

Kustoff (TN)	Pence	Stewart
LaHood	Perry	Stivers
LaMalfa	Posey	Taylor
Lamborn	Reed	Thompson (PA)
Latta	Reschenthaler	Thornberry
Lee (CA)	Rice (SC)	Tiffany
Lesko	Richmond	Timmons
Lipinski	Riggleman	Tipton
Long	Roby	Turner
Loudermilk	Rodgers (WA)	Upton
Lucas	Roe, David P.	Van Drew
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (AL)	Vela
Marchant	Rooney (FL)	Visclosky
Marshall	Rose, John W.	Wagner
Massie	Rouzer	Walberg
Mast	Roy	Walden
McCarthy	Rutherford	Walker
McCaul	Scalise	Walorski
McClintock	Schweikert	Waltz
McHenry	Scott, Austin	Watkins
McKinley	Scott, David	Weber (TX)
Meuser	Sensenbrenner	Webster (FL)
Miller	Shimkus	Wenstrup
Mitchell	Simpson	Westerman
Moolenaar	Smith (MO)	Williams
Moohey (WV)	Smith (NE)	Wilson (SC)
Mullin	Smith (NJ)	Wittman
Murphy (NC)	Smith (WA)	Woodall
Newhouse	Smucker	Spano
Norman	Stauber	Wright
Nunes	Stefanik	Yoho
Olson	Steil	Young
Palazzo	Steube	Zeldin

□ 1355

Messrs. BROWN of Maryland, YARMUTH, JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. TLAIB changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Kaptur (Dingell)	Payne
Bera (Aguilar)	Kennedy (Kuster)	(Wasserman
Bonamici (Clark (MA))	(NH))	Schultz)
Boyle, Brendan F. (Jeffries)	Kim (Davids (KS))	Peters (Kildee) (NH))
Brownley (CA) (Clark (MA))	Kirkpatrick (Stanton)	Pingree (Kuster (NH))
Carson (IN) (Cleaver)	Lamb (Golden)	Pocan (Raskin)
Castor (FL) (Demings)	Langevin (Lynch)	Porter (Wexton)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)
Costa (Cooper)	Lee (NV)	(Demings) (Butterfield)
Dean (Scanlon)	(Kuster (NH))	Royal-Allard (Garcia (TX))
DeSaulnier (Matsui)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Ruiz (Dingell)
Deutch (Rice (NY))	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Rush (Underwood)
Doggett (Raskin)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Schneider (Casten (IL))
Doyle, Michael F. (Cartwright)	Lowey (Tonko)	Schrirer (DelBene)
Escobar (Garcia (TX))	McEachin (Wexton)	Serrano (Jeffries)
Frankel (Clark (MA))	McNerney (Raskin)	Sherrill (Pallone)
Garamendi (Sherman)	Meng (Kuster (NH))	Sires (Norcross)
Grijalva (García (IL))	Moore (Beyer)	Speier (Scanlon)
Hastings (Wasserman Schultz)	Mucarsel-Powell (Wasserman Schultz)	Thompson (CA)
Jayapal (Raskin)	Nadler (Jeffries)	(Kildee)
Johnson (TX) (Jeffries)	Napolitano (Correa)	Titus (Connolly)
	Pascarella (Pallone)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
		Welch (McGovern)
		Wilson (FL)
		(Hayes)

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 3884, MARIJUANA OPPOR-
TUNITY REINVESTMENT AND
EXPUNGEMENT ACT OF 2019

Mr. MC GOVERN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1244 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1244

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3884) to decriminalize and deschedule cannabis, to provide for reinvestment in certain persons adversely impacted by the War on Drugs, to provide for expungement of certain cannabis offenses, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-67, modified by the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MC GOVERN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL), my good friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MC GOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1400

Mr. MC GOVERN. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I feel I need to respond to the meltdown that occurred right before the vote on the Republican side.

As the distinguished minority leader knows, House Democrats have sent two major coronavirus relief bills over to the Senate. Sadly, those bills have been gathering dust on MITCH McCONNELL’s desk. He has refused to schedule a vote and a debate on those bills.

But the good news is that today, at 12:45, we find out that Leader McCONNELL and Speaker PELOSI have spoken about their shared commitment to completing an omnibus and COVID relief package as soon as possible. I take that as good news.

We can walk and chew gum at the same time in this Democratic-controlled House of Representatives. That means we need to deal with not only passing an omnibus bill and a COVID relief bill, but we have other work that needs to be done as well.

I find it curious, Mr. Speaker, that the bill the minority leader objected to

is a bill that deals with the unequal enforcement of our drug laws where people are treated differently and more negatively because of the color of their skin. Really?

My distinguished Republican friend did not object to any of the bills we are bringing up today sponsored by Republicans—five different bills—but he chose to object to a bill that is addressing the issue of racial justice.

Now, I guess I shouldn’t be surprised because it is consistent with the attitudes that come out of this White House, but it also makes clear to me that the Republican Party is no longer the party of Lincoln. It is the party of some of the most intolerant voices on the rightwing and those who dabble in conspiracy theories. It really is sad.

The Republicans made a motion that the House do now adjourn to highlight the fact that we are able to vote remotely in this Chamber in the midst of a pandemic. The leader said that nearly one-third of the Democratic Caucus didn’t vote yesterday, which, by the way, they did because we do have responsible voting rules in place in the middle of this pandemic. Now, get this, Mr. Speaker. But then, right after saying that, 95 percent of the Republican Conference didn’t even show up to vote. You can’t make this stuff up, Mr. Speaker.

They didn’t vote in person, and they didn’t vote remotely—nothing. Maybe I am missing something here, but I don’t think the strategy was very well thought through.

The distinguished minority leader is puzzled why we have passed rules that allow people to vote remotely during this pandemic. I have a news flash for him: Close to 275,000 people are dead. We have colleagues, both Democratic colleagues and Republican colleagues, who have been infected by this virus.

While many Republicans are rushing to attend maskless superspreader Christmas parties at the White House, we in the Democratic majority are following the guidelines by the Attending Physician in the Capitol, by the CDC, by Dr. Fauci, and by every reputable medical expert in the world.

Operating remotely during a pandemic, I want to tell my friend, is not radical, it is not unique, and it is not unprecedent or lazy. It is responsible. It is constitutional. The Supreme Court is working remotely, as are legislators around the country and around the world.

We aren’t doing this because it is convenient, Mr. Speaker. We are doing it because it is necessary, and we are doing it because we want to save lives.

So, we invite our Republican colleagues to join us, to be responsible, and to understand why these rules are so incredibly important and maybe set an example for others in this country, especially those who operate in 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1244, providing

for the consideration of H.R. 3884, the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act, under a closed rule. The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary. It self-executes a manager's amendment by Chairman NADLER, and it provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, we are here today to continue our effort to reform our Nation's failed approach to the war on drugs, to put racial justice at the heart of our Nation's Federal cannabis policy, and to make restorative justice a reality for so many Americans. This is what the public has demanded for so long, that Congress address the broken status quo that allows the color of someone's skin to dictate the repercussions of their actions.

This is not hyperbole, Mr. Speaker. Cannabis accounts for almost half of all drug arrests in our country—half. Most are arrested for possessing small amounts, not for selling or manufacturing anything.

That is bad enough. But today in America, Mr. Speaker, you are nearly four times more likely to be arrested for cannabis if you are Black. Communities of color use cannabis at roughly the same rate as their White counterparts, but if you look like me, Mr. Speaker, you are far less likely to face the same penalties.

I am not okay with that, and nobody should be. I am not okay with a system that treats those who have been convicted of minor cannabis offenses like they are some kind of drug kingpin. And I am not okay with a system that sends people to prison for cannabis-related offenses even in States where recreational cannabis use has been legalized.

To do nothing about this is intolerable, and to pretend like this is a problem for communities of color to solve alone is inexcusable.

America's failed war on drugs helped create this problem. It will take a national, holistic approach to resolve it.

H.R. 3884 represents a major step forward. It complements other bipartisan criminal justice reform bills passed in this Congress and in the 115th Congress.

This underlying bill removes cannabis from the Controlled Substances Act, decriminalizing it at the Federal level so States can set their own laws.

It also puts a process in place to expunge prior convictions made in Federal courts and establishes services to help those convicted of cannabis-related crimes whose lives have been harmed by the war on drugs, because no lives should be destroyed by this failed policy.

Finally, this bill also makes Small Business Administration funding available for legitimate cannabis-related businesses while helping ensure people of color can participate in this thriving industry.

This is what beginning to reverse the failed war on drugs looks like, Mr. Speaker. It is a testament to all of those who have fought for a fresh and more effective approach year after year after year.

Now, I have worked side by side with many of them in this effort since I was first elected to Congress back in 1996. For so long, we were told the same thing. We were told to wait, to wait, to wait. Well, cannabis-related amendments couldn't even get a fair fight on this floor under the prior Republican Congresses. Not a single one was ever made in order in the 112th, 113th, or 114th Congresses—not one. We could bring no bill to the floor related to cannabis. The only one made in order last Congress was an amendment to eradicate illegal grow operations on National Forest System land.

Congress has stood idly by for too long as communities of color, in particular, were being torn apart. This majority, Mr. Speaker, is committed to doing something about it. The House has debated more amendments on cannabis policy last year than it did during my entire 20 years in Congress, and now we are moving forward with the most sweeping reforms in generations. This is what a more responsive Congress looks like.

Now, some, particularly on the other side, have wondered why we are moving forward with these reforms now. We must soon fund the government for the next fiscal year and pass the annual defense bill. We are also trying to prod the Senate to get serious about a true COVID relief bill.

Again, as I said earlier, we have a little bit of hopeful news, based on the conversation between the Speaker and the Senate majority leader. We have a lot to do in the waning days of this Congress, and I get that. But the answer is simple. This is not an either-or proposition. Congress, as I said before, can walk and chew gum at the same time.

A recent survey found that nearly 60 percent of Americans support this underlying bill. That includes a majority of both Democrats and Republicans. The facts are clear, and the public wants Congress to act.

The question is, what are we going to do about it?

I think it is time for us to take a stand, to stand for restorative justice, to stand for racial justice, to stand for criminal justice reform, and to stand with the majority of Americans demanding reforms to our Nation's cannabis policy.

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

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

I appreciate my friend from Massachusetts yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this may very well be the last rule I do down here on the floor of the House, and I was sad when SUSAN was reading from the rule be-

cause I have gotten to do some humdingers. We have done some serious legislating in the 10 years I have been in Congress. We have done some serious rulemaking in the 2 years Mr. McGOVERN has been chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, you can always tell when we have been burning the midnight oil in the Rules Committee because the rule will take a good 7, 8, or 9 minutes to read here on the floor of the House. Why? Because getting good legislation done is a complicated, difficult thing to do. It involves a lot of give and take; it involves a lot of voices at the table; and it involves a lot of time in the Rules Committee to make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, we are down here today surrounded by Purell wipes, hand sanitizer, and social distancing, and we are not here to talk about that COVID package that my friend from Massachusetts referenced. We are here to, sadly, participate in what has become a theme in this Congress, and that is folks will have the germ of a wonderful idea on the Democratic side of the aisle. They will nurture that idea in their Democratic Caucus, and they will put together all the parts of that idea they believe need to come together in their Democratic Caucus. Then, we will come to the House floor, and we will pass that idea with Democratic votes. Then, we will be vexed, truly vexed, about why that idea goes to the United States Senate and dies.

I say truly vexed, Mr. Speaker. I have been here a long time. We have seen this happen. Leadership of both parties knows, when you put together an idea all by yourself, when you don't take the time to get all the voices in the room together, and when you don't take the time to build the strategic partnerships, then good ideas do die. Sometimes it is on the way to the other Chamber; sometimes it is in conference; and sometimes it is on the President's desk.

We had numerous amendments offered to this bill. None but the manager's amendment was made in order. We had Republican advocates for many of the provisions in this bill speak of the opportunity to do something together but that those opportunities were missed along the road in the Judiciary Committee.

I take my friend from Massachusetts' comments to heart when he is so enthusiastic by a conversation that our Speaker has had with the majority leader in the Senate. I, too, am excited about that because talking about what we have done all by ourselves in a partisan way doesn't lead to positive outcomes for my constituency. Our leadership in the Democratic-led House getting together with the leadership in the Senate, the Republican-led Senate, that kind of bipartisan partnership does lead to good outcomes for our constituents back home. I am hopeful that we will be able to see that come to fruition.

Today, however, we do not have the COVID package. We have the Marijuana Opportunity Reinvestment and Expungement Act. Mr. Speaker, I have long said that we needed to have a bill like this on the floor of the House. My friend from Massachusetts tells me we have debated more marijuana amendments in the past 2 years than we have in the past 20 years. I take him at his word that that is true. I don't think this is a topic that we have not been spending enough time on. I think it is a topic that has received more than its fair share of attention in this Congress.

The racial equities that my friend talks about deserve better than to be part of a partisan package that goes nowhere. The generational disparities that my friend from Massachusetts talks about deserve better than to be part of a package that has been cobbled together for the floor rather than built together for the President's desk.

□ 1415

I agree with absolutely every heartfelt comment my friend from Massachusetts shared, from the time being now, to the opportunities that have been wasted, to the inability to have these discussions when we need to and the ability that we have had recently to have them more.

So to have all of that truth there to be wasted on a December 3 package that will not be moving anywhere, I would say to my friend, I believe hurts me as much as I know it will hurt him. He does not go through these efforts to simply be a part of the motion; he goes through these efforts because he believes in the goal. I regret that this appears to be another messaging exercise in front of us today.

NDAA, Mr. Speaker, National Defense Authorization Act, a bill that we have come together as Republicans and Democrats to speak with one voice on for over 60 years, still hangs out there, needs to be done by this year; funding of the Federal Government, not just because of all the healthcare items, but because of those more mundane items, from transportation to education to our veterans—all of those dollars need to be provided.

Reauthorization of program after program, like the United States Coast Guard, for example, we have priority after priority after priority that this House still has left to accomplish, not in a partisan way, but in a unified way that can move through the United States Senate and on to the President's desk. I know we are going to get to these priorities, but it is not without some frustration that I find myself on the floor here again talking about bills that will not be on their way to the President's desk.

I find myself talking in a disappointed tone with my friend from Massachusetts about opportunities that we have to make a difference for families, but opportunities that are going to be missed because of the way we have crafted it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat this rule and give us a chance to do better. In the absence of that, I also will have an opportunity to defeat the previous question and bring up some of those COVID packages that really can make a difference for our friends back home.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Mr. Speaker, like my colleague, the distinguished member of the Committee on Rules from Georgia, I, too, hope that the renewed interest in both Houses in passing COVID relief yields fruit sooner rather than later. It does require that the Senate make it a priority, and I have been advised that the Senate's priority this afternoon once again is confirming another conservative judge. So we will both have to hold out hope as we move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today, pleased to rise in support of today's rule and the underlying legislation, the MORE Act.

It becomes clearer by the day that the time is long overdue for the Federal Government to bring its marijuana policy into the 21st century.

The current approach has failed our youth, has failed to stem more harmful drug usage, and, most notably, has failed communities of color across the United States. That is because, when it comes to marijuana, there are two justice systems in the United States: a gentler, more understanding system mostly available to White Americans, and a punitive, less-forgiving system primarily enforced against Black and Brown Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't justice. This is not who we must be as a nation.

Thousands of people, mostly younger Black and Brown men, remain incarcerated, while a growing number of States, including Pennsylvania, have decriminalized and legalized marijuana for medicinal and recreational use.

The question is no longer whether we are living in a world if we will legalize cannabis. States across the country are leading the way and demonstrating how to safely, responsibly, and effectively regulate cannabis for medicinal and recreational use.

Mr. Speaker, the MORE Act will decriminalize marijuana by removing it from the Controlled Substances Act and apply retroactively to prior and pending marijuana-related convictions. The bill will also require Federal courts to expunge prior convictions and require courts to consider resentencing hearings for those still under supervision.

The MORE Act will not fix all of the injustices caused by the obsolete and ineffective approach of the Federal Government towards cannabis, but it is a good and long-overdue start.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to side with justice and side

with common sense to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), one of our former colleagues on the House Budget Committee, currently the leader of the Republican side of the House Committee on Rules.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Georgia for yielding.

Normally, when I come down to this floor, it is to debate the rule with my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, and it is to disagree with the legislation, in many cases. And at least that is true: I am opposed to the rule and opposed to the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the real purpose that I am here today is something that my friend from Georgia referred to oft too fleetingly in his opening comments, and that is that this may be his last appearance managing a rule of the floor of the House.

Now, I had the good fortune to serve in Congress throughout my friend's distinguished 10-year career. We served, as he said, on the Committee on Budget together. We have had the opportunity to serve on both the majority and the minority on the Committee on Rules together. I was very proud to be a member of the Republican Study Committee—still am—during his tenure as our chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I have to say, probably something that my good friend, the chairman, will agree with, we regret very much that my friend has made the decision to leave Congress and go pursue—and, I am sure, successfully—other things.

We regret it because ROB WOODALL has been, throughout his 10 years, a Member's Member, a person whom I have never heard say one ill word about anyone on either side, even while vigorously disagreeing with that person; a person who has made us proud with the civility and the decency with which he has conducted his office and discharged his duties; somebody that I think everyone on the Committee on Rules not only likes and admires, but considers an invaluable part of the Committee on Rules because he manages to make his points and bring out the best in our committee and, again, do so in a way that is always civil, that is always appropriate, and, frankly, that is quite often humorous and diffuses difficult situations.

If we had more Members in the United States House of Representatives like ROB WOODALL, we would be a better body than we are—and I think both sides would agree on that. He knows how to conduct debate and argument. He knows the process. He knows how to work through the process in a civil manner. I have seen him do it in the majority. I have seen him do it in the minority.

I could not be prouder of him and the service he has rendered to this institution. I could not be, frankly, sorrier about losing a colleague who I think has contributed each and every day.

Now, ROB was the chief of staff, Mr. Speaker, before he came here, to one of our predecessors, John Linder, who also was a member of the Committee on Rules. So he came to this committee really understanding how it works, much like the chairman, who had a very similar career pattern himself, working as a staffer then coming on and now, obviously, rising to the preeminent position on the committee as our distinguished chairman. He has seen a lot of Members work through this process as well, just as I have, and I suspect he values my friend, even though he is on the other side, as deeply as I do.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, for the record, to my friend, ROB: We are going to miss you. We are going to miss you on the committee. But much more importantly, this institution is going to miss you. It is going to miss your civility. It is going to miss your decency. It is going to miss your industry. It is going to miss the manner in which you represent all of us to your constituents and, frankly, when you speak on this floor to the people of the United States of America. You have every reason to be proud of the career that you have built here. You could never be as proud of your career as all of us are of you and the manner in which you have conducted yourself.

My friend, this may be the last rule; although, I have got to tell you, if I can sneak you in one more time, I would. It is like we are losing, I think, our best pitcher, and if I can find one more game to stick him in, believe me, I will. But I want to tell you how much I admire you, how much I like you, how much I revere your career, how much I will miss you as a Member and a friend.

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

Mr. Speaker, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished ranking member, Mr. COLE.

We are going to miss you, ROB, and this may be my final opportunity to be able to yield to you during a rules debate. The end of Congress is obviously rapidly approaching, and you have decided to retire from Congress after a very distinguished career. We have spent countless hours not only up in the Committee on Rules, but together on this floor debating many contentious issues. My distinguished friend from Georgia is always very focused, and he is always right on message and he is really quite impressive.

Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, my mother watches these proceedings, and she will always say: You know, that WOODALL guy, he is a very good debater.

And I always say: Well, what about me? I mean, do you have anything nice to say about your son?

But the bottom line is I have had some of my best fights with you, and we have disagreed on a lot of issues, but we have disagreed without being disagreeable.

The Committee on Rules has to deal with a lot of contentious issues. We have dealt with our share of contentious issues in this last Congress, but I have really taken great comfort and great inspiration by the example of you, Mr. WOODALL and Mr. COLE and others who understand the incredible nature and the incredible majesty of this institution that we get to serve in. So even among these contentious debates, you have never, ever drawn us down. It has always been in a way that is respectful and that honors your convictions and your beliefs.

We have been together early in the morning; we have been together in the middle of the afternoon, late at night. We meet a lot in the Committee on Rules, but Mr. WOODALL's good nature and his sense of humor, whether it is intentional or unintentional, makes it a little more interesting and, I dare say, makes it a lot more fun.

So I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the many years of distinguished service, both your near decade of service as a Member of Congress and before that, as Mr. COLE pointed out, your service working for Congressman John Linder, who was also on the Committee on Rules.

You have brought with you some incredible people as well. I see your long-time Committee on Rules staffer Janet Rossi on the floor here today. She is here to honor your service, as well as the others who are here today. And I just want to thank her for all of her work in the Committee on Rules as well over these years.

I always think it is really hard to be a staff member and work for us on the Committee on Rules because you have to listen to all of us go on forever and ever and ever.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close with this, and that is I think you and I come from different parts of the country and we have very different points of view on our politics, but to me, politics should be about conviction, not about political opportunism or flip-flopping with whatever way the prevailing winds are going.

What I have always admired about you is that you feel strongly about what you believe in. You know what you believe in and you fight for your convictions, whether it is popular or not popular. And I agree with Mr. COLE when he said that this institution would be better served if we had more Members like you.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say thank you, and I hope you come by the Committee on Rules next time you come back to Washington, and maybe if I get lost and I am in Georgia, I will stop by your firm and we can reminisce.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts as chair of the Committee on Rules, and I collectively thank the Committee on Rules for its diligent work on the MORE Act, and that is H.R. 3884.

Let me, as well, thank JERRY NADLER, chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, for his great work and, of course, two outstanding members, BARBARA LEE and EARL BLUMENAUER, for their consistent and persistent determination.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I spoke to a representative of the law enforcement community, and I indicated to him that we are about to move forward on the decriminalizing of marijuana at the Federal level, eliminating, federally, the criminalization of marijuana and cannabis. I indicated that it was not to undermine law enforcement and not to promote drug use but, in essence, to bring about justice and to provide for the right kind of roadway for what over a majority of Americans, Republicans and Democrats, want.

It is an important legislative initiative. It provides a vehicle for sales tax and a vehicle that allows businesses in the marijuana business to be able to bank legally. It provides for a reinvestment program, an opportunity grant program, and, as well, an expungement program governed by Federal courts.

□ 1430

It ensures that there are no sales made to those under 21. It deals with substance abuse. This is a real step forward in bringing America together, and I know that my colleagues tomorrow on the floor of the House will recognize that is what we are doing.

As many people know, the States that have decriminalized can continue; those who have not can continue their laws as well.

So I ask my colleagues to support H.R. 3884 when it comes to the floor. Let us do it in unity.

I, too, want to take the opportunity, very briefly. Mr. WOODALL, I think we have seen each other quite frequently, either on this floor in debate or in the Rules Committee. Let me echo the generosity and cordialness of your persistent intellect in challenging each and every one of us who came to make our case. That is all we can do as Americans and Representatives, is to make our case.

I join you. Let us work together for a COVID-19 relief package and have that as our legacy as we leave this place. But I wanted to make sure you knew that Texans appreciate your great leadership. Georgians and Texans have a good relationship. Congratulations to you. Thank you for your service.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Rules Committee.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, first, before I talk about the bill at hand, I

want to say just what an honor it has been serving with you on the Rules Committee, Mr. WOODALL.

You know, I didn't know Mr. WOODALL, really, before I served on the Rules Committee with him, and I found him to be very witty, a very good debater as well. You do it in such a nice way. You really win the debates, but you do it with a smile, and you do it in a friendly way. I really appreciate the way you conduct yourself and how you actually win arguments, but you are very friendly about it.

I don't know what your future holds, but I wish you all of the best. You are extremely talented, and it really is an honor to serve with you.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about the bill. I find it crazy, quite frankly, that the American people and small businesses are hurting, because of the COVID crisis, and they need COVID relief, and we are not concentrating on a bipartisan COVID relief stimulus package right now that will actually be signed into law.

I find it just incredulous that, instead, my Democratic colleagues are focusing on legalizing marijuana nationwide.

Sometimes I think that the world is turned upside down, when you have a State—I think Oregon—that bans plastic straws but legalizes cocaine and heroin. It is just insane to me and I think to a majority of my constituents, whether they be Republican, Independent, or Democrat, quite frankly.

It is interesting to me—I sit on the Rules Committee and the Judiciary Committee—that on a lot of these tobacco bills that the Democrats have been promoting, it says, okay, we don't want flavored tobacco. But yet on marijuana, they don't seem to care about that. They don't care.

In this bill, there is nothing about we shouldn't have flavored edibles or candies or brownies that would be enticing to children. As far as I know, that is not in this bill at all. Yet, we want to ban that with tobacco. This makes absolutely no sense to me and no sense, I think, to the American public.

At a time when parents are trying to get their children back into school with an in-person option, because their children are falling so far behind because of the lockdowns of schools, here we are with a bill that will make it easier for these same children to get marijuana products.

I am sorry. I just don't get it. I don't understand the motivation. I am absolutely opposed to this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to my good friend from Arizona. I am not sure she was on the floor earlier when I announced that, finally, MITCH McCONNELL seems willing to want to negotiate a deal, not only on an omnibus bill, but he seems to be interested in talking about how we can get a COVID

relief bill. This notwithstanding the fact that for the last over six months, he has held everything up. We have actually sent two major COVID relief bills over to the Senate. So I am hopeful. I am going to try to be hopeful that, in fact, this is for real.

I would also say that the focus of this bill is on unfair, unequal, and racist drug laws. I mean, as I said in my opening statement, if people want to know what systemic racism is, look at how our drug laws are enforced in this country.

If you look like me and you were caught with a small amount of cannabis, you would probably get off with a very, very light sentence, if anything. But if the color of your skin were black or brown, it is a whole different story.

I mean, our system of drug laws is what systemic racism is in this country. No matter what you think about, you know, States legalizing marijuana or not legalizing marijuana, or whatever, I think we all ought to be committed to making sure there is equal justice under our laws.

People's lives were ruined because of the color of their skin and how our drug laws were enforced. It is wrong. The time has long since passed for us to do something. That is what this is all about.

So we will work on the COVID relief bill, and I hope that MITCH McCONNELL is sincere in what he said to Speaker PELOSI. I believe we will come together on an omnibus bill to keep our Government running, but we also need to address issues like this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments and his courtesy.

Listening to my colleague from Arizona sort of made my head hurt. This legislation does not legalize cannabis across the country. What it does is it stops the Federal Government from interfering with what States have decided to do.

No small amount of irony, her State just approved legalizing cannabis. And this legislation would prevent the Federal Government from interfering with what her voters decided.

I have been waiting for this historic moment for a long time. I was in the Oregon legislature when we were the first State to decriminalize cannabis. I have been working from Bangor, Maine, to Santa Barbara ever since trying to end the failed prohibition of cannabis.

It is happening today, because it has been demanded by the voters, by facts, by the momentum behind this issue.

It is now a \$17 billion industry. It employs 250,000 people. It is powerful in terms of economic development.

More important, as my friend from Massachusetts said, this is an opportunity to strike a blow against the failed war on drugs that has literally

destroyed hundreds of thousands of young Black lives. Black people use cannabis no more frequently than Whites, but they are arrested about four more times, and in some parts of the country, it is much, much greater.

We are still arresting or citing 600,000 people a year for something that the majority of Americans now think should be legal. That is why the voters in this country took it into their own hands. That is why today, 99 percent of the American population have some access to legalized cannabis.

This will help us set up a system moving forward. It will stop the interference by the Federal Government for research, for banking, for being able to promote an opportunity to make this work properly and not interfere with what voters in States have decided to do in the best interest of their public.

I really appreciate our being at this point. The legislation was carefully crafted over the course of two years with the Judiciary Committee. It comes on the heels of other legislation, like the Safe Banking Act, and we have research legislation that is moving forward. Five States, including Arizona, just approved it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a historic moment. It is an important step towards rationalizing the policy, towards racial justice, towards health, so that maybe the parents in my neighborhood don't have to formulate cannabis medicine to stop their babies from being tortured by extreme seizure disorder.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YARMUTH). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, that is why a number of States that haven't yet legalized cannabis have passed legislation to legalize that.

This is an opportunity for us to right this historic wrong. This is an opportunity for us to turn the page and move forward without Federal interference so that we are not outsourcing the product development to Canada or Israel. It is an opportunity for us to realize the promise while we realize the notion of racial justice.

I urge, in the strongest possible terms, for my colleagues to get in step with the vast majority of the American public, with what has happened at the State level, to be able to make this safe, affordable, and healthy, something that will make a big difference for people across the country. It is something for which time is long overdue, and I herald the day and hope that my colleagues will vote for it.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will amend the rule to allow for consideration of a bill that will assist our struggling small businesses as we enter the winter months and folks are anticipating increased risks of having to shut their doors.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), the ranking Republican on the Small Business Committee, a gentleman who has had great experience bringing together bipartisan groups in an effort to make a difference for families back home.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate the comments of the previous speaker on our side, the gentlewoman from Arizona. Mr. WOODALL has made great contributions to this body in the decade that he has served here.

He happens to be a classmate of mine. We came together in 2010. That was his first time as a Member of Congress. It was my second time around, because I lost back in '08 after being here 14 years. So I have seen Mr. WOODALL in operation here for the last decade. He has done a tremendous job on behalf of not only his constituents but for the people of this great Nation. I want to thank him for his dedication and hard work for the people that he represents and for the people of this Nation overall.

Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, I spoke on this very floor urging action on behalf of our Nation's 31 million small businesses, as the ranking member of the House Small Business Committee, formerly the Chair of that committee for two terms.

I said then that there was no better way to celebrate Small Business Saturday than to deliver much-needed aid, again, to the small restaurants and manufacturers and shops that are many of them just hanging on by a thread.

That assistance could come in the form of the Paycheck Protection Program, the PPP. That program has supported over 50 million jobs across this great Nation. That is over 50 million people who didn't have to worry about how they were going to pay their bills or how they were going to support their families, because of this bipartisan program that we passed here in this body.

□ 1445

Unfortunately, that program stopped accepting applications almost 4 months ago, back on August 8, but still has over \$130 billion remaining in its coffers. Millions of small firms across the country have utilized the PPP program to keep their shops open, to keep paying their employees, and to keep serving their communities.

To me, it seems like common sense to open the program back up. After all, it was initially crafted, as I mentioned, in a bipartisan way, Republicans and Democrats actually working together.

It was bicameral, the House and the Senate working together, and then the administration, obviously, signing it into law. And that program has proven to be overwhelmingly successful and saved so many jobs all over this Nation, including in my district back in Cincinnati.

So I introduced a bill that would do just that and provide targeted assistance to small businesses that truly still need help. Unfortunately, the Democratic leadership in this body has blocked efforts to even have a vote on this legislation, not just once or twice or three times or a dozen times, but 40 times, 4-0. Forty times the Democratic leadership has blocked consideration or having a vote on this.

Because the Democrats would also support this. You would have Democrats and Republicans, once again, working together and passing this and helping small business people all across the country and, most importantly, the people and families that are supported by them.

As we all know, many small businesses are still uncertain about their future. Many are on the verge of closing their doors permanently. If that continues to happen, communities all across our great Nation will be absolutely devastated.

This should have been dealt with months ago. But apparently our Democratic leadership feels it is more urgent to vote on legislation to legalize pot and to deal with lions and tigers than they do to help those small businesses that really need the help. That is just a shame.

Today, if we defeat the previous question, we make improvements to the Paycheck Protection Program, and finally get additional targeted relief to the small businesses all across this country that are counting on us. Let's not let them down.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman from Ohio, I think we all know what needs to happen, and that is that the Senate majority leader needs to be willing to come to the table and sit down and work out a deal.

We heard today that the Speaker has had a constructive conversation with him. Hopefully we will end up with something that, quite frankly, is going to help a lot more people than what the gentleman is suggesting here. What we do know is that nobody has been working harder than the Speaker of the House to try to get a COVID relief bill. She met around the clock with Secretary Mnuchin, with anybody in this administration who would be willing to come to the table.

Our problem has been the Senate. Now, that may be changing today. I hope it is. But I would also say that we have sent over two major COVID relief bills, which, unfortunately, the gentleman voted against, which would help not just small businesses, but help our schools, help our first responders;

help with PPE for people who, quite frankly, are running short right now as we see another surge; help support our cities and towns that are struggling; and help support our restaurants.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I think about how many times the gentleman from Ohio has been down here to do exactly what he has just done, which is to say: I have a bill that is ready to go, a bill that I know will get bipartisan support here on the floor of the House, a bill my friends in the Senate will be anxious to move, and a bill that I know the President will put his signature on.

I appreciate his efforts in that, and I know it is not a Johnny-come-lately commitment to these struggling businesses. I remember when we were sitting down trying to work out that very first package in the spring, and the very productive role that the gentleman from Ohio played in bringing people together to get that done.

You remember that, Mr. Speaker.

We didn't have a bunch of debates on the floor of the House, a bunch of previous questions to defeat, a bunch of amendments designed to confuse or distract. No. We worked it all out together, both sides. Both sides, politically here in the House, both sides bicameral here in the Congress, both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Why?

Because we all felt that sense of urgency to get something done, and we did it.

Mr. Speaker, I tell constituents back home that the thing most freshmen are going to learn in the first 6 months that they didn't know when they got here is how hardworking and conscientious all of their colleagues turn out to be. All you see are these faces on FOX News or MSNBC fussing with one another, but the truth is that behind the scenes it is a very powerful orchestra of men and women trying to get the people's business done.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say to my friend from Massachusetts, first and probably most importantly, I wish he was not chairman of the Rules Committee. I wish a Republican was chairman of the Rules Committee because the American people felt in their wisdom that Republicans should be running this institution. There are a lot of reasons why it didn't happen. I am not here to place blame on that today.

But I will say to the gentleman that if it cannot be a Republican who leads the Rules Committee, how pleased I am that the gentleman has led the Rules Committee, because his love for this institution far transcends whatever the political passions of the day are.

The Rules Committee has had to do a lot of difficult decisionmaking in this Congress, Mr. Speaker. I wish we did not have proxy voting in this institution today. We do. That is the product of a Rules Committee effort. In many

cases, the effort of the wisdom of Solomon trying to figure out how to protect an institution and all of its practices, where we are just caretakers of this institution, going to pass it on to the next generation, while we have had to grapple with some challenges that we never anticipated grappling with, and hopefully will never have to grapple with again.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts has brought an incredible amount of not just leadership, but a great amount of love for this institution, and for the members of his committee. And I don't want to embarrass the gentleman by pointing out some of these circumstances, but I can go through a list of times this year where the gentleman from Massachusetts stood not on behalf of the Democratic Caucus, but on behalf of the Rules Committee against some other undercurrents in the United States Congress, to stand up on behalf of his 13 members and the work that we have to get done there together. That's never an easy thing to do, and I want to tell the gentleman how much I appreciate and notice those efforts.

Mr. Speaker, to do the really big things that we all know need to get done, not the least of which are on the committee you and I serve on, the Budget Committee, it takes strong men and women, men and women of conviction, but also men and women of faith, not just faith in their Lord, but faith in this institution that we can bring out the very best in one another as opposed to bringing out the very worst.

Far too often we have bills like the one before us today that could be bills that we were talking about with one voice.

When is the right time to decide that edible marijuana for our children should be banned at the Federal level? Is it after 50 States have grappled with these decisions? Is it before?

Well, we have made that decision in terms of alcohol. We have made that decision in terms of tobacco. It seems like the easy time to make that would be now. But we have not made that decision in the underlying bill. We have not made those amendments in order.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning, and I will say here at the end: I am glad we are taking up this legislation.

It offends me, as one who loves the law, that we ask Federal law enforcement officers to enforce one set of rules while the State and local law enforcement officers may be enforcing a completely different set of rules. It offends me that we would put Federal law enforcement officers in harm's way for an industry that, as my friend from Massachusetts pointed out, is a multibillion-dollar cash cow legalized by State jurisdictions across the country.

I am troubled by having two sets of laws in this country. Laws we choose to follow and laws we choose not to follow. This is the institution to solve that. Having this discussion for the

first time is a step in the right direction. Having this conversation end today, because it is a partisan package that is not well thought through serves none of us.

Mr. Speaker, I would again encourage my colleagues to defeat the rule so we don't go down that road.

Mr. Speaker, my friend from Massachusetts mentioned Janet Rossi on my team. I have Nick Scoufaras on my team, sitting beside me. We all are surrounded by great people that we get to work with day in and day out.

When you go to work for a member on the Rules Committee, that means you will work early, and you will work late, and you can work often. It is an amazing opportunity that we have to serve in this institution. It is also an amazing opportunity that folks that we get to surround ourselves with have to serve in this institution.

There is no more humbling space than having someone who can do anything they want to with his or her life say, Rob, I will join you; I will sit here with you; we will work side by side and we will accomplish things together.

While I appreciate the very heartfelt comments from my friend from Massachusetts and my friend from Oklahoma, one thing that occurs to me on my way out the door is how much less one would be able to do without all the greatness that folks are surrounded by.

Mr. Speaker, I get to thank Nick because he is here. I can thank Janet because she is here. But I would just say to each of my colleagues who are here, we are all so lucky folks are surrounding us in order to help us all lift this great Nation up. We often get sucked into the drumbeat of whatever the activity of the day is if you have not had an opportunity to recognize the greatness of those staffers around you, and occasionally even the Members around you, even those who sit on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot to be concerned about in America today, but a lot of opportunities for optimism. And many of those opportunities sit here, and sit here, and sit there, and sit here. I am grateful to be a part of that.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that we can bring the Chabot legislation to the floor. If we can't defeat the previous question, defeat the rule so that we can go back and make sure all voices are heard.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his kind words. I almost feel like I want to yield him more time to have the compliments keep coming.

The bottom line is that even though we disagree on a lot of issues, and sometimes in our debates you make me want to pull the remaining last two strands of hair out of my head, the reason why I sometimes feel that way is

because you are passionate, you are smart, and you are effective. You have served your constituency incredibly well, and you have served this institution incredibly well.

Mr. Speaker, going back to what Mr. COLE said at the very beginning, I think this place would benefit from more people of your caliber. And even though you would like to demote me to ranking member instead of chairman, I am still going to miss you, and I thank you for your friendship. You are a good man, and we are going to miss you a lot.

□ 1500

Mr. Speaker, the underlying bill deserves to be considered and passed. As I said earlier, nearly 60 percent of the American public supports this bill. A majority of Democrats and a majority of Republicans throughout the Nation want this bill passed.

Prior Republican Congresses were apparently fine with turning a deaf ear to the will of the people. They blocked virtually all cannabis-related measures from getting a vote on the floor year after year.

But this majority is not. We believe in listening to the people we represent. We believe in actually doing something about the war on drugs. Its failures have been staring us in the face for a very long time.

Americans came together in record numbers following George Floyd's death to fight against systemic racism. Combating that means, among other things, reforming our policies toward cannabis. These laws have been used to disproportionately lock up people of color for decades. It is past time we showed the moral courage to do something about it.

This is a historic moment. Let us seize this chance. Let us pass this bill. I urge everyone to vote "yes" on the previous question, and I urge a vote of "yes" on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. WOODALL is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1244

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 8265) to amend the Small Business Act and the CARES Act to establish a program for second draw loans and make other modifications to the paycheck protection program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 8265.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

MR. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 965, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 3, 2020.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on December 3, 2020, at 11:44 a.m.:

That the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the bill S. 910.

That the Senate agrees to the House amendment to the bill S. 1069.

That the Senate passed S. 434.

That the Senate passed S. 496.

That the Senate passed S. 578.

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1044.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3349.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3465.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

COMMUNITY ADVANTAGE LOAN PROGRAM

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7903) to amend the Small Business Act to establish the Community Advantage Loan Program, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 7903

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

SECTION 1. COMMUNITY ADVANTAGE LOAN PROGRAM.

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

“(37) COMMUNITY ADVANTAGE LOAN PROGRAM.—

“(A) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Community Advantage Loan Program are—

“(i) to create a mission-oriented loan guarantee program that builds on the demonstrated success of the Community Advantage Pilot Program of the Administration, as established in 2011, to reach more underserved small business concerns;

“(ii) to increase lending to small business concerns in underserved and rural markets, including veterans and members of the military community, small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, women, and startups;

“(iii) to ensure that the program under this subsection (in this paragraph referred to as the ‘7(a) loan program’) is more inclusive and more broadly meets congressional intent to reach borrowers who are unable to get credit elsewhere on reasonable terms and conditions;

“(iv) to help underserved small business concerns become bankable by utilizing the small-dollar financing and business support experience of mission-oriented lenders;

“(v) to allow certain mission-oriented lenders, primarily nonprofit financial intermediaries focused on economic development in underserved markets, to access guarantees for loans under this subsection (in this paragraph referred to as ‘7(a) loans’) of not more than \$250,000 and provide management and technical assistance to small business concerns as needed;

“(vi) to provide certainty for the lending partners that make loans under this subsection and to attract new lenders; and

“(vii) to encourage collaboration between mission-oriented and conventional lenders under this subsection in order to support underserved small business concerns.

“(B) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the term ‘covered institution’ means—

“(I) a development company, as defined in section 103 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 662), participating in the 504 Loan Guaranty program established under title V of such Act (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.);

“(II) a nonprofit intermediary, as defined in subsection (m)(12), participating in the microloan program under subsection (m);

“(III) a non-Federally regulated entity certified as a community development financial institution by the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund established under section 104(a) of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4703(a)); and

“(IV) an eligible intermediary, as defined in subsection (l)(1), as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this paragraph, that participated in the Intermediary Lending Pilot Program established under subsection (l)(2);

“(ii) the term ‘existing business’ means a small business concern that has been in existence for not less than 2 years on the date on which a loan is made to the small business concern under the program;

“(iii) the term ‘new business’ means a small business concern that has been in existence for not more than 2 years on the date on which a loan is made to the small business concern under the program;

“(iv) the term ‘program’ means the Community Advantage Loan Program established under subparagraph (C);

“(v) the term ‘Reservist’ means a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces named in section 10101 of title 10, United States Code;

“(vi) the term ‘rural area’ means any county that the Bureau of the Census has defined

as mostly rural or completely rural in the most recent decennial census;

“(vii) the term ‘service-connected’ has the meaning given the term in section 101(6) of title 38, United States Code;

“(viii) the term ‘small business concern in an underserved market’ means a small business concern—

“(I) that is located in—

“(aa) a low- to moderate-income community;

“(bb) a HUBZone;

“(cc) a community that has been designated as an empowerment zone or an enterprise community under section 1391 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

“(dd) a community that has been designated as a promise zone by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

“(ee) a community that has been designated as a qualified opportunity zone under section 1400Z-1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

“(ff) a rural area; or

“(gg) any area for which a disaster declaration or determination described in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), or (E) of subsection (b)(2) has been made that has not terminated or expired more than 2 years before the date (or later, as determined by the Administrator) on which a loan is made to such concern under the program;

“(II) for which more than 50 percent of the employees reside in a low- or moderate-income community;

“(III) that is a startup or new business;

“(IV) owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, including Black Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans, Asian Pacific Americans, and other minorities;

“(V) owned and controlled by women;

“(VI) owned and controlled by veterans;

“(VII) owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans;

“(VIII) not less than 51 percent owned and controlled by one or more—

“(aa) members of the Armed Forces participating in the Transition Assistance Program of the Department of Defense;

“(bb) Reservists;

“(cc) spouses of veterans, members of the Armed Forces, or Reservists; or

“(dd) surviving spouses of veterans who died on active duty or as a result of a service-connected disability; or

“(IX) that is eligible to receive a veterans advantage loan;

“(ix) the term ‘small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals’ has the meaning given the term in section 8(d)(3)(C);

“(x) the term ‘startup’ means a business that has not yet opened; and

“(xi) the term ‘veterans advantage loan’ means a loan made to a small business concern under this subsection that is eligible for a waiver of the guarantee fee under paragraph (18) or the yearly fee under paragraph (23) because the small business concern is a concern described in subclause (VI), (VII), or (VIII) of clause (viii).

“(C) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a Community Advantage Loan Program under which the Administration may guarantee loans made by covered institutions under this subsection, including loans made to small business concerns in underserved markets.

“(D) PROGRAM LEVELS.—In each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, not more than 10 percent of the number of loans guaranteed under this subsection may be guaranteed under the program.

“(E) NEW LENDERS.—

“(i) FISCAL YEARS 2021 AND 2022.—In each of fiscal years 2021 and 2022—