

Michael passed away on June 14, 2015, after an 11-year battle against ALS, also known as Lou Gehrig's disease.

When Michael was diagnosed with ALS in 2004, he was determined not to let the disease control his life. He found hope in his family, friends, and faith. This hope encouraged him to become an advocate for the 30,000 other Americans who live with ALS.

Mike encouraged others and their families to be strong and resilient in the face of illness. His upbeat and optimistic personality was a constant reminder to take advantage of every opportunity that life hands us. He was a frequent visitor to my office. He was a tireless self-advocate who remained upbeat, compassionate, and personable—even in the face of a horribly debilitating disease.

Mr. Speaker, we can all learn from Michael Sullivan's exemplary service, selflessness, and love. He will be greatly missed. His friends and family are blessed to have known such an honorable man. In the words of Michael: "One day together, we can create a world without ALS."

#### PROTECTING SENIORS' ACCESS TO MEDICARE ACT OF 2015

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House showed leadership tonight in passing H.R. 1190, Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act of 2015.

The IPAB board was going to be very problematic for seniors, and H.R. 1190 is going to be a very important tool in correcting the wrongs of the Affordable Care Act and preserving access to health care. It would indeed have had an unelected board making Medicare spending decisions which, again, would be shifting power to Washington, D.C., and away from that all-important doctor-patient relationship, where it really should be.

We want to talk about savings in the medical field—and we need to—because not nearly enough is done, whether it was in the Affordable Care Act or other conversations around D.C. We need to talk about and work on actually achieving cost cutting, reduction of unnecessary costs delivering health care, litigation, and the time it takes to bring miracle pharmaceuticals to markets.

These are the kinds of things that we need to be doing to make health care more affordable and, indeed, more accessible.

#### CALIFORNIA DROUGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I am not at all sure it is going to be that controversial, but I was just looking outside the Capitol before I came in to make this presentation, and it is raining. It is a downpour. For those of us from California, it has been a long time since we have seen a downpour.

The Golden State, the seventh largest economy in the world and home to over 35 million people, is in the throes of a historic drought. This is the fourth year, and it is a world of hurt in California.

The economy is moving along. We are not complaining about the economy. Many parts of it are moving along. But for everyone in the State of California, whether you are in the far north up near Mount Shasta or way down here in the San Diego area, we are hurting.

There is a lot of talk. Water restrictions are taking place in every city, whether you are on the coast, up in the north, or in the far south at Laguna Beach. Wherever you happen to be in the State of California, these restrictions are tightening up on the ability of communities to prosper, grow, and keep their lawns green, but more important in some communities, to even live there.

In some parts of the Central Valley, down here in the Fresno area, there are communities that are out of water. Communities of 3,000, 5,000, maybe even 10,000 people, have virtually no water at all.

This is a problem today. As we look to the future, we are going to see the State's economy and population grow and the demand for water will ever increase, unless we do something. What we must do is develop a water plan for all of California.

Unfortunately, what we do most of the time in California is fight over water. There is the famous saying from Mark Twain: "Whiskey is for drinking. Water is for fighting over."

And so it has been ever since my great-great-grandfather came to California in the early days of the Gold Rush up here in the mother lode region. You couldn't mine without water. And fighting over that water was the order of the day, and it is today.

So as this entire State and much of the Southwest region—Nevada, southern Oregon, Utah, New Mexico, and even the western parts of Texas—suffer through this historic drought, we have taken to fighting in California. And I want to spend a few moments this evening talking about what we must do immediately and then a long-term solution for the State of California.

Immediate, we are going to have to seek help. The State of California is

using some bond money from past bond acts and some bond money from the historic passage of Proposition 1 last November to immediately try to fix problems that exist in those communities without water. And so that money will begin to flow to those communities, wherever they happen to be.

There are a couple up here in the Sacramento Valley and further down in the San Joaquin Valley. The deserts have always been without water, so this is not new to them, although it is more extreme.

It is good that the bond act can provide immediate relief, but the rest of the short-term solutions will come from Washington. I want to congratulate and thank the administration for providing \$110 million of money for a variety of projects. Some of those projects are to dig deeper wells for those communities without water, to find ways to improve the conservation immediately, and to set about other programs that are short-term in nature—all to the good. And that should continue.

In the days ahead, we are going to take up the appropriations bill for water. In that appropriations bill, we should direct the administration to do what it is doing—and to continue doing it through this drought—and that is to focus all of those resources on the immediate drought that is occurring.

Whether it is aid for ranchers and farmers or cities, it makes no difference. It is broad and it needs to be done, and it should line up with Proposition 1 of the last November ballot. That is both short-term and long-term. So the Federal Government supports those projects that would be funded under that \$7 billion bond act that the citizens of California voted for in an overwhelming majority.

But I would also like to talk about the long-term here. Because droughts will come and go, and we must be prepared not only in California, but across the West.

For many years, the Department of Water Resources in California has looked at the problem and has made many, many suggestions; but until about 4 years ago, those suggestions were never put together in a comprehensive plan.

I am familiar with this. I am a water warrior in California. I have represented this part of California for nearly 40 years, the great Central Valley of California. I will put up another map so you can get a better look at it.

So the plans that were put together by the California Department of Water Resources deal with the Sacramento River, which flows south, and the San Joaquin River, which flows north from the Fresno area. This is way beyond Sacramento. Mount Shasta and Oregon, it is way up there.

These are the two great rivers of California, together with the Colorado, which is way to the south. It flows into an area here which is called the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta. This is the

largest estuary of the Western Hemisphere, which is on the West Coast. From Alaska to Chile, there is no other estuary as important to fish and species of all kinds and to the environment and the economy of California.

As this water flows down the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River, it is collected here and pumped south into the San Joaquin Valley and over the Tehachapi Mountains way down here to southern California. That is the Great Southern water project and the Federal water project.

But the result of that pumping is an extreme decline in the environment of the delta, Suisun Bay, and San Francisco Bay. Along with it, the salmon and other species have been largely decimated by those projects.

So what are we to do? We will take the information that has been developed over these many years by the California Department of Water Resources and develop a comprehensive plan.

One plan, which actually dates back some 60 years now, is one that would take the water around the delta and deliver it to the pumps down here at Tracy. That plan, first proposed in the forties and then in the fifties, was taken up by our current Governor, Governor Jerry Brown, in the late 1970s and early 1980s. It was called the Peripheral Canal—peripheral, that is around the delta, delivering water to the pumps.

I represented the delta at that time, and I said: Governor, what you have managed to create here is the great vampire ditch.

The Peripheral Canal was big enough to take the water from the Sacramento, depriving the delta of the freshwater that it needed for its environment, and deliver it to the pumps.

So we had another great water war. It actually went on the ballot, and the people of California decided not to build that canal. And so there it sat until the second iteration of our current Governor, and he decided it was time to address this problem.

And so now his suggestion is, instead of a canal, bury it underground so nobody can see it. He said: Don't worry about the canal. Don't worry. You will never see it.

I said: Because it is not going to get built?

He said: No, no. Because it will be underground.

Two massive tunnels, each 40 feet in diameter—about as tall as this Chamber, actually, if we consider this is probably 50 feet in here—big enough to take all of the water out of the Sacramento River half of the year, creating an existential threat to the delta.

Something needs to be done, no doubt about it. So by cobbling together the plans that were developed by the Department of Water Resources and others, I put together what I called, a Water Plan for All California.

By the way, this tunnel was first priced at \$25 billion and did not create

1 gallon of new water—not 1 gallon of new water.

□ 1945

What it did was to create an existential threat to the delta, in that it was big enough to deprive the delta of the fresh water half of the year. I said: Governor, that doesn't work. Let's look at this in a serious way that can create water for California's future.

This proposal was put together from plans that the State agencies had developed in the past. I commend this to anybody that really wants to look at what California's water future could be. Instead of a battle royal, which we are now commenced with as we fight over these tunnels, and \$25 billion—oh, by the way, there is a new iteration of it, and they are throwing aside most of the habitat restoration and most of the environmental restoration and just going for the straight tunnels and just a little bit of mitigation.

Let's do something different. Let's create water that California will need in its future. Let's build a system that will actually deliver more water for California, while protecting the environment, and that is what this plan is all about, a water plan for all California.

There are the following elements in it: conservation; recycling; storage; fixing the delta, which actually has to be fixed; letting science run the process rather than politics; and make sure you protect the water rights that have been in existence for more than a decade and a half—excuse me—a century and a half.

These are the principal elements, and we are going to go through them one at a time and explain why, if we were to spend, let's say, the full \$17 billion, the current cost of the tunnels, and that is the first bid; that is not the final cost. Let's say we would spend that \$17 billion.

Let's allocate some of it for conservation, agricultural conservation. Now, every agriculturalist—and I am one—in California will say, Yes, but we are already conserving water. Indeed, we are, and a lot of water conservation has taken place, but that much more can be done again.

There are somewhere, by the estimates of the State, 3 to 4 million acre feet of new water, available simply through conservation, and that does not include the urban conservation.

Now, understand, in today's drought, conservation is on everybody's mind, and in fact, it is mandated by law and executive order, but we can do maybe 3 million acre feet of new water. That is enough for over 120,000 homes a year per million acre feet.

Secondly, recycling—I often say, and I think this is more or less accurate, that the fifth largest river on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere are the sanitation plants in Southern California.

Whoa, what do you mean the fifth biggest river? Well, consider this: the

Colorado River, over here, abutting Arizona and Nevada, water is taken from the Colorado River, 200 miles into the Los Angeles Basin.

Water is taken from northern California, the Sacramento River, in a canal, pumps here at the delta, in a canal, 5,000 feet over the Tehachapi Mountains, into the Los Angeles Basin. That water is cleaned once. It is used in the Los Angeles Basin, cleaned again, in most cases, to a higher standard than the day it arrives in southern California; and nearly all of it is dumped into the ocean.

What? You do that in California? Well, we do. Fortunately, Orange County, a bastion of conservatism, is far ahead of the rest of the State and probably the Nation in water recycling. We need to do more of it.

For a few million, a couple of million dollars—excuse me, a couple of billion dollars, we could recycle at least a million acre feet of new water in southern California, water that is already there, water that is not being used.

In northern California, the San Francisco Bay area, for my friends in San Francisco, you are taking what you tell the world is the cleanest water in America, right out of Yosemite National Park, piping it across the Central Valley into the San Francisco area, clean it—well, you really don't have to do much cleaning because it is already clean—use it once, then you pipe it a mile offshore and dump it in the ocean.

Recycling is necessary in every part of California. Another million, perhaps, more acre feet of water could be available through recycling.

So conservation, recycling, 3, 4 million acre feet—we are getting close to what California needs in the future.

So where are you going to put the water? Even in the midst of a drought, we have had heavy rain flows—no place to put the water.

My colleague from northern California, the Sacramento Valley, Mr. LAMALFA and I have introduced a bill to build an off-stream storage reservoir here on the west side of the Sacramento Valley, a reservoir that could hold 2 million acre feet of water—well, slightly less—and that water would be available when needed.

It could flow down the Sacramento River, sweetening, pushing back the saltwater in the delta; or it could be used for agricultural purposes in the Sacramento Valley or down in the San Joaquin Valley.

It also gives flexibilities to the great reservoirs of Shasta, the Oroville Reservoir on the Feather River, and the Folsom Reservoir here on the Sacramento River, giving flexibility to the water managers.

When it is needed for salmon and other species, you could use the water out of Sites Reservoir. When it is needed for agriculture or for water quality in the delta, you could use it out of Sites Reservoir, keeping the cold water in Shasta, Oroville, or Folsom that is

necessary for the salmon that spawn in those rivers.

Storage, off-stream storage, off-stream storage here, just east of Contra Costa, in Los Vaqueros Reservoir, off-stream storage further south down here in Los Banos at the San Luis Reservoir, and the biggest off-stream reservoir of all, the great aquifer of the Sacramento, San Joaquin Valley, the great Central Valley of California, arguably, the second or third largest aquifer anywhere in the world, one that is now seriously overdrafted, as Californians, agriculture, cities, and others thirst for the water in this drought.

These storage reservoirs in northern California are just one part of the storage systems that are needed for the future. The other part actually exists here in southern California, out here along the coast, the West Basin, the San Fernando Valley, the San Gabriel Valley, the Santa Ana in Orange County, and as you move east into Riverside and San Bernardino.

These are all historic aquifers that could be available to take that recycled water, put it back in the ground, pull it out, clean it, and recycle and recycle and eventually, these aquifers, many of which are contaminated, would be clean and available for the future.

We could probably add all of the capacity of these aquifers in southern California and have greater storage capacity than the largest reservoir in the State of California, which is Shasta Reservoir, way up here in northern California.

By using the aquifers as a storage facility in what we call conjunctive water management, when you have a lot of rain, you store it—store it off-stream, store it below ground in the aquifers. Then when you have your dry periods, as California historically does, you can take that water out, but you cannot take out as much as currently being taken from these aquifers in California.

We are seeing the collapse of the aquifers in the San Joaquin Valley. We are seeing the land subsiding in some places, as much as a foot a year as the water is extracted, so we have to stop that, and so water management becomes extremely important in the process.

I want to now turn to the delta, put this delta map back up and remind us, the Sacramento River coming down, the San Joaquin River coming north. From the north, the Sacramento, from the south, the San Joaquin, meeting here in the great delta of California—this delta is seriously at risk, as I said a moment ago.

What to do about this? The Governor's plan, to take water around it, to deliver it to the pumps down here, I think, creates an existential threat. Don't build something that could destroy the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere.

Instead, build something that is the right size, recognizing that while the

delta is imperiled, perhaps by earthquakes, perhaps by sea level rise, nonetheless, all the plants call for water to be pumped out of the delta, even if it is taken around the delta.

The first thing to do, right now, is to armor, strengthen those key levees in the delta that are necessary for the transfer of water to the pumps, for the protection of the cities here on the eastern side, and to make sure that you are able to always be able to take that water through the delta. It is called the armored delta.

Under the Governor's plan or my plan or any other plan, those levees are going to be used for at least the next two decades, if not for a much longer period of time. Improve the delta, levees, and that is a job for the Federal Government.

I talked earlier about what could be done immediately by the Federal Government, and that is to secure some of these key delta channels by improving the levees on those channels. That is step one.

Step two is what I call science. This area, the richest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere, home and nursery to salmon, to other species, such as the delta smelt and many other species, requires very careful attention and very careful scientific study.

We are talking over here, in a place called Rio Vista, about building a science center, bringing together all the State and Federal agencies so they can work in a collaborative science program. That is a great program called the Rivers Program. There are other science studies that are underway.

You have to let science drive this process. You cannot allow politics to drive it; otherwise, you put at risk the communities in this area; you put at risk the environment; you put at risk the fish species, and you put at risk the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere.

Keep in mind that the Congress of the United States, twice in the last 4 years, has passed legislation that removes the environmental protections for this estuarine system and simply grabs 800,000 acre feet of water that was meant for the environment and sends it into the southern valley, into the southern valley here.

It is a rip-off. It is part of what has taken place in California since the gold miners came in the 1850s, and that is, if you want water, you simply take it from somebody. In this case, you are taking it from the delta, from the environment, from the agriculture; and you are pushing aside the environmental protections. Don't do it. It is not necessary.

There is another thing, in addition to fixing the levees, and I call it the "Little Sip, Big Gulp." Here it is. This is a map of the delta of California. Sacramento is up here, the confluence of the American River and the Sacramento River. That is the State capital. This is the delta here.

We were talking about it in the larger map. San Francisco Bay is over here, Suisun Bay and the rest. This is the heart of the delta. Stockton is down here. Tracy and the big massive pumps at Tracy, capable of taking well over 15,000 cubic feet per second, are down here in this area.

The tunnels that the Governor wants to build would start here, travel through some of the richest agricultural land in the delta, or in the Nation, agricultural land that has been in production since the 1850s and 1860s, along the Sacramento River, displacing, oh, maybe 4 or 5 miles of habitat and agriculture and communities along this area. The tunnel would come down into this—the tunnels would come down into this area.

\$17 billion—why would you do something that, first of all, is large enough to allow for the destruction of the delta? Why would you spend all that money, when a good portion of that project is already built? This is it.

This is the Sacramento Deep Water Ship Channel, an ocean, a channel that begins at San Francisco Bay, comes up the Sacramento River, and then, in a channel that was built by the Army Corps of Engineers, all the way up to the Port of Sacramento here in West Sacramento, on the other side of the State capital.

This is a deep water shipping channel. Ocean ships come into San Francisco Bay and come all the way up here. It is a pretty good economic activity. Agricultural products are shipped out.

I was over that way this last weekend, and they have log decks. I guess these are logs from the various fires that have occurred in California, and those are going to be shipped off to China. I sometimes wonder why we don't use those logs for the things that we should be making in America, but that is another subject for another day.

So what is an alternative? I call this the little sip solution, "Little Sip, Big Gulp solution." Take the water out of the Sacramento River here, 3,000—not 15,000—3,000 cubic feet per second. We know how to do that. Fish screens are already built to do that.

□ 2000

Let it flow down the Deep Water Channel to about here, just north of Rio Vista. Put in a single ship lock and a pump.

Alternative one: put it in a small pipe through the delta down here to this area; and then, in an open channel along what is called Old River, take it down to the pumps at Tracy, 3,000 cubic feet per second.

You could do that most every day of the year, and it could deliver 2 million acre-feet of water to the pumps at Tracy in most years. In this drought year, it wouldn't be possible.

A second alternative would be to take it down the Deep Water Channel, 3,000 cubic feet, to the shipping lock and the pump, put it into a canal that

goes behind Rio Vista here, crosses Sherman Island at the confluence of the Sacramento and the San Joaquin Rivers, and over to Contra Costa County to the pumps.

This is a very interesting solution because this solution creates a fail-safe solution for about 7 million people that live in the San Francisco Bay area, because this particular route intersects six aqueducts: the Solano aqueduct here, this would intersect it down here in Contra Costa; East Bay Municipal Utility aqueduct; the Contra Costa County aqueduct; the Los Vaqueros aqueduct for the Los Vaqueros river; zone seven, down here in the Livermore area, over here in this area; and also the South Bay aqueduct, going all the way down to Silicon Valley.

What has happened, if this solution were chosen, should the need ever arise for some reason, these critical water districts that supply the water to this entire Bay area could get access to the Sacramento River water. So if, for some reason, the delta was to become saline as a result of a collapse of a levee system or any other reason, we have a fail-safe solution for the entire Bay region, except Marin County, which has its own water system.

Either of these is a system that would be right-sized. That is a Little Sip big enough to provide 2 million acre-feet of water, which is roughly 40, 45 percent of the amount of water needed south of the delta for southern California, for Los Angeles, and for the San Joaquin Valley.

That is the Little Sip solution: a route through the delta, a pipeline from here to Old River, and then an open channel on the east side of Old River to the pumps, or a canal across Contra Costa and Solano County. Either of them would work. And it would be a fraction of the cost of the massive twin tunnels that would come this direction, destroying the agricultural communities here in Portland and Clarksburg and putting at risk the entire delta because of the enormous size.

This is a 15,000-cubic-foot-per-second tunnel system. Now, granted, they are only going to build three of the intakes here on the Sacramento River. Okay. It is good to have only three. That gives you 9,000, which is roughly two-thirds of the water going down the Sacramento River half of the year.

So what does that mean for the delta? It means the delta is going to be salty and deprived of the freshwater that this estuary needs. And all they need to do is to put in one more intake, and then they can take all of the water half of the year.

Don't do it. Never build something that could be so destructive of such a precious natural resource as the delta.

So this is the Little Sip.

Where does the rest of the water come? It is called the Big Gulp. Even in this drought year, there have been two very heavy rains that have sent a surge of water down the San Joaquin and down the Sacramento. The pumps were

turned on—not to their full might, but the pumps were turned on, and the water was shipped to the south.

Okay. It worked. Can it work in the future in normal years?

There is sufficient water in the delta in a normal year to get another 2, 2.5 million acre-feet of water out of the delta, itself, and that is the Big Gulp. So you combine a small facility with a Big Gulp when the water is available in the delta.

Now, keep in mind, this project and the twin tunnel project that the Governor is proposing both require storage south of the delta. Neither project will work. And, in fact, the California water system today will not work without storage south of the delta.

That is why—to back up to a map of all California—we have to have storage offsite, at Sites Reservoir. There is talk of enlarging Shasta Reservoir, way up here in this area. There is talk of building a new reservoir here on the San Joaquin River at Hanford's flat. There is talk of enlarging—in fact, this one is almost certain to happen—enlarging Los Vaqueros Reservoir. The San Luis Reservoir down here needs to be rebuilt because of earthquake safety, and it could be expanded.

There is another reservoir site just south of it, Los Banos Grande. That is another large reservoir. And, of course, the aquifers in the entire Central Valley of California, and we have already talked about the aquifers in southern California.

So you have to have storage south of the delta. If you have storage south of the delta, then the Governor's plan or my plan, the Little Sip, Big Gulp plan will work. Storage is absolutely essential in all of these configurations. Fail to do the storage, and nothing is going to work.

Let me just review what we have been talking about here. We have been talking about a water plant for all California.

Conservation, to be sure, the great agricultural areas—even over here in the Salinas Valley—conservation along this entire area, conservation in southern California, the great metropolitan areas, and in the Bay area. In doing so, the State's own estimate was 5 million. Let's just say you get 3 million acre-feet. Agricultural conservation, urban conservation, 3 million acre-feet of new water, water that is currently unavailable but there.

Recycling, we talked about recycling here in southern California. A \$2 to \$3 billion investment will give you 1 million acre-feet of water, and you already have the storage systems in place, the underground aquifers of southern California. Similarly, recycling in the Bay area.

Sacramento, right here, starting just a month ago, a new recycling program, a \$2 billion recycling program in Sacramento to recycle water—some for that area, the rest to put clean water down the river rather than some of the water, which is a little shady.

So recycling, another million acre-feet at least, maybe more, as you bring on the recycling in the Bay area.

Now we have got 3 to 4 million acre-feet of water.

Storage systems, it is estimated that the Sites Reservoir can add in this drought here, were it available, would have been 900,000 acre-feet of water in this drought year. Of course it is not built; it is not available. But on average, it should provide some 500,000—400,000 to 600,000 acre-feet of water annually out of Sites Reservoir; plus, as I described earlier, the ability to reoperate the great reservoirs and, together, be able to perhaps get even more water as a result of Sites Reservoir. The other reservoirs can provide additional water also.

So we ought to be able, through these processes, to get somewhere near 5 million acre-feet of new water for California. If we have conservation, if we have the storage and we are able to get through the current drought, it is a safe bet that 5 million acre-feet of annual water yield will carry California into the next 30 to 50 years and beyond that, depending on population growth and technologies.

I had not mentioned the use of this water out here. Well, that is the Pacific Ocean. Desalinization and recycling use exactly the same technology. Recycling happens to be cheaper, in that it takes less energy to clean recycled water than to clean the ocean water because the ocean water has a lot of salts and other things in it, and it is just more expensive. But clearly, desalinization is also in our future.

Down here, in the San Diego area, a new recycling plant is going online this year. They have been talking about one in Santa Barbara that actually was built but then mothballed because it rained again. But that one in Santa Barbara is likely to go back online as a result of the current drought and in anticipation of future droughts.

So desalinization is also in California's future.

Those are the basic elements: conservation; recycling; creation of new storage systems; fixing the delta, the levees; Little Sip, Big Gulp strategy; science-driven process.

Keep in mind, you have got to be right on the science; otherwise, you are going to destroy this extraordinarily valuable habitat of the delta and other places.

Finally, you had better be paying attention to the water rights and the laws of California, which, unfortunately, in the first iteration of the bill that passed Congress 4 years ago, just blew aside California water rights. So if you want to start a big, big water war, if you want to heighten and enflame a water war in California, push aside the water rights which, incidentally, is now taking place as a result of the drought.

That is a Water Plan for All of California. It is here. It is available. My Web site has it. I recommend it to anybody that is interested in a solution for

California's long-term water problems; and also, I recommend to people that we have the Federal Government in the short term align its water policy programs from the EPA—the Environmental Protection Agency—the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Army Corps of Engineers, that those water programs in the short term be aligned with the State of California's bond act so that we can promote, augment, and advance the projects that would be undertaken in the \$7 billion water bond that the California voters passed last November.

My plea to those who think the tunnels are the solution is: stop, take another look. Take another look at the Little Sip, Big Gulp solution. This actually was something that was first proposed by the Natural Resources Defense Council. We were working with this about 5 years ago. They came up with the Little Sip, Big Gulp name, and with some modification, it is now a proposal that would cost a fraction of what the twin, massive, 40-foot-in-diameter tunnels would cost.

So, for California, there is a future. It is the Golden State. It is an economy unmatched by any other in the United States. It is an economy particularly—well, actually, the entire State's economy is stressed as a result of the drought. And if we take the kind of steps that I have been talking about here, we will be able to provide the water that California needs in the next drought and in the years to come as the population grows and as the economy grows.

So that is the water plan for all California. There are many other pieces of the puzzle, one of which I am going to take just a second to talk about. And that is this week, as we take up the appropriations for water programs in the State of California—actually, water plans for the United States, not just the State of California—we ought to be mindful of a project called the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a program that has been in effect for half a century. It takes the royalties from the offshore oil and minerals onshore and allows much of that royalty to be spent on preserving the special places of America—the wildlife refuges, very unique habitat areas—setting aside those areas, using that money to buy up the land and, in some cases, to buy up easements so that the land will forever remain available to future generations in a more natural state. That is the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Unfortunately, the authorization for it expires this year, and at the moment, there is no perceived movement by the Congress of the United States to reinstitute and reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

When I was deputy Secretary of the Department of the Interior in the mid-nineties, we used this fund to set aside redwood forest off along the coast of California, to protect the Everglades of Florida, to set aside some of the land

along the sand dunes on the Great Lakes. This is a project for all of America, one that is worthy of being reauthorized and properly funded.

With that, Mr. Speaker, perhaps enough about California's drought. No, I will take that back.

□ 2015

Mr. Speaker, we have got a problem in California, short term and long term, and it deserves the attention of the Congress of the United States because California is the seventh largest economy in the world and critically important to the future of this Nation.

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

#### INJUSTICE AT HOME AND ABROAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been a tough week, for all Christians in the country have lost three brothers and six sisters in the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina. The whole country mourns—well, probably not everybody. Evil has those who support it and wallow in it, as did the evil perpetrator of the killings.

Our prayers continue to go out to the immediate family members and to the church family members for their peace and for their comfort because those of us who are believers know that those we have lost are at the foot of the Saviour in Paradise.

I learned today that the President will be going to speak at the funeral. I recall a speech in Arizona, and so as I encouraged our prayer caucus tonight, we should be praying for the President to be a uniter as he speaks.

I thought about the way a great President named Abraham Lincoln concluded his second inaugural address. The war was not over; there was great hatred and bitterness. Of course, he mentioned in his inaugural address—talking about North and South—both read the same Bible, both pray to the same God, and each invokes His aid against the other.

He goes on to give what is one of the great theological treatises on the nature of God; he quotes from the Old Testament a couple of times, but with all the killing that occurred during the Civil War, he ended trying to encourage uniting. I know there are those who advise the President that he should not let a good crisis go to waste, but for many of us, the hope and prayer is that at this week's funeral, he will be a uniter.

Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln closed his second inaugural with the words: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds,

to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Mr. Speaker, that was a man who sought to unite, who knew there was a Heavenly Father to Whom we could pray and Who would answer our prayers. I hope and pray that will be the outcome at the funeral of my brothers and sisters in Charleston, South Carolina.

Of course, then there is the judge side of me. Having sentenced people both to prison and to death, the judge side of me says, from what we know, it sure cries out for the death penalty, but we will let the justice system in South Carolina take care of that.

In the meantime, as we think about injustice, it is also hard not to think of our friends and our allies in Israel who have trouble finding any friends. They are persecuted on every side. We got this report from the U.N., an article talking about it from Marissa Newman of The Times of Israel: "Israel slams 'politically motivated and morally flawed' U.N. Gaza report."

The article says: "Israel on Monday said it would 'seriously' evaluate the United Nations Human Rights Council inquiry on the Gaza conflict, while politicians from left and right slammed the international body for bias and declared that the international investigators lacked access to evidence."

The article goes on down further: "The report is biased," said Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu in response. "Israel is not perpetrating war crimes but rather protecting itself from an organization that carries out war crimes. We won't sit back with our arms crossed as our citizens are attacked by thousands of missiles."

The article says: "The Human Rights Council 'in practice does everything but worry about human rights,' the prime minister charged. 'The commission spends more time condemning Israel than Iran, Syria and North Korea put together.'"

It seems that these are the times that cry out for a moral, pragmatic, and unified response to the anti-Semitism that is growing—it is just unbelievable—in Europe and in the United States colleges and universities. It is incredible.

Mr. Speaker, the Bible talks about times when right will be wrong and wrong will be right; perhaps we are entering such an era. A country like Israel is under attack from virtually every front, every side; and Palestinians, radical Islamists, and Iranians declare that they will see that it is annihilated.

Their leaders make statements such as "we are glad that they are gathered in Israel so that we can annihilate them all at once," and the U.N. basically sees somehow level parties on the same plane: terrorists and people who promote democratic beliefs and carry them out, allow people to vote, believe