

two telephone calls my mother received were condolences. One was from Barry Goldwater, and one was from Ted Kennedy. The two had both talked before they called. I mention that because that was the type of people they both were. It had nothing to do with ideology; it was who they were.

In 1980 I had the second closest election in America. Somebody suggested to me that it must be because of my philosophy. I thought probably, but I can't figure it out. So I called up the man who had the closest election in 1980, the year of the Reagan sweep.

I said, "Senator Goldwater, what is the message we are being sent?"

Barry laughed and said, "We have to change our luck."

He suggested that he move into the office of the retiring Senator Abe Ribicoff of Connecticut, a Democratic Senator from New England. He said, "I am going to move into his office and change my luck. You better be strong enough to move into mine."

I suggested that I didn't have quite the seniority to do that. He said, "I will arrange your move next week." He did.

When I was sworn in for my second term in January of 1981, I was in that office. I have stayed in Senator Barry Goldwater's office ever since. I have stayed there now for—well, I am in my 35th year in Senator Goldwater's office, and I consider it a matter of pride, and I consider it a matter of pride to have served with him.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUMF

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President. I would like to touch on two topics. The first is that today the President has submitted a request for authorization for use of military force with regard to ISIL, or ISIS, as some call it.

First, I think it is good news that the President has made that submission, and I think he is right when he says the country is stronger when both Congress and the President act together.

I would say there is a pretty simple authorization he could ask for, and it would be one sentence, and that is, "We authorize the President to defeat and destroy ISIL." And that is what I think we need to do.

I look forward to reading through his submission. I understand it contains a time limitation. It does not contain geographic limitations. It contains some language that supposedly will make people feel more comfortable about the use of ground troops.

An authorization to use force that has limitations built into it is really quite unprecedented. We did some research, and the Congressional Research Service said that there really were

only two previous authorizations that have limited the President in terms of the use of force to be used or the duration of the conflict. One was in 1983 in Lebanon, and one was in 1993 in Somalia. Both of those were peacekeeping missions, so it made sense to limit the peacekeeping mission to use of force. But it appears that never before in certainly modern history has the Congress of the United States authorized the President to take on and defeat an enemy but has done so with limitations on the time or geography or anything of that nature. That is an important point for us to understand because under no circumstances can ISIL stay. What we need to be authorizing the President to do is to destroy them and to defeat them and allow the Commander in Chief—both the one we have now and the one who will follow—to put in place the military tactics necessary to destroy and defeat ISIS.

It is important to point out that circumstances on the ground might rapidly change. They already have. For example, when this began—if you look back a year and a half ago, if I had stood on the floor and given a speech about defeating ISIL or ISIS, no one would have known what I was talking about because at the time most Americans and most Members of Congress had no idea what that was. That is how quickly this has developed into a threat.

I would remind everyone that when they actually crossed over from Syria into Iraq, the President called them the JV team. Even today the facts on the ground continue to evolve very rapidly. For example, we now know through open source reports that ISIL has now established a presence in Derna, Libya, which gives them access to a port facility, and it is a completely uncontested space. There is no government shooting at them. There are no airstrikes. There is no one coming after them there. They can do whatever they want in Libya, and they are doing it. They are using it as a place to train, a place to recruit, a place to resupply, a place to raise money, and they have access to a port that allows them to bring all these things in.

There have also been open source reports of groups in Afghanistan beginning to pledge allegiance to ISIS. In fact, in at least four different countries in north Africa, there are now groups who have pledged allegiance to ISIL. So while we continue to focus on the conflict with relation to Iraq and Syria, we cannot overlook the fact that they are sprouting affiliates throughout the entire region.

I think that after the brutal murder of numerous Americans—we saw last week what happened to the Jordanian pilot—I don't have to spend much time convincing people how dangerous this group is. What we don't hear enough about is the atrocities being committed on a daily basis on the ground, what they are doing to the Sunni popu-

lation, for example, of areas they have now conquered, the brutality, the way they enforce sharia law with brutal tactics, not to mention the brutal stories we have heard of women being sold off or given away as brides to ISIL fighters, children trafficked into slavery, entire populations slaughtered, and fighters who were captured and killed in mass killings. This is what this group envisions for the world.

The goals of this group are not simply to govern what we knew once as Iraq or Syria or Libya or any other country; their ultimate goal is for the entire world—including where we stand today—to one day live under their mandate, under the rules they have established, under their radical version of Sunni Islam. You may say that is far-fetched, and it may be today, but that is their clear ambition—to spread their form of radical Islam everywhere and anywhere they can. They openly talk about this.

This group needs to be defeated. I wish we had taken this group on earlier. I wish, in fact, that we had gotten involved in the conflict in Syria earlier and equipped moderate rebel elements, non-jihadist rebel elements on the ground so that they would have been the most powerful force there. The President failed to do that in a timely fashion, and as a result a vacuum was created, and that vacuum was filled by this group who has attracted foreign fighters from all over the world to join their ranks.

Now we are dealing with this problem, but I would argue better late than never. Had we dealt with this a year and a half ago or 2 years ago, it wouldn't have been easy, but it would have been easier. But it is important to deal with it decisively now. We can debate the tactics, but it is the job of the Commander in Chief, in consultation with his military officials who surround him and advise him, to come up with the appropriate tactics to defeat the enemy.

For our purposes—very straightforward—ISIL is the enemy. They need to be defeated, and we should authorize this President and future Presidents to do what they can and what they must to defeat ISIS and erase them from the equation.

VENEZUELA

Mr. President, I also wish to take a moment to talk a little bit about what is happening in Venezuela. Tomorrow, February 12, will mark the 1-year anniversary since students and others across Venezuela took to the streets in peaceful demonstrations and demanded a better government and a better future than the current one, which is corrupt and incompetent and provides no leadership to the country.

Tomorrow also marks the 1-year anniversary since the Venezuelan Government, under Nicolas Maduro, responded with a violent crackdown that left dozens of people dead, thousands injured, and hundreds in jail as political prisoners. There have been at least 50 documented cases of torture by government

forces on peaceful demonstrators, and more than 1,700 individuals await trial today in Venezuela before a judiciary that is completely controlled by Maduro's government. This includes Leopoldo Lopez, who has been languishing in the Ramo Verde prison for almost a year.

In the year since the people took to the streets demanding more opportunity, accountability, and more freedom, the basic necessities have vanished from the shelves. It is one of the richest nations in the hemisphere, and its economy is in shambles.

Venezuela is also plagued with one of the world's highest murder rates, rampant corruption related to state assets, a 57-percent inflation rate, a junk rating on the global bond market, and unprecedented scarcity of goods as basic as toilet paper. Lately, things have gotten so bad in Venezuela under Maduro that they are no longer just kidnapping people. As the *Diario las Americas*, which is a newspaper in Miami, reported earlier this week, people are now kidnapping dogs and other pets in Venezuela and holding them for ransom. That is how bad things have gotten.

Why is this happening? Why has the cradle of Latin American independence—a country blessed with oil and energy wealth, with talented and hard-working people—become a failed state?

For starters, because it is modeling its economy after Cuba, which itself is a failed state.

Second, for years Venezuela has been in the grips of incompetent buffoons, one after another. First it was Hugo Chavez and now Nicolas Maduro. They have squandered the nation's riches.

Third, the country is being run by corrupt individuals. Just last week reports came out alleging that the speaker of the national assembly, Diosdado Cabello, is himself a drug kingpin.

Fourth, even with all the oil wealth Venezuela has squandered, it still possesses some of the largest oil reserves on the planet, but oil prices are dropping. In a country such as Venezuela where innovation and entrepreneurship are stifled, where wealth and power are concentrated in the government and its cronies, the entire economy is the oil industry. Ninety-six percent of Venezuela's export revenues come from oil.

So I am proud that in December the Senate and the House passed and the President signed a bill that sanctions human rights violators in Venezuela. It mandates that their assets be frozen and visa restrictions be placed upon them if they are involved in human rights violations. That is going to be critical going forward. As things get worse, more people in Venezuela will take to the streets, and the national guard in the country—which is nothing but armed thugs working on behalf of the Maduro government—will be tempted to crack down on people violently. So our legislation would impose visa sanctions and asset sanctions on individuals responsible for these human rights violations.

The good news is that the President has moved forward with some of these visa restrictions, and that is a very positive step. America should not be and cannot be a playground for Venezuela's human rights violators. But the financial sanctions part of the bill are long overdue. They are urgently needed because things are only going to get worse in Venezuela. People are only going to get more desperate. They are only going to speak out more. They are only going to demand freedom more. And I suspect, although I hope I am wrong, that the response from the Venezuelan Government will be more violence and more crackdowns on the people of their own nation.

If, God forbid, they use lethal force against their own people—which is a right they have reserved for themselves, a right the government has approved and has given authority to the national guard to use—we cannot simply stand by and watch as innocent people are killed or injured because the regime believes there will be no consequences.

So today I wanted to come here for a few moments and urge the President to do what I asked him to do in a letter last week, and that is to not sit idly by on the Venezuelan sanction law he signed last year but to use it—to use it immediately and decisively to make clear that the United States of America will not stand for repression taking place in Venezuela and that we will use the tools of our economy and the power we have given the President to punish those responsible for committing human rights violations in Venezuela against the people of that great nation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the Department of Homeland Security and the necessity to fund it.

Earlier today the President submitted a document for the authorization of use of military force to the Congress. I take the President's request very seriously. I look forward to the analysis that will be done by the Foreign Relations Committee, the Armed Services Committee, and debate on the floor.

Why did the President send it and why did so many in the Congress call for it? It is because everybody says that we have to do something about ISIL. You know what. I think we do have to do something about ISIL. What a ghoulish, barbaric terrorist group. There is no doubt there has to be an international effort to strike them from the planet and that the United States has to be a part of it.

But what comes out when we talk about ISIL is the need to have a strong, robust counterterrorism effort. If we are going to fight counterterrorism, we must fund the agency that has the principal responsibility for protecting the homeland.

The Department of Defense protects us against foreign invaders, but we have to also protect the homeland—whether it is against cyber security threats or other terrorist activity or other dangers that come to our country.

So why after 2 weeks do we have the Department of Homeland Security appropriations for fiscal year 2015? We are ready to vote on it. We have a clean bill. I am speaking now as the ranking or vice chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee. During fiscal year 2014, I chaired the committee. At the end of the year, when we worked on our omnibus, it was the will of the Congress that we would fund all government agencies except Homeland Security and instead put it on a continuing resolution until February 27 because there were those in both Houses who were cranky about the fact that President Obama exercised Executive authority in certain matters related to immigration.

So now we are holding up the entire funding for the Department of Homeland Security because some people are cranky with President Obama over him using an Executive order on immigration. These very people who are so cranky are criticizing him for being a weak leader. Oh, where is President Obama? Why doesn't he take strong and decisive action? When the President takes strong and decisive action, they not only don't like it, they are willing to hold up the entire funding for the Department of Homeland Security over this. What is this? Do we have a new math where 1 and 1 makes 14 or 5?

We created the Department of Homeland Security after the horrific attack of 9/11, and they need to be funded.

I am here to urge that we pass a clean funding bill to protect the Nation from terrorism, cyber security threats which are mounting every day, and so we can also help our communities respond to other threats.

I believe immigration does deserve a debate. I am not arguing about that, nor would I ever want to stifle a Senator's ability to speak on topics where they have strong beliefs and deeply held views, but let's move immigration to a different forum to talk about it.

In the last Congress the Senate passed a comprehensive immigration bill. It went to the House, and it sat there. Gee, it sat there. After a while it kind of sat there some more, and then it died as that session came to an end.

The President, frustrated that the House of Representatives refused to take up a bill and debate it through its committees and on the floor, acted through Executive order.

So my view is let's bring up immigration, let's move our comprehensive bill again with a full and ample debate, full and ample amendments. Maybe the House will finally get around to talking about immigration instead of talking about President Obama, and then we can pass the Homeland Security bill.

Three times last week the Senate rejected a procedural vote to take up Homeland Security. People can ask: Senator BARB, why did you do that? I voted not to delay but to move on. We Senate Democrats tried to move a clean Homeland Security funding bill. What does that mean? We focused only on the money. We said we did not want to have the five poison pill immigration riders that are in the House bill. We wanted to be able to take that out.

The President has been very clear. If we send him a bill that includes funding plus five poison pill riders on immigration, he will veto it. What is the consequence? We become a public spectacle in the world's eyes. We play parliamentary ping-pong with the President of the United States. We pass a bill because we want to have a temper tantrum. He vetoes it. It comes back. We have another debate where we huff and puff and hope problems will go away. We then try to override a veto and all the while we are eating up time.

The world is watching us. Our treasured allies are not the only ones asking about what is going on with the United States and how the greatest deliberative body has become the greatest delaying body. Our enemies say we can't get our act together internally to pass the very money to take them on, so they are going to try to bring it to us.

In the end, when all is said and done, more is getting said than done. Before we go out for the Presidents Day recess, I urge the Senate to pass this bill.

Tomorrow we are going to vote to confirm the Secretary of Defense, Dr. Ashton Carter. He has gone through the process and was reported out of committee. I look forward to voting for him.

Why are we going to move so fast to confirm Dr. Carter? Because we need a Secretary of Defense. We have to fight for America. We have to stand up for America. We have to be muscular and ready to deal with those bad guys. I agree with that.

I salute our military every day and in every way. They are out there on the frontlines, and their families are there to lovingly support them.

We are going to have a Secretary of Defense. Let's not forget we also have a Secretary of Homeland Security, Mr. Jeh Johnson. Instead of America having deep pockets to fight terrorism, the Secretary of Homeland Security will have empty pockets.

What is this? We are going to rush to confirm Dr. Carter, and I think we ought to. There is no dispute from me on that. Shouldn't we also rush to complete our work and fund Homeland Security? I think we should. We could do it tomorrow. We could do it tomorrow and pass this clean bill.

The Department of Homeland Security's mission is to protect America from terrorism and help communities respond to all threats, from terrorism to natural disasters. We are talking about the TSA, which protects our air-

ports. We are talking about the Border Patrol and ICE, so if we are talking about immigration, don't we want to fund the agents out there protecting our borders? Don't we want to continue to have cyber warriors securing our networks? We need to support the people who are dealing with bio and nuclear threats. We need to also continue supporting State and local first responders, firefighters, and EMS personnel in the different States so they can be ready—whether they are responding to a local disaster or something that has been caused by a despicable attack. We need to be able to pass this bill.

The Department of Homeland Security funding runs out on February 27, and my view is that instead of running the clock we should move this bill. I believe it could pass tomorrow and that we could get our job done. But, no, we are all going to go back to our home States and tell everybody how they have a government on their side and how they can count on us to fight for America. But the way to fight for America is to stop fighting with each other.

Let's try to find a sensible Senator and move this bill forward. I believe people on both sides of the aisle are patriots. I believe people on both sides of the aisle want to defend America. Let's come together on both sides of the aisle, right down the middle, and let's find a way to move this bill forward and have a debate on immigration. I don't want to stifle or stiff-arm it, but let's move this forward, and let's stand shoulder to shoulder doing our job to fund the agency that has the principal responsibility for protecting the homeland.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I am here to also talk about the DHS funding bill. I will say from the outset that I don't think the President did the right thing by taking this unilateral action. I think he has made it more difficult to pass immigration reform in this body.

Having said that, to attempt to use the spending bill in order to try to poke a finger in the President's eye, in my view, is not a good move. I believe that rather than poke the President in the eye, we ought to put legislation on his desk, and we ought to use this time—we have already used up 2 weeks trying to attach measures to a funding bill when we could have used this time to move actual immigration legislation.

Coming from the State of Arizona, we desperately need immigration reform. We desperately need to have more resources and better security on our border. We have needed that for a long time. We have had situations where part of the border gets better and then falls back. As soon as the economy ramps up again, we can expect a lot more flow across the border. We don't have sufficient border secu-

rity in the State, and Arizonans pay the price in terms of the cost of health care, education, criminal justice. We bear the brunt of the Federal Government's failure to have a secure border and to provide for a secure border.

We need to pass that kind of legislation. There has been a bill that has been introduced in the House and the Senate. I happen to be a cosponsor of the bill in the Senate which would help us to get a more secure border. That is one piece of legislation we could be moving right now so it could be put on the President's desk.

Second, we all know we need better interior enforcement. We need to make sure employers who employ illegal aliens are not able to do so. We need to make sure employers have the tools to find out if those they are hiring are here legally. That has been needed for a long time. It has been provided in other pieces of legislation. We could do a bill just on interior enforcement. We could be doing that now rather than simply making a statement on a spending bill.

We also need legislation to expand the guest worker plans and programs we have now. There has been legislation introduced in this body already to deal with high-tech workers. We need to make sure those who are educated in our universities and receive graduate degrees in the STEM fields are encouraged to stay. They ought to be encouraged to stay to help create jobs in this country rather than returning to their home country and competing against us. That has been needed, and that is recognized on a bipartisan basis. We could move legislation right now with regard to high-tech visas.

We also need to expand other visa categories. We need an ag worker bill to make sure areas where we simply don't have enough labor to deal with the needs we have on our farms—we need to pass legislation to do that. Legislation has been introduced and could be moved through now. We could be doing that.

We also obviously need to move legislation to deal with those who are here illegally now—the so-called DREAMers. They are here through no fault of their own. They were brought to this country when they were 2, 10 or 12 years, and they are now as American as you or I. They ought to be given a path where they can stay and have some kind of certainty moving ahead, but that needs to be done by Congress. It cannot simply be done by the President in Executive action. That kind of legislation could move here now as well.

We obviously need to deal with legislation for the broader class of those here illegally. We dealt with it in S. 744, which was introduced and passed in the Senate in the last Congress. It provided a way for those who are here illegally to get right with the law and to deport those who are in a criminal class but also allow those who are here and want to adjust their status to find a way to do so and to be able to stay.

Legislation such as that could move as well but instead we are spending weeks trying to make a statement on a spending bill.

So I hope we will actually do what this Senate is prepared to do and is ready to do again, which is actually to legislate—to move legislation through the committee process to the floor and on to the President's desk. That is how we ought to respond to the action the President has taken. I hope we will do so.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, over the last two weeks Republicans in Congress have insisted on playing political games with funding for the Department of Homeland Security. The same agency that supports States such as Massachusetts when disasters hit, the same agency that provides grants for equipment to keep firefighters safe when they rush into burning buildings, the same agency that helps train and fund local police, the same agency that tracks down weapons that terrorists can use to threaten our safety here at home, the same agency that keeps our borders and airports safe—this is the agency the Republicans are willing to shut down. Why? Why put America at such risk? Because Republicans want to protest the steps President Obama has taken to try to address our country's immigration challenges.

This is not a responsible way to govern. This is a dangerous way to govern. There are real threats out there, from ISIS in the Middle East to cyber threats, to acts of terror such as the one in Paris earlier this year.

DHS gives funding to State and local governments to help them prevent terror attacks. Massachusetts received over \$30 million in these grants just last year alone. If DHS shuts down, that funding dries up, leaving our firefighters, our police, and our EMTs hanging, putting the safety of every American at risk.

Think about the Customs and Border Protection agents, who screen people traveling into the United States through our airports, and the men and women of the Coast Guard who patrol our waters. They will still have to work those tough, sometimes dangerous jobs, but if the Republicans shut down the Department of Homeland Security, these people just won't get paid. Tens of thousands of workers nationwide could be working to help keep us safe and not get a paycheck to cover their groceries and rent. That is no way to treat the people who protect this country.

The solution is simple. Last year Democrats and Republicans agreed on a bipartisan bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security. That bill was ready to go until the Republicans decided they wanted to play politics. They decided to hold the Department of Homeland Security hostage to try to force the President to reverse an Executive order on immigration. That Department of Homeland Security funding bill is still ready to go. We could vote on it today and be done with all of this. Everyone who works to protect our safety would keep on working and keep on getting paid.

A few days ago the Boston Globe wrote an editorial about this, and they said:

The game of political chicken has to end with the Republicans blinking. It's one thing to disagree with a President's executive actions, but it's another thing altogether to hold crucial funding for a wide range of security programs hostage.

I couldn't agree more.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Feb. 7, 2015]

GOP SHOULD FOCUS ON FIXING IMMIGRATION, NOT COMPROMISING SECURITY

(Editorial)

In the latest political show vote on Capitol Hill, Republicans are protesting President Obama's executive orders on immigration, enacted in November, by trying to attach language undoing them to a bill that funds the Department of Homeland Security. The attempt is going nowhere: Earlier this week, Democrats in the Senate blocked the bill from reaching Obama's desk. At the same time, the president has vowed to veto any legislation that reverses his immigration measures.

This game of political chicken has to end with the Republicans blinking. It's one thing to disagree with the president's executive actions, but it's another thing altogether to hold crucial funding for a wide range of security programs hostage.

Republicans who believe Obama's executive orders are an abuse of power should instead look for remedy in the courts. If Obama overstepped, the surest way to reverse his orders would be through a judicial ruling. Meanwhile, Congress should pass a "clean" Homeland Security funding bill that funds the agency without the immigration language.

Obama enacted the executive orders only after the House refused to vote on a Senate-passed bill that would have overhauled our current immigration system. In retaliation, the GOP decided to attack the president's orders at the funding source: DHS. The Republican bill included so-called "poison pill" amendments that prevent the use of DHS funds or fees to enforce Obama's executive actions, which will benefit about 4 million undocumented immigrants by shielding them from deportation while also allowing them to apply for work permits. The amendments also prevent the use of any funds to continue implementing a 2012 order that protected some undocumented immigrants who came to the United States as children.

Along with some Republicans who voted against the bill in the House and the Senate, three former secretaries of Homeland Secu-

rity have also urged the GOP to stop using the agency's budget as a political weapon. Republicans Tom Ridge and Michael Chertoff, and Democrat Janet Napolitano, wrote to Republican leadership: "DHS's responsibilities are much broader than its responsibility to oversee the federal immigration agencies and to protect our borders . . . Funding for the entire agency should not be put in jeopardy by the debate about immigration." They called for a clean funding bill for the rest of the year, like the one Maryland Senator Barbara Mikulski and New Hampshire Senator Jeanne Shaheen filed last week.

Obama has said he would be happy to see Congress pass a law that would make his executive orders unnecessary. Republicans, instead of engaging in quixotic budget tactics, should get to work on a new immigration bill and stop compromising national security.

Ms. WARREN. Let's be clear. If Republicans in the Senate don't change course, they will shut down the Department of Homeland Security and compromise the safety of the American people, and they will have done it because a handful of extremists in the Republican Party are angry at the President because he is trying to fix what we all know is a broken immigration system. Well, if they are angry about the President's immigration policy, let's debate the President's immigration policy. Last Congress the Senate passed a bipartisan bill to address immigration. Let's debate that bill again. Or if they want to propose a new bill, let's vote on that. But don't play games with the safety of the American people.

The way forward is clear. We need to pass a bill to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRRIGATE ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President. I wish to discuss legislation I introduced yesterday that would help Native American irrigators, ranchers, farmers, and families fully utilize the irrigation systems in Indian Country. The bill, S. 438, is entitled the Irrigation Rehabilitation and Renovation for Indian Tribal Governments and Their Economies Act, or the IRRIGATE Act.

I thank my colleagues who have joined me as co-sponsors of this legislation, including Senators TESTER, HATCH, ENZI, DAINES and BENNET.

Careful management of water in Indian communities is essential if we are to ensure a reliable supply in the future. Many ranchers and farmers, both Indian and non-Indian, still depend on the Bureau of Indian Affairs, BIA, to deliver water for their needs.