on my property produced blossoms long before they usually do. They are confused. But not only are they confused; it is dangerous for agriculture. It is dangerous for human beings. It is dangerous for animal life. It is dangerous for our seas. And we have a difference of opinion.

That is what the President was speaking to, that we need to move towards that end, but he understands, as we all understand, that fossil fuels are necessary right now.

Natural gas is—we are the biggest producer of natural gas in the world. We are the biggest producer of oil in the world. That hasn't stopped. And, yes, we need to get to, as our Build Back Better bill does, that none of the Republicans voted for, it gets to a reliance on fuel that will not help Putin.

Now, there are some people in the Republican party who apparently think Putin is a pretty good guy. He is a genius. He is this, that, and the other.

We don't think so. We think he is a war criminal. And we think there are some other folks who are providing us with oil on whom we ought not to rely, not only for the global health, but also for our national security.

And to the extent that we invest in alternatives which, by the way, every energy company in America, and I think the world, probably—I am not going to say that, but in America—that I thought wants to do. They are all doing research on alternative energy sources because they know that at some point, we need to get off of the reliance on fossil fuel. That is what the President was speaking about.

But he leased—he put 80 million acres in the Gulf for lease. Well, why would anybody put 80 million if there was no more drilling? He put 80 million acres, and only 1.7 million the private sector even sort of nodded at, before any tests, before any knowledge. You know, they need the lease to test it.

So I say to my friend, we are going to need fossil fuel, and we need to bring gasoline prices down. But, very frankly, we are not going to bring prices down if we don't produce more product, and the focus is not higher profits, buying back stock, and making high dividends. There is no incentive to do that.

□ 1300

We need to do it. I have urged the President to talk to the leaders of the energy companies in our country. They are part of the success of America. We are at war. We are at war with Putin, a war criminal, a tyrant, and that has destabilized world markets; since the last month up a dollar. That is Putin's dollar we are paying. We are paying that dollar because of Putin.

Madam Speaker, the whip mentioned Putin as an aside; just as an aside, as if the contemplation, as the President pointed out, Madam Speaker, that Russia was going to invade Ukraine. Even Mr. Zelenskyy thought maybe you are overstating the case. Extraordinarily courageous leader in Ukraine.

So even in preparation for the instability that this war that Putin has criminally undertaken without any provocation—murdering people, women and children, people in hospitals, people in schools—yes, oil prices have gone up because the world market was very concerned about this. We don't control it here.

So although it is a dollar since he invaded, I am convinced that a substantial amount of the increase was caused by the instability of his threat. Marshalling troops at the border of Ukraine and Belarus from Russia destabilized the market, no doubt about it.

I tell the gentleman again, there is an ability to drill. There is an ability to do research and discover and do the seismic tests. There is that ability now. I don't accept the gentleman's premise that there is a roadblock.

The President does not want to expand. You understand that. He has said that; you quoted him. He wants to get to alternative energy sources. He wants to save the planet. I share that view with him. But we are going to have to have fossil fuels in the short term because we won't be able to power our economy or our people for some years to come.

Hopefully, by 2035, we will have a substantial reduction, and hopefully, by 2050, a very, very substantial reduction, perhaps zero. But in the short term, we are going to need a resource that has been a critical resource for the growth of our economy and other economies around the world.

Nobody is criticizing those who produce that. I say nobody. At least I am not criticizing them. But I really believe that we could get more production under present circumstances, and that is what we ought to be doing.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, clearly the gentleman and I disagree on many of these items. Drilling in America is the cleanest way to produce oil in the world. If it is going to come from Russia, which I don't want, if it is going to come from any dictator, they actually emit more carbon than if you make it in America.

But I want to point out, as the gentleman talked about, this magical lease sale in the Gulf of Mexico and why no one bid on it, the reason is because it didn't happen. The Biden administration did not move forward with that lease sale. That is what we are trying to address with these bills.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Biden didn't make that decision; the courts made that decision.

Mr. SCALISE. But the gentleman was saying it wasn't bid on; the oil

companies didn't want to do it. They did. They wanted to invest in America. An environmental group went to block it and got a court to go along with them. The normal practice is the administration stands up for America and American policy and objects, and the Biden administration refused to challenge it in the courts because they didn't want the lease sale to go forward. And the lease sale did not go forward. That is why no one bid on it, because there was no lease sale.

We fix that with these pieces of legislation we would like to bring to the floor, but we will continue this discussion. Hopefully, we can resolve it. We will continue pushing for it.

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

TRANSFORMING STUDENT DEBT

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce our Transforming Student Debt to Home Equity Act.

Home ownership is a key that opens the door to the middle class for tens of millions of Americans. But today, too many young workers and their families are weighed down by student loan debt that keeps this dream out of their reach.

The Transforming Student Debt to Home Equity Act would create a pilot program to test various approaches that combine student loan payments and mortgage payments into one monthly bill. It would empower hard-working Americans that are current on student loan repayments to actually combine their loan costs, allowing them to build home equity.

The purpose of this act is to move forward with those pilot projects, and with millions of vacant homes around our country, this legislation would spur neighborhood revitalization and improve our quality of life.

The promises of the American Dream should be available to all, so let us lift up and invest in new means to help the next generation and invest in middle-class workers and families that build up our Nation by investing in it.

REALLOCATING EMERGENCY RENTAL ASSISTANCE

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the attack on families in rural America by the Biden administration in their reallocation of Emergency Rental Assistance funds.

As of March 31, unspent ERA funds from rural States, like my home State of Arkansas, are being taken and given to a handful of blue States, like New York, California, and New Jersey, who have already received and spent their own share of Emergency Rental Assistance funds.

As the Treasury claws back this money, this reallocation of funds will disproportionately affect rural America. The reallocation of ERA money is unfair and turns a blind eye to the needs of renters who have not received rental assistance simply because they live in rural areas of our country.

To stand up for rural Arkansans and Americans across the country, I have introduced the Protecting Rural Renters Act, which will prohibit the ERA funds originally promised to our rural areas from being reallocated elsewhere.

This act would simply remove the State allocations from the statutory claw-backs and effectively prevent these funds from being taken away from our rural citizens. This is in the best interests of our Nation.

AFFIRMATIVE STEPS TOWARD CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

(Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Madam Speaker, as the conversation around the country centers on the legalization of marijuana, we must simultaneously address the criminal and racial justice issues embedded in this conversation.

Despite cannabis usage rates between White and non-Whites being similar, Black Americans are arrested for cannabis offenses at a rate of nearly four to one compared to Whites.

For decades, the war on drugs has been a tool to target Black and Brown Americans. As a result, their life trajectories have been impacted negatively.

The MORE Act would create a Community Reinvestment Grant Program, which would provide funding for communities negatively impacted by the war on drugs. These grants would be used for the development of expungement processes, employment programs, and substance use disorder treatment. These reinvestments are imperative for our communities and our country.

I am proud that I voted to pass the MORE Act today as an affirmative step toward the criminal justice reform.

NOT AN INNOCENT APRIL FOOLS' DAY PRANK

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Madam Speaker, last year I introduced H.R. 6176, with the goal of preventing the Secretary of Energy and the President from doing exactly what they announced this week, tapping the Strategic Petroleum Reserve without issuing a plan for American energy independence.

Now, several months after living under President Biden's failed energy policies and decisions, he has announced the largest release of oil reserves in history, putting one million additional barrels on the market per day on average every day for the next 6 months.

Biden's anti-American energy agenda jeopardizes our national security once again.

Tapping the SPR at the levels announced this week by this administration is a dangerous move. Drawing down our strategic reserves by over 25 percent poses a huge national security risk, a risk that America would not be in the place to take if Biden would end the Federal freeze on all new oil and gas projects and stop the regulatory assault on U.S. energy development and financing. Tapping the SPR will not lower gas prices.

Today is April Fools' Day, but with Biden in office you would think every day is April Fools' Day. However, he is not pulling innocent pranks on the American people, but he is personally harming the safety, security, and prosperity of America.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, there is so much going on these days, so much to comment on. At this time, I yield to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), my friend, whenever she is ready.

KEVIN MCKEE IS AN INCREDIBLE ATHLETE

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. GOHMERT for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the accomplishments of an incredible athlete from Iowa's Second District.

Kevin McKee of Davenport recently finished competing in the Beijing 2020 Paralympics, where he won a gold medal in sled hockey. Kevin has proudly represented the United States for over a decade, winning gold medals in the last three Paralympics.

Kevin has always had a passion for sports, playing tennis in high school and wheelchair basketball in college. However, Kevin soon realized his passion for sled hockey in 2020 when he started playing on the sled hockey club team with the Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago.

Beginning in 1960, the Paralympic Games are held every 4 years and feature a wide range of athletes with different physical abilities, including impaired muscle power, impaired passive range of motion, limb deficiency, leg length difference, hypertonia, ataxia, athetosis, vision impairment, and intellectual impairment. The

Paralympics are held almost immediately following the respective Summer and Winter Olympic Games.

Paralympians like Kevin show all of us that with hard work, dedication, and the drive to succeed, anything is possible.

Congratulations, Kevin, on an outstanding performance. I look forward to cheering you on in the future.

Mr. GOHMERT. Madam Speaker, I notice the skill and adroitness of Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS making her way hurriedly around the rows, through the rows. She must have picked up something from such a great sled hockey player.

Madam Speaker, I want to turn my attention to some recent criticisms of an amazing man. I agree with some who have clerked at the Supreme Court, that Justice Clarence Thomas may be easily the most intelligent Justice on the Court. That fact actually turned him from his days at Yale Law School—actually he started at Harvard for, I think, a day or so, but he felt like Harvard was too conservative, so he dropped out and applied to Yale and was pleased it seemed more liberal in its thinking.

□ 1315

But Yale was able to take a brilliant person like that, and according to his book, he began to notice how liberals who were White seemed to look down on him with an arrogant view of Clarence Thomas that, gee, if it weren't for us liberals, a Black man like Clarence Thomas would not have even gotten into this school, when actually he had the raw intelligence to do that regardless and had done well everywhere he had been, including Holy Cross when he originally went there thinking he might be a priest at some point. Those are my recollections from his autobiography, a splendid read, ''My Grandfather's Son.''

That kind of arrogance, looking down on him like he couldn't do this on his own if it weren't for us liberals, turned him off. That, along with other issues, drove him to become quite conservative.

The clarity with which he sees issues is a real treasure for the U.S. Supreme Court.

Now, just as when he was nominated to the Supreme Court, he has come under grave attacks from these same liberals that used to look down on him when he was a liberal, thinking he couldn't possibly be as smart as they were when, actually, he exceeded their level of intelligence.

That was what was called a soft form of discrimination. What he experienced in the hearings for his confirmation and since he has been on the U.S. Supreme Court, clearly, has not been soft discrimination. It has been overt, radical, mean-spirited, evil discrimination. Nothing soft about it. How dare that man come off the plantation and dare to have any point of view that was not provided to him by other liberals? The man thinks for himself, and he is brilliant.

These same liberals that are now coming after him seek not only to discriminate against him because he is a Black conservative who is brilliant, but they also want to assert a marriage penalty against him because his wife also thinks for herself.

Now, there is a great article written by Mark Paoletta, and this is dated March 11. I won't go through the whole article, but he says: ''D.C. Circuit Judge Nina Pillard, for example, voted not to rehear a case rejecting President Trump's refusal to produce his tax returns in response to a congressional subpoena. That was exactly what her husband, the ACLU's litigation director, advocated in an article reviewing the lower court decision.''

Now, Justice Thomas is being told he needs to recuse himself because he has a wife who thinks for herself. We can't have that, these liberals say. Yet, the hypocrisy rises higher and higher with every comment they make about Justice Thomas and/or his wife.

''Ninth Circuit Judge Stephen Reinhardt, a liberal icon, participated in a case even after his wife, the chief of an ACLU chapter, commented on the lower court opinion. Her ACLU chapter even submitted a brief to the district court. Reinhardt defended his decision not to recuse, writing his wife's 'views are hers, not mine, and I do not in any way condition my opinions on the positions she takes regarding any issues,''' even though he took the same position that his wife took.

The article said: ''Ethics experts defended Reinhardt's decision, noting that 'Judge Reinhardt is not presumed to be the reservoir and carrier of his wife's beliefs. . . . A contrary outcome would deem a judge's spouse unable to hold most any position of advocacy, creating what amounts to a marriage penalty.' ''

Exactly. And liberals will not apply that standard to liberals, yet they come after Justice Thomas with their fangs bared, viciously attacking him and his wife.

What happened to the old ideas of liberals being these caring, compassionate people who would never judge one's spouse by the acts or thoughts of the other? Well, those have gone by the wayside, and we see exactly what is at play here.

The article says: ''The Supreme Court has long rejected this 'marriage penalty.' ''

Further down, it says: ''While any lower court can substitute a recused judge with another judge, there is no one to replace a Supreme Court Justice who recuses.''

We lost my constitutional law professor in the last year, David Guinn. He was a tough professor but a great teacher. He continued to be an incredible resource up to the end of his life. He used to say there is only one court that owes its existence wholly to the U.S. Constitution. Of course, that is the U.S. Supreme Court. All other courts, as he would say, rely completely on the auspices of the Congress for their existence, for their continued existence, and for their jurisdiction.

It is interesting to look at this, and it is a great point that is being made by some scholars. Since the Supreme Court is set up as a separate branch, that is actually the one that Congress does not have authority to set up rules for recusal, for the Supreme Court.

In this article, Mr. Paoletta says: ''Consistent with the Court's policy, even though Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg's husband, Marty Ginsburg, practiced law at a firm that represented parties before the Supreme Court, Justice Ginsburg never recused herself. Law professor Jane Ginsburg, the Justice's daughter, wrote an article about a case pending before the Supreme Court. The petitioner cited Jane's article in its brief, and Justice Ginsburg voted for the result advocated by her daughter.

''Marty Ginsburg solved a complex tax problem for his client, Ross Perot's company EDS, and Perot endowed a chair named after Marty Ginsburg at Georgetown University Law Center. When Perot and EDS appeared several times before the Supreme Court, Justice Ginsburg did not recuse. Nor was she required to.''

I would add, nor did any of these people attacking the Black conservative, Justice Thomas, bother to advocate their new position back then.

''If reporters mean to tighten recusal standards, they should prepare to levy a marriage penalty on all judges' spouses, not just the Thomases.

''But the press now singles out Justice Thomas, calling on him to recuse because of his wife's activities. Ginni Thomas is a longtime conservative activist who works with groups that take public positions on issues and sometimes even file amicus briefs at the Supreme Court. But unlike the spouses and children of other judges, Ginni does not practice law, much less write briefs. She merely builds conservative coalitions to pursue shared political aims. None of her activities require Justice Thomas to recuse.

''Even so, the press criticized Ginni Thomas for honoring conservative leaders at an awards luncheon because those individuals subsequently filed amicus briefs at the Supreme Court. Historically, this has not required recusal. Ginsburg once donated an autographed copy of her VMI opinion to the pro-abortion NOW Political Action Committee, which auctioned off the opinion at a fundraiser in 1997. Moreover, in 2004, she spoke at a lecture named after herself for the NOW Legal Defense Fund''—that is, the National Organization for Women—''on whose board she served in the 1970s. Two weeks before that lecture, Justice Ginsburg voted in favor of a position advocated by the NOW Legal Defense Fund in an amicus brief.

''None of those activities required Ginsburg to recuse, but the press has

attacked Thomas for stoking concerns of a hyperpartisan court by attending conservative events. Thomas' critics conveniently ignore the numerous instances of liberal Justices attending similar events, such as Justice Sotomayor giving speeches to the liberal American Constitution Society.

''These recent stories have also ignored Justice Ginsburg's partisan attack on Donald Trump during the 2016 Presidential campaign. The Justice called him 'a faker' and criticized him for not disclosing his tax returns. She even voiced concerns about Trump being President. The day after he was elected, Ginsburg again objected by wearing a collar that traditionally signaled she would be dissenting in a case, though there were no cases handed down that day. Yet, she sat on a case challenging a congressional subpoena for President Trump's tax returns, and she decided plenty of other cases involving President Trump and his administration. No one talked of impeaching Justice Ginsburg for her conduct.

''The media are weaponizing baseless ethics charges to smear a conservative Black Justice. Thomas infuriates them because he expresses views they consider unacceptable for a Black man to hold, and because an increasing number of Justices are aligned with those views and may be ready to issue rulings that undercut longstanding liberal precedents. But going after his wife is despicable. And it won't work.''

It is also interesting that the majority in H.R. 1 attempts to go after—without naming Justice Thomas, it requires the Judicial Conference of the United States, which is chaired by the Chief Justice, to establish a mandatory code of conduct for the Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court. This is potentially unconstitutional. This is according to testimony before Congress by Hans von Spakovsky.

He makes a good point: ''Article III states that the 'judicial power of the United States shall be vested in one supreme court and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish. . . . The Constitution, not Congress, created the Supreme Court. It is an independent, coequal branch. In the same way that the Justices cannot dictate what ethics rules apply to Members of Congress or the President, it is highly questionable whether Congress can dictate the ethics rules that apply to the Supreme Court.''

□ 1330

Since the Judicial Conference was established by Congress, ''for the benefit of the courts it had created,'' and ''is an instrument for the management of the lower Federal courts, its committees have no mandate to prescribe rules or standards for any other body.''

According to the Chief Justice, Justices use the current code of conduct for the lower courts as guidance as well as ''a wide variety of other authorities to resolve specific ethics' issues.''

The Supreme Court has ''never addressed whether Congress may impose those requirements on the Supreme Court.'' But a serious constitutional problem under Article III with Congress trying to impose such mandates on the Justices, although they comply with the current provisions voluntarily.

So very good points, but just interesting how selective things have gotten.

Now, most judges and most judicial standards will indicate that if a Justice has spoken out and taken a position on a case that has come or is before the Court, it indicates an opinion before the case has concluded that that Justice should be recused. But we know two of the Supreme Court Justices actually appeared, performed same-sex weddings before they came out with their opinion. So that certainly seems to raise questions that people attacking Justice Thomas never actually raised back during those days.

It was interesting to be in here and hear the colloquy between the majority leader and the minority whip and hear the majority leader go back to the allegations raised by President Biden about all these leases that are not being utilized for drilling. Quite interesting, because there are some very legitimate reasons about why they are not utilized. And one of the things that has done tremendous damage to investment in additional wells, one thing, there has been encouragement for banks to look the other way. Do not get involved in fossil fuel development, which is rather interesting; could lead to our own demise as a Republic when we have been the most blessed country when it comes to natural resources of any country of which I am aware.

Our world is jealous. And yet, we routinely put off-limits those very resources we desperately need, even though we produce them more cleanly for the environment than any other country that we are buying them from, particularly China, Russia, others that have gotten control—some in Africa.

But one article here by Peter Hasson about ''Biden's Misleading Spin About Oil Production Under Him vs. Trump.'' ''But the White House's framing omits a key fact: while domestic oil production in 2021 was higher than it was in 2017, it was lower than it was in 2018, 2019, and 2020, Federal statistics show.''

And the significant reason for that is that drilling doesn't occur overnight. Production doesn't occur overnight. It is a work in progress. So that one President, when he comes into office, actually inherits the preparation to drill or the killing of drilling by the prior President.

So when President Trump took office, his first year, the drilling and production numbers were a result of what had happened before he took office. And thus, when President Biden takes credit for production numbers in his first year, of course, he doesn't want to acknowledge it, but those were the results of actions taken during the Trump administration. But after that, he does deserve to get credit for the damage or the good that is done.

An article by Thomas Barrabi and Ariel Zilber points that, ''If President Joe Biden came out forcefully on the side of increasing U.S. oil production, the price of a barrel could fall quickly, experts told The Post—even if it takes a while to bring that new energy online. Just looked at what happened Wednesday''—this article is from March 9—''in the wake of the United Arab Emirates and Iraq saying they'd up production by an estimated 800,000 barrels a day: The global price of oil dropped by $22 a barrel within minutes.

''If Biden signaled full-throated support for U.S. drillers to get to work—and perhaps allowed the restarting of the Keystone XL pipeline from Canada—global oil prices could similarly fall sharply, the industry experts told The Post.''

And I have noticed that when there is good news about the production of oil or natural gas, that the price doesn't fall quite as quickly as it goes up after bad news, but it should be noted that after years of not replacing oil in the Strategic Petroleum Reserve of oil, the SPR, President Trump not only saw to it that America became energy independent for the first time in decades, but they started putting oil in that Strategic Petroleum Reserve, so that in the event of an emergency, we would have oil to keep going.

It was not put there for a President that has done damage to our ability to produce what we need, to try to get out from under the criticisms from people that can't afford where he has driven the price of energy. And in fact, I would humbly submit that by President Biden's starting to take a million barrels of oil per day from that Strategic Petroleum Reserve, he is setting America up for a catastrophe. Because there are interruptions in the production of oil and natural gas. They come time to time, and especially when there is war activity.

Now, President Biden used a claim that there is a wartime emergency. Yet, under our Constitution, only the U.S. Congress has the authority to declare war, and no such war has been declared. And in fact, President Biden has made very clear, we are not putting troops in Ukraine.

And I was hearing on the news today that actually things that were announced by this administration that would be helping Ukraine fight off Russia have not arrived. There were announcements, but the help that was supposed to be coming from the United States has not come that will help them fight off Russia.

So we can hear all the grand pronouncements about how evil Putin is. But at times, they are just that. They are pronouncements.

Because we are not giving the help to Ukraine that is being promised. Is this some kind of show without putting actions behind it? A lot of Ukrainians

think so when they look at the Biden administration. Because they are desperate. They are fighting with all they have.

I heard the majority leader casting aspersions at Republicans thinking Putin is some great guy. He is a thug.

And yet, who was it that put back in Putin's head that the United States has no problem with him attacking innocent countries and invading innocent countries? Well, we can go back in the second half of the Bush administration, George W. Bush administration, when President Bush and Secretary Condoleezza Rice got upset, as many of us did, when Putin's Russia invaded the country of Georgia. And he slapped some very serious sanctions on Russia to try to send a message: Don't go invading other countries.

So when Biden became Vice President, Obama became President, one of the first things they did, they sent a Secretary of State named Clinton with a red plastic button that they misnamed in Russian. They meant to call it a reset button. But the people working for the Obama/Biden administration and for Secretary Clinton were not smart enough to properly translate the word, so it didn't mean reset.

But they went over there with the intention of sending a message that President Bush, he overreacted when you attacked Georgia. And the message from Obama, Biden, Clinton was, We won't overreact like that when you invade countries you shouldn't. We won't. We don't have a problem with it. That was Bush. That was Condoleezza Rice. They had a problem with your invading Georgia, but we don't have a problem like that.

What was Putin supposed to think? Exactly what he thought.

Number one, this Biden, Obama, Clinton, they are weak people. And they are giving me a green light to invade Crimea, which he did. And what happened? Nothing. The Obama/Biden administration sent blankets over there. It is hard to stop a tank with a blanket; that is what was sent.

But Putin got that message. And then Trump comes in. And he can say flattering things about Putin, but he knew that Putin is not stupid, and he knew that he could be vicious, and he made very clear, you don't invade under my administration, or you will pay a big price. But once President Trump was gone, and we got back to the old policies of the Obama/Biden administration, Putin knew he had a President that he could push around. And that was accented when President Biden telegraphed that we could be okay with a minor incursion. If it is just a small invasion, we probably wouldn't even react. That was the message that was heard in Russia.

And at times, it is almost as if there are people in this administration that have been paid off by Russia.

□ 1345

Well, I guess some people in the Biden family have been paid off, but that is another matter. At times, though, it does seem like with the change in policy of standing firmly against China's devastating activity when it comes to stealing our secrets, patents, and copyrights, and the lack of action by this administration, it does seem like, gee, it makes you wonder if somebody is getting paid off in this administration. Then you realize, oh, yeah, the Biden family has made a lot of money from China.

People want to talk about maybe Clarence Thomas should recuse himself, I wish they would apply those standards to people who benefit in this administration from the failure to stop China.

In any event, just mark my words, this administration, President Biden, releasing a million barrels of oil a day from our strategic petroleum reserve is really going to come back to hurt us. When we are in an emergency situation and we need that oil, it is not going to be there because President Biden was hoping he could ameliorate some of the anger of voters by the prices that we are seeing at the gas pump and the prices we are seeing in inflation.

That is the thing, when energy prices go up, it affects every price; because food, the things we use to stay warm or to house ourselves, even electric cars cannot be produced without the use of fossil fuel—can't—they will some day, but they can't right now. You got to have fossil fuel or you cannot make a car; not for production, not cheap enough to be bought by the American public.

Since I have been here in Congress, I filed a bill to have a huge cash prize to anyone who could develop the type of battery, capacitor, some way to hold megawattage of electricity for at least 30 days without significant loss. One of these days somebody is going to come up with that, an ability to hold electric. When that happens, we won't need fossil fuel at all. Whoever comes up with a way to do that is going to be mega wealthy.

Once we have that ability, we should be able to capture lightening. There are all kinds of ways we can have energy. I have been told, oh, no, we already can capture energy because some place they have water in a lower reservoir and during off-peak time they pump the water up to a higher reservoir so that during peak times they have the water flow down and that turns turbines and that produces electricity. That is storing energy, but it is not storing electricity.

That energy has to then be converted back into electricity by turning the turbines. Some day we are going to have the ability to have energy held in massive quantities, but right now we don't have that ability.

The batteries that are being used in vehicles, we are heading for all kinds of headaches when enough people buy electric vehicles and we have to do something with all of those toxic batteries. It is going to be bad. It is going to be horrendous for the environment if too many people start buying electric vehicles.

There is a great article by Kevin O'Scannlain in March of this year titled ''The Red-Herring of Unused Leases,'' which is what the majority leader brought up. It says: ''The fact is, natural gas and oil companies hold numbers of 'nonproducing' leases—which is far different from the claim of 'unused' leases mentioned by the White House,'' and by our majority leader.

Here are some key numbers: 1,548, that is the number of nonproducing offshore leases, according to the Federal Bureau of Ocean Energy Management; 13,000, that is the approximate number of nonproducing onshore leases, according to the U.S. Bureau of Land Management:

''Context: 'Nonproducing' means exactly that. These are leases that have not yet been developed to the point of actual production—the average time from onshore lease sale to production is 3 to 4 years; 7 to 10 years for offshore leases—and those that have not produced commercial volumes of oil and gas.''

''Polling released last week shows that Americans know the stakes involved overseas and at home. They overwhelmingly support—by a 90 percent margin—increased U.S. production over reliance on foreign energy. That means lawmakers and regulators need to address that.''

''The first, by some members of the Biden administration, including White House Press Secretary Jen Psaki on Thursday, is that American oil and natural gas producers are sitting on hundreds of unused Federal leases and do not need access to more. The second, by some industry opponents, is that ramping up U.S. production will not help the Ukrainian people today.

''Psaki has made the claim about 'unused' Federal leases before. It has become a line at the White House pivots to when pressed to explain why it isn't doing more to support American oil and gas production—with soaring demand putting upward pressure on prices and with much of Europe at the mercy of its top energy provider, Russia.''

Here are key facts about Federal leases:

''The law already requires companies to either produce oil and/or gas on leases or return the leases to the government—the so-called 'use it or lose it' provision. . . . '' It is already in there. Generally, it is required in the first 10 years.

''When a company acquires a lease, it makes a significant financial investment at the beginning of the lease in the form of a nonrefundable bonus bid and pays additional rent until and unless it begins producing.

''For Federal onshore, the Mineral Leasing Act prevents any one company from locking up unproductive excessive Federal acreage.

''Developing a lease takes years and substantial effort to determine whether the underlying geology holds commercial quantities of oil and gas. The lengthy process to develop them from a lease is often extended by administrative and legal challenges at every step along the way.''

Every company is familiar with lawfare, going to court, being drug repeatedly into court to stop the use of a lease.

''The argument about 'unused' leases is a red-herring, a smokescreen for energy policies that have had a hamstringing effect on the world's leading producer of natural gas and oil. It suggests American producers have been motivated by desire to manipulate the market during the current crisis in Europe. This is false. American oil and gas producers are able and willing to do their part to support American energy leadership, including providing energy that can help allies abroad.

''Ultimately, energy policies affect the energy investment climate. Specifically, they impact the ability of producers—typically accountable to shareholders—to take the risks involved in spending billions of dollars to find and develop oil and gas. Mischaracterizing the way Federal leases work does not help foster new investment and risk-taking.''

''The time for helping Ukraine with American energy was months ago. Then, the Biden administration support for robust U.S. production might have helped deter Moscow from thinking that European nations were so dependent on Russian energy might do less to oppose Russia the aggressor.

''Instead, the administration discouraged American energy. For more than a year it has halted new Federal leasing—key to future energy investment and production. It canceled energy infrastructure, blocked development in parts of Alaska, entertained new taxes to punish the U.S. energy industry and chilled future investment by signaling that oil and gas would not be part of America's future energy mix. All last summer, the administration called on OPEC+, the oil cartel, to increase its production more rapidly in the face of rising energy costs, bypassing the American producers.''

Let me go back and readdress ANWR. We lost Don Young. We had a wonderful service and tribute to him. It was a great funeral, a great service for a great man. I got to sit beside Don Young for years in the Natural Resources Committee because I became the second most senior person on Natural Resources. Since I made Republican leaders mad, they were not going to allow me to be chairman, and we sit by seniority, so I sat by Don Young for years.

Don would get so upset when people would pretend to speak for Tribal groups in Alaska or for the Alaskan people, and say, they don't want ANWR—well, there was one little Tribe that didn't, but the rest sure did. He would take Members of Congress on trips to ANWR. So much of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, that area that was designated by the Carter administration, it is beautiful, it is pristine, there is wildlife in abundance.

Don always wanted to make sure that anybody that would listen and cared to know the truth could see for themselves in Alaska—here is this massive wildlife area that has been set apart by Congress. Well, here is this little bitty area comparatively where the Carter administration said: You know what, there is nothing there. Nothing can live there. This is a great spot, and we will allow drilling here. For decades, drilling was not allowed in the one place that it would have been okay to have drilling.

When the Trump administration says, hey, there was a designated place. And despite commercials where you see all this wonderful wildlife, that is not in the part designated for drilling. All the beautiful mountains and all, that is not the part designated by President Carter for drilling. It would bless the heck out of Alaska and their people because of the revenue it would bring.

It would be a blessing for America to further be independent and to further have the ability to encourage countries like Ukraine, and to discourage countries like Russia from picking on them because we have enough of the energy needs, we can fill enough energy needs. They don't have to worry about begging a ruthless dictator, like Putin has become.

Yet, year after year we have had people trying to stop it, and then once Biden was sworn in as President he did the same thing. No, we are going to put that back off limit. It is really a shame.

This article says: ''The current situation is a reminder that American energy abundance requires foresight and planning, investment and policy support. This is the path to sound energy policy that keeps America safe and strong and allows American energy to support allies.''

I am hoping—since I am not going to be in the next Congress—I am hoping that the bill I filed years ago that would provide a big cash prize to whoever comes up with the method of storing massive amounts of electricity for long periods of time efficiently, I am hoping that that won't be so futuristic that we couldn't have a majority actually pass that.

□ 1400

Because once we do that, there is no need for fossil fuels. We will have all the energy we need, and you could even produce cars. Let's face it, natural gas is such an important feedstock for so many of the products we use every day that we have come to rely on as necessities, as essential, including things in vehicles themselves.

In fact, in Texas, our air and water have been getting cleaner year by year. A lot of that is due to moving from oil and coal into natural gas; much cleaner.

In fact, here are some oil and gas facts:

In March of 2020, before the lockdowns began, the United States reached its highest level of energy production by January 2021. For the first time in nearly 50 years, U.S. was producing more oil than we were consuming. In just over a year, we have seen a 4 percent surplus of domestic oil and gas production fall to a 4 percent oil and gas deficit.

President Biden directed the Secretary of the Interior to halt new oil and gas leases on public lands and waters. President Biden canceled the Keystone XL pipeline which would have transported 830,000 barrels of oil per day from Alberta to refineries on the Gulf Coast of Texas.

The Biden administration has created significant regulatory uncertainty by threatening new and excessive burdensome regulations on the oil and gas industry, including the EPA methane rule and the DOI waste prevention rule.

The Biden administration has rescinded Trump administration permitting improvements, including the NEPA reforms, the WOTUS reforms, and the ESA reforms.

The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission has failed to approve natural gas pipeline applications leading to a backlog of pending applications that discourage economic growth and new energy development.

The U.S. Department of the Interior scrapped the Trump administration decision that authorized expanded leasing and development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska.

The price of gasoline has risen from an average of $2.38 under President Trump to approximately $3.53 today. It is a lot higher than that. Today I noticed around $5 around here.

This is the largest year-over-year price rise in 30 years and leaves little room to absorb the impact of potential massive oil and gas sanctions on Russia.

So those are some facts.

I want to touch on one other matter here. The name of this article is ''Republicans expose 'uncommon' CDC, teachers' unions ties on COVID school reopening guidance in report.''

This is from Jessica Chasmar, March 30.

''Republicans accuse Walensky of downplaying the degree to which the CDC departed from past practice to allow AFT to affect the policymaking process.''

''Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, official's testimony claiming that the agency coordinated with teachers' unions at an extraordinary level in crafting its school reopening guidance, despite the agency's earlier claims that such coordination was routine and nonpolitical.''

''Republicans wrote that emails between the American Federation of

Teachers, the White House, and the CDC showed that the AFT's 'cozy relationship with the Biden administration's political leadership at the CDC positioned the union to impose line-by-line edits' to the reopening guidance, despite the CDC's 'past practice to keep draft guidance confidential.'''

So we find out the mental and physical suffering of children due to 2 years of closed schools in some places, we can, again, go back to some of the teachers' unions that helped bring that about.

An article from the Daily Caller by Nicole Silverio, apparently NBC actually edited photos of Lia Thomas to look more like a woman.

That is what Erica Denhoff alleged in the NBC's ''Today'' show, they photoshopped her work to make transgender swimmer Lia Thomas look more feminine.

And then this has application to January 6, work by the FBI, we still need to get to the bottom, those who committed crimes and harmed the Capitol need to be punished. But those who didn't, so many appear to be sought and persecuted, not just prosecuted.

It has gotten kind of strange.

But Julie Kelly has a March 10 article about the Governor, Gretchen Whitmer, an alleged kidnapping plot, and the trial that was going on about that.

''After it became clear during opening statements that the defense could not argue their case without explaining the deep involvement of the FBI's confidential human sources,'' so the judge reversed his ruling, ''telling the jury that 'it won't be possible to draw a line between the government proving their case and entrapment.'''

''One FBI official told his supervisor he planned to conduct a 'terrorism enterprise investigation' into the loose band of misfits with no solid plans, much less the ability, to do anything nefarious at the time. The alleged ringleader, Adam Fox, lived in the ramshackle basement of a vacuum repair shop with his two dogs; if he needed to go to the bathroom or brush his teeth, Fox had to use the facilities at the Mexican restaurant next door.''

''Secret gatherings and out-of-town excursions, courtesy of the FBI and U.S. taxpayers, animated the scheme.''

Then she goes on to explain the extent to which the FBI and U.S. taxpayers paid to have meetings to try to bring the conspiracy to kidnap Governor Whitmer into actually going forward.

It really is shocking and does raise a serious question: When you have a dozen or so FBI informants or employed people, many getting paid in cash and benefits of tens of thousands of dollars, is it a plot then by the FBI or is it really a plot by the people who hadn't had the ability without the FBI to do anything about it?

So it is a sad time when the FBI seems to be using taxpayer resources to create events that would not happen without their involvement.

So there is a lot of oversight that needs to be done and a lot of housecleaning that needs to be done. It doesn't look like that will be happening any time soon.

I am grateful that we are again beginning to see some of our friends across the aisle getting back to basics and concern about civil rights that have been abused by government entities.

We have got a lot of work to do, and I hope that we will at least come together in stopping the Federal Government from being the source from which criminal plots are made available and potentially real.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I have to make a plane, so I won't be here for the whole 30 minutes. It will be probably more like 15 minutes.

Before addressing the issues I wanted to talk about today, I want to one more time talk a little bit about vitamin D, because earlier today I talked to Dr. Amiez Dror from Israel about a study that he conducted.

The study is absolutely amazing. In Israel about 45 percent of the population is vitamin D deficient, and that is really deficient. By deficient, they mean less than 20 nanograms per milliliter. About 75 percent of the Israeli population has vitamin D less than 30 milligrams per nanoliter.

In any event, it wasn't a huge study, but he looked to see how people who had adequate levels of vitamin D performed once they came into the medical system compared to people who were under that 20 nanograms. He found people who were vitamin D deficient, which is almost half the Israeli population, were 14 times more likely to have severe or critical COVID than the people who were above 20 nanograms per milliliter.

As far as people who died, 25 percent of the people who were hospitalized and were vitamin D deficient died compared to only 2.3 percent of those who had adequate vitamin D.

Think about that. You are 11 times more likely to die, Madam Speaker, if you are vitamin D deficient.

When he looked at adequate prelevel hospitalization for vitamin D, it was a better predictor of how you would turn out than having COPD, having diabetes, or having congestive heart failure. Unbelievable what a great predictor it was.

Nevertheless, continued our kind of asleep public health establishment has still not talked about this like they could have. We recently went over 1 million deaths in the United States attributed to COVID, but we can't talk about the fact that—and he is not the only doctor who feels that way—you could have cut that number in half or maybe well time more than half, if out of the chute well before we had such things as vaccines, we knew about vitamin D being good for people back in April or May of 2020.

If they had spent some of these advertising dollars they spent on other things en masse or whatever, they could have, I believe, saved half the lives. I right now personally know nine people who have died of COVID, and I can't help but think how many of these people or which of those people would have survived if they had publicized the importance of taking vitamin D.

Now, of course, I also asked the doctor how much vitamin D you should take. He felt for people in good shape it would be 2,000 to 3,000 international units.

If you are overweight, because the fat cells absorb the vitamin D, you should take more, maybe 4,000 or more international units.

He points out that even if you are in the sun, one of the things that creates so many people in Israel to be vitamin D deficient is—as the United States—so many people take sunscreen. It is important to protect yourself from skin cancer, but you have to remember, if you are one of these people who put sunscreen all over yourself, even in a sunny climate, you are not going to get adequate vitamin D levels.

He is a very important doctor. He has a Ph.D. in genetics. He is also a medical doctor. He also has degrees in molecular biology. So you are talking about a real sharp guy here.

If we had an on-the-ball press corps paying attention today, they should give him a call in Israel. He loves to talk to people about this, and you could get something that is very important in your local newspapers.

□ 1415

If anybody connected to the public health establishment is hearing this speech, they should give my office a call. We will give them the contact information.

It would have been better if this sort of stuff were out there 2 years ago, but the COVID infection rate goes up and down. We are on a downswing right now, though we are not as low as we were last July.

Vitamin D helps prevent other diseases as well. I realize a lot of the medical establishment in the United States does not like to focus on things in which people don't make a lot of money. But for people who want to save lives, there is still time to get the story of vitamin D out there. I certainly think every major and minor newspaper in the United States should be covering it.

He happened to mention that he got something in the New York Post, but it should be in more than just the New York Post.

Right now, we have our President, who I watched a little bit yesterday,

focusing on Transgender Day, saying how important it is we talk about transgenders to first and second graders. I can't believe that is where we are as a country. That is what President Biden felt was important to talk about.

I am going to talk about some other issues, some suggestions that President Biden might want to adapt to something he could talk about a little bit more.

I continue to believe the border is the biggest crisis America faces today. In February, we let about 72,000 people, including got-aways, into the country. ICE also releases people into the interior.

Right now, the administration does not release those numbers, so we will say 70,000 on the low side. That was this past February. Two years ago, well under 20,000 were being let in, in February. We are in a situation right now where about four times as many people per month are coming into the country.

I will point out, we are not always getting the best. The last time I was down there, I walked down a path that the people coming here illegally walked down. It was littered with photo IDs being thrown away from Chile, Brazil, Colombia, wherever.

But we are about to have the situation become much, much worse. We are about to get rid of what we refer to as title 42. That means that people who are coming here will no longer be held up because of the COVID threat.

There is a concern that the number of people coming here will be about 18,000 a day being let in, or 500,000 a month.

I think we have the biggest crisis in this country, allowing 70,000 people who are unvetted come into this country. We are about to go from 70,000 to half a million a month, and our President is focusing on: Are we doing enough to educate second graders about transgenders?

I would hope the press corps would drill him on these questions again and again: Who is going to pay for these people? How is it fair for the people who are trying to come into this country appropriately? What are you going to do about people who are coming here who perhaps are breaking the law?

I haven't touched on the fact that while we are focusing right now on people coming into the country, we are now having a fraction as many people being deported as we were before. That is another problem that we have to address.

In any event, I hope the press zeros in, when they have a chance to talk to President Biden, on what he is going to do since his own administration is estimating 18,000 people a day are going to come here.

Other things he is doing to encourage people to come here: We know, in the Build Back Better bill he was promoting, he was trying to get people who come here illegally to get free college. We know, as a practical matter, when you come here, if you are sick, we take you to the hospital. You will get free healthcare. I think probably virtually every State in the country—certainly, in Wisconsin—if you are ill and show up at the emergency room, they will treat you. So, you are getting free healthcare, perhaps free college.

It is just a disaster. It is the end of America. They talk right now about this happening the second half of May. America has to look out. Like I said, we are heading toward the point where we could have as many as half a million people a month coming here—the end of America.

The other crisis that we should be looking at—not quite as important as the border but close—is the amount of inflation.

We had President Biden show us his new budget. In that new budget, we are talking about a 12 percent increase in nondiscretionary spending. It is not rocket science as to where this inflation is coming from. When you spend money excessively, and the Federal Reserve has to print money, you are going to get inflation.

I had naively hoped, at the beginning of the year, after the huge, excessive spending the last 2 years, that Republicans and Democrats would get together and hold discretionary spending to even. Of course, mandatory spending is going to go up anyway as the population ages—more money spent on Medicare, more money spent on Social Security. But, no, I didn't get my wish of zero percent increase.

A 12 percent increase in nondefense discretionary, what does that mean? It means we are going to continue to have the Fed print more and more money.

We have a graph here to look at. It shows the year-over-year increase in M2, one measure of the amount of money in the system, which directly leads to inflation.

Looking at the 1970s—and I was alive in the 1970s—there might have been a 7 percent increase, year over year, in the size of the monetary supply. Look where we are right now. We are just short of a 40 percent increase.

Look at where we are now compared to the 1970s and how difficult it was to get that inflation out of the system in the late 1970s and particularly the early 1980s. It really did take a real economic downturn to make the dollar have any value again. That is what it took in the 1980s, if you remember that downturn, that recession. Can you imagine how difficult it is going to be to give the dollar adequate value again?

Not only that, as I look in that budget, it is a divisive budget. One more time, we have program after program aimed at certain groups, not all Americans across the board, as our forefathers would want.

When I go back home, I talk to a restauranteur. He has a little restaurant. He has his chin up. He doesn't want to be publicized. He felt, during the COVID stuff, he was denied a $30,000 grant because of his race. He is a White guy.

This is the type of thing that page after page after page of this proposed budget throws out. Again, we have to focus on some people rather than other people, which is one of the reasons why I do feel, in addition to his incompetence at the border, in addition to his incompetence with regard to inflation, in addition to the fact that I think he has done a bad job on COVID, as illustrated by the fact that he has been there well over a year and still they haven't adequately publicized vitamin D—President Trump should have been doing that as well, quite frankly.

Despite all of these other problems, he for sure has become a divisive President, trying to lower the opinion of the police by saying that they are racist.

In any event, these are the things that we should be focusing on right now.

I must leave in a second due to a flight, but I will make one more comment on Ukraine. It is my belief, talking to other Congressmen in this Chamber, as well as talking to people in the Biden administration, that they are not adequately preparing for the end of the Ukraine war. The longer the war goes on, the more people die, the more both the Ukrainian and Russian economies are shattered. If you look at all the bombs going off in Ukraine, you can imagine how long it is going to take to rebuild that country.

Therefore, it should be obvious that, like any war, eventually, an armistice is going to be signed, and an agreement is going to be met. I don't think enough exercise, enough time, is being put into bringing both sides to the table and working toward an agreement. As soon as an agreement is reached, it will benefit both of these countries as well as the rest of the world.

I strongly encourage the Biden administration to see what they can do. I appreciate what France has done, and I appreciate what Israel has done, trying to broker a deal.

There was a time when the United States was the world leader—I still like to think we are the world leader—in which we would get involved in brokering a deal, certainly brokering a deal before this whole war gets so out of line that it begins to affect the rest of the world as easily as it could if it would become a world war.

Like I said, every day that goes by, the more people die, the more equipment that is destroyed, it increases the chance that things will get out of line. So, I beg the Biden administration to exert a little bit of leadership toward trying to get this war to end.

We all wish the Ukrainians are doing well, but ultimately, an agreement will have to be signed.

I am all for helping Ukrainians. I have certainly voted for billions of dollars which will be used by that country. But I am sure the people there will be happy when the war is over.

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

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until noon on Monday next for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 4, 2022, at noon for morning-hour debate.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PERRY (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, and Mr. VAN DREW):

H.R. 7354. A bill to limit the revocation and rescission of the designation of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a foreign terrorist organization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VAN DUYNE (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. ROY, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H.R. 7355. A bill to provide that under the securities laws certain disclosures related to greenhouse-gas emissions or consumption of an issuer shall not be construed to be required; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. PERRY):

H.R. 7356. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the procedure to designate a foreign state, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 7357. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require an executive agency to submit information to any committee of the House of Representatives upon the request of 7 of the members of the committee, and to submit information to any committee of the Senate upon the request of 5 of the members of the committee, if the information relates to any matter under the jurisdiction of the committee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself and Ms. SCHRIER):

H.R. 7358. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to apply the exempt infant formula requirements to certain human donor milk, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

H.R. 7359. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the authority to suspend the right to introduce certain persons or property into the United States in the interest of the public health; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. DONALDS):

H.R. 7360. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to provide Federal financial assistance to support advanced nuclear reactors and associated supply chain infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FEENSTRA (for himself, Mrs. AXNE, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. GIMENEZ):

H.R. 7361. A bill to upgrade the communications service used by the National Weather Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GARBARINO:

H.R. 7362. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit mobile service providers from providing service on smart phones that have been reported stolen, to require smart phones to be equipped with anti-theft functionality and mobile device identification numbers, and to prohibit the alteration or removal of mobile device identification numbers of smart phones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 7363. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 to clarify the responsibility of landowners who do not participate in the operation of oil facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. ROUZER):

H.R. 7364. A bill to permit policyholders under the National Flood Insurance Program to elect to have previous premium rates remain in effect until the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency satisfies certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 7365. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exclude certain activities from hours worked, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. MANN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. BOST, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BACON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ROSE, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. FEENSTRA, and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 7366. A bill to ban the imposition of any State or local liability insurance, tax, or user fee requirement for firearm or ammunition ownership or commerce; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACOBS of California:

H.R. 7367. A bill to amend the Arms Export Control Act to provide for better monitoring and verification of the use of defense articles and defense services by countries of concern, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select), and Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. AXNE):

H.R. 7368. A bill to direct the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency to develop a program to provide assistance to creditworthy borrowers with Federal student debt in purchasing certain foreclosed homes owned by the Federal Government, the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, and local land banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 7369. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the eligibility of veterans who may receive self-employment assistance under the Veteran Readiness and Employment program of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PORTER (for herself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. BONAMICI, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 7370. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to study student mental health at institutions of higher education and to issue guidance on compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 for mental health and substance use disorder policies of institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SUOZZI (for himself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. JONES, Mr. KATKO, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. REED, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. BOWMAN):

H.R. 7371. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 55 Broadway in Greenlawn, New York, as the ''Samuel Ballton Post Office''; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. TITUS (for herself, Mr. MEIJER, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 7372. A bill to amend the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 to require the President to establish a semiconductor supply chain working group in response to the Russian invasion of Ukraine and submit reports to Congress on potential future disruptions to the supply chain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 7373. A bill to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend certain waivers related to child nutrition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Mrs. HINSON, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DONALDS, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. DUNN, Mr. HILL, Mr. PENCE, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. ELLZEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr.

JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. CLOUD, Mrs. FISCHBACH, Mr. GARCIA of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mrs. KIM of California, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. SPARTZ, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. HERN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Ms. LETLOW, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MOORE of Utah, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, Mr. GOOD of Virginia, Mrs. HARSHBARGER, Mrs. BOEBERT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BUCK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. TIFFANY, and Mr. BACON):

H. Res. 1020. A resolution condemning the Biden administration's plans for seeking to remove sanctions on the oppressive Maduro regime and negotiating with Iran in response to the crisis in Ukraine, and instead calling for Congress and the administration to support the production of American energy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. CARSON, Ms. OMAR, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. RASKIN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. COSTA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Mr. PALLONE):

H. Res. 1021. A resolution recognizing the commencement of Ramadan, the Muslim holy month of fasting and spiritual renewal, and commending Muslims in the United States and throughout the world for their faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. TLAIB (for herself and Mrs. DINGELL):

H. Res. 1022. A resolution expressing support for the recognition of April as Arab American Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Arab Americans in the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PERRY:

H.R. 7354.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section VIII of the United States Constitution

By Ms. VAN DUYNE:

H.R. 7355.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 7356.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 7357.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 7358.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, U.S. Constitution

By Mr. DESJARLAIS:

R.R. 7359.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7360.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FEENSTRA:

H.R. 7361.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. GARBARINO:

H.R. 7362.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution. Congress has the power to enact this legislation, as well, under Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3 and 18.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 7364.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause I (relatin providing for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) and 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out powers vested in Congress).

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 7365.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. JACKSON:

H.R. 7366.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. JACOBS of California:

H.R. 7367.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 7368.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LEVIN of California:

H.R. 7369.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 7370.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SUOZZI:

H.R. 7371.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution, Congress has the power ''To establish Post Offices and post Roads.''

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 7372.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 7373.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 19: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 623: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 648: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 673: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 674: Mr. CARSON.

H.R. 829: Mr. DELGADO.

H.R. 1080: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 1179: Mr. GUEST and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1282: Ms. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1334: Mr. HOYER and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1481: Ms. NEWMAN, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. JACOBS of California, and Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 1803: Mrs. MCBATH.

H.R. 1916: Mr. REED.

H.R. 1919: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2351: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 2489: Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 2515: Mr. MOORE of Utah.

H.R. 2689: Ms. STANSBURY.

H.R. 2773: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2820: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2837: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 2918: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 3077: Mr. LIEU.

H.R. 3173: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 3244: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 3281: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 3348: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Ms. PORTER.

H.R. 3451: Mr. BEYER and Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 3577: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 3822: Mr. CARBAJAL.

H.R. 3824: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3962: Mr. TIFFANY.

H.R. 3991: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 4176: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 4410: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 4442: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 4571: Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 4603: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 4766: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. OMAR, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 4870: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4892: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. LEVIN of California.
H.R. 4967: Mr. PANETTA.
H.R. 5112: Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 5232: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 5370: Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 5497: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Ms. STANSBURY.
H.R. 5530: Mrs. MCBATH.
H.R. 5581: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 5678: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 5769: Mr. AGUILAR.
H.R. 5801: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. WILD.
H.R. 5886: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 5999: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
H.R. 6015: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 6026: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 6102: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 6161: Mr. GOHMERT.
H.R. 6171: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 6215: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 6251: Mrs. HAYES.
H.R. 6261: Ms. BROWNLEY and Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 6270: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 6544: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 6649: Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 6659: Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. BABIN, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. MEUSER.
H.R. 6681: Ms. BROWNLEY.
H.R. 6818: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 6926: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 7004: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 7026: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 7030: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 7032: Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 7060: Mr. BALDERSON.
H.R. 7077: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. Velázquez, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DELGADO, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.
H.R. 7099: Ms. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 7116: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 7147: Ms. STRICKLAND, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 7150: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. DAVIDSON, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. CAREY, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. CLYDE, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 7179: Mr. NORMAN.
H.R. 7185: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 7189: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 7194: Mr. HILL, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, and Mrs. STEEL.
H.R. 7222: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 7229: Mr. MANN.
H.R. 7256: Mr. ELLZEY.
H.R. 7263: Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. PERRY, and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 7294: Mrs. WAGNER and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 7303: Mr. KATKO and Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 7310: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. MFUME.
H.R. 7330: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. GARBARINO.
H.R. 7344: Mr. TIFFANY.
H.J. Res. 1: Mr. LIEU, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HOYER, Ms. MENG, Ms. DEAN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Ms. PORTER.
H.J. Res. 72: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.J. Res. 79: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. CLYDE.
H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Con. Res. 84: Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ and Mr. JONES.
H. Res. 79: Mr. CARSON.
H. Res. 240: Mr. MORELLE.
H. Res. 404: Mr. GOHMERT.
H. Res. 529: Mr. STEIL.
H. Res. 891: Ms. WATERS.
H. Res. 1008: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Res. 1015: Mr. DAVIDSON.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS AND WITHDRAWALS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 2 by Mr. ROY on House Resolution 216: Mrs. Kim of California, Mr. Carey, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Moolenaar, Mr. Rogers of Kentucky, Mrs. Steel, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Stewart, Mr. Turner, Mr. Leutkemeyer, Ms. Cheney, Mrs. Rodgers of Washington, Mr. McHenry.

Petition 10 by Mr. DUNCAN on House Joint Resolution 67: Mr. Biggs.

Petition 11 by Mr. SCHWEIKERT on H.R. 6009: Mr. Biggs.

Petition 12 by Mr. GOSAR on House Joint Resolution 46: Mr. Estes, Mr. Biggs, Mrs. McClain, Mr. McKinley, Mr. Roy, Mr. Steube, Mrs. Lesko, Mr. Huizenga, Mr. DesJarlais, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Wilson of South Carolina, Mr. Webster of Florida, Mr. Cline, Mr. Clyde, Mr. Norman, Ms. Herrell, Mr. Buck, Mr. Fulcher, Mr. Grothman, Mr. Pfluger, Mr. Davidson.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING THE GREAT LAKES BOAT BUILDING SCHOOL FOR BEING NAMED OPERATION ACTION U.P.'S NON-PROFIT OF THE YEAR

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the Great Lakes Boat Building School for being named Operation Action U.P.'s Non-Profit of the Year. Through their tireless work and steadfast devotion to their students and community, GLBBS has become an indispensable part of the Upper Peninsula, the State of Michigan, and the Great Lakes region.

The Great Lakes Boat Building School was created in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan in 2005, with a mission to bring a local maritime trade school to the region. Their school has given many people the opportunity to learn about the boat building industry and embark on successful careers after their education. In addition to being awarded the 2020–21 Non-Profit of the Year by Operation Action U.P., they also recently have been recognized as a Bronze-Level Veteran-Friendly School by the Michigan Veteran-Friendly Schools Program. As a Veteran myself, I greatly appreciate the work they have dedicated to our men and women in uniform as they return from service. GLBBS continues to serve as a model for other programs across the country for the national educational standards they regularly exceed.

Madam Speaker, it's my honor to recognize the Great Lakes Boat Building School for their significant contributions to our region and their recent well-deserved recognitions. Michiganders can take great pride in knowing the First District is home to such dedicated citizens. On behalf of my constituents, I wish them all the best in their future endeavors.

KARLA DIAZ CASTANEDA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Karla Diaz Castaneda for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Karla Diaz Castaneda is a 12th grader at Vantage Point High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Karla Diaz Castaneda is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Karla Diaz Castaneda for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF MASTER WEAVER FLORENTINA ''FLOREN'' MENO PAULINO

HON. MICHAEL F.Q. SAN NICOLAS

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Master Weaver Florentina ''Floren'' Meno Paulino. Master Weaver Paulino, or ''Tan Floren'' as she is affectionately known, was an esteemed artist, pillar of CHamoru tradition, and fountain of wisdom for the People of Guam. Our community will fondly remember her as a woman whose generous spirit and commitment to cultural preservation have and will continue to extend far beyond the fringes of her woven works.

As a young girl having grown up as part of the Greatest Generation of Guam, Tan Floren learned the basic skills of weaving from her father to contribute to her family and community. From baskets to mats, woven items were a significant part of daily life for CHamorus. By age twelve, Tan Floren began crafting items such as guagua' nengkanno' and tuhong siha—respectively translated as food baskets and hats. As she continued to learn and develop her skills, the knowledge she obtained from family and friends brought her to a level of proficiency required for weaving decorative items such as paluma, uhang, adothonulu, and inareklan flores—otherwise known as birds, shrimp, head bands, and floral arrangements. Over the years, her continued practice and growth paved the way for her to rise as a traditional master weaver specializing in plaiting coconut palm and pandanus leaves into utilitarian and decorative items.

Navigating new opportunities to pass on the traditional art of weaving, Tan Floren found a home in the Gef Pa'go Cultural Village where she could demonstrate her skills. For decades, she taught traditional weaving methods and articles for tourists, guests and student visitors alike. This passion for sharing knowledge with and empowering others poured out into other areas of her life as well, having retired from the Government of Guam after years of service at Inalåhan Elementary School, Inalåhan Middle School, and Talo'fo'fo Elementary School. She further maintained an active role in community life by participating in numerous cultural events across our island and region throughout the year. Moreover, she received formal recognition as a Master Weaver by the Guam Council on the Arts and Humanities Agency (CAHA) in 1997 as part of the Masters of CHamoru Tradition poster series.

Master Weaver Florentina ''Floren'' Meno Paulino is an icon of resilience who continues to inspire many throughout our island and region to remain steadfast in their pursuits of ancestral knowledge and indigenous rediscovery. Her tireless dedication to perpetuating the values of life, family, and culture central to our CHamoru identity resonate acutely with me, and I join the People of Guam in remembering and celebrating her life and legacy of deep-rooted community service. My family and I wish to extend our hearts and prayers for Master Weaver Florentina ''Floren'' Meno Paulino, her family, and friends. She will be dearly missed, and her love and memories will forever remain in the hearts of the People of Guam.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. BRADY. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted NAY on Roll Call No. 98; NAY on Roll Call No. 99; YEA on Roll Call No. 100; YEA on Roll Call No. 101; and NAY on Roll Call No. 102.

ROSALINDA CARDONA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Rosalinda Cardona for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Rosalinda Cardona is a 12th grader at FutureForward Bollman and Northglenn High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Rosalinda Cardona is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Rosalinda Cardona for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

WOMEN OF THE REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS MOVEMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 29, 2022

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the countless people—organizers and activists, jurists and justices, doctors and clinic staff—whose work and leadership continues to secure access to abortion services across the country. For generations, women have been at the forefront of the fight to secure reproductive health services, and their bravery and vision continues to inspire our work today. In the face of the most serious effort to turn back the clock on abortion access in decades, their work is more important today than ever.

Around the country, medical providers and clinic staff show up to work every day to ensure that people have the care they need. They routinely provide care in the face of unrelenting threats, violence, and harassment by anti-abortion extremists, showing up each day to ensure that people in our communities have access to care. These providers and clinic staff have been innovating and adapting to meet an unending series of challenges and hurdles. Each day, abortion care providers are working toward a world in which every person can shape their own futures and families.

I want to share some of their names here today—just some of the many women whose work is critical to making abortion accessible.

Dr. Kathryn Fay, MD/MSCI, is on the faculty in the Division of Complex Family Planning at Brigham and Women's hospital, an instructor at Harvard Medical School, and is an NIH-funded researcher focusing on reproductive coercion. She continues to provide a full spectrum of care, including labor and delivery services, medication and procedural abortions, contraceptive counseling, and routine gynecologic care.

Dr. Halley Crissman is an OB/GYN in Southeast Michigan who provides gender-affirming care, abortion care, and comprehensive sexual and reproductive care. Dr. Crissman advocates tirelessly for her patients—for their access to safe, high quality medical care, and for their respect and bodily autonomy. She is the Director of Gender Affirming Care with Planned Parenthood of Michigan which is working to expand access to gender-affirming hormone care across the state of Michigan, while simultaneously working to protect and expand access to abortion care.

Dr. Katherine Farris has worked at Planned Parenthood South Atlantic for more than 13 years. She is a family physician who has provided abortion care throughout her career because she recognizes that without the ability to decide if or when to become a parent, no person has true freedom or autonomy to create the life they desire.

Dr Rathika Nimalendran works as an abortion provider at a health clinic in North Carolina. In a profile for Physicians for Reproductive Health, she wrote ''I have always been compelled to provide abortion care. I believe in a woman's right to choose what is best for her, and I provide abortions to help women who have made the choice to safely terminate a pregnancy.''

Joan Whitaker retired as the director of health services at ABCD (Action for Boston Community Development) in June 2020 after serving the Boston community for 33 years.

Dr. Adeola Oni-Orisan is a medical anthropologist and board-certified family physician specializing in reproductive healthcare. She provides abortion care in California and also travels to Georgia to provide abortions as interim-medical director of abortion services at Planned Parenthood Southeast. As a medical anthropologist, her work seeks to illuminate experiences of seeking and providing reproductive health care in Black birthwork communities in the bay area. She is also a leader in One Love Black Community, an organization which supports Black birthing people in San Francisco who are pregnant, postpartum, or postabortion.

Madam Speaker, abortion is essential, abortion providers are essential, and independent abortion clinics do essential work. Many also provide other life-saving services, including hormone therapy and gender-affirming care, prenatal and birthing care, STI and HIV testing and treatment, birth control and family planning, and sometimes even primary care. We celebrate each of these women today, together with doctors and nurses, clinic staff and administrators, across the country.

In addition to medical professionals and clinic staff, we also honor the women whose work as advocates, activists, and organizers is critical to ensuring that each person has access to the care they need. Women who have fought for the passage of laws that protect, rather than restrict, abortion access, have advocated for funding for reproductive health priorities; women who go into communities to coordinate and educate, and to connect people with the care and services they seek. Women who ensure we all know what our rights are, and who teach us to raise our voices to demand the protection of those rights.

I particularly want to pay tribute to the women who have been working on the ground in Texas, especially in the months since the enactment of S.B. 8. In the light of unprecedented restrictions and draconian new laws, organizers and activists in Texas have persisted, and their work is more critical now than ever.

I want to highlight one organizer today: Lucy Ceballos Felix. Lucy, originally from Matamoros, Tamaulipas; Mexico, is certified by the state of Texas as a Community Health Worker (CHW) and Community Health Worker Instructor (CHWI). Since 2012, Lucy has worked at the National Latina Institute for Reproductive Justice as Associate Director of Field and Advocacy in Texas, meeting with groups of women and other from various cities in the four counties of the Rio Grande Valley, Corpus Christ, and Houston. Her work helps community groups learn how to discover and develop their leadership, mobilize their community, and take action on political issues that are harming their lives, families, and communities. In the light of recent Texas legislation, Lucy's work is needed now more than ever.

I could speak for hours about the women who paved the legal path that is now under threat from the Supreme Court and the women who, as legislators at both the state and national level, have fought for passage of bills that expand abortion access and refused to accept policies that put it farther out of reach. I want to close by paying tribute to just one—Rep. Shirley Chisholm.

Rep. Chisholm was a trailblazer in so many ways, and not the least of these was her support for reproductive rights and abortion access. In 1969 she was named honorary president of NARAL, in 1970 she supported legalization of abortion in her home state of New York, and in 1970 described abortion as an issue of economic and racial justice. In 1989, she was one of 16 Black women who published the first collective statement calling for equal access to abortion. Rep. Chisholm emphasized what continues to be true today: that although abortion restrictions and bans hurt everyone, their impacts fall most heavily on women of color, low-income women, and others who already face barriers to accessing health care. Rep. Chisholm understood that reproductive justice is critical to economic and racial justice, and I am proud to continue her work as co-chair of the Pro-Choice Caucus.

Madam Speaker, every day across the United States and around the world, women are protecting, upholding, and expanding abortion access. Generations of women—lawyers, organizers, providers, activists, volunteers—are responsible the rights and freedoms we currently enjoy, and the Pro-Choice Caucus is committed to building upon their legacy. Even in the face of unprecedented threats, we will continue to fight for a future where everyone, no matter where they live or how much money they make, has the freedom to make decisions, for themselves, about their bodies, their lives, and their futures.

FREYA ARCHULETA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Freya Archuleta for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Freya Archuleta is a 9th grader at Adams City High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Freya Archuleta is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Freya Archuleta for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

WESTMINSTER RETIREMENT COMMUNITY 55TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. McCAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to mark the 55th anniversary of the opening of the Westminster Retirement Community in Austin, Texas. I wish to congratulate them for

the meaningful work they do for the senior community in Austin and commend them for their commitment to providing high-end, quality care to their residents.

Westminster will always hold a special place in my heart, as they cared for my mother in her final days. I want to thank the doctors, nurses, and all the staff for the love and care they provided her during her time with them.

Since 1967, Westminster has provided life care, residential services, and state-of-the-art healthcare to thousands of residents who have trusted and relied upon their facilities and staff. To reach this milestone, Westminster's staff has worked tirelessly to ensure that their residents receive the care they need while also providing a comforting place to live during retirement.

The high quality of care and standard of living for the residents of Westminster has garnered national attention and led to a recognition as a Top 25 'Best in Wellness'' Senior Living Community in North America by the ICAA. This continued commitment to serving their residents in Austin illustrates the value that they serve in this community.

For 55 years, Westminster Retirement Community has diligently served the senior population in Austin to ensure that its residents live a long, healthy, and joyous life. Westminster has become the reliable institution that it is today due to its effort and acute attention to the care of its residents.

I want to recognize Westminster on their 55th anniversary and I commend them for the outstanding work they do for the retirement community in Austin.

TRIBUTE TO VOORHEES COLLEGE ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY AND RENAMING

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a proud historically Black college, in South Carolina's 6th Congressional District, on the occasion on its 125th Founder's Day. Voorhees College has provided educational opportunities for young African Americans in South Carolina since 1897 and on April 7, 2022 will be renamed Voorhees University.

Voorhees is the first HBCU founded by an African-American woman, Elizabeth Evelyn Wright, under the name Denmark Industrial School on April 14, 1897. When Ms. Wright founded the school, at the young age of 23, her vision was to provide a quality education to young men and women.

Ms. Wright's vision for the school grew, and in 1902, it became Voorhees Industrial School, after attracting the financial support of New Jersey philanthropist Ralph Voorhees. Mr. Voorhees and his wife donated money for the purchase of 280 acres of land in Denmark, South Carolina to expand the campus. More support came in 1924, when the school came under the auspices of the American Church Institutes for Negroes, which was part of the Episcopal Church.

In 1928, the name was changed to Voorhees Normal and Industrial School, reflecting its addition of a junior college. In 1946, the junior college became the first Black college in South Carolina accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. In December 1962, the institution became known as Voorhees College. The high school was closed, and, in 1967, Voorhees began granting 4-year degrees.

The students on Voorhees College's campus, like many other historically Black institutions, became engaged in the 1960's civil rights activities. In 1969, students occupied the Wilkinson Hall offices of the mostly white administration to protest their failure to hire additional Black faculty and provide more scholarships to low-income students from the Denmark community.

The difference between this and other college protests was that, having seen the shooting of student protestors on the nearby South Carolina State College campus the previous year, the students armed themselves. Their actions drew national media attention. After two days, the South Carolina National Guard forced the students to end their protest. Many were arrested and suspended. Some received jail sentences of 18 months to two years. All of them went on to complete their degrees.

Despite the tumultuous times, Voorhees College has always followed Elizabeth Evelyn Wright's vision for the school, ''to try to help my fellow man to help themselves, and if a way was not open for them, I must open it myself.'' It was in that spirit in December 2021, that the Southern Association of College and School Commission on Colleges approved Voorhees Master's degree program, setting in motion today's historic renaming to Voorhees University.

Voorhees College, under the leadership of Dr. Ronnie Hopkins, the tenth President, continues to offer its students a quality, comprehensive, general education, coupled with professional education, in a value-centered liberal arts tradition. Its mission is, ''to produce highly qualified graduates who coalesce intellect and faith in pursuit of life-long learning, healthy living, the betterment of society, and an abiding faith in God.'' This mission is deeply imbedded in the hearts and minds of faculty, staff and students allowing students to combine intellect and faith as they broaden their minds and prepare for their futures.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and our colleagues to join me in celebrating the 125th anniversary of Voorhees College and its new status as Voorhees University. May it continue to build upon the vision of its founder and serve as an exemplary example of higher education.

AWNEE MONTANO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Awnee Montano for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Awnee Montano is a 12th grader at Northglenn High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Awnee Montano is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Awnee Montano for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

HONORING THE BIRTHDAY OF MRS. IRENE BURRUS

HON. TROY A. CARTER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate and honor Mrs. Irene Burrus on the joyous and momentous occasion of her 99th birthday on March 31, 2022.

Irene has been a supporter, trusted advisor and personal friend of mine since I was a mere kid. I thank God for her and her incredible love, passion, and sincere care for our community at large.

Mrs. Irene Burrus has been a tireless volunteer in the New Orleans community for more than 50 years. She is a leader and possesses the skills to involve her friends and neighbors in the causes and organizations she believes in. Her kindness and empathy for others makes her a respected member of her community and has inspired many to follow in her service to others.

Irene was married to the deceased John Burrus, who served our country and was awarded the Navy Cross by President Harry S. Truman. She became involved in many causes for our military and veterans throughout the State of Louisiana.

Irene worked at the New Orleans Ernest N. Morial Convention Center for over thirty years. She has shared an unwavering love and dedication for the city of New Orleans with everyone she encountered. In 2013, at the age of 89, she volunteered three days of her time to welcoming people from over the world to the activities surrounding Super Bowl XLVII. She is well-known to serve breakfast to law enforcement every Mardi Gras.

A stalwart figure in Louisiana's volunteer circles, Irene was awarded the Heroism of the Year award by the Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations and was one of the first five inductees into the Algiers Wall of Fame for her community service to Algiers and New Orleans.

Irene's service to causes and organizations is unmatched. She is a member of the Algiers Police Advisory Group, the Welcome Neighbors Organization, the Morning Kiwanis Club, the Algiers Economic Development Foundation, the Tall Timbers Garden Club, the Algiers Development District, the Algiers Charter School Association for Fundraising, the Military Wives Organization, the Old Aurora Neighborhood Association, the Historic French Quarter Easter Parade, the Algiers Republican Women, the Louisiana Republican Women, and the Algiers Courthouse Board of Directors.

Throughout her life, Irene has been ''Shero'' to the countless families she has helped along

the way. She has showered blessings upon everyone she has loved so deeply, and we are eternally grateful. I wish her the happiest of birthdays surrounded by family and friends and pray we celebrate many more years to come.

SABRINA GONZALEZ

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Sabrina Gonzalez for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Sabrina Gonzalez is a 11th grader at Vantage Point High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Sabrina Gonzalez is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Sabrina Gonzalez for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

HONORING WILLIAM FRANK CHAPMAN, JR.

HON. H. MORGAN GRIFFITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise in honor of William Frank Chapman, Jr. of Salem, Virginia, who passed away on March 20, 2022, at the age of 88. Frank served in the Armed Forces and was a businessman and active community leader.

Frank was born on January 25, 1934. He graduated from Andrew Lewis High School. He then attended Fork Union Military Academy and was recruited by North Carolina State University on scholarship to play football, which he did for two years before transferring to the University of Virginia to finish his education.

He served in the United States Navy before returning to Salem. Upon his homecoming, he founded and served as president of Chapman-Taney-Painter-Logan Insurance, Inc. and Bonding for many years. He later worked at Sherwood Memorial Park in operations. After his retirement, Frank dedicated much of his life to service to his community.

He and his friend, Burks Logan, worked as co-chairmen of a capital campaign for the Salem Museum and were honored as ''Hometown Heroes'' in 2012 by the Roanoker Magazine. He was a life member of the Salem Museum and Historical Society and served as president of the board for five years.

I had the pleasure of knowing Frank personally. He was a friend and fellow Republican. I recall when I ran for the Virginia House of Delegates for the first time, he vowed to support me. But one of his close friends, with whom he had endured many hard times, decided to run against me. Frank approached me, hat in hand, to apologetically ask that I release him from his commitment. I respected his candor and loyalty. He was a true southern gentleman.

He faithfully served his community and party. He was a Trustee of the Virginia Agents Political Committee, a lifetime member of the Salem Rescue Squad, former state director of Salem Junior Chamber of Commerce, and former president of the Salem-Roanoke County Chamber of Commerce. Frank also served on many committees at the First United Methodist Church in Salem, where he was a lifelong and third-generation member.

Frank was also an avid outdoorsman. In 1981, then-Governor John Dalton appointed him to the Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries Commission to represent the sixth district. He served as vice-chairman from 1984 to 85. Frank also served as vice-chairman of the Catawba District of Boy Scouts of America. He was a member of the Salem Rotary Club and was recognized as a Paul Harris Rotary Fellow in 2005. Throughout his life, he held many esteemed titles and leadership roles—all to serve, lead, and better his community.

Frank was predeceased in death by two wives, Billie Lee Bates Chapman and Page Clark Chapman; his parents, William Frank Chapman, Sr. and Wilma Cross Chapman; and a sister, Lula Cross Harris Russell.

He is survived by his wife, Julie Stagg Chapman; three children, Lee Ann Chapman Critz and her husband, Blake, Frank Bates Chapman, and Catherine Chapman Mosley; four grandchildren, Sara Catherine Critz Kronstain and husband, John, Benjamin Lee Critz and wife, Anna, Luke Bates Mosley, and Addison Grace Chapman; and five great-grandchildren, Emma, Thomas, Matthew, Mason and Olivia. He also leaves behind his beloved stepchildren and grandchildren. I would like to offer my condolences to the family on the loss of this great man, friend, and community leader.

VATSANNA BRINES

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Vatsanna Brines for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Vatsanna Brines is an 11th grader at Vantage Point High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Vatsanna Brines is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Vatsanna Brines for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF GUAM ON ITS 70TH ANNIVERSARY AND CELEBRATING THE 54TH ANNUAL GUAM CHARTER DAY

HON. MICHAEL F.Q. SAN NICOLAS

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. SAN NICOLAS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Guam (UOG) and join the People of Guam in celebrating both its 70th Anniversary and 54th Charter Day. I extend my sincere congratulations for their decades of achievements and commend them for their countless contributions as a leader in the continued transformation of our local and global communities.

UOG Charter Day is an annual celebration that marks the 1952 founding of the institution and 1968 signing of the charter that renamed the Territorial College of Guam as today's University of Guam. In the years since then, the institution has remained an unwavering force in building strong educational foundations, fostering a breadth of opportunities for personal and professional growth, and creating new spaces for our people to rise as leaders in every level of society. From healthcare and education to business and public administration, every aspect of life on Guam has been deeply impacted by the very students, alumni, faculty, staff, and administration of UOG. Having earned an unprecedented 16 years of continuous accreditation, maintained an outstanding reputation as the only four-year U.S. accredited land-grant institution in the Western Pacific, and conferred over 19,914 degrees to its students, the University of Guam is an instrument of positive change that will continue to shape our island, region, nation, and world in the future ahead.

This year's Charter Day theme, ''Charting a Course for New Horizons,'' and platinum anniversary theme, ''70 Years of Transforming lives and Advancing Communities,'' further speak volumes about the ways in which UOG uniquely embodies its mission to enlighten, discover, and serve. Consistently taking its commitment far beyond the confines of academics and research, the institution has navigated a critical role in supporting the evolving needs of our community. Most recently, this has materialized in the provision of a central island vaccination clinic, personnel support for widespread community testing, online COVID–Ready Caregiver courses, tele-health counseling services, COVID–19 tele-education, a health clinic and outreach events, and COVID–19 awareness presentations in partnership with numerous community-based organizations, the Guam Army National Guard, and Guam Department of Public Health and Social Services over the course of the COVID–19 pandemic.

Madam Speaker, the University of Guam is a pillar of excellence and beacon of promise for generations past and generations more to come. Once again, I would like to congratulate the University of Guam for seventy years of

service, and I look forward to witnessing the continued progress this fundamental institution will realize for the People of Guam and our region.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF HENRY GARNETT PLASTER

HON. JACK BERGMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. BERGMAN. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to recognize the life of Henry Garnett Plaster, who passed away recently after a lifetime of service. Through his extreme dedication to the public good, Henry became an essential part of Loudoun County, the State of Virginia, and the United States of America.

Henry was born July 26, 1928, to Henry Garnett Plaster, Sr. and Jerusha Lohman Plaster in Washington, D.C. After graduating from St. Albans School in 1946, he went on to receive a B.S. in Physics at Duke University in 1950, and was part of the NROTC program. He received a master's degree in Engineering Administration from The George Washington University in 1961. Following his graduation from college, he began active duty in the United States Navy. He served in the Korean War and received a battle star in 1953. Henry resigned his commission in June 1953 and subsequently retired as a Lieutenant, USNR.

Henry was hired by the Central Intelligence Agency in 1954 and while his work at the agency was classified, he played a major role in a variety of CIA efforts including the CORONA and HEXAGON satellite programs. After serving his country for more than 43 years at the CIA, he retired in 1993 as the Cold War ended. He was awarded the Intelligence Medal of Merit in 1971 and the CIA Career Intelligence Medal. After his retirement, he left Bethesda, Maryland and moved to his family farm Glenmeade in Bluemont, Virginia. Henry and his wife Anne became very involved in their local community. He was the longtime Chairman of the Snickersville Turnpike Association, a very active member of the Bluemont Citizens Association, and was heavily involved in preserving local Civil War history.

Henry passed away peacefully on March 21, 2022. His steadfast care and friendly nature toward all members of his community will surely leave a lasting mark on those who had the opportunity to know him. He is missed dearly by his family and friends, and his legacy will undoubtedly live on for generations to come. Henry's tireless dedication to public service touched the lives of countless Americans, and the impact of his work cannot be overstated.

Madam Speaker, I ask you to join me in honoring the life of Henry Garnett Plaster. His legacy will forever live on in his family and in the many lives he bettered through his service.

DOMINICK ARELLANO

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Dominick Arellano for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Dominick Arellano is a 12th grader at Vantage Point High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Dominick Arellano is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Dominick Arellano for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

CONGRATULATING ELIZABETH M. HEWLETT ON HER RETIREMENT FROM THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask the House to join me in recognizing Elizabeth "Betty" M. Hewlett for her more-than-two decades of service on the Prince George's County Planning Board of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. Betty has done a tremendous job managing land-use issues and questions relating to the development of land for the benefit of residents of Prince George's County and the Fifth District. She has been a good friend, and I've been proud to work with her throughout the years to make a positive and lasting impact on our community.

Since she began her distinguished career with the Planning Board, Betty has been a tremendous public servant. As Chairwoman, she oversaw the provision of community planning services, the regulation of real-estate development, and the parks and recreation programs for the residents of Prince George's County. Betty was also a trailblazer: she was the first woman and first African-American to serve as the Chairwoman of the Planning Board. She mentored many Black women who became elected officials and now lead their communities with purpose and vision. Her championship of diversity in Prince George's County government and public services has helped create new opportunities for residents to realize their full potential and become forces for change in their own communities.

Betty has served Prince George's County in many ways beyond her outstanding work on the Planning Board. She has played a critical role in the organizing of my annual Black History Month Breakfast, which brings community members and leaders together to celebrate Black History Month and rededicate ourselves to the ongoing fight for justice and equality. Additionally, Betty has served on the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) Board of Directors and the Metropolitan Development Policy Committee of the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments. Her devotion to improving the lives of Prince George's County residents has been incomparable.

Madam Speaker, I offer Betty my congratulations on retiring from public service after a career of great contribution to Prince George's County and to our State of Maryland. I hope all f my colleagues will join me in recognizing Elizabeth M. Hewlett as she celebrates this milestone and in wishing her all the best in the future.

SCOTT SAX

HON. DAN NEWHOUSE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Scott Sax, who is retiring as the president and project manager of the Central Plateau Cleanup Company at Hanford.

A leader in the nuclear cleanup industry, Scott has been a pioneer in paving the way for the future of the Hanford Site for the last 20 years. I've had the chance to get to know Scott over the years, and let me tell you, his experience at Hanford has covered just about everything—from the tank farms to the Plutonium Finishing Plant and K Basins, to the Hanford vitrification plant.

Under Scott's leadership, Washington Closure Hanford achieved critically important milestones for the cleanup mission along the Columbia River. His passion for serving the people of Central Washington is admirable and I congratulate him on his many achievements during his career.

I thank Scott for his many contributions to the State of Washington and the nuclear industry and I wish him, his wife Lauri, and his family the very best in his well-earned retirement.

CANDELARIA ARCE

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Candelaria Arce for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Candelaria Arce is a 12th grader at Prairie View High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Candelaria Arce is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Candelaria Arce for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I

have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

TV ANCHOR DOUG WEATHERS SHOWED US WHAT QUALITY JOURNALISM LOOKS LIKE

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, retired Savannah TV anchorman Doug Weathers remains one of the most recognizable people in the community. He's still remembered and beloved. I believe he could step into a studio tomorrow to do the local news and again dominate the ratings. Walking into a room with Weathers, who still looks fit, has great hair and bursts with high energy at age 91, is like walking down a street in Memphis with Elvis. People shower him with shouts of 'Hey Doug,' and they want to bend his ear about something. And Doug, being Doug, will stop and listen, no matter whether it's to hear a story about a lost dog, a widow's prize fruitcake recipe, someone who's down on his or her luck or a gardener's giant zucchini. Weathers was very much the king of local TV news and he had the competition all shook up during his 41 years on the air here. The Georgia Association of Broadcasters recently honored the grand man of the local airways by naming him to its hall of fame. No on-air broadcaster in the state was more deserving of this honor, as Weathers was the face and the voice of two TV stations here during his tenure—WTOC (twice) and WJCL. Former WTOC general manager Bill Cathcart tells a story about how he once hired a consultant to rank every anchor in Savannah and list them according to their popularity. The consultant handed him a list with a folded piece of paper attached to the top. When he started reading the report, he didn't see Weathers' name. The consultant told him to unfold the paper. Doug was so far ahead of his competition that he earned his own page.

Among the many reasons that people in Southeast Georgia loved Doug was that he reflected them and their values. He didn't preach, because most of his audience got their fill of that on Sundays. He delivered the news straight and unfiltered. He was humble. He never failed to remember that he and his news staff were invited guests into people's homes. Too few people in the news business know that lesson today. Doug was a showman who liked 'hokey' and refused to take himself too seriously. He was fond of calling those news programs that featured grim-faced pontificating prattlers 'tube-coolers', in reference to scores of viewers at home hitting their off buttons to turn their attention to something else. Weathers was not too big to do any parade or make any appearance. One of his favorites was speaking at career days in local schools where he told star-struck kids that he got his start at WTOC doing drudge work like splicing film and sweeping up the studio for 90 cents an hour. He was big on getting a college education, even though he himself wasn't a stellar student. "I didn't graduate 'cum laude.' I graduated 'thank the Lordy' " was a favorite punchline.

Weathers also burned his own shoe leather hitting the streets to report the latest crime story, hospital hijinks or political scandal, most often scooping his rivals. No story was beneath him. He respected his viewers. Perhaps his greatest strength was his ability to attract, mentor and keep talent, pros like weatherman Pat Prokop, sports anchor Rick Snow, co-anchor Angela Gale and a bevy of fine reporters like Mike Manhatton, Jim Carswell, Janice McDonald, Jim Hildebrandt, George Murphy, Avis Blackmon, Jody Chapin, Dawn Baker, Ron Wallace and Johnny 'Get hooked on fishing, not drugs' Cole. Of course, these are also among the many reasons why this newest Georgia broadcasting hall-of-famer probably couldn't find a seat anchoring one of today's network snooze slots. He wasn't elitist. He kept his opinions to himself. He didn't make stuff up. He didn't make his viewers wretch or want to cough up a lung after one of his newscasts. He didn't hurl insults or twist the news to support a personal agenda. If more of the talking heads on the national news programs were more like Savannah's own Doug Weathers, they would gain more trust and viewers and look less like people who were talking out of a different part of their anatomies.

RAYVON MONTOYA

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Rayvon Montoya for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Rayvon Montoya is a 7th grader at Pinnacle Middle School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Rayvon Montoya is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Rayvon Montoya for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

SPECIAL RECOGNITION OF HUNTER LONG FOR WINNING THE DIVISION III WRESTLING STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

HON. ROBERT E. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. LATTA. Madam Speaker, it is with a great deal of pride that I rise to pay a very special tribute to an outstanding high school wrestler in Ohio's Fifth Congressional District. Hunter Long of Wayne Trace High School has represented his school ably on his way to achieving the Division III State Wrestling Title. Hunter overcame the challenges posed by intense competition in his effort to win the Division III State Wrestling Championship.

In pursuing the State Championship, Hunter Long defeated his opponent in the finals of the 132-pound classification. His hard work and dedication, both on and off the mat, in achieving this accomplishment is truly outstanding. He achieved an impressive season record bringing pride to his school and community.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying special tribute to Hunter Long of Wayne Trace High School. On behalf of the people of the Fifth District of Ohio, I am proud to recognize this great achievement.

DAEVION TURNER

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 1, 2022

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and applaud Daevion Turner for receiving the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award.

Daevion Turner is an 11th grader at Vantage Point High School and received this award because their determination and hard work have allowed them to overcome adversities.

The dedication demonstrated by Daevion Turner is exemplary of the type of achievement that can be attained with hard work and perseverance. It is essential students at all levels strive to make the most of their education and develop a work ethic which will guide them for the rest of their lives.

I extend my deepest congratulations to Daevion Turner for winning the Adams County Mayors and Commissioners Youth Award. I have no doubt they will exhibit the same dedication and character in all of their future accomplishments.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session and stands in recess until 3 p.m., on Monday, April 4, 2022.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 20 public bills, H.R. 7354–7373; and 3 resolutions, H. Res. 1020–1022, were introduced. **Pages H4126–27**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4127–28**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative Perlmutter to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4077**

Whole Number of the House: The Chair announced to the House that, in light of the resignations of the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Fortenberry, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Vela, the whole number of the House is 430. **Page H4077**

Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act: The House passed H.R. 3617, to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, by a yea-and-nay vote of 220 yeas to 204 nays, Roll No. 107. **Pages H4078–4116**

Rejected the Latta motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary by a yea-and-nay vote of 202 yeas to 220 nays, Roll No. 106. **Pages H4112–15**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–37, modified by the amendment printed in part A of H. Rept. 117–285, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill. **Pages H4078–87**

Agreed to:

Gottheimer amendment (No. 1 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–285) that authorizes $10M for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to conduct a study on technologies and methods that law enforcement may use to determine whether a driver is impaired by marijuana (by a yea-and-nay vote of 233 yeas to 172 nays, Roll No. 103); and **Pages H4106–07, H4110**

Lamb amendment (No. 2 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–285) that directs the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to conduct a study on the impact of legalization to the workplace, using states that have legalized recreational use of cannabis as a guide, and requires NIOSH to develop best practices for employers as companies transition their policies related to cannabis, prioritizing employers engaged in federal infrastructure projects, transportation, public safety, and national security (by a yea-and-nay vote of 234 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 104). **Pages H4107–08, H4111**

Rejected:

Raskin amendment (No. 3 printed in part B of H. Rept. 117–285) that sought to state that cannabis use shall not be the reason for denying or rescinding a security clearance (by a yea-and-nay vote of 202 yeas to 214 nays, Roll No. 105). **Pages H4108–10, H4111–12**

H. Res. 1017, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 3617) and (H.R. 6883) was agreed to yesterday, March 31st.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Five yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4110, H4111, H4111–12, H4114–15, and H4115.

Adjournment: The House met at 9 a.m. and adjourned at 2:26 p.m.

Committee Meetings

FY23 HEARING TO REVIEW DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE STRATEGY, POLICY, AND PROGRAMS FOR COUNTERING WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Intelligence and Special Operations held a hearing entitled ''FY23 Hearing to Review Department of Defense Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction''. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Defense officials: John Plumb, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy; Deborah G. Rosenblum, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical, and Biological Defense Programs; Vice Admiral Collin Patrick Green, Deputy Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command; and Rhys M. Williams, Acting Director, Defense Threat Reduction Agency, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment.

AMERICA'S NATURAL SOLUTIONS: THE CLIMATE BENEFITS OF INVESTING IN HEALTHY ECOSYSTEMS

Select Committee on the Climate Crisis: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''America's Natural Solutions: The Climate Benefits of Investing in Healthy Ecosystems''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 4, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Ketanji Brown Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, Stephanie Dawkins Davis, of Michigan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, Arianna J. Freeman, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Robert Steven Huie, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, Evelyn Padin, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, Jennifer H. Rearden, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York, and Vanessa Roberts Avery, of Connecticut, to be United States Attorney for the District of Connecticut, Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SH–216.

House

Committee on Rules, Full Committee, hearing on a Resolution Recommending that the House Of Representatives Find Peter K. Navarro and Daniel Scavino, Jr., In Contempt Of Congress For Refusal To Comply With Subpoenas Duly Issued By The Select Committee To Investigate The January 6th Attack On The United States Capitol, 3 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

3 p.m., Monday, April 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate may consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12 noon, Monday, April 4

House Chamber

Program for Monday: To be announced.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Bergman, Jack, Mich., E339, E343
Brady, Kevin, Tex., E339
Carter, Earl L. ''Buddy'', Ga., E344
Carter, Troy A., La., E341
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E341
Griffith, H. Morgan, Va., E342
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E343
Latta, Robert E., Ohio, E344
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E340
McCaul, Michael T., Tex., E340
Newhouse, Dan, Wash., E343
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E339, E339, E340, E341, E342, E342, E343, E343, E344, E344
San Nicolas, Michael F.Q., Guam , E339, E342

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.