

**FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:
MARK-UP OF SEVERAL BILLS AND
POSTAL-NAMING MEASURES**

COMMITTEE ON
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SEPTEMBER 20, 2023

Serial No. CP:118-6

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability



Available on: *govinfo.gov*,
oversight.house.gov or
docs.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

53-519 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2023

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
GARY PALMER, Alabama	RO KHANNA, California
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	KATIE PORTER, California
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	CORI BUSH, Missouri
JAKE LATURNER, Kansas	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
PAT FALLON, Texas	JIMMY GOMEZ, California
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
KELLY ARMSTRONG, North Dakota	ROBERT GARCIA, California
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	GREG CASAR, Texas
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
LISA McCLAIN, Michigan	DAN GOLDMAN, New York
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	<i>Vacancy</i>
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	
CHUCK EDWARDS, North Carolina	
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director

JESSICA DONLON, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel

CHRISTIAN HOEHNER, Policy Director

LAUREN LOMBARDO, Senior Policy Analyst

LAUREN HASSETT, Professional Staff Member

MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JULIE TAGEN, Minority Staff Director

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

C O N T E N T S

Meeting held on September 20, 2023	Page 1
--	-----------

BILLS CONSIDERED

* H.R. 4984, the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act Bill Discussed	2
* H.R. 5040, the Cannabis Users' Restoration of Eligibility Act Bill Discussed	14
* H.R. 5527, the Modernizing Government Technology Reform Act Bill Discussed	34
* H.R. 4428, the Guidance Clarity Act of 2023 Bill Discussed	37
* H.R. 5528, the Safe and Smart Federal Purchasing Act of 2023 Bill Discussed	40
* Several Postal–Naming Measures Bill Discussed	63

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Statement for the Record; submitted by Rep. Connolly.
- * Statement for the Record, by NORML; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Statement for the Record, by a former DEA agent; submitted by Raskin.
- * Statement for the Record, by an attorney who works for the Federal Government; submitted by Rep. Raskin.

The documents listed above are available at: docs.house.gov.

**FULL COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETING:
MARK-UP OF SEVERAL BILLS AND
POSTAL-NAMING MEASURES**

Wednesday, September 20, 2023

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY,
Washington, D.C.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:06 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. James Comer [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Comer, Turner, Gosar, Foxx, Grothman, Palmer, Higgins, Sessions, Biggs, Mace, LaTurner, Fallon, Donalds, Armstrong, Perry, Timmons, Burchett, Greene, McClain, Boebert, Fry, Edwards, Langworthy, Burlison, Raskin, Norton, Lynch, Connolly, Krishnamoorthi, Khanna, Mfume, Ocasio-Cortez, Porter, Bush, Gomez, Brown, Stansbury, Garcia, Frost, Lee, Casar, Crockett, Goldman, and Moskowitz.

Chairman COMER. The Committee will please come to order. A quorum is present.

Without objection, the Chair is authorized to declare a recess at any time.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 5(b) and House Rule XI, Clause 2, the Chair may postpone further proceedings today on the question of approving any measure or matter or adopting an amendment on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered.

The Chair recognizes himself to make an opening statement.

The Committee meets today pursuant to notice to consider House Resolution 4984, the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act; House Resolution 5040, the Cannabis Users' Restoration of Eligibility Act; House Resolution 5527, the Modernizing Government Technology Reform Act; House Resolution 4428, the Guidance Clarity Act of 2023; House Resolution 5528, the Safe and Smart Federal Purchasing Act of 2023; and several postal naming measures. As required by House Rules, a copy of the legislative matters has been made available to Members and the public at least 24 hours in advance.

Today's agenda represents a range of bills that go to the core of this Committee's legislative jurisdiction. First, we will address legislation to enable the ability of the District of Columbia to better utilize one of the most important assets in our great Nation, land, and I want to take a brief moment to recognize Washington D.C.

Mayor, Muriel Bowser. We really appreciate your attendance today and appreciate the close working relationship that this Committee has with you and your office.

Second, we will debate how the Federal Government should vet applicants for our Nation's most sensitive position. Third, we will consider legislation reforming our government's financing methods for modernizing costly and risky legacy IT systems. Fourth, we will move a targeted and commonsense bill to bring clarity to the meaning of "Federal agency policy" and regulatory guidance documents. And last, we will take up a simple review requirement of our Federal agencies' procurement methods. I look forward to robust debate and bipartisan consideration of today's legislative business.

With that I yield to the Ranking Member, Mr. Raskin, for his opening statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, and I look forward to us considering all of these bills and in the spirit of bipartisanship that we have been proceeding over the last several meetings. And I think that we can find common ground on pretty much everything we are looking at today, so I appreciate your leadership, and I yield back to you.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the opening statements of all other Members will be included in the record.

Chairman COMER. Our first item for consideration is **H.R. 4984**, the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act.

The Clerk will please designate the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 4984, the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act, a bill to establish a new lease of Federal land to the District of Columbia.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will please designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered to H.R. 4984, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read, and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I now recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

In this Committee's May 16 hearing on "Overdue Oversight of the District of Columbia," Mayor Bowser called on Congress to reimagine the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus site in Southeast D.C. She saw the vacant site as an opportunity to bring athletics, jobs, and housing to the District. This Committee listened and drafted the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act to do just that. H.R. 4984 will repurpose approximately 174 acres of unused Federal land in D.C. The site is currently under a lease that requires the land to be used for stadium purposes, recreational purposes or other public purposes, but does not permit commercial or residential development. Our bill would change that.

First, the bill immediately transfers the site from the Department of Interior to the General Services Administration, which has a track record of managing commercial development projects. It then requires GSA to enter into a 99-year lease with the District. The 99 years will provide stability for long-term commercial and residential development projects and lends stability to the District. Under the lease, D.C. can use the land for stadium purposes, commercial and residential development, recreational facilities, or open space, or additional public purposes. This site currently sits empty. I think that is important to understand, but this bill enables the District to fill these empty lots with stores, restaurants, office buildings, and apartment complexes.

This bill also has requirements for commercial and residential development. Development must not adversely impact wetlands under the National Park Service, which are downstream of the river. Also, 30 percent of the land must be used for parks or open space. Development must also include necessary parking, provide adequate safety and security measures, and reduce the impact of noise and traffic on surrounding areas.

By considering this bill, the Oversight Committee is fulfilling its duty to oversee the Nation's Capital. H.R. 4984 will revitalize the RFK Stadium site, create new jobs, and add millions of dollars in tax revenue for the District. The Members of this Committee did not see eye to eye on every issue, but we have come together for the good of our Capital City.

I want to thank my Committee colleague, Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton, for co-sponsoring this bipartisan legislation. I am thankful that we were able to work together on this important legislation. I would also like to thank the various D.C. stakeholders, especially Mayor Muriel Bowser, who assisted in making this bill a reality. I call upon my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to continue to support this bill. I now yield to the Ranking Member Raskin for 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, and I am happy to yield to Congresswoman Norton on this matter.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank Chairman Comer for his leadership on introducing the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act, and for working closely with me on this bill.

This bill would allow the District of Columbia to revitalize the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus, which is 174 acres of underutilized Federal land in the District of Columbia. At least as far back as 2006, the National Capital Planning Commission, the central planning agency for the Federal Government and the District, has called for revitalization of the RFK campus.

D.C. currently leases the RFK campus from the Federal Government, but the campus may be used only for recreation, a stadium, and open space, and the lease expires in 2038. Currently, the RFK campus primarily consists of parking lots, a stadium that is being demolished, and sports fields. This bill would direct the Federal Government to lease the RFK campus to the District for up to 99 years and permit the campus to be used for commercial and residential development, recreation, a stadium, and open space.

This Committee has a long history of working in a bipartisan manner to develop unused and underutilized Federal land in the District of Columbia. For example, I partnered with then Oversight Chair, Tom Davis, on a bill that transferred, among other things, Reservation 13, which is next to the RFK Stadium, from the Federal Government to the District. The 67-acre Reservation 13 is now being turned into mixed-use development. I also worked with then Oversight Committee Chair, Darrell Issa, on a bill that enabled The Wharf, a 3.5 million square foot development on the Southwest Waterfront. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. The gentlelady yields back. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the bill?

Mr. GOLDMAN. May I be heard?

Chairman COMER. Representative Goldman.

Mr. GOLDMAN. Thank you for yielding, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the Chairman and my distinguished colleague from D.C. for working on this bipartisan legislation. I grew up in Washington D.C., going to RFK Stadium, watching the Washington football team. It is a place of incredible memories for me, a place where the rocking and rolling of the stadium really brought Washington together, united the city like nothing else really did. Republicans, Democrats, whites, blacks, everyone came to East Capitol Street on Sundays to celebrate the football team.

I am excited at the prospect of bringing the Washington football team back to D.C., and that is where the team belongs. But I am even more excited about the possibility of expanding the use of this area for not only a potential stadium, but also for much-needed residential development, including affordable housing. This is a city that is growing, it is expanding, it is improving. We have to make sure that every resident in the city gets access to those opportunities. So, I am both excited at the possibility that Washington football team will return to Washington where it belongs and that we can use this space to revitalize an area that is in sore need of it.

So, I thank the Chairman for the time and appreciate his leadership on this bill, which I think will be a real tremendous addition to the city and for those of us who care a lot about the Washington football team.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the bill? Any Member wish—what is that?

Mr. PERRY. I have an amendment.

Chairman COMER. You can be recognized for the amendment now.

COUNSEL. Right. You can just say we have an amendment on the desk.

Chairman COMER. Do you want to recognize the amendment now?

Mr. PERRY. Certainly.

Chairman COMER. All right. Will the Clerk please report the Perry amendment?

The CLERK. An amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4984, as offered by Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania.

Chairman COMER. The Clerk will distribute the amendment to all Members.

[Pause.]

Chairman COMER. Sir, does everyone have a copy of the amendment?

COUNSEL. We did it electronically.

Chairman COMER. OK. All right. So, we have done it electronically.

An amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4984, offered by Mr. Perry of Pennsylvania.

Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

I reserve a point of order.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Perry, is recognized for 5 minutes to explain the amendment.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, Mayor. Let me be abundantly clear. I am not opposed to the development of the site. I think it is great that the Mayor has got a vision here as the delegate and a Member of Congress from the District to make the Nation's capital city better. I think that is what we should be doing as public servants and public officials. What I am opposed to is the use of public funds to pay for the relocation of or the development of the site for a multimillion-dollar sports franchise, a multibillion-dollar sports franchise, by the way, that receives very unique tax incentives that only exist for them and few others.

Just in the past year or two, we have seen several examples of government spending vast sums of taxpayer dollars, whether through municipal bonds or direct financing on similar projects. In March 2022, New York state and local taxpayers were put on the hook for hundreds of millions of dollars for a new Buffalo Bills stadium. In April 2023, Nashville, Tennessee decided to foot the local taxpayers with a bill of \$1.26 billion for a new stadium for the Tennessee Titans. I do not have a problem with the Bills or the Titans, for the record. I am a Pennsylvanian, so I am a different fan for different teams, but that is irrelevant.

What is important is these are franchises that do not even have the potential for a bidding war that may occur between D.C., Virginia, and Maryland. Ultimately, one but not both of the following things is true about these projects: either they will result in a profit for the developers, thus rendering subsidies unnecessary, or they are unprofitable, and our constituents should not be left holding the bag. Local and state governments should not be shaken down by corporate interest in the all-too-common crony grifting scheme.

Now, while media reports may vary, estimates I have seen placed the value of the Commanders, a particular franchise, anywhere from \$4 billion to over \$6 billion. And while I am not a resident of this area, it seems to me that that is the team I most associate with this area, and it is great that the value is that. I think it speaks to the support of this team by this area, but I understand that refurbishment, and construction of a major stadium is not cheap. However, again, if it is possible, the franchise should have no problem covering all the cost of that long-term investment.

And let us remember that while many people here and even close to here will have an allegiance to the team, the teams are not our teams. They do not belong to the citizens. They belong to an owner. And I do not probably have to remind you that there have been oc-

casions, unfortunately, where the owner has picked up our team, which is really their team, and left in the middle of the night for some other city after the taxpayers have been on the hook to pay for their new stadium that no longer suits them. This amendment prohibits public funding for a stadium as a term of a lease under this bill, in addition to the other prohibitions.

So again, I support the redevelopment of the area completely. I just think that if somebody is going to make hundreds of millions and billions of dollars in profit from that redevelopment, that those folks should take the risk—that is what our country is built on—and build the stadium. God bless them. Go do it. Make the community better for it. And if you are going to make a profit, that is awesome, too because if you are putting your capital at risk, there should be a return for that. But the taxpayer should not be forced to put their capital at risk for no potential return on that investment and, likely, only the downside. So, I support the reinvestment, the revitalization, but I just do not think the taxpayer should be on the hook for a multibillion-dollar franchise stadium that they would have to support.

With that, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield for a quick question?

Mr. PERRY. I certainly will.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Is it the position of my friend that no taxpayer dollars anywhere should be used for any stadium? It ought to be entirely the private sector risk?

Mr. PERRY. On this occasion, this amendment says no public funds, including funds appropriated or otherwise made available by the Federal Government, will be used for such purposes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I did not hear an answer to my question.

Mr. PERRY. So, do I not support—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Philosophically, are you—

Mr. PERRY. Philosophically, I am opposed to that, yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. OK. Thank you.

Mr. PERRY. Yes, sir. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to speak on the Perry amendment? Ms. Norton?

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. How D.C. spends its local funds, which consists of local taxes and fees, should be a decision for D.C., not Congress. D.C.'s locally elected officials should be able to decide for themselves how they spend local D.C. funds. If they want to spend local D.C. funds on a stadium, they should have the authority to do so. If they do not want to spend local funds on a stadium, they should have the authority not to. D.C.'s locally elected officials are accountable to D.C. residents. If D.C. residents do not like the decisions of their locally elected officials, they can vote them out of office. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. Any other—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Well, would my friend yield to me?

Chairman COMER. Go ahead.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I just want to echo the philosophy behind what the distinguished Congresswoman from the District of Columbia

just said. Look, I ran a local government for 5 years, I was on the local board for 14, and we would never welcome Congress or any outside body telling us how to manage our affairs and including how we allocate priorities with our budget. And, you know, if Congress wants to get into this, I have said before, let us do it whole hog. Let us take over zoning while we are at it, so that we get into a level of detail where we are micromanaging the city because apparently we do not trust the city to manage its own affairs.

We may or may not like decisions made by another jurisdiction. God knoweth, there are jurisdictions I do not agree with who make decisions, but they are elected by their constituents to represent their values. And I think we ought to respect D.C.'s right like any other grouping of American citizens, unfortunately, who do not have voting representation in this body yet, to make their own decisions, and we ought to stay out of it. I thank my friend for yielding.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to speak on the amendment?

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you kindly. So, this is complicated now because our Federal responsibilities over Federal land now is intentioned with the principle that the distinguished Congresswoman from the District of Columbia and Mr. Connolly just articulated, and—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Wait a minute. You called her distinguished, but I am just Mr. Connolly. I mean, what is going on?

[Laughter.]

Mr. RASKIN. That was deliberate.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Oh, all right. All right.

Mr. RASKIN. Forgive me. So, we are talking about the disposition of 174 acres of Federal land for a 99-year period, and we are describing it as a lease. Mr. Chairman, if you would yield for a second, if I could ask you, is there consideration in the bill for—in other words, is the Federal Government getting paid for this where—

Chairman COMER. Would you notice the terms of the lease?

COUNSEL. It is at no cost.

Chairman COMER. No cost. At no cost.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. So, I am glad to see the Mayor here. You know, I do not think I yield to nobody in this Committee in terms of my championship of statehood for the people of Washington and their rights of self-government, and I think they should follow the 37 states that we have admitted since the original 13. So I am drawn, though, to the logic of the gentleman from Pennsylvania's amendment because, as I understand his response to Mr. Connolly, what he is saying is, if we are going to dispose of Federal land to a state, a city, a county, here 174 acres for a 99-year period on very favorable terms, which is right, then we should not additionally say there can be government financing that goes along with a stadium if that is the purpose of it, if I understand you right now.

I have heard from a lot of people in D.C. about this on how to dispose of the property, and some have said, you know, give it for the purposes of a football team, a stadium. Others have said give

it to D.C., but not for a stadium, for affordable housing. Others have said give it to D.C. for whatever purposes D.C. wants, but do not throw in public financing as well. And I suppose I see the logic of it. I mean, to me, it does not seem like a pure home rule question because it is a question about conditions on Federal land that we control.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Are we talking about Federal financing of this project or D.C. financing of this project?

Mr. RASKIN. The gentleman can explain his amendment. I thought it was Federal. Is it any kind of public finance?

Mr. CONNOLLY. I believe—

Mr. RASKIN. I just do not have it in front of me. I have not seen it.

Mr. PERRY. Yes. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. RASKIN. Exactly. We recognize Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY. Yes. So, it is six lines. I am going to read them to you. "The District shall ensure that if the District uses the campus for the purposes described in paragraph 1(a) regarding stadiums,"—not parks, not housing, stadiums,—"no public funds, including funds appropriated"—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Right.

Mr. PERRY [continuing]. "Or otherwise made available by the Federal Government will be used for such purposes," end of amendment.

Mr. CONNOLLY. And I think, Mr. Perry—

Mr. RASKIN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, my friend. So, we are talking about, you know, prohibiting D.C. from using its own resources. That is a different matter. Now, yes, maybe Federal land, if we do not want to give it to them or let them have it, or if we want to use it for some other purpose, we can do that. It is a very different issue to get into the business of telling the District of Columbia how it may spend its funds, and that is the problem I have with this amendment, and I would urge my friend to think about that distinction.

Again, if there were an amendment to say, no, we are not going to let District of Columbia have RFK Stadium property, we are taking it back, that would be a different matter. This is about how they finance their intention to use that property should the Federal Government grant it. And I do not believe we want to go down the road of dictating to D.C. how it budgets or how it finances projects.

Mr. RASKIN. Got you. And I, you know—

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend.

Mr. RASKIN. I mean, you and I have agreed strongly for statehood and the sovereign rights of people of Washington to govern there. The reason that I am viewing this a little bit differently is because, at least as I have heard from people both locally and some nationally, there is a movement against any level of government paying for stadiums for multibillion dollar franchises, and I believe that is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is talking about. And so—

Mr. CONNOLLY. If my friend would yield one more time?

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, by all means.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I do not like using taxpayer dollars for athletic stadiums. That is my philosophical position, and I think it is Mr. Perry's and maybe yours. That is different, though, than proscribing what the District of Columbia can do. That is now me imposing a philosophical value or a viewpoint. They have a different one, and that is up to them, from my point of view.

Mr. RASKIN. I got you. OK. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The time has expired. I will recognize myself, and I think Mr. Casar and maybe others want to be recognized. I must, unfortunately, oppose this amendment by my very good friend from Pennsylvania. Under H.R. 4984, the District is responsible for financing any development on the RFK Campus, whether that is a stadium, commercial development, or residential development. It is the intention of this bill to give the necessary flexibility to the Mayor's office to work out what is the best blend of development on the Memorial Stadium Campus site. Remember, this is a very vacant property right now.

If D.C. decides that a new stadium would lead to job creation and economic benefits then it makes sense for the Mayor's office to have the flexibility to create a funding package to make that possible, this amendment could limit the District's ability to finance part of the construction of a stadium or supporting infrastructure, or both. If my colleague, Mr. Perry, has a general concern about public financing of sports complexes and stadiums, which I do not disagree with, I would suggest that we explore a general policy fix to the issue that does not laser in on placing a unique prohibition on the District. This would apply to Washington, but it would not apply to other cities.

Now, you mentioned Nashville, my family has had PSL to the Titans since they moved from Houston to Nashville, right. And, you know, as you mentioned in your statement, they just passed legislation to tear down the old stadium and build another one. This bill would not apply to the Titans. It would not apply to the Ravens. It would not apply to the Pittsburgh Steelers or any of those teams.

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. PERRY. None of those that you have just mentioned, and I am not arguing with it, but they are not under the Federal Government's jurisdiction—

Chairman COMER. Right.

Mr. PERRY [continuing]. But this is.

Chairman COMER. I understand.

Mr. PERRY. I yield.

Chairman COMER. And look, we have been critical of some of the decisions that the Washington Council has made, especially with respect to crime and things like that. You know, I believe that we have got to do what we can to work with the city to create jobs and to, you know, take a vacant property and redevelop it. That is, you know, what we want. I agree with your concern about public finance, and I agree with what Mr. Connolly said about public financing, but I believe that this amendment would hinder D.C. at a time when we need to do everything we can to work with D.C. to create new economic opportunities for the city.

So, with respect to a general policy fix that would not just place a unique prohibition on D.C., I am aware of legislation from last Congress that addressed the tax exemption of interest on professional stadium bonds—that is, public bonds used to finance or refinance capital expenditures for a stadium or arena—that was introduced in the Ways and Means Committee. So, for these reasons, I respectfully oppose the amendment offered by my good friend, Mr. Perry.

And now, we will recognize any other Members who wish to speak on the bill. I think Mr. Casar was first.

Mr. CASAR. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take too much more time because I think a lot of this has been laid out here. But from my own experience, working very hard to bring major league soccer and get a stadium constructed in my own city, there is important work necessary to be able to attract and keep a sports franchise. At the same time, in our case, if you bargain hard enough, we got it to the place where the city did not have to put a single penny in, and I think we need to get to a place where cities do not feel that they have to expend dollars to attract teams.

And so, I do think that this is a complicated policy issue, but I do not think it is as simple as the D.C. sovereignty issue in and of itself. I do think we should consider how it is that D.C. can negotiate and do what it has to do that is best for this property. But I am going to be looking at the amendment with the eye toward how do we make sure that cities are not pitted against one another, and communities are not pitted against one another in a bidding war of having to put in more and more public funds, and I think that is a broader and important policy conversation. I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania bringing it to our attention and talking about it. I see it as more complex than that.

We were able to get to a place where the team actually paid a lease payment to the city for having its stadium, but however, it was not as large of a lease payment I think as the market rate would have commanded, but it was important for our community to get the team. These are balances that local elected officials have to strike, and we should think about what the appropriate guardrails are at the Federal level without constricting their ability to negotiate. But in some ways, I think we can support their negotiations because I do not like this idea of people threatening to move teams all over the place and then the public ultimately having to pay the price for that. So, I appreciate the issue being raised, but I do see it as distinct from the D.C. sovereignty issue. I think we are dealing with Federal property and what the right policy is as it relates to these big sports leagues that, frankly, make a whole lot of money. So, I appreciate—

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASAR. Yes, and I would like to yield the remainder of my time to Mr. Raskin.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Casar, and I appreciate the distinction you just made. You know, it seems to me that the Perry amendment would lie anytime we are disposing of Federal land anywhere in the country. I mean, if we are giving essentially a \$1 lease to any jurisdiction in any of our states for the purposes of building a stadium and surrounding uses, the Perry amendment

should go along with it, and that should apply to all of our states. You know, I am with Mr. Casar on it. I think it is a real problem that there is a shakedown going on of the states and the counties and cities by private owners where there is sort of a race to the bottom who can give the most taxpayer money for this purpose to, as, you know, Mr. Perry puts it, multibillion dollar corporations.

So, you know, I guess my feeling is, I am opposed to that money going from anybody's state, including my state, Maryland, to this team or any other team for these purposes. And so, I would say that that should be a matter of Federal policy across the board that we support, and we should pass statehood for Washington so that, you know, the people of Washington get to govern themselves. Thank you, Mr. Casar. I yield back to you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Casar, would you yield?

Mr. CASAR. Yes, sir.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend. I just say to both of you, I do see it as a matter of sovereignty for the District of Columbia. If we want to dispose of that Federal property, then that is our prerogative. That is not D.C.'s prerogative. It is our land. But if we decided, no, we are going to allow D.C. to continue to have it and develop it, I make a big distinction in terms of our intruding on D.C. in terms of what it will do with that property once we have agreed that they can have it, and we are now intruding into their finances, their decisionmaking, and their sovereignty. And I take the Ranking Member's point. Maybe we ought to have a policy with all Federal property in how it is disposed of. That is worthy of examination, but are we really going to cherry pick from that principle and once again tell D.C. what it can do and not do.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASAR. Of course.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I mean, actually it is his time.

Mr. RASKIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. CASAR. I am happy to yield this time to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Casar. Just to pursue that point for a moment because I agree it should be across the board, but are there other cases where we are talking about disposing of Federal land to other parts of the country for these purposes?

Mr. CASAR. Well, I can tell you there is a lot of kind of controversy, for example, about disposition of postal properties in terms of that process. What are the rights of a local government? Shouldn't they be given first right of refusal, and we have not settled that yet.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes, but don't we impose conditions on those leases?

Mr. CASAR. No, we do not. The Postal Service maximizes profit, and that is part of the problem.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. Any other Members wish to be heard on the Perry amendment?

Mr. GOLDMAN. May I be heard briefly, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Mr. Goldman?

Mr. GOLDMAN. I am not sure what is cosmically going on where I am agreeing with the Chairman and disagreeing with my friend, the Ranking Member. I wish the Chairman's logic, that he would apply it to other matters related to Washington, DC. But to the ex-

tent that this is wrapped into market forces, as my colleague from Texas said, the fact that D.C. would have no lease payments will factor into the negotiation with any team. And so if, ultimately, that is a tremendous benefit to a team—that they do not have to pay a lease for this land, that would reduce the need for taxpayers to fund it. But the broader point that, ultimately, Washington D.C., under its own self-rule, should be able to make a determination as to what it does with land that it possesses or leases.

Just like other Federal land, as you point out, Mr. Raskin correctly, we should not be imposing restrictions. We can get into a long debate about public financing/private financing for stadiums. We can look just down the road at Nationals Park, which has completely revitalized an entire neighborhood, and they are on track to pay back their bonds early. So, we cannot simply narrow this to stadium financing versus other financing because stadiums have proven all around the country to be huge economic revitalizers. And for us in Congress to restrict what Washington D.C. can do with its land is imposing our views on a sovereign government and what they do, and ultimately, it will likely not be the city itself. It will ultimately be a, if they go this route, something that would be voted on by the people of Washington, or if they do not like it, they will take it out on Mayor Bowser who is sitting right here, and I am sure she is ready to bear that accountability.

But we here in Congress should not be dictating to the residents of Washington, DC. what they use their tax dollars for. And I do not think it is as simple as Mr. Perry points out that we are just talking about stadiums because stadiums, and especially this one, which could include a lot of development around it, do not exist in a vacuum. So for that reason, I join with the Chairman, and I am going to really milk this, for the first in opposing this amendment.

Chairman COMER. I thank the gentleman from New York. Any other Member? The Chair recognizes Mr. Palmer from Alabama, but since we are talking about what could potentially be a football stadium—I am sure, everyone probably knows this, but there are a few that may not—Mr. Palmer played college football for Alabama under Bear Bryant. I would tell everybody that if I did something like that. So, the Chair now recognizes Mr. Palmer.

Mr. PALMER. Well, it is always important that I qualify that I practiced football for Bear Bryant at Alabama. I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Perry.

Mr. PERRY. I thank my friend from Alabama, and I would just say that this is, I think, a very unique case. And I think we have to acknowledge and recognize that while Washington D.C. is home to the residents of Washington D.C., and we certainly respect their rights to elect their Mayor and chart their own course, but it is also America's capital. It is America's capital. And I am fascinated by the standpoint or the viewpoint that leases come without any restrictions whatsoever. You could try and get a car lease and say we are going to pay X amount for X amount of miles and see what happens when you drive over the mileage. See what happens when you damage the vehicle. You are leasing it. We are leasing it. It is not giving it away. We are leasing it.

And yes, it might be a long time, and I am long going to be dead by the time the lease is done, but we are elected by the American people to take care of these things, that they put this responsibility on us. And so, this is the Nation's Capital, and leases come with restrictions. Yes, indeed, they do. If you go lease a home—we are talking about more affordable housing—I suspect that the affordable housing that might be built on this site, whether it is a purchase agreement with a homeowner's association or whether it is a lease is going to come with restrictions, is going to come with restrictions. So, the blanket statement that we cannot touch this at all is absurd on its face, and I am just going to heat it up a lot right now.

I would just imagine what the conversation in this room would be—I did not bring it up, but since it was brought up—the post office. You happen to remember, there was a post office in town here that was leased by somebody. And I know I spent the better part of 4 years in different committees going over the lease and where the profits were coming from and who they were going to, and, oh, my goodness, the emoluments clause. And if the same person were to happen to own an NFL team that was going to be housed and based in Washington D.C., or potentially, what would the conversation in this room be then about the restrictions on a lease?

So, let us just be fair to one another. I am not opposed to the NFL team coming. I am not opposed to any NFL team coming. I hope that one comes to Washington, DC. because I think that the Nation's Capital should have an NFL team to rally around. But here again, I just do not think the taxpayer should be on the hook for people that can afford to pay for it. That is all I am saying here. So, let us be honest with one another about what is really occurring, and what is about to occur here, and what should be the right path.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman—oh sorry.

Mr. PERRY. I yield back. Well, did you have a question? I yield the balance back to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. And I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you kindly. I was agreeing with most of what you had to say until you brought up the Trump Hotel, which I called the Washington emolument, but you are right that that was a lease where there was valuable consideration paid for it. The conflict in that case was about a provision lease which said that no public official could benefit from it, but I guess we need not rewind history there. But your general point is correct, which is that a lease is a lease, and so we have got to vindicate the Federal interest. And I just happen to think that, you know, if this is the place where we are able to voice our support for those nationally and locally in the District of Columbia, who are saying public dollars of any kind should not go to private sports teams and their stadiums, if this is the first time we are giving land for the purposes of a stadium or the second time after the prior lease, then I think it is a good time to state that principle, and I am happy to yield back to Mr. Palmer.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Palmer, would you yield to me?

Mr. PALMER. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend. With all respect, I think that is a double standard, all right? If that is your philosophy, and I happen to share it, well, why would we just ban it for D.C.? Why wouldn't we ban it across the country? Let us pass a Federal law that says no public tax dollars—state, local, or Federal—can ever be used to subsidize a sports stadium of any kind. That would be one way to handle this. But to pick this lease on this property and start with D.C., to me is unfair and a double standard. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. PALMER. If I may, I would just say in regard to Federal funds, I would agree that we should not be using Federal funds for privately held venues, but state and local funds, that is out of our jurisdiction. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member wish to speak on the Perry amendment?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is on the amendment, offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Perry.

All those in favor of the amendment signify by saying aye.

All those who oppose signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Our next item for consideration is **H.R. 5040**, the Cannabis Users Restoration of Eligibility Act.

The Clerk will please designate the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 5040, the Cannabis Users Restoration of Eligibility Act, a bill to limit the consideration for marijuana use when making a security clearance or employment suitability determination.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk will please designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute offered to H.R. 5040 as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purpose of the amendment.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

I support H.R. 5040, the Cannabis Users Restoration of Eligibility Act, as amended by my amendment in the nature of a substitute. Recent administrative policy changes have reflected a shift in the Federal Government's approach toward prior marijuana use and its impact on security clearances and Federal employment. The Director of National Intelligence, for example, issued a memorandum in December 2021 stating that recreational marijuana use may not be used to determine security clearance decisions. Following this, the Office of Personnel Management has proposed a new personnel vetting questionnaire that would distinguish be-

tween the use of marijuana and the use of other more problematic illegal drugs.

Despite the Federal Government's stance on this issue, many young and talented applicants are discouraged from applying for national security jobs because they are confused about Federal hiring policy, and I do not blame them. Federal hiring policies are confusing enough, and this is one area where we can work in a bipartisan way to clarify and codify what is largely an existing practice.

I appreciate the Ranking Member's willingness to consider and accept several changes I am proposing to H.R. 5040 with my amendment. These changes, which include removing all references to current marijuana use, simplifying the review and reconsideration process, and removing the Merit Systems Protection Board appeal, ensure H.R. 5040 more closely adheres to current administrative policies.

As of June 2023, states have legalized recreational marijuana. In April, Kentucky became the 38th state to legalize medical marijuana. This legislation makes it clear to younger applicants what the rules of engagement are when it comes to prior drug use and eligibility for Federal employment. By removing this uncertainty and clarifying the process, we can hope to attract small and talented tech experts to the field of public service.

I want to thank the Ranking Member and Representative Nancy Mace for bringing this legislation before the Committee's consideration. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan and measured bill, as amended. I now recognize the Ranking Member for his opening statement.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for bringing H.R. 5040 forward. This is the bill that Congresswoman Mace and I have introduced, the Cannabis Users Restoration Eligibility Act, or the CURE Act, and I am always thrilled to work with Ms. Mace who has such a zealous devotion to her constituents and to the public interest. And I am thrilled to be able to speak for this bill, and I appreciate the constructive and bipartisan spirit in which the Chairman and Committee have approached it.

The basic issue is that the majority of states have now decriminalized or legalized or endorsed the medical use of marijuana, but Federal agencies are still disqualifying people from Federal Government employment or denying them security clearance simply for honestly answering that they have used marijuana in the past. As of April of this year, 38 states, three territories, and the District of Columbia allow the medicinal use of marijuana, and congratulations, Mr. Chairman, about Kentucky's adoption of medical marijuana. As of June 2023, 23 states, two territories, and Washington, DC, have enacted measures to authorize and regulate marijuana for full recreational adult use. It is up to the citizen.

Now, despite the rapid expansion of all of these laws across the country, thousands of our constituents every year are being denied Federal security clearance or losing the chance of obtaining Federal employment solely because they admit honestly to having used marijuana in the past, even if and when it was completely lawful for them to do that. There has been tremendous progress over the last 2 or 3 years in this realm, and so people have used it lawfully. And then if they report that they have used it lawfully on a secu-

rity clearance form, they could be denied security clearance, and they can be rejected for Federal employment. A constituent of mine was 1 week away from his official start date with a job at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services that he was exceptionally well qualified for. Days before starting, he received notice that he had failed to successfully complete the Agency's security background check. He was dumbfounded and shocked because he had actually already been employed by the Federal Government for nearly 8 years. After lengthy discussions with CMS, he learned that he had failed the background check simply because he checked "yes" to having used marijuana over the last 7 years. He voluntarily admitted his medical usage between 2019 and 2022 because he legally obtained a medical marijuana license, as prescribed by his physician under Maryland state law.

He was surprised to learn that he had no right to appeal the decision and that CMS officials refused to speak with him any further about the matter. He had not used the medical marijuana card in over a year prior to applying for the position, and he was no longer using marijuana. He also answered on the background check application that he would not use marijuana in the future. But the Agency unilaterally determined that his "criminal conduct," even though what he did was fully lawful, was not rehabilitated, and that would be the end of the matter.

My constituent, who has dedicated his impressive career to public health and wanted to serve the American people in this new capacity, had the decency to be truthful and honest on his background check about having used marijuana in the past, and it was perfectly lawful at the time, as I said, yet he was punished for his honesty and law-abiding behavior. The CURE act will ensure that qualified people seeking to serve our country are not stopped from doing so simply because they admit to having once used marijuana, which more than 50 percent of the American people have admitted to having done in various public opinion surveys. It will also allow for someone who has previously been denied a security clearance or a Federal job opportunity simply for having used marijuana to have that denial reviewed.

Mr. Chairman, I want to submit Statements for the Record in support of this bill, one from NORML, another from a former DEA agent whose employment was terminated for using CBD oil, and a third from an attorney who works for the Federal Government. The Chairman's manager amendment would only prohibit consideration of prior marijuana use and removes the appeal process if a person learns they were previously denied Federal employment or security clearance on the basis of marijuana use alone and is again denied employment or a clearance.

I am happy to support the Chairman's narrowing amendment. I thank the Chairman for working with me on language that can receive strong and, I hope, unanimous bipartisan support in the Committee. Our constituents should never be denied the opportunity to serve our country simply because they have once used marijuana, as at least half of Americans report they have done. With these changes I hope all colleagues can agree to move this legislation forward to ensure that our constituents do not have their careers and

lives derailed for honestly stating their past conduct. Thank you, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair now recognizes the co-sponsor of the bill, Chairwoman Nancy Mace, for 5 minutes.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I would like to thank Ranking Member Raskin for working on this piece of legislation. It is crucial and critical. The bill prevents prior cannabis use from becoming grounds for failing to receive a security clearance or for being denied employment. It is crazy to me that if you did not want to get addicted to painkillers, like opioids, prescribed by your doctor, and you wanted to take a few gummies for that pain, that you would be prohibited from getting a clearance in a Federal job. That is wild that we cannot hire people, where it has been legalized, for these kinds of positions, and we need commonsense solutions on cannabis in this country when we have had, as Ranking Member Raskin mentioned in his opening remarks, that nearly half the country has admitted use, and we do not want people to be lying on their applications for a clearance. We want them to be honest about their use.

The other thing is that many applicants for security clearances, who have consumed cannabis but did so legally in recreational states or another country, should not be prohibited from getting clearances. The bill focuses on clarifying, codifying the emerging default policy that many Federal agencies have already implemented that recreational cannabis use may be relevant but not determinative of security clearance decisions. We should not penalize applicants for being truthful about their past use of cannabis, especially when they are not current users of the plant.

Since 2014, the FBI and other agencies have expressed concern that the workforce so fears the supposedly prohibition on prior marijuana use that it hurts the recruitment ability, especially in the cybersecurity field. And I do support, along with Ranking Member Raskin, the Chairman's amendment in the nature of a substitute to remove the current use provision from the prohibition, which I feel is a reasonable compromise and an example of the bipartisan work from which this bill has emerged. Last Congress, I introduced the first Republican-led cannabis decriminalization bill, and I plan to reintroduce it in the near future. We have got to move our Nation at the Federal level forward on this issue. As a Republican lead to the bill, I again want to thank Ranking Member Raskin for his leadership in working together. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. Does any other Member wish to speak on the bill? Mr. Garcia?

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I also want to thank the sponsor of this bill and the authors. This is great to see this Committee advance important bipartisan legislation. The CURE Act will prevent prior marijuana use, of course, from becoming grounds to block a government security clearance, and it makes sure the past marijuana use does not deny Federal job opportunities to otherwise qualified applicants. When I was Mayor of Long Beach, we saw this often happen and ran into numerous issues around hiring when it came to past use of cannabis. We reformed

laws at the local level to attract the best and the brightest, and that is what should be done here as well federally.

Now, we know that this bill is just one of many steps that we need to take out to really update all of our drug laws. Our drug policy, particularly at the Federal level, is counterproductive with so much of what was moving forward in this country. The War on Drug policies continue to harm especially vulnerable communities. Current laws harm the Federal Government and even on national security. They keep out some of the best and brightest and most qualified applicants for key government positions. We need to hire the best people possible, especially when we have labor shortages, and deliver our services for all constituents everywhere across the country.

Now, the idea that someone who has used marijuana is automatically a security risk is just, quite frankly, just silly. More than 155 million Americans, almost a majority of our country, now live in states that have decriminalized marijuana and cannabis use. I think we can all agree that this kind of divergence from state and Federal law makes no sense. In this Congress and on every government funding bill that has come up, I have introduced an amendment to block the Federal Government from testing job applicants. That is something that we should continue to do.

This bill will go a long way in modernizing our hiring systems at the Federal level, and I will also want to add that while our Committee oftentimes can be partisan, I think this is one area we can all come together to support commonsense and overdue reforms just like this one. I want to thank both Congresswoman Mace and Congressman Raskin, Mr. Chairman, for your work, and I encourage a "yes" vote on this bill. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Does anyone else wish to speak on the bill? The Chair now recognizes Mr. Sessions from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I understand what supporters of this legislation are trying to do, and I have serious concerns. The underlying legislation seems to be a reaction to societal shifts regarding the acceptance of marijuana use, increased usage, and corresponding shrinkage of potential applicants for Federal jobs, but this is not as they have touted, it is not about a Federal job. What it is about is the high standard of national security that we are arbitrarily attempting to waive. It is also an attempt to grant some form of leniency to those who have used marijuana on a limited basis or perhaps even as a user.

I want to be clear. This should not be a debate about the legalization of marijuana. Today is about a national standard that we would establish for those who want to claim this security clearance. It is whether marijuana use creates risks that should be considered when adjudicating security clearances or making these decisions on terms of national security, and this is what I believe it should be, and this is in line with relevant guidelines from the Director of National Intelligence. This guideline says that past marijuana use cannot be the sole determining factor when making it an adjudication, but it can be considered a factor. It also makes clear that this drug, marijuana, is harmful and could raise national security concerns.

While I appreciate the important changes incorporated in this language, as it reads, it would prevent any consideration of past marijuana use making it suitable for Federal Government employee and for security clearances. So, agencies would just have to pretend that marijuana is entirely without a concern, including addiction. Even if marijuana were legal at the Federal level, that does not mean it should not be considered when adjudicating security clearances on the most secret and sensitive documents and information that protects this Nation. Carrying significant debt is not illegal, for example, but it still is a cause for denial.

Let me state this clearly. My concern is that we are moving for the sake of expediency without proper consideration of whether there are national security risks in doing so. We are even saying it is about Federal employment. It is not. Are we setting policy without properly studying the ramifications? In this regard, this debate is quite similar to the telework debate where we held a hearing where my colleagues and across the board engaged the Biden Administration about long-term sweeping civil service policy allowing for telework without assessing the potential impact on an agency's mission.

Marijuana is a Schedule I substance. This is true regardless of the fact that the Biden Administration is asking the DEA to move it to Schedule III substance. At one point, marijuana usage was enough to disqualify applicants for Federal clearance for Federal employment. I have not seen any significant information that says that marijuana use does not create potential security risks. There are studies that link it directly to mental illness and psychosis, but I am not going to put myself in the role of being the scientist and trying to determine that answer.

I do have or expect for responsible authorities in this body to provide a clear answer as to whether marijuana use creates the type of risk that should be keeping an applicant from getting a national security clearance. And I have not seen it, nor have we even had that debate, though I note that the Chairman of the Intelligence Committee is present today, and I am sure he will speak up. This is not a marijuana legalization question. It should not be. It is about national security.

My amendment seeks to create a long enough time window from the last reported use, 3 years, to allow for a long-term mental health issue to be established. My amendment also strikes language recording a look-back to those applicants who may have been rejected even 15 years ago. To be succinct, I do not know how you can make this work in a workforce where you go back and look at someone 15 years ago. So, with that, I yield back my time, and I urge my colleagues to support the Sessions amendment.

Chairman COMER. OK. We have not called the Sessions amendment up yet, but—

Mr. SESSIONS. I was not calling for that. I hope they will—

Chairman COMER. Oh, OK. OK. OK. Very good. I now recognize the Chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, Mr. Turner, for 5 minutes.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As Chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, I am here to oppose this bill. The role of the intelligence community in our Nation's security cannot

be overstated. Their mission is to protect us from threats, both foreign and domestic. The identities of individuals serving in missions must be kept secret because lives are at risk. To do this effectively, the intelligence community needs the tools to assess the character, judgment, and trustworthiness of individuals seeking access to classified information or positions with the Federal Government requiring high trust.

Let us be clear. This bill applies to those who design and maintain our nuclear weapons, as it does to some of our most sensitive intelligence operations. The Cannabis Users Restoration of Eligibility Act prevents the intelligence community and Federal agencies, writ large, from using historic marijuana use, a Federal Section I controlled substance, in determining eligibility for security clearance.

While some states have legalized cannabis, recreational and medical use, it remains illegal at the Federal level. This legislation implicates security clearance procedures for Federal agencies, an illegal and moral dilemma, essentially requiring issuance of clearances to individuals who may have knowingly violated an existing Federal law, cannabis possession and use. Let us be clear. When people say that it is perfectly legal, it is not legal. It is still a Federal law, and it is still a Federal crime. It is critical to understand that security clearances and Federal employment are privileges, they are not entitlements. These positions come with a tremendous responsibility to protect our Nation, its citizens, and its secrets. We must continue to hold those seeking such positions to the highest standards of integrity, judgment, and trustworthiness.

Now, there are other things that have been misstatements that I want to clarify. No one currently is denied a security clearance solely for past marijuana use, and the Chairman indicated that, the Director of ODNI in her memorandum specifically indicated that it can be a factor. It is not to be a sole determination. This is called the CURE Act, but this actually does not cure anything here. It actually creates a problem where the Director of ODNI has already stepped forward.

The other aspect that concerns me is that there has not been any hearing on this bill. The Director of ODNI, which has taken forward steps in this, which is responsible for determining what is necessary for giving clearances to those individuals, again, who have access to the highest and generate, not just access, generate some of the highest levels of intelligence information and takes some of the most risky missions for our Nation, no one has asked the Director. There is no letter that has been given to us that this is fine, that we should just go ahead and do this. This takes away tools and responsibilities from the Director of National Intelligence without our having appropriately engaged the Director. This should be in the Director's responsibility and not here. With that I—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield for a response?

Mr. TURNER [continuing]. Intend to oppose this. I want to also thank the Chairman and his team for working with House Intelligence Committee to strike the original portion of their amendment in the nature of a substitute, but as this legislation stands, I cannot support it, the message it sends and the potential prece-

dent it sets. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in opposing this bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would you yield for a question?

Mr. TURNER. Sure, Gerry.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Turner. Is it your position that anyone who has used marijuana or admits to using marijuana in his or her past should be disqualified from a security clearance?

Mr. TURNER. Gerry, that is not the current state of the application of clearances by the Director of ODNI. Chairman Comer stated that in the beginning of his statement, already past marijuana use is not a sole basis for anyone being denied a clearance. I support what the Director of ODNI has done. I think that we should continue to defer to the Director of ODNI. This is some of our most sensitive operations, ones that not even every Member of Congress has access to, and yet we are here passing a law without even having asked the Director what is it that she thinks that we should be doing. I yield back.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you. I just would note, the Ranking Member in his opening statement did cite examples of people simply honestly—

Mr. TURNER. Actually, OK, I will reclaim my time. So, what he actually referred to was not security clearances. It was a security background check. And I would be incredibly surprised, absent someone down there and under oath and all the documents related to their application, that anyone on just a security background check would be denied solely based on marijuana since we know—

Mr. RASKIN. Well, then there is no problem—

Mr. TURNER. Hold on, hold on, hold on. Since we know that for the actual security clearance itself, it is not a basis.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, if you would yield for a second. If what you are saying is true—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Raskin, I will seek my full 5 minutes.

Mr. RASKIN. OK.

Mr. HIGGINS. [Presiding.] The gentleman's time has expired, and the Chair has agreed to recognize Mr. Palmer for comment on the legislation.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Just to inquire, are we not going back and forth? Is it not the Democrat's turn?

Mr. HIGGINS. We had agreed because of a very constrained schedule to allow Mr. Palmer, but the Chair certainly will—

Mr. CONNOLLY. OK.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. Recognize the distinguished gentleman next, if you would allow.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you. I thank my friend.

Mr. PALMER. I want to thank the gentleman for Virginia for allowing me to speak out of turn.

I rise in opposition to this bill as well, and I want to build on the points made by Chairman Turner, that I think there has not been enough attention paid to this because there is no distinction in regard to the levels of security clearances that someone could get. This does not limit it to just top secret. There is no clarification of this, and I am very, very concerned about this.

Now, somewhat tongue in cheek, we did have a President who admitted to marijuana use before he became President, but he said he did not inhale, and I am making a point here. The marijuana that President Clinton used had a THC content of about 2 percent. It has gone up. The THC content has gone up over 200 percent since that time. That is the addictive part of marijuana. It is also the part that causes psychosis, and I think we need to take that into account. Not all marijuana use is the same.

When a lot of people think of medicinal marijuana, they are thinking of CBD. They are not thinking THC. We are seeing more and more research from all over the world that indicates excessive use of marijuana with the higher levels of THC cause psychosis, depression, violence. This is a serious, serious issue. We cannot look at this in a recreational sense, and that is a huge concern for me, that we are taking the step without some clear safeguards.

And I agree to a certain extent that, from a perspective that someone who has enough character to admit that they used marijuana at some point in their life, that should be taken into consideration, whereas if it is someone who had been charged with the felony use that is disclosable. That is different, OK? So, I just think that this is something that honestly needs to be reconsidered, that this bill should be pulled from consideration from the markup today and given us a chance to work through some of these issues.

And like I said, what bothers me about this is I ran a think tank for 24 years. And during that time is when Congress properly devoted its attention to the tobacco industry because what we saw in the tobacco industry was they knew how addictive nicotine was. They knew that it caused cancer, lung cancer, throat cancer, other cancers, and this Congress acted to deal with that because industry was profiting from something that clearly caused harm. What we are seeing now in the marijuana industry is that they know that the THC content has gone up dramatically in the plants while the CBD content has gone down, and there is enormous profits that will be involved in this. And what we are doing today legitimizes that, so I think this is something that we need to reconsider from a number of angles.

And with that, again, I thank the gentleman from Virginia. I have to go to a meeting, but thank you for allowing me to speak out of turn. And as I said, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill, but I would rather see us pull the bill. I yield back.

Mr. HIGGINS. The gentleman yields, and Mr. Connelly, I appreciate your consideration for allowing our colleague—

Mr. CONNOLLY. No problem.

Mr. HIGGINS [continuing]. To speak before you. Sir, you are recognized.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the Chair, and I thank my friend from Alabama. Both of you have always been fair, and I thank you.

Before I yield to the Ranking Member, I just want to say, I think Mr. Palmer made some very thoughtful points, and they cannot be dismissed, but I also think it is important that we remember the history of marijuana. Its history is ugly. If you listen to the White House tapes during the Nixon years, the origins of classifying this as the most dangerous drug in the world were racist. And the President himself, Mr. Nixon—you can listen to it on the tape—

made reference to the African-American community and why he did not care, and why it would be a good thing actually to criminalize this after all. It is ugly, and it is chilling to listen to.

We made this the most dangerous drug in terms of classification without a single scientific study justifying it, and to this day, Mr. Turner, you know, mourns the fact that ODNI was not consulted. Well, the science behind marijuana does not exist. We do not have any data on, well, how many car fatalities are there every year, how many overdoses are there every year. We had hearings on this Committee, and I asked those questions of Federal officials, and the answer was we do not know. We do know alcohol-related statistics, but we do not know marijuana, so millions of lives over the last 60 years have been damaged or destroyed over simple recreational use of marijuana.

I agree with Mr. Palmer, there is a distinction to be made in heavy selling of a drug and mild recreational use, and that is the concern I particularly have, that people get penalized for the latter, you know and treated as if it were the former. I now happily yield to the distinguished Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Connolly, and I agree wholeheartedly with the statements you just made. I also was edified by the things that Mr. Palmer was saying and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Sessions, but I do think that we have got very effective answers to the things that were being said. And I should preface it by saying I am not advocating anyone using marijuana, alcohol, or any other intoxicating substance. I tell my kids I do not want them using, you know, any of that stuff.

Alcohol, of course, has been proven to be far more lethal and dangerous than marijuana. We lose thousands of people a year to alcohol-related car accidents. You can overdose alcohol. I do not think there is a single recorded episode of overdose of marijuana, but, you know, if you are asked my personal advice, I do not want anybody using it. But do I think the fact that you have had a drink or gotten drunk, or you have smoked marijuana, either illegally in the past or lawfully as tens of millions of people are able to do now across the country, do I think that that should be the basis for ruining your life or your career? Absolutely not, and that is what we are talking about here. We have got a majority of states now and a majority of the states, I believe, represented by Members of this Committee, where marijuana has either been legalized, full-blown legalized, decriminalized, or there has been a medical marijuana program adopted as there just was, Mr. Chairman, in Kentucky.

Now, do we want to say to our constituents who have lawfully used marijuana that they can be precluded from Federal employment for that reason alone or they can be denied a security clearance for that reason alone because they have honestly reported what they have done? I mean, that just does not make any sense to me.

I suppose the historical analogy is, after Prohibition was repealed, would we say that, well, you had a drink during Prohibition, therefore, you should never be able to serve in the FBI or the National Park Service or the Department of the Treasury or the Pentagon? I mean, that just does not make any sense. And yet, I am hearing from constituents all the time who are being tripped

up on this. And so, we are denying ourselves the benefit of often the most qualified person for the job simply because they told the truth about lawfully doing something in the past. And so that is really the issue here today, and we are talking only about usage.

If somebody is convicted of dealing large quantities of marijuana or small quantities of marijuana, they are not included under our legislation. We are talking about people who have used it, and in most cases today now because of the trend of the law, used it lawfully. Thank you very much, Mr. Connolly. I yield back.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. [Presiding.] The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SESSIONS. Ask unanimous consent to speak, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Yes.

Mr. SESSIONS. It is amazing what we are really trying to conflate here—Federal employment with a national security clearance so that you can handle national security issues—they are trying to conflate being hired by the Federal Government. And that is not what this is about, nor should the hearing be about that, but I want to advise my colleagues, there are reams of evidence that you can look at. The National Highway Administration, in many states, 33 percent or higher of deaths on highways, they have found THC in that blood. To say that there is no evidence that we have to point at this, if you look at any HIDTA report, HIDTA reports track the death of Americans. They track the use of marijuana that is in a person's system. They track this and have definite information. There are reams of data, and perhaps what we need to do is have a Subcommittee of this Committee to actually look at the facts of the case.

But to say this is about Federal employment and someone would be denied that, is wrong. To say that someone would use medical marijuana without a question being raised about it, why are you using medical marijuana, how did you go to a doctor, and what were those symptoms that you say you have got that would allow you to break the Federal law.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I will in a second. These are all significant amounts of questions to ask about even medical marijuana use. I would engage the gentleman and would offer him. I have got 2 minutes and 45 seconds left, so how about if I give him a minute?

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, kindly. I will not need that much. When I was in the Maryland State Senate, we adopted a medical marijuana program. We considered all of the evidence, but one very powerful piece of evidence came from a colleague who was suffering from multiple sclerosis, and she said the only thing that gave her any kind of relief was medical marijuana, was medical cannabis. And I sat there in our Senate Judiciary Committee to hear dozens of witnesses talk about the alleviating effects of medicinal cannabis for people going through chemotherapy, people suffering leukemia, a whole host of different diseases, so I would not doubt that.

If the premise of your opposition is that medical marijuana is somehow some kind of counterfeit project, I mean, that is not going to convince a lot of people because I know that there are hundreds of thousands—

Mr. SESSIONS. So, reclaiming my time after giving the gentleman the time.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes.

Mr. SESSIONS. You are bringing up things that have nothing to do with the national security clearance. You are bringing up nothing about Federal employment. You are trying to make this about the legalization and the viewpoint of marijuana. And I am trying to make this, and I think the young Chairman of the Intelligence Committee said, whoa, hold on. This is about waiving unilaterally the law and the background check and even being able to ask a question, so I want to go to that.

If a person lies about their background or use, just like others who make application for Federal license for guns, if you lie on that application or security background check, you should be prosecuted. You should have to serve up to whatever that penalty is, so let us not say that somebody was brave enough not to lie. We have to get to the point in this country where we take things on for what they are. Legal or illegal marijuana is a dangerous substance, and there are reams of data, including deaths of people on the highway, criminals that commit crime, and it happens all over the place.

So, I will start keeping these and we will find out just how many things we come up with, but we should not pass this. We should pull the bill, have a hearing, and let the facts come out wherever they are.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I——

Ms. MACE [continuing]. I ask for unanimous consent for——

Mr. SESSIONS. I appreciate, Mr. Chairman——

Ms. MACE [continuing]. Permitting my colleague that extra time, I will have some time to speak on this.

Chairman COMER. That is a very good point the gentlelady from South Carolina makes. We allowed Mr. Sessions to speak twice. I will now entertain that same privilege to the gentlelady from South Carolina for 5 minutes.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If we are concerned about dangerous substance use or abuse, then we ought to look first to alcohol, alcoholism, and the addiction that runs there. If a criminal has committed a crime, they are not going to get a security clearance, period, and I will tell you, it was Harry Anslinger. He was a bureaucrat that led prohibition against marijuana many, many years ago, and to quote him today, "There are 100,000 total marijuana smokers in the U.S., and most are N-word, Hispanics, Filipinos, and entertainers. Their satanic music, jazz and swing, result from marijuana use. This marijuana causes White women to seek sexual relations with N-word, entertainers, and any others." The whole premise of prohibition of marijuana and cannabis use way back when was racist. I am not going to peddle in any future racism on that prohibition.

And, you know, I have had experience with this at a very young age. To my colleagues here, I have told this story before, raped at the age of 16. I was prescribed prescription drugs. It was an antidepressant at the time, and it made me want to kill myself. I stopped taking the prescription drugs. I had a limited time using cannabis not realizing at the time that I was self-medicating, but

cannabis saved my life. Today, I do not have psychosis. I have never leaked state secrets. I do not walk out of a SCIF and tell everybody what I have just learned. I do not leak classified information. And anyone that was in the same position that I was should not be penalized for using something that has saved their life, and so you know, I think it is far past time that we pass this type of legislation where someone is not going to be penalized for it.

And if you take another hypothetical, if you were a college student, let us just say you have the highest grade in your class for programming, and you just got out of college, you tried cannabis one time in the state of Colorado when you were 21 years old where it was legal. Two years later at the age of 23, you cannot apply for a job to work in the FBI in a critical need position like cybersecurity because you tried cannabis one time if we are going to go with, you know, with your amendment of my colleague over current use being defined as the last 3 years.

And so, any applicant would not receive clearance, even though they have not done anything wrong. Everything they did was legal, and not addicted to cannabis, not addicted to alcohol. You know, so the grounds that we have got to research this more is just the rights' way of saying we are just not going to address this right now. It is time to move forward, it is time to move on, it is time to get on with the will of the people, and these people should not be penalized.

Some of the most qualified technical experts at America's most innovative companies have used cannabis in the past. I have used it in the past. And you know, in college, I taught myself to code. By the time I was 21, I knew six programming languages. I would have been a great asset to this country at a young age, but we are going to prevent people because they might have used it 1 time in the last 3 years or, hey, we are just going to try to kill the bill because we do not want to move on cannabis at all in this country. And I—

Mr. CONNOLLY. Would my friend yield?

Ms. MACE. Yes, I will yield.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank the gentlelady for her insights. Is it not true that, while people are calling for—we need more study to see how dangerous this is, we have lived with the categorization of marijuana as the most dangerous drug in the world for over 60 years since the Nixon Administration without any studies? Is that not true?

Ms. MACE. Yes, that is right.

Mr. CONNOLLY. That is right. So, there was no scientific basis for the assertions we just heard from my friend from Texas, for example, that this is very dangerous, and it causes deaths. We do not know that. We had a hearing, people under oath from the Federal Government who admitted we do not keep those statistics, we do not know. Meanwhile, it is still the most dangerous drug in the world in terms of Federal classification. And I think that is what my friend from South Carolina is getting at. Isn't it time we revisit that issue? Isn't it time that we at least provide some relief because it most certainly is not the most dangerous drug in the world, and, in fact, if you look at gateway drugs, most studies show No. 1 gateway is prescription drugs.

Ms. MACE. Right.

Mr. CONNOLLY. No. 2 is alcohol.

Ms. MACE. And if I can reclaim my time. I have 3 seconds.

Ms. CONNOLLY. Of course.

Ms. MACE. But in the studies that are in the Journal of American Medicine, one medical marijuana dispensary in one state reduces the addiction to opioids prescribed by your doctor by the way, they can prescribe heroin, reduces it by up to 20 percent, reduces morbidity by opioid use by 19 percent. So, I do not want to hear the argument that this is dangerous. Start with alcohol first and the alcoholism that is rampant in this country rather than attacking a plant that can save lives. And we need to move forward and allow people who have used it in the past to be able to get some of these jobs and get clearances. Thank you, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Higgins from Louisiana.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the passion behind the introduction of this legislation, and I am going to oppose it, and let me clarify why. I am rather surprised that some of my colleagues have not embraced this from a constitutionalist perspective.

Before I get into that, I am going to ask Mr. Raskin, I yield time to answer a question. But let me just clarify that I support individual rights and freedoms within the parameters of the laws of our representative republic. I was a police officer for a long time. I am probably the only guy up here that had to deal with difficult situations, including fighting and arrest with American citizens that were under the influence of every controlled dangerous substance and every combination of controlled dangerous substance and alcohol that you can possibly imagine, and I never had to fight a guy that was smoking a joint. Those guys, they are sitting on a couch, man, eating Oreos, watching cartoons. So, if you are an American, you want to use marijuana for medicinal purposes, I do not have a problem with that. Now, I advise my children who are adults now, do not ingest marijuana. It is too powerful now. It is not the same marijuana that was around in the 1970's when I was their age. It is super powerful.

That being said, we have a constitutional dilemma in this country that we have allowed to exist for a long time. And let me just say that regardless of any legislation put forth from today's website for DOJ Schedule I controlled substance, substances in this schedule have no currently accepted medical use in United States, a lack of accepted safety for use under medical supervision, and a high potential for abuse. This includes marijuana.

This is the Federal law. In a representative republic, we have allowed our sovereign states to legalize a Schedule I controlled dangerous substance. And our real obligation, as Congress, having allowed the sovereign states to establish precedent now for many years, it is incumbent upon the Federal Government to follow the lead of the sovereign states. And we should take action to change the schedule of marijuana from Schedule I to, I believe, Schedule III, which would include, say, codeine, and Schedule IV which would include, say, Xanax and Valium, whereby marijuana could be properly controlled and documented and regulated, reflective of

the reality of the 21st century and bring the United States out of this constitutional dilemma. Well, we are just pretending that we are not a Federalist society, and we just allow our sovereign states to enact laws within that sovereign states directly in violation with Federal law. That is what we have to fix.

With due respect to my colleague, before we get into legislation like this, we should address the constitutionalist dilemma that we have all inherited, and I think we should take action. So, my colleagues bring legislation to move marijuana from Schedule I to Schedule III or Schedule IV, you are going to find me in support of that because it is a constitutional fix. I will still be personally opposed to the use of marijuana for any recreational purpose, but as a constitutionalist, I believe it is incumbent upon this Congress to address this dilemma we face.

I would like to yield to my colleague, the Ranking Member, our respected yet liberal constitutionalist professor.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you for that ambiguous introduction, Mr. Higgins, and thank you for yielding time, and I agree with a lot of what you said, especially, you know, I tell my kids, you know, I am a teetotaler and I would be a prohibitionist if it worked, but it does not work because in a free society you cannot tell people how to use their own bodies. But in any event, I think you just made a very eloquent argument for this legislation because I think what you said is, it is time for the Federal Government to catch up with the states. And that is how change happens here, and this is part of catching up with the states. Let us not deny our own constituents, who followed the law in their states, the opportunity to serve in Federal Government or to get a security clearance.

Mr. HIGGINS. If I could reclaim my time to close.

Mr. RASKIN. By all means.

Mr. HIGGINS. Let me respond, if Chairman will allow, by saying the first step as a Congress in a Federalist society, in a representative republic, would be to address the constitutional dilemma that we have allowed to exist. We cannot move forward with legislation ancillary to the illegal status of marijuana and how it relates to Federal applications. Before we address the constitutionalist conflict regarding the sovereign states legalization and even legalization of sale and distribution and growth of marijuana, we must address that. We can do it by changing the schedule of marijuana from I to III or IV. My time has expired. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Chairman COMER. I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana. Ms. Norton, would you like to be recognized?

Ms. NORTON. Yes. I yield to my friend from Virginia, Mr. Connolly.

Chairman COMER. You are next, yes. Wait, wait. Yes, Ms. Norton is recognized for 5 minutes, and she yields to Mr. Connolly. When her time has expired, then I will recognize Mr. Edwards.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ms. Norton, I really appreciate it.

I want to center on my friend from Louisiana. He makes exactly the right point. We have not seen this kind of discordance between state behavior and laws and Federal law since Prohibition. And what went wrong with Prohibition, we had a Federal law that was unenforceable, unenforced, created a huge criminal underclass,

fueled organized crime in America forever, and created a flaunting of the law and a lack of respect for the law because maybe there were high moral purposes behind Prohibition, but it was absolutely the wrong thing to do in terms of trying to circumscribe human behavior. And all kinds of people flaunted that law, including the President of the United States. President Harding, who championed Prohibition, had a closet full of alcohol in the White House, so starting from the top on down, and it made law enforcement very difficult, if you were trying to enforce the law.

And so, I think the gentleman from Louisiana makes an excellent point. We have to change the Federal law. We cannot have this kind of growing divergence between the states and the Feds. More than half the states now have changed their laws on marijuana. I think, however, where he and I disagree is about this bill. He says that we need to change the classification and the Federal law before we start doing things like this. I think Ms. Mace and Mr. Raskin and I would come at it exactly the opposite. We cannot wait.

Injustices are occurring while we wait for this big change in Federal law, and God knoweth, given the pace of Congress, when that is going to happen. Here is something we can do to at least address one piece of justice in America while we are waiting for that big change. So, I think the gentleman makes exactly the right point, but I think we just disagree on where this piece of legislation would fit in, in that. And I now yield to the distinguished Ranking Member if he wanted to comment—I am sorry, with Ms. Norton's permission.

Ms. NORTON. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank her.

Mr. RASKIN. So yes, I suppose we do not need to belabor it much more. We believe this is part of the transformation of the law that the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana is calling for. And there is immediate unfairness that is taking place with our constituents who cannot get hired anywhere in the Federal Government for admitting past marijuana use and are denied the possibility to get a security clearance.

I spoke to another gentleman who was actually approved and was, again, set to start employment with a very high-ranking job in the EPA, and then they caught him up on one thing, which was his having admitted that he had used medical marijuana for a very bad back, and he said it worked for him for a while. It stopped working, he stopped using the marijuana. He did not think twice about just reporting it, and then suddenly, they cannot fill the job anymore. They tell him, he is gone, and that is in the Biden Administration. I made a bunch of calls to people in the Biden Administration. They said, sorry, that was the decision made after he confessed that, you know, he had used marijuana for medicinal purposes.

So, in any event, we are talking about our own people. We are talking about our own government. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding and the gentlelady from District Columbia, and I yield back to you, Ms. Norton.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Edwards for 5 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I certainly appreciated the comments from Mr. Higgins, and I agree very much on many of the points that you made. That is why I have introduced the Stop Pot Act. It is House Bill 5323, if you would like to go take a look at that, because states have thumbed their nose at the Federal Government and chosen to not follow Federal law.

I am strongly opposed to H.R. 5040, the Cannabis Users Restoration of Eligibility Act, and I encourage my colleagues on the Committee to join me in voting no. Relaxing Federal policies related to marijuana included as an eligibility factor in granting security clearance is not necessary given that several states have illegally allowed use of recreational marijuana. We need to be clear, however, that these individuals are not applying for government jobs in a state that has moved toward the legalization of marijuana. They are applying to work for the Federal Government and possibly handle our Nation's most sensitive classified information.

According to the Federal Government, as we sit here today, marijuana is a Schedule I drug under the Controlled Substances Act, which are defined by the DEA as drugs with no currently accepted medical use and a high potential for abuse, and it is illegal. What message does this send to the thousands of individuals who in the past have stayed on the straight and narrow when it comes to drug use out of acknowledgment for the fact that it could curtail their ability to hold certain positions in the Federal Government? What message does it send when Congress would not even enforce its own laws? Marijuana remains a dangerous gateway drug that has a multitude of negative impacts on states that have legalized its possession and use, and I do not believe that we should move toward it becoming more acceptable in the eyes of the Federal Government. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Does any other Member wish to speak on the bill? Does the gentleman from Texas wish to introduce his amendment?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, in fact, if there is time there, I would ask that my amendment be considered. I do not know if we are going to mark it up this afternoon or if you are going to go to it, but I would ask that my—

Chairman COMER. Would the Clerk please report? We sent via email the amendment, correct? So, every Member has the amendment.

Will the Clerk designate the amendment?

The CLERK. An amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5040 as offered by Mr. Sessions of Texas.

Chairman COMER. An amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute H.R. 5040. Oh, you just read that.

Without objection, the amendment is considered as read.

Chairman COMER. I reserve a point of order.

The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes to explain his amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. We have had a vibrant discussion today about the issue. I think that there are a number of viewpoints that have been established today, but the truth was held hostage, that this would deny someone Federal

employment. That is not what this bill is about, nor my amendment. It is to put in place an understanding about our Nation's most important secrets and the ramifications of what may be brought into play when the Federal Bureau of Investigation or another agency chooses to look at the person for their application to look at our Nation's most important secrets.

We have been stung lately by people, even Air Force people, who misuse the information that they were given. It just does happen. But I think background investigations, as we look at who should have those most classified secrets and work with them, is what we are talking about today. And instead, we have talked about how great marijuana is, how states have done all these things, how medicinal purposes and people who had used it when they had medical problems. Those should be considered also about whether we are going to give a national security clearance to someone.

I tried to bring what I think was a bit of reality to this and said if it is less than 3 years, that would offer this Federal Government an opportunity to have a conversation with someone to make a determination. But in fact, the legislation that is before us that I am attempting to change says you cannot even have a conversation, would not even be considered.

Now, it is easy for me. I do not drink. I did it in college, I get that. I have never used marijuana, but that is not what this is about. Today is not about the legalization or denial of a Federal job. It is about national security. It is about the people who guard our secrets and those people who would be given access to those secrets.

Any Member of this body has to sign something, a piece of paper, when they come saying they will not divulge national security secrets. They will, if they are in those settings, handle national security issues properly. That is your own obligation. But when we take a person who is hired and is seeking it, they are saying, I am opening up my entire life. No, we cannot ask anything about marijuana, just have to just ignore that, and I think that is wrong. I think they should be able to talk about, as I stated earlier, gambling, infidelity, the things, the places you hang out with, who you hang out with, whether you pay your taxes, whether you follow the Federal law, whether you are going to be faithful to this country, and I think we are making a huge mistake.

So, I tried to offer an amendment that would say, OK, I see the reality of some things, but if it is less than 3 years, we are not going to change that standard. We are going to keep that. So, I would encourage us, as perhaps the gentleman, my dear friend, Mr. Higgins, has said, perhaps others, I would ask that we agree to pull this. I know there are those that think, well, now is the time to do this on marijuana. We are talking about national security. We are talking about facts that we can all agree on, and then the opportunity to know who we are going to have in the room that can see the most sensitive issues. And if you are a drinker or have a problem with alcohol, that would appear, but it also would appear for the misuse of Federal law of a dangerous subject. I did not say the most dangerous. You say a weak thing is the most dangerous. No, I think it is just dangerous.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is what I would like to see happen. I would love to see the debate that we have had today marginalize itself to pull in the bill. Otherwise, I ask that my amendment be made an order.

Chairman COMER. Does any other Member wish to speak on the amendment? The Chair recognizes the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I rise in very strong opposition to the distinguished gentleman's amendment. The first thing I want to say is the gentleman from Texas repeatedly says this is not about Federal employment, and I am reading from Section 1(e)(B) of his amendment, which says, "An individual who used marijuana at any time during the 3-year period preceding the date such individual applied for Federal employment shall not be suitable for such employment under Part 731 of Title 5." So, if he meant to draft it in such a way as not to apply to Federal employment, he has not succeeded with this amendment.

In any event, the general purpose of the amendment, I think, intended to be to take the amendment and rope off for some reason the immediate 3 years prior to the person's application for Federal employment or a security clearance. I mean, it strikes me that has got it exactly backward. It is in the last 3 years where we have seen the most dramatic changes in terms of state law. So, we are talking about they are targeting the people who clearly have been using marijuana in accordance with the state law because it has been decriminalized, legalized, or made medicinally lawful in the vast majority of the states. And so why would we say the people who state that they have used it in compliance with those laws are categorically disqualified for Federal employment or a background security clearance? That makes no sense to me.

In any event, that is not even what the amendment does because it begins with, "Strike Sections 1 and 2 and insert the following." So, it demolishes the entire bill and then just leaves the exception. This is literally the exception that devours the rule, and I am not even sure it is coherent and makes any sense at that point. But in any event, I mean, taking it for what it intends to be, I think it is a dagger pointed at the very purpose of this bill. If you are against the bill, just vote against the bill, but this amendment is a guillotine for it. And I am happy to yield to my good friend from Virginia, Mr. Connolly.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Just for a question, Mr. Ranking Member. You will recall, I asked the Chairman of the Intelligence Committee this very question. Would you favor the use of marijuana as a disqualifier for a security clearance, let alone Federal employment? And his answer was, no, but I would not prohibit it from being part of a background check. He made that distinction. Is it not the case that the amendment before us is a much tougher standard than Mr. Turner himself proposed? This would just blatantly say you are disqualified if you used it the last 3 years, period.

Mr. RASKIN. That is the way I am reading it. I am happy to stand corrected, but it looks like a categorical disqualification for anyone who states on a form that they have used marijuana—

Mr. CONNOLLY. And just for—

Mr. RASKIN [continuing]. Even lawfully.

Mr. CONNOLLY. That is right. So, this is actually a tougher standard than we have been discussing, even those on the other side opposing the bill. Just one more factual question. Mr. Sessions, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, it seems to take objection to the categorization of marijuana as the most dangerous drug in the world. That is not an opinion. That is a Federal classification. It is listed as a Class I drug. So, it is the Federal Government that did that classification, not us in this discussion. Is that not correct?

Mr. RASKIN. That is absolutely correct. And, you know, it seems as if the opposition to the bill is coming from some people who say, well, let us change the classification first, and then a sequence of implications will follow and then those who do not want to see any change at all. After all, there is a reason that is still the law, Mr. Connolly, as you well know. There are people who vehemently oppose any altering of the classification of the drug. I do not know where the offer of the amendment is on that, whether he agrees with the gentleman from Louisiana.

But what we are trying to do is to crack the iceberg open to say, at least in this egregious case of unfairness where we are disqualifying our own constituents from being fairly considered for Federal employment, let us deal with that problem.

Mr. CONNOLLY. I thank my friend.

Mr. RASKIN. I thank you kindly. I yield to the gentlelady from South Carolina.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady from South Carolina will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I strongly oppose this amendment, with my other colleagues, to redefine "current use" as any consumption of cannabis in the last 3 years. And by the way, I take national security very seriously. I sit on the House Armed Services Committee, I am in a lot of SCIFs, I go overseas, and take it very seriously, so any notion that we are not taking national security because of someone's previous cannabis use is not accurate at all.

The amendment is precisely what my colleagues says it is regarding Federal employment. And as my colleagues, Mr. Connolly and Mr. Raskin, accurately point out, this amendment does make cannabis use in the past 3 years a sole factor for denial, not just "part of the conversation" as has been suggested. This argument against cannabis is tired, it is old, and, quite frankly, it is outdated, and the states are far ahead of us on this issue, and we have to keep up.

I do appreciate the comments from my colleague from Louisiana earlier today on the constitutional issue. This is why I introduced legislation last Congress to decriminalize cannabis, and I will be reintroducing it this year. Nevertheless, states have enacted this legislation. Adult citizens in many states can walk into a store and buy cannabis just like they would to any store that sells alcohol. We cannot punish people for using a substance they have fully legally purchased, and even in jurisdictions where cannabis is still illegal, penalties for use can often be as minor as those for a speeding ticket. So, are we going to now deny anyone who has had a speeding ticket access to information or access to clearance to get Federal jobs, et cetera?

Contrary to my colleagues' comments, the bill does not prevent background checks, and demonizing and preventing former legal cannabis users is just simply wrong. Mr. Chairman, the idea that having consumed cannabis 2 to 3 years prior to receiving clearance should be disqualifying is kind of laughable. Some of the most qualified technical experts at America's most innovative companies are cannabis users past or present. The amendment offered by my colleague would prevent some of the brightest young minds in our country from serving the republic simply because they might have one time tried a 2-milligram gummy in a frat house or at a sorority once in their lifetime or were legally prescribed cannabis by their physician in the place of very addictive opioids.

We must not define "current use" as someone who has not consumed cannabis, in many cases legally, in over the last 365 days. It is an arbitrary restriction, and, quite frankly, the definition of "in the past 3 years" as "current" is an abuse of the English language. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. I believe that is everyone. So, now the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Sessions.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the noes have it, and amendment is not agreed to.

A recorded vote is ordered. As previously announced, further proceedings on the question will be postponed.

Our next item for consideration is **H.R. 5527**, the Modernizing Government Technology Reform Act.

The Clerk will please designate the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 5527, the Modernizing Government Technology Reform Act, a bill to reform and reauthorize the Technology Modernization Fund and its governing board.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of substitute.

The Clerk will please designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5527, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read, and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purpose further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

I support H.R. 5527, the Modernizing Government Technology Reform Act. The Technology Modernization Fund or TMF was established by the bipartisan Republican-led Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017. The TMF was established because it can be difficult to plan and budget for Federal legacy IT upgrades through the annual appropriations cycle. The TMF addresses this problem by acting as a self-sustaining funding mechanism to flexibly assist agencies with legacy IT modernization. Funding these projects is important because delayed legacy IT modernization ef-

forts create cyber risk and inefficiencies in government and operations.

TMF program operations, however, have strayed from the original congressional intent established by the bipartisan law Congress passed. Today, TMF does not consistently require agencies to repay their awards at a level that would allow the program to be self-sustaining. This operational choice has put a strain on TMF's resources and hindered its ability to help address future legacy IT modernization projects. This bill, informed by the oversight efforts of Cybersecurity, Information Technology, and Government Innovation Subcommittee Chairwoman, Nancy Mace, reforms the TMF to ensure it remains a sustainable financing tool for fixing costly and risky legacy IT systems. These reforms include a requirement that TMF awards be reimbursed at the level needed to keep the fund operational until it sunsets in December 2030 as reauthorized under the bill.

Under this bill, an agency must also reimburse the TMF for all administrative costs incurred in support of its project. This legislation is timely and necessary. It is important to act now because under the status quo, this Administration will continue to spend down existing funds without the intention of ensuring the fund remains solvent into the future. In fact, this Administration may be hoping that a future Congress will prohibit any oversight of this fund and just fill it in with more appropriations. Well, I am not seeing an immediate future where this Nation can afford to spend any funds we absolutely do not need to. That is why it is imperative that we ensure this necessary funding tool remains solvent with the funds that it currently has. It also must be focused on actually fixing the most costly and risky Federal IT systems across our government.

I believe this bill before us is a smart reform. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation. I want to thank Ms. Mace, Mr. Connolly, and Mr. Khanna for their work on drafting this important bill. I now recognize Mr. Connolly for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank our Subcommittee Chair, Nancy Mace, from South Carolina for her collaboration on a bipartisan reauthorization of the MGT Act.

The MGT Act was legislation I co-authored with our former colleague, Will Hurd of Texas, and it was enacted as part of the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act. The bill did two fundamental things. First, it authorized all CFO Act agencies to establish IT working capital funds which the Subcommittee historically tracked through the FITARA scorecard. Second, the bill established a centralized Technology Modernization Fund and a governing board for that fund. While we have never been able to get sufficient support for the TMF from our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, the Biden Administration saw the value of the fund when it requested \$9 billion for the TMF as part of the COVID recovery plan. We were ultimately able to secure \$1 billion of that \$9 billion request.

The TMF has used that funding to help bring agencies into the 21st century. Examples include digitizing the Department of Veterans Affairs customer support and better veterans benefits management systems, modernizing the U.S. Office of Personnel Man-

agement website, and implementing a zero-trust architecture for USAID. Building off the original MGT Act success, the MGT Reform Act will extend the authorization for the TMF through 2030 and sustain this critical IT investment tool for Federal agencies.

The bill reiterates that Congress wants the TMF to recoup some of the funding it provides agencies in order to remain a revolving fund. The bill provides an annual authorization of \$50 million for the TMF, which I hope our appropriators will meet or even exceed. The IT needs of the Federal Government are enormous. They are, however, underfunded. A recent Government Accountability Office report stated the U.S. Government spends over \$100 billion on information technology every year. Most of that will be used to operate and maintain existing systems, including legacy systems, some of which are 50 years old. These systems can be costly to maintain and vulnerable to cybersecurity hackers. It is clear that even a one-time billion-dollar cash infusion is not sufficient, given the needs of the Federal Government.

At the start of the COVID-19 outbreak, Congress acted swiftly to provide unprecedented levels of economic relief to the American people through the multitude of stimulus bills. For once, political will was not the missing ingredient in serving those in need of assistance. It was government's outdated IT platforms. Despite a robust legislative response on a bipartisan basis and unprecedented financial support, many individuals and small businesses were denied timely assistance because of severely deficient IT infrastructure at the Federal, state, and local levels. That is what we are trying to address through the fund. That is why this legislation is so important, and, again, I thank you, Mr. Chairman and my colleague, Ms. Mace, the Chair of our Subcommittee, for your leadership in moving this piece of legislation forward. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Does any other Member wish to be heard? The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank Ranking Member on my Subcommittee, Mr. Connolly, for his leadership over the years on this bill, the Technology Modernization Fund and its governing board. The Technology Modernization Board, or TMB, were established by the bipartisan Modernizing Government Technology Act of 2017. The TMF was created to establish a sustainable revolving fund to address the costly challenge of modernizing legacy IT systems. Since its creation, the OMB and GSA have not consistently required full or even partial repayment of the TMF awards.

This put a strain on the funds resources and has hindered its ability to keep and help agencies upgrade their legacy IT systems, and God knows the Federal Government has a lot of work to do in that regard. Reforming this program through this legislation is essential to ensuring the solvency of our agencies at home and a technological edge on our adversaries abroad.

H.R. 5527 reforms and reauthorizes the TMF and Tech Modernization Board to improve their administration and ensure they adhere to original congressional intent on agency repayment. The bill requires the TMF program office to fully recover administrative costs associated with funding projects, while also removing an exemption allowing GSA to establish repayment terms exceeding 5

years. The bill also creates a Federal legacy IT inventory—it is something that is long past due—an oversight tool to ensure Federal Government is addressing the problem of legacy IT systems. This new requirement ensures agencies compile and submit a list of high-risk legacy IT systems and prioritize the replacement of those which present the greatest risks to the Federal Government.

I would encourage my colleagues to support this piece of legislation, and I would only warn any other member of the Federal workforce or Agency that comes before this Committee and does not give us answers on a lot of these technological issues, you have been forewarned. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields back. Seeing no further request to speak, the question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it.

The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chair, I ask for a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. Pursuant to House Rules, further proceedings of this measure are postponed. All recorded votes will be rolled to the end.

COUNSEL. She is going to withdraw her—

Chairman COMER. OK.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman, I have to retract that request.

Chairman COMER. OK. The gentlelady withdraws her amendment. So, in the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on final passage in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, say no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the—

Ms. MACE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I request a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. Now pursuant to House Rules, further proceedings on this measure are postponed. All recorded votes will be rolled to the end at a time to be announced. Thank you, gentlelady.

Chairman COMER. Our next item for consideration is **H.R. 4428**, the Guidance Clarity Act.

The Clerk will please designate the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 4428, the Guidance Clarity Act, a bill to require Federal agencies to state on the first page of guidance documents that such guidance does not have the force and effect of law and is intended only to provide clarity to the public about existing legal requirements or Agency policies.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of substitute.

The Clerk will please designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4428, is offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and to the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

I support H.R. 4428, the Guidance Clarity Act. This important reform clarifies what Agency regulatory guidance is and what it is not. Agency guidance plays a key role in the Federal regulatory system. Often it is unclear how Federal statutes or regulations will be administered by a Federal Agency. Agency guidance is important to help small businesses and individual households understand how Federal agencies will carry out the law and implement programs. These entities typically cannot afford high-priced attorneys to help them understand what laws apply to them, so when an Agency issues guidance to clarify an issue, that helps to avoid unnecessary expense. And this is a critical distinction: agency guidance is not the law itself.

However, Federal agencies sometimes use guidance documents to intimidate entities into compliance with agency views. Other times, they try to evade the Administrative Procedure Act's congressional review requirements for issuing binding rules by cleverly slipping what they intend to be rules into guidance documents. Agencies have been known to threaten enforcement action based on mere guidance. Recognizing the problem of the prior administration, Justice Department issued a formal policy and adopted regulation to prevent its lawyers from bringing such enforcement actions based merely on guidance documents. Unfortunately, President Biden's Justice Department rescinded the policy and related regulation, so once again, the threat of abuse is a reality for Americans.

The Guidance Clarity Act solves this problem by requiring regulatory guidance documents to include the following statement: "The contents of this document do not have the force and effect of law and are not meant to bind the public in any way. This document is intended only to provide clarity to the public regarding existing requirements under the law or Agency policies." With that simple addition, agencies will no longer be able to intimidate regulated parties, unfairly threaten enforcement actions, or impose rules disguised as Agency guidance, but agencies will certainly still be free to issue guidance documents to help regulated entities to understand how agencies intend to administer the law.

I urge all my colleagues to support this simple commonsense bill. This is a bipartisan bill and one that passed easily out of the Committee last Congress by voice vote in a July 2021 markup and then later under suspension by the House by voice vote in October 2021. The text of this bill we are considering today has not changed. I want to thank Representatives Jared Golden and Emanuel Cleaver for their bipartisan co-sponsorship, and I especially want to thank Representative Blaine Luetkemeyer, the bill's sponsor, for his sustained efforts over several Congresses to ensure this bipartisan reform is enacted into law.

As the Ranking Member is aware, the Administration recently offered technical assistance on the bill suggesting some possible revisions. We are in discussions about that, but we have not yet reached an agreement. While the amendment in the nature of sub-

stitute I will offer today does not contain any substantive revisions addressing those discussions, I intend to continue working across the aisle on the path forward for this critical legislation. It is my hope that we can come to a bipartisan and bicameral agreement that further perfects this commonsense bill.

I now recognize the Ranking Member for his statement.

Mr. RASKIN. And I will rest with your statement, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for your hard work on this one. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. Do any other Members wish to be heard?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it.

Do we need a recorded vote? OK.

And the amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on the final passage in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, say no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it.

I request a recorded vote. Pursuant to House Rules, further proceedings on this measure are postponed. All recorded votes will be rolled to the end at a time to be announced.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman, forgive me. I was on the wrong bill, and so I did have a statement I would like to give, if that is OK?

Chairman COMER. OK. All right. That is fine.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you kindly.

Chairman COMER. We will let you read the statement. The bill has already been approved, but we will let you read the statement.

Mr. RASKIN. I got you. So, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Making Federal regulatory guidance clear is a desirable goal, but there is a lot more to the legislation than meets the eye. And I am afraid that 4428 could have the effect of confusing entities that have to implement Federal regulations using the guidance provided, and the legislation would require all guidance statements to explicitly state on the first page that it does not have the force of law. And although agency-issued guidance to the public does not literally have the force of law, stating this on each piece of guidance could be tremendously confusing and misleading, particularly for all the statutory programs and regimes that rely on a combination of statute and implementing guidance in the real world. For example, we do not place a disclaimer on stop signs that says this stop sign does not have the force of law. That could lead to a lot of people running stop signs and having accidents, and then denying responsibility for their conduct because the disclaimer told them not to worry about it.

So, I am afraid this legislation could furnish regulated entities opportunities to escape or dodge the law and to bring lawsuits later over agency guidance, with the inevitable result being agencies will be unable to enforce the regulatory commands. And so, for these reasons, I will oppose and vote against the bill in this particular forum, but I am willing to work with my colleagues on the other

side of the aisle to improve the legislation as it moves forward. And thank you for your indulgence, and I yield back.

Chairman COMER. That vote will be postponed until we have the entire vote series.

Our next item for consideration is **H.R. 5528**, the Safe and Smart Federal Purchasing Act of 2023.

The Clerk will please designate the bill.

The CLERK. H.R. 5528, the Safe and Smart Federal Purchasing Act of 2023, a bill to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to evaluate the lowest price technically acceptable provisions in the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk, please designate the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5528, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I now recognize myself for 5 minutes for a statement on the bill and the amendment.

I support H.R. 5528, the Safe and Smart Federal Purchasing Act. The Lowest Price Technically Acceptable, LPTA, is a source selection method outlined in the Federal Acquisition Regulation. This process uses price as a determining factor for a contract rather than any other technical operational factors. Following legislative work done by this Committee during the 115th Congress, constraints were placed on agency use of LPTA in the Fiscal Year 2019 NDAA. These constraints recognize that LPTA criteria are not always appropriate for agencies' complex or technically innovative series. For instance, it can result in agencies sacrificing long-term value for short-term savings. We also do not want LPTA to be used in a manner that jeopardizes national security.

This bill requires the director of Office of Management and Budget to evaluate this source selection process to determine whether agencies are using LPTA in a manner that creates any national security risk. This legislation is a useful step toward understanding the current methods Federal agencies are using for their source selection decisions. It will uncover whether agencies are relying on LPTA when it is not appropriate.

I want to thank Mr. Donalds of Florida for his leadership on this bill. I urge my colleagues to support this measured and targeted legislation that can inform future Committee work on Federal procurement, a policy area we all know is ripe for reform and potential taxpayer savings. I now recognize the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Safe and Smart Federal Purchasing Act would require the Director of OMB to evaluate the procurement activities of each agency to determine whether the use of Lowest Price Technically Acceptable, or LPTA, acquisition procedures have created any national security risks. Under LPTA procedures, price is the determining factor in awarding a contract

to a technically acceptable offer, with no consideration given to any other factors. This contrasts with the more frequently used best value process under which cost is just one factor, and non-cost factors like quality and performance, technical or managerial expertise, and past performance, are included in the evaluation. Recent Congresses have passed legislation requiring DOD and civilian agencies to limit the circumstances in which LPTA is used.

While I do not intend to oppose legislation today, Mr. Chairman, I do ask you to work with the Minority as the bill moves forward in legislative process. I note that we have not received input on this bill yet from the Administration, and I am not sure that the Director of OMB is the appropriate person to be conducting these evaluations or that the evaluation could be accomplished in 6 months as the bill requires. But with those caveats, I am happy to go along with it, and I thank you. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back, and we have a Member en route maybe. We will stand at ease a moment. We have a Member, Byron Donalds, the primary sponsor of the bill, en route to speak in support.

OK. Let us suspend that. If the Ranking Member is OK, we will suspend debate on this bill and go ahead and call up **H.R. 599**, Representative Gomez's postal naming bill with ANS.

Our next item for consideration is H.R. 599, a bill designating the facility the U.S. Postal Service, located at 3500 West 6th Street, Suite 103 in Los Angeles, California, as the Dosan Ahn Chang Ho Post Office. I recognize the Clerk.

The CLERK. H.R. 599, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service, located at 3500 West 6th Street, Suite 103 in Los Angeles, California, as the Dosan Ahn Chang Ho Post Office.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the bill should be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes himself to offer an amendment in the nature of substitute.

The Clerk will please report the amendment.

The CLERK. An amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 599, as offered by Mr. Comer of Kentucky.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, the amendment is considered as read and the substitute will be considered as original text for the purposes of further amendment.

Chairman COMER. I recognize myself for 5 minutes for statement on the bill and the amendment.

I now call up the ANS for H.R. 599. I want to thank Mr. Gomez and his staff for their patience and for working with us to advance this postal naming bill. A 2004 law previously named a post office for the honoree, but this post office was recently relocated just a short walk from the previous location. However, when a post office moves to a new location, the name of that post office is not moved to the new location because our postal naming laws designate a specific street address. My amendment modifies H.R. 599 so it updates the address in the 2004 law. This is not the first time this Committee has had to rename a postal office that had moved locations. We are working with the Postal Service to figure out a better long-term solution to this problem.

Again, I want to thank Mr. Gomez and his staff for working with us on this ANS. I encourage my colleagues to support this technical amendment and passage of H.R. 599, which we will consider next as part of the package of postal naming bills. I now recognize the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am in strong support of H.R. 599, and I yield back to you.

Chairman COMER. OK. We will now suspend until we regain a quorum.

Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair declares the Committee in recess. Subject to the call of the Chair, we will reconvene after the votes.

[Recess.]

Chairman COMER. The Committee will come to order.

A quorum being present, we will now resume debate on the ANS to **H.R. 5528**.

The question is now on the final passage of 5528, as amended.

COUNSEL. This one first.

Chairman COMER. OK. The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment is agreed to.

The question is now on final passage of 5528, as amended.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes—

Voice. Mr. Chair, I call for a recorded vote.

Chairman COMER. A recorded vote is ordered. Pursuant to House rules, all recorded votes will be rolled to the end, which we are starting now. OK.

We will now resume debate and discussion on the ANS to **H.R. 599**. Do any Members wish to be heard?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, the question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

I request unanimous consent for the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Hearing no objection, the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 599 is agreed to.

The Committee will now resume consideration of **H.R. 4984**, the D.C. Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Stadium Campus Revitalization Act.

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk will call the roll on the Perry Amendment.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Turner votes no.

Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.
 Ms. Foxx?
 MS. FOXX. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.
 Mr. Grothman?
 Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.
 Mr. Palmer?
 Mr. PALMER. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes yes.
 Mr. Higgins?
 Mr. HIGGINS. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes yes.
 Mr. Sessions?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Biggs?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Ms. Mace?
 Ms. MACE. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes yes.
 Mr. LaTurner?
 Mr. LATURNER. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes yes.
 Mr. Fallon?
 Mr. FALLON. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.
 Mr. Donalds?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?
 Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.
 Mr. Perry?
 Mr. PERRY. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes yes.
 Mr. Timmons?
 Mr. TIMMONS. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes yes.
 Mr. Burchett?
 Mr. BURCHETT. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes yes.
 Ms. Greene?
 Ms. GREENE. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes yes.
 Mrs. McClain?
 Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.
 The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.
 Mrs. Boebert?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Fry?
 Mr. FRY. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes yes.
 Mrs. Luna?
 [No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Edwards?
 Mr. EDWARDS. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.
 Mr. Langworthy?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Burlison?
 Mr. BURLISON. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes yes.
 Mr. Raskin?
 Mr. RASKIN. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes yes.
 Ms. Norton?
 Ms. NORTON. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes yes.
 Mr. Lynch?
 Voice. No, no, no, no, no.
 Ms. NORTON. Sorry, no. This is on the amendment.
 Chairman COMER. Right. Perry amendment, right.
 Ms. NORTON. Yes. No.
 (Laughter.)
 Ms. NORTON. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.
 Mr. Lynch?
 Mr. LYNCH. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.
 Mr. Connolly?
 Mr. CONNOLLY. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes no.
 Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
 Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Nay.
 The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes nay.
 Mr. Khanna?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Mfume?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
 Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.
 The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.
 Ms. Porter?
 Ms. PORTER. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes no.
 Ms. Bush?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez?
 Mr. GOMEZ. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.
 Ms. Brown?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury?
 Ms. STANSBURY. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes no.
 Mr. Garcia?
 Mr. GARCIA. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.

Mr. Frost?
 Mr. FROST. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.
 Ms. Lee?
 Ms. LEE. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.
 Mr. Casar?
 Mr. CASAR. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.
 Ms. Crockett?
 Ms. CROCKETT. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.
 Mr. Goldman?
 Mr. GOLDMAN. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no.
 Mr. Moskowitz?
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no.
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.
 Chairman COMER. Does any Member wish to be recorded? Mr. Timmons?
 Mr. TIMMONS. No.
 Mr. MFUME. Mr. Mfume votes aye.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Timmons recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Timmons is recorded as yes.
 Mr. TIMMONS. No. Off "yes," on "no."
 Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Mfume recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Mfume is not yet recorded.
 Mr. MFUME. I am voting aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.
 Mr. LATURNER. LaTurner?
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. LaTurner recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner is voted as aye.
 Mr. LATURNER. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Sessions recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Sessions is not yet recorded.
 Mr. SESSIONS. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.
 Chairman COMER. Any other Member wish to be recorded?
 [No response.]
 Chairman COMER. Seeing none, will the Clerk tally the vote?
 [Pause.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 13. The nays are 24.
 Chairman COMER. The noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to, and let me say, that was the most interesting coalition of yeses and noes—
 (Laughter.)

Chairman COMER [continuing]. in the history of the House Oversight Committee. Historians will be studying that roll call vote for decades.

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4984.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 4984 is agreed to.

A recorded vote is ordered.

The Clerk will call the roll.

Wait.

COUNSEL. No recorded vote. We can go here.

Chairman COMER. OK. The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 4984.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Turner votes yes.

Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. Yes.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes yes.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes no.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes no.

Mr. Higgins?

Mr. HIGGINS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes no.

Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.

Mr. Biggs?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.

Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.

Mr. Donalds?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.
Mr. PERRY?
Mr. PERRY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.
Mr. Timmons?
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.
Mr. Burchett?
Mr. BURCHETT. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes no.
Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes aye.
Mrs. Boebert?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.
Mrs. Luna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards?
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.
Mr. Langworthy?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes yes.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.
Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.
Mr. Khanna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume?
Mr. MFUME. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.
 Ms. Porter?
 Ms. PORTER. Aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.
 Ms. Bush?
 Ms. BUSH. Aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Bush votes aye.
 Mr. Gomez?
 Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.
 Ms. Brown?
 Ms. BROWN. Aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.
 Ms. Stansbury?
 Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes yes.
 Mr. Garcia?
 Mr. GARCIA. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.
 Mr. Frost?
 Mr. FROST. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.
 Ms. Lee?
 Ms. LEE. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes yes.
 Mr. Casar?
 Mr. CASAR. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.
 Ms. Crockett?
 Ms. CROCKETT. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes yes.
 Mr. Goldman?
 Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.
 Mr. Moskowitz?
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes yes.
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Donalds recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Donalds is not yet recorded.
 Mr. DONALDS. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.
 Chairman COMER. Does any other Member wish to be recorded?
 [No response.]
 Chairman COMER. Seeing none, will the Clerk tally the vote?
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman on this vote, the ayes are 31. The
 nays are 9.
 Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favor-
 ably, as amended.
 Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.
 The Committee will now resume consideration of **H.R. 5040**, the
 Cannabis Users' Restoration of Eligibility Act.

The question is now on the previously postponed amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, offered by the gentleman from Maryland—

COUNSEL. By Mr. Sessions.

Chairman COMER. Oh, I am sorry. Oh, offered by the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Sessions.

The Clerk will call the roll. This is on the Sessions Amendment.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

Mr. TURNER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Turner votes no.

Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins?

Mr. HIGGINS. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes yes.

Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes yes.

Mr. Biggs?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes no.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes no.

Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes yes.

Mr. Donalds?

Mr. DONALDS. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.

Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes no.

Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes yes.

Mr. Timmons?

Mr. TIMMONS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.

Mr. Burchett?

Mr. BURCHETT. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes yes.
Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes yes.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Yes.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes yes.
Mrs. Boebert?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes yes.
Mrs. Luna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards?
Mr. EDWARDS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes yes.
Mr. Langworthy?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes yes.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.
Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. No.
The Clerk. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes no.
Mr. Khanna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume?
Mr. MFUME. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes no.
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes no.
Ms. Porter?
Ms. PORTER. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes no.
Ms. Bush?
Ms. BUSH. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Bush votes no.
Mr. Gomez?
Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez, no.

The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.
 Ms. Brown?
 Ms. BROWN. Brown, no.
 The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.
 Ms. Stansbury?
 Ms. STANSBURY. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes no.
 Mr. Garcia?
 Mr. GARCIA. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.
 Mr. Frost?
 Mr. FROST. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.
 Ms. Lee?
 Ms. LEE. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.
 Mr. Casar?
 Mr. CASAR. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.
 Ms. Crockett?
 Ms. CROCKETT. No.
 The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.
 Mr. Goldman?
 Mr. GOLDMAN. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no.
 Mr. Moskowitz?
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes no.
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes no.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Langworthy recorded?
 The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy is not yet recorded.
 Mr. LANGWORTHY. No.
 The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes no.
 Voice. Mrs. Boebert.
 Chairman COMER. How is Mrs. Boebert recorded?
 The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert is not yet recorded.
 Voice. Khanna.
 Chairman COMER. Would anyone else—yes, how is Mr. Khanna
 recorded? How is Mr. Khanna?
 The CLERK. Mr. Khanna is not yet recorded.
 Mr. KHANNA. I am a no.
 The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.
 Chairman COMER. Does any other Member wish to be recorded?
 Mrs. BOEBERT. Madam Clerk.
 Chairman COMER. Mrs. Boebert?
 The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert is not yet recorded.
 Mrs. BOEBERT. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes yes.
 Chairman COMER. Any other Member wish to be recorded?
 [No response.]
 Chairman COMER. Will the Clerk please tally?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman on this vote, the ayes are 15. The nays are 28.

Chairman COMER. OK. I am sorry. Could you repeat the vote?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman on this vote, the ayes are 15. The nays are 28.

Chairman COMER. OK. The amendment is not agreed to.

The question is now on the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5040.

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

All those opposed, signify by saying no.

In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 5040 is agreed to.

A recorded vote is ordered.

The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 5040.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

Chairman COMER. This is on reporting favorably on H.R. 5040. I think you are a no.

Mr. TURNER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Turner votes no.

Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes no.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. No.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes no.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.

The CLERK. I am sorry, sir. Could you repeat that?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes no.

Mr. Higgins?

Mr. HIGGINS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes no.

Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes no.

Mr. Biggs?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.

Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. No.

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes no.

Mr. Donalds?

Mr. DONALDS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.
Mr. Armstrong?
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.
Mr. Perry?
Mr. PERRY. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes no.
Mr. Timmons?
Mr. TIMMONS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes no.
Mr. Burchett?
Mr. BURCHETT. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes yes.
Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes no.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. MCCLAIN. No.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes no.
Mrs. Boebert?
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.
Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.
Mrs. Luna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards?
Mr. EDWARDS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes no.
Mr. Langworthy?
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes yes.
Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes no.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes yes.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.
Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.
Mr. Khanna?
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.
Mr. Mfume?
Mr. MFUME. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.
Ms. Porter?
Ms. PORTER. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.
Ms. Bush?
Ms. BUSH. Bush votes aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Bush votes aye.
Mr. Gomez?
Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez, aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.
Ms. Brown?
Ms. BROWN. Brown, aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.
Ms. Stansbury?
Ms. STANSBURY. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes yes.
Mr. Garcia?
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.
Mr. Frost?
Mr. FROST. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.
Ms. Lee?
Ms. LEE. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes yes.
Mr. Casar?
Mr. CASAR. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.
Ms. Crockett?
Ms. CROCKETT. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes yes.
Mr. Goldman?
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.
Mr. Moskowitz?
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes yes.
Mr. Chairman?
Chairman COMER. Yes, and how is——
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.
Chairman COMER. How is Mr. Biggs recorded?
The Clerk. Mr. Biggs is not yet recorded.
Mr. BIGGS. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes no.
Chairman COMER. Does any other Member wish to be recorded?
[No response.]
Chairman COMER. Seeing none, will the Clerk please tally?

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 30. The nays are 14.

Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

The question is on favorably reporting H.R. 5527.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Turner?

[No response.]

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.

Ms. Foxx?

Ms. FOXX. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman. This is 5527?

Chairman COMER. Yes, 5527, Modernizing Government Technology Reform Act.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you. I vote yes.

The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes yes.

Mr. Grothman?

Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.

Mr. Palmer?

Mr. PALMER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

Mr. Higgins?

Mr. HIGGINS. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes yes.

Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.

Mr. Biggs?

Mr. BIGGS. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.

Ms. Mace?

Ms. MACE. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.

Mr. LaTurner?

Mr. LATURNER. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.

Mr. Fallon?

Mr. FALLON. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.

Mr. Donalds?

Mr. DONALDS. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.

Mr. Armstrong?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.

Mr. Perry?

Mr. PERRY. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes yes.

Mr. Timmons?

Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.
Mr. Burchett?
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.
Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes yes.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Yes.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes yes.
Mrs. Boebert?
Mrs. BOEBERT. Yes.
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes yes.
Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes yes.
Mrs. Luna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards?
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.
Mr. Langworthy?
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.
Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes aye.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes aye.
Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.
Mr. Khanna?
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.
Mr. Mfume?
Mr. MFUME. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.
Ms. Porter?
Ms. PORTER. Aye.

The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.
 Ms. Bush?
 Ms. BUSH. Aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Bush votes aye.
 Mr. Gomez?
 Mr. GOMEZ. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.
 Ms. Brown?
 Ms. BROWN. Aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.
 Ms. Stansbury?
 Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.
 The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.
 Mr. Garcia?
 Mr. GARCIA. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.
 Mr. Frost?
 Mr. FROST. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.
 Ms. Lee?
 Ms. LEE. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes yes.
 Mr. Casar?
 Mr. CASAR. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.
 Ms. Crockett?
 Ms. CROCKETT. Yes.
 The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes yes.
 Mr. Goldman?
 Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.
 The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.
 Mr. Moskowitz?
 Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes yes.
 Mr. Chairman?
 Chairman COMER. Yes.
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.
 Chairman COMER. Any Members yet to be recorded?
 [No response.]
 Chairman COMER. Seeing none, will the Clerk please tally?
 The CLERK. Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 43. The nays are zero.
 Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably.
 Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.
 The question is—is on favorably reporting H.R. 4428, the Guidance Clarity Act.
 The Clerk will call the roll.
 The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Turner?
 [No response.]
 The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?
 Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.
Ms. Foxx?
Ms. FOXX. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes yes.
Mr. Grothman?
Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.
Mr. Palmer?
Mr. PALMER. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.
Mr. Higgins?
Mr. HIGGINS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes yes.
Mr. Sessions?
Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.
Mr. Biggs?
Mr. BIGGS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.
Ms. Mace?
Ms. MACE. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.
Mr. LaTurner?
Mr. LATURNER. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.
Mr. Fallon?
Mr. FALLON. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.
Mr. Donalds?
Mr. DONALDS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.
Mr. Armstrong?
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.
Mr. Perry?
Mr. PERRY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.
Mr. Timmons?
[No response.]
Mr. Burchett?
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.
Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes yes.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Yes.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes yes.
Mrs. Boebert?
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.
Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.

Mrs. Luna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards?
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.
Mr. Langworthy?
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.
Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes no.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes no.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes no.
Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. Nay.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes nay.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Nay.
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes nay.
Mr. Khanna?
Mr. KHANNA. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes no.
Mr. Mfume?
Mr. MFUME. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes no.
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Nay.
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes nay.
Ms. Porter?
Ms. PORTER. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes no.
Ms. Bush?
Ms. BUSH. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Bush votes no.
Mr. Gomez?
Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez, no.
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes no.
Ms. Brown?
Ms. BROWN. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes no.
Ms. Stansbury?
Ms. STANSBURY. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes no.
Mr. Garcia?
Mr. GARCIA. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes no.
Mr. Frost?

Mr. FROST. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes no.
Ms. Lee?
Ms. LEE. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes no.
Mr. Casar?
Mr. CASAR. No.
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes no.
Ms. Crockett?
Ms. CROCKETT. No.
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes no.
Mr. Goldman?
Mr. GOLDMAN. Goldman, no.
The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes no.
Mr. Moskowitz?
Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes yes.
Mr. Chairman?
Chairman COMER. Yes, and how is Mr. Timmons recorded?
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.
Mr. Timmons is not yet recorded.
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.
Chairman COMER. Any other Members wish to be recorded?
[No response.]
Chairman COMER. Seeing none, will the Clerk please tally?
The CLERK. Mr. Chairman on this vote, the ayes are 24. The nays are 19.
Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.
Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.
Now the question is on favorably reporting H.R. 5528, the Safe and Smart Federal Purchasing Act.
The Clerk will call the roll.
The CLERK. Mr. Jordan?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Turner?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar?
Mr. GOSAR. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Gosar votes yes.
Ms. Foxx?
Ms. FOXX. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Foxx votes yes.
Mr. Grothman?
Mr. GROTHMAN. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Grothman votes yes.
Mr. Palmer?
Mr. PALMER. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Palmer votes aye.
Mr. Higgins?
Mr. HIGGINS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Higgins votes yes.
Mr. Sessions?

Mr. SESSIONS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Sessions votes aye.
Mr. Biggs?
Mr. BIGGS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Biggs votes aye.
Ms. Mace?
Ms. MACE. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Mace votes aye.
Mr. LaTurner?
Mr. LATURNER. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. LaTurner votes aye.
Mr. Fallon?
Mr. FALLON. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Fallon votes aye.
Mr. Donalds?
Mr. DONALDS. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Donalds votes yes.
Mr. Armstrong?
Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Armstrong votes yes.
Mr. Perry?
Mr. PERRY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Perry votes aye.
Mr. Timmons?
Mr. TIMMONS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Timmons votes aye.
Mr. Burchett?
Mr. BURCHETT. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Burchett votes aye.
Ms. Greene?
Ms. GREENE. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Greene votes yes.
Mrs. McClain?
Mrs. MCCLAIN. Yes.
The CLERK. Mrs. McClain votes yes.
Mrs. Boebert?
Mrs. BOEBERT. Aye.
The CLERK. Mrs. Boebert votes aye.
Mr. Fry?
Mr. FRY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Fry votes aye.
Mrs. Luna?
[No response.]
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards?
Mr. EDWARDS. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Edwards votes aye.
Mr. Langworthy?
Mr. LANGWORTHY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Langworthy votes aye.
Mr. Burlison?
Mr. BURLISON. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Burlison votes aye.
Mr. Raskin?
Mr. RASKIN. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Raskin votes aye.
Ms. Norton?
Ms. NORTON. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Norton votes yes.
Mr. Lynch?
Mr. LYNCH. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Lynch votes yes.
Mr. Connolly?
Mr. CONNOLLY. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Connolly votes aye.
Mr. Krishnamoorthi?
Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Krishnamoorthi votes aye.
Mr. Khanna?
Mr. KHANNA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Khanna votes aye.
Mr. Mfume?
Mr. MFUME. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Mfume votes aye.
Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.
Ms. Porter?
Ms. PORTER. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Porter votes aye.
Ms. Bush?
Ms. BUSH. Bush votes aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Bush votes aye.
Mr. Gomez?
Mr. GOMEZ. Gomez, aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Gomez votes aye.
Ms. Brown?
Ms. BROWN. Brown votes aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Brown votes aye.
Ms. Stansbury?
Ms. STANSBURY. Aye.
The CLERK. Ms. Stansbury votes aye.
Mr. Garcia?
Mr. GARCIA. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Garcia votes aye.
Mr. Frost?
Mr. FROST. Aye.
The CLERK. Mr. Frost votes aye.
Ms. Lee?
Ms. LEE. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Lee votes yes.
Mr. Casar?
Mr. CASAR. Yes.
The CLERK. Mr. Casar votes yes.
Ms. Crockett?
Ms. CROCKETT. Yes.
The CLERK. Ms. Crockett votes yes.
Mr. Goldman?
Mr. GOLDMAN. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Goldman votes aye.

Mr. Moskowitz?

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Aye.

The CLERK. Mr. Moskowitz votes aye.

Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. Yes.

The CLERK. Mr. Chairman votes yes.

Chairman COMER. Have any Members failed to record their vote yet?

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Seeing none, will the Clerk please tally?

Mr. Chairman, on this vote, the ayes are 43. The nays are zero.

Chairman COMER. The ayes have it, and the bill is ordered favorably reported.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

Now, pursuant to notice, I now call up the following postal naming bills, which were distributed in advance on this markup: **H.R.s 3865, 5034, 3947, and 599**, as amended.

Without objection, the bills are considered read.

If any Member would like to speak on any of the measures, they may do so now.

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Hearing no more discussion, I request unanimous consent for the bills' immediate consideration and approval, en bloc.

[No response.]

Chairman COMER. Hearing no objection, the en bloc package is ordered favorably reported.

Without objection, the motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

If there is no more business before the Committee, the Committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:18 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]