Marijuana Regulation and Federalism

John M. Greabe
University of New Hampshire School of Law, john.greabe@law.unh.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.unh.edu/law_facpub

Part of the Alternative and Complementary Medicine Commons, Chemicals and Drugs Commons, Commercial Law Commons, Criminal Law Commons, Health Law and Policy Commons, and the State and Local Government Law Commons

Recommended Citation

John M. Greabe, Marijuana Regulation and Federalism, Concord Monitor, Mar. 12 2017 at D1, D4.
Marijuana Regulation and Federalism

Additional Information
This article is part of the series Constitutional Connections by John M. Greabe and was originally published by the Concord Monitor.

This editorial is available at University of New Hampshire Scholars' Repository: https://scholars.unh.edu/law_facpub/258
Marijuana regulation and federalism

Federal law makes the cultivation and use of marijuana illegal for all purposes. Yet, over the past two decades, 28 states plus the District of Columbia have legalized marijuana for medicinal purposes, and eight states plus the District of Columbia have legalized it for recreational purposes. Marijuana regulation thus provides a useful and timely example for exploring the ways in which the distribution of power between the federal government and the states can facilitate policy change.

Let’s start with the basics. The Constitution performs three principal functions. First, it creates a federal government of three branches – the legislative branch (Congress), the executive branch (the president), and the judicial branch – and provides them with separate but somewhat overlapping powers. We refer to this arrangement as our “separation of powers.”

Second, it specifies the powers that the federal government may exercise. Most of these powers are held concurrently by both the federal government and the states, but a few (for example, the power to coin money) are given exclusively to the federal government. If the Constitution does not explicitly confer a power on the federal government, that power is understood to reside solely with the states. But federal law is supreme, it is written into the Constitution, and it is enforceable by the federal government.

A Little Perspective

NOAH SMITH, WRITING FOR BLOOMBERG: “The first and most obvious hurdle to integration is xenophobia. If the Trump administration manages to whip up hostility to Hispanic, Asian and Muslim immigrants, they may feel they have no choice but to retreat into ethnic enclaves. Anti-immigrant fears would then become a self-fulfilling prophecy. The country must therefore maintain a welcoming and inclusive attitude. Another way to encourage fast integration is to shift the immigrant mix toward the high-skilled. Though all immigrants integrate, those with more education and skills tend to do so faster. Fortunately, U.S. immigration has been moving quickly toward a more educated population, probably as a result of the end of illegal immigration. The Trump administration should be very careful not to choke off this positive trend by scaring high-skilled immigrants away or restricting their entry. A shift to a Canada-style merit-based immigration system, which Trump has promised but not yet delivered, would be a plus. If the U.S. can ease its latest wave of anxiety, the future is bright. Once again, immigrants will fulfill George Washington’s dream, and the country will remain ‘one people’ – bigger, stronger and more dynamic than before. The great American experiment is still working. The country’s leaders just have to step back and let it work.”

NHsnapshot

ON MARCH 12, 1986, Gov. John Sununu signs into law a measure providing money to pay for placing children in group and foster homes. The measure provides money to cover court-ordered placements. It is a result of the state’s failure to pay for a law it approved the year before.
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established the National Health Service to fulfill that ideal, thus negating the need for organizations like Planned Parenthood – decide in-
Marijuana legalization proves system sometimes works as founders intended

Constitution from D1 preempts any conflicting state laws. We refer to this general distribution of power between the federal government and the states as our "federalism." Third, it recognizes certain zones of liberty surrounding the individual. Some of these zones belong only to citizens, but most are held by all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States. Some limit only the federal government, but most constrain both the federal government and the states. We refer to these zones of liberty as "our individual constitutional rights." Back to marijuana. The Constitution does not explicitly give Congress the power to regulate marijuana. But it does grant a number of relevant powers. It empowers Congress to regulate interstate commerce and to adopt additional measures that are necessary and proper for putting this power into operation. It also vests the president with general law enforcement powers while directing him to take care that federal laws be faithfully executed. In 1976, Congress used its commerce clause powers to pass the controlled substances act. The goal of the CSA was to combat drug abuse and control the trafficking of drugs such as marijuana. The act defines a federal felony to manufacture, distribute, dispense or possess marijuana. In 2002, not long after California had legalized marijuana for certain medical uses, a dispute arose over whether state authorities could constitutionally enforce the CSA against a disabled California resident who was lawfully growing and using marijuana under state law. The resident sued, claiming that the CSA could not constitutionally be applied to her. She claimed that her conduct had no bearing on interstate commerce and thus was beyond Congress's power to outlaw.

In 2005, the supreme court disagreed and said that federal authorities could constitutionally enforce the CSA against her. The court held that she was an engaged in conduct that affected interstate commerce. Nonetheless, the court said, the Constitution's interstate commerce clause gives Congress the power to regulate interstate commerce. If, as the court held, repudication of others elsewhere, could have in the aggregate affect interstate commerce. And a majority of the court said that growing marijuana for personal medicinal use was just such an activity. However, this decision is not on the federal government's power to outlaw marijuana. Congress has passed a law that completely bans its cultivation and use. The Supreme Court has upheld the constitutionality of that law's enforcement in very extreme circumstances. Why do states continue to enact laws legalizing marijuana? aren't such efforts a waste of time? They are not. Our constitutional system of checks and balances pressures that the states will resist federal legislation with which they disagree. As more and more states pass laws that authorize marijuana use, we can expect the courts to register disapproval with federal marijuana policy. The pressure will mount to modify or abandon that policy. Moreover, law enforcement is conducted mostly by state and local officials who cannot be conscripted into federal service. Police officers in states that have legalized marijuana are unlikely to spend their limited resources combating small-scale marijuana use that has been legalized at the state level. Finally, there is another matter of federal executive law enforcement discretion under the constitution. In 2011, notwithstanding the CSA, the Obama administration adopted a policy of non-interference with state marijuana legislation efforts so long as such efforts are accompanied by strict rules regulating the cultivation and sale of the drug. The Trump administration has signaled that it may reconsider the Obama administration's hands-off policy with respect to state laws legalizing recreational marijuana use. Portable consumption devices are unlikely to be entirely rolled back. One of the principal reasons that the founders adopted a federalist system was to enable local resistance to unpopular federal policies. The recent success of the marijuana legalization movement suggests that, at least some, the system continues to work as the founders intended.

(John Grebe teaches constitutional law and related subjects at the University of New Hampshire School of Law. He serves as the director of the New Hampshire Institute for Civic Education.)