particularly deadly forms of cancer. If successful, the treatment will be a game-changer for so many of these people with these two types of cancer.

Now, while John is not around to see the culmination of his life work because he passed away in 2009 at the age of 64, I don't only trust, I know that John is seeing what is going on today. And I am so happy to be here and be able to talk about the Kanzius Research Center.

Some of the people are in the gallery actually: my good friend, Mark Neidig, who is the executive director; board president, Maryann Yochim; and D.C. board member, Debra Thornton, to name a few. Again, an exceptional American.

WINDS OF CHANGE

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, today, Oregon begins a campaign that may turn the corner, once and for all, on our illogical, ill-advised approach to marijuana.

We have reached a critical point, where, over the last 40 years, a misguided policy of prohibition has patently failed. It simply doesn't work. It criminalizes behavior that most Americans feel should be legal. It costs taxpayers billions of dollars a year in the futile enforcement of prohibition. It feeds billions more into the coffers of drug cartels, which destabilize Mexico while they terrorize Central American countries, sending tens of thousands of children fleeing to our borders.

Imagine a situation so desperate that a parent would send a child on a treacherous journey, thousands of miles away.

The current policy undermines the credibility of government drug prevention programs. How do we expect people to respect an authority that pretends marijuana is more dangerous than methamphetamine or cocaine, that cannot answer the simple question: Has anybody ever died of a marijuana overdose?

Why respect an agency that wastes time and money that should be spent on drugs that are much more deadly and addictive?

The winds of change are blowing through the Capitol. We have seen, in the recent weeks, we have had five consecutive victorious votes on the House floor to have a more rational policy.

But the real leadership is at the State level. Forcing the issue are 23 States and the District of Columbia, where, now, over a million patients have access to medical marijuana, often in programs authorized by the voters.

In 2012, voters in Colorado and Washington both legalized adult use and have now started commercial markets, in Washington State just this month.

The campaign in Oregon is going to be key. It is a carefully-drawn statute which will be considered by the voters.

Now, make no mistake, the one-size-fits-all prohibition fanatics will be out in force, and we will hear about any hiccups in the neighboring State of Washington, largely blown out of proportion.

But we are going to hear everybody talk about their legitimate concern for keeping marijuana out of the hands of children. We all agree that young brains should not be subjected to marijuana. But, frankly, this is one of the biggest failures of our current program of prohibition.

We have a huge underground, shadow market. No one thinks that a 12-year old has a harder time getting a joint than a case of beer. Nobody checks ID. No one has a license to lose.

The success in Oregon will usher in, I think, a new era where the States have the right to regulate marijuana, just like alcohol. There will be more money for things we care about, like education, drug treatment, and drug enforcement, to keep and protect our children.

The failure of the current Federal prohibition is obvious. I am hopeful that voters in Oregon can help usher in this new era of regulation for adults and protections for children.

I think it is going to be a fascinating public policy debate.

□ 1030

WATERS OF THE U.S.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, the Environmental Protection Agency's regulatory attack on our economy and way of life in central and northwestern Pennsylvania has been growing for some time.

In recent months, the EPA moved forward with an egregious power grab to redefine the Agency's jurisdiction under the Clean Water Act through a new proposed rule commonly known as the Waters of the United States.

In Pennsylvania, agriculture is our number one industry. As in other parts of the country, our farmers and ranchers know that clean air, clean water, and being good stewards of the environment in which they live and work is of fundamental importance to their livelihoods.

Despite local prerogatives and successful State and regional initiatives to protect our natural resources, the Federal Government, once again, has chosen to undercut these efforts with punitive Federal regulations.

In March, the EPA issued the Waters of the U.S. proposal, explaining that the rule expands neither Federal authorities, nor the amount of water or land under the Agency's jurisdiction.

Well, the EPA has argued the action is necessary to eliminate ambiguity over which bodies of water are jurisdictional under the law. Unfortunately, this is a far cry from the truth. In reality, the EPA's plan represents an unprecedented expansion of Federal power that will harm our economy and erode the rights of both States and private landowners.

Enacted in 1972, the Clean Water Act was created as a partnership between the States and the EPA in order to better manage identified pollution sources through a range of pollution control programs, such as setting wastewater standards.

The scope of the law is limited to navigable waters, and for the first time, it made it unlawful to discharge any pollutants into these bodies, unless a permit was obtained.

The law was never intended to impinge upon States' authority as the primary managers of water resources within their borders. The law was never intended to regulate small, noncontiguous bodies of water, such as streams, ditches, ponds, and creek beds, which would impose unnecessary burdens on economic activity. Unfortunately, that is exactly what the EPA has proposed.

Despite Supreme Court rulings interpreting the regulatory scope of the Clean Water Act more narrowly than what the Federal Government has asserted, the EPA's new rule moves in the opposite direction.

In fact, essentially all waters in the country under the EPA's proposed rule could potentially be subject to regulation and permitting approval by the Federal Government.

The Obama administration and the EPA have argued the rule is intended to eliminate ambiguity and offer greater protections for States, farmers, and landowners when, in fact, it will create new regulatory burdens, more ambiguity, and less certainty.

EPA Chief Gina McCarthy earlier this month characterized the growing opposition to the Waters of the U.S. rule—which has come from both Republicans and Democrats—as ''ludicrous'' and ''silly'' and recently summarized the backlash as a ''growing list of misunderstandings.''

Madam Speaker, it is no misunderstanding. EPA's new Waters of the U.S. rule is a historic power grab that poses a fundamental threat to our economy and way of life in Pennsylvania and for communities across the country.

Unfortunately, the only thing ludicrous is how the EPA continues to believe a punitive one-size-fits-all approach to environmental stewardship is the only way forward.

RECOGNIZING BOY SCOUT TROOP 772

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group from my district, Boy Scout Troop 772 of Fort Pierce, Florida.