

considered part-time, and they would be cutting hours back to 28 or less due to ObamaCare.”

Spiritwear, an Idaho-based clothes company that specializes in licensed college and football team colors and logo apparel is poised to more than double their business this year.

Mr. Speaker, that is great news, isn't it?

However, the company is on the cusp of having 50 full-time employees. She is upset that what seems to be her best solution, hiring independent contractors, would give her less control—and it would—over worker hours and how much involvement they can have in other parts of the company.

Darden Restaurants, parent company of such well-known and very good restaurants as Olive Garden and Red Lobster and Longhorn Steakhouse, they tested making some workers part-time last year. The chain has decided not to make all full-time workers part-time, but it has not ruled out a broader shift toward that very thing, part-time work.

Then in January 2014, Target announced that they would no longer provide health care coverage for their part-time employees.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 29 minutes remaining.

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have some time left, but I think, colleagues, that you get the picture here. We have a real problem right here in River City—and by that, I mean the Nation's Capitol, but I also mean the entire country—and we have to do something about it.

We can't just keep kicking the can down the road, as we have done with Medicare and Social Security, needed reforms, protections, strengthening to make sure that these programs are there for our children and our grandchildren.

But here we have created a whole new entitlement program that really, when you look at it, it is punishing both our seniors and our young because it is forcing the young people who finally reach that 27th birthday, and they can no longer, now, be on their parents' health insurance plan. Maybe they have been living at home, post-college, and the parents have finally just said, Honey, you are just going to have to move out. We need our space. We need a little privacy.

These young people have a job, and they want to move out with a friend or someone that they went to school with. They want to move on with their lives. They are adults now, and they have got a job, and they find that, to get health insurance, it is astronomical. Yet the salary that they make, their entry-level salary, is too much to make them eligible for a subsidy.

So what are they going to do? They are going to pay that fine, that \$95 fine, and maybe even when it gets to \$600, they are going to pay that, and

they are going to go bare. I use that as an expression of being not having health insurance coverage. They may be 10-foot tall and bulletproof. They may take care of themselves. They may not do skydiving and some risky sort of behavior. But you never know when that Mack truck is going to run you down and you are going to end up in the emergency room.

So we want to make sure we get this right. So far we have gotten it totally wrong. But we can do better. We will do better. We need to do it in a bicameral, bipartisan way.

I mentioned my colleague, Dr. PRICE, and his bill. I mentioned my other colleagues on the House GOP Doctors Caucus as we continue to work on things, my cochair, Dr. PHIL ROE, a fellow OB/GYN from Tri-Cities, Tennessee, former mayor of Kingsport or Johnson City. We can do it and we will do it.

But, Mr. President, you said, if you like what you have, you can keep it. You also said, if anybody, Member of Congress, has a better idea, bring it to you and you will consider it. Well, I have mentioned two bills here tonight. We have other ideas, and you have 2½, almost 3 years left in your second term. You want a legacy? We are going to help you have a legacy, and a good one, but you have got to work with us. It is a two-way street.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives and this great deliberative body that we are part of. I appreciate the delivery of Mr. GINGREY a little bit earlier.

I wanted to take us, if I could direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the situation in the Middle East. And we know that the implication in our Constitution is that the President conducts the foreign policy. I would teach that class if I had the time, and I don't disagree with that.

But also, this Congress has responsibility. We have responsibilities, for example, that are specific within the enumerated powers of the Constitution. And if anyone thinks that the House of Representatives or the United States Senate or Congress itself, as a body, doesn't have a voice on foreign policy, I would direct them to the enumerated power of the power to declare war.

Certainly, we have also foreign policy responsibilities here, and we appropriate funds for foreign aid and a good number of other resources that go to

help out countries that are either our allies or hopefully will become our allies one day. There is a lot that we do that has to do with foreign policy. We have a Foreign Affairs Committee. We have a Select Committee on Intelligence. We have Armed Services. All of those things are committees that deal with issues that have to do with our foreign relations and our foreign policy.

So, because of that, Mr. Speaker, a number of us in this Congress have taken a responsibility to step forward and be engaged in foreign policy, and also to have a voice and be better informed than simply letting the message come from the White House.

SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY AND THE DROUGHT IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I see that my friend from Utah has just filed the rule, and I appreciate the gentleman from Utah, not only what he has done here today, but his leadership. I want to take a moment to make the message here as the topic that is coming up now is a rule that was referenced by the gentleman from Utah about the San Joaquin Valley and the drought in California.

I have traveled out there, and I have been there to see about 250,000 of 600,000 acres that were manmade drought. And now we have nature-made drought that is coupled with the manmade drought, and I intend to support the legislation that comes to the floor tomorrow.

I thank especially the California delegation for leading on this and helping the rest of the country understand how important the water issues are around the country.

I have worked with water and water management all of my professional life, and these issues come close to home when you either need water or you can't get rid of it. And that is what this bill is tomorrow. It is about needing water and directing it to the best resources.

But if I would, Mr. Speaker, revert back to the topic at hand, and that is the topic of the foreign policy and the very solid constitutional claim that Congress has to be engaged in foreign policy, to help manage that foreign policy and to appropriate resources to foreign policy.

To that end, a number of us in this Congress, and not nearly enough of us, have been involved in foreign policy and free trade agreements and traveled to a good number of countries to engage with people in other parts of the world to help stitch together and knit together our relationships that are so important.

□ 1700

So if I could, Mr. Speaker, I would like to first paint the big picture of what the world looks like. I will offer a little bit of history first and then paint a picture of how the globe looks today.

I will take us back to World War II, which was the most dramatic shift in power that the world has seen, at least

in my understanding of history. We saw the clash of the Imperial Japanese and the Nazi regimes that threatened to swamp the entire world. Having fought back a world war on two fronts, in Asia across the Pacific and in Europe, here in America, we see this as the time that America rose to become a superpower. As we saw then, immediately after World War II, we saw the Cold War begin, and the Soviet Union formed as a product, a part at least, a product of World War II, clashing with the United States in that Cold War that lasted for 45 years.

It was two different ideologies. It is free enterprise, capitalism, it is God-given liberty challenged up against the forces of the former Soviet Union, which were atheistic and communistic and a managed economy from top down.

We saw what happened. We saw how that was resolved, Mr. Speaker.

It was described, I think, best by Jeane Kirkpatrick, who was the Ambassador for Ronald Reagan to the United Nations, when she said, some time around 1984, as she stepped down as Ambassador to the United Nations, she said, What is going on in the world, in this Cold War, in this clash, this competition between the two huge ideologies, what is going on between the Soviet Union and the United States is the equivalent of playing chess and Monopoly on the same board. And the question is, Will the United States of America bankrupt the Soviet Union economically in the Monopoly part of the game before the Soviet Union checkmates the United States of America in the chess component of the game?

Monopoly and chess on the same board. The Russians, building missiles and expanding their military capability and trying to outdo the United States to the point where we would have to capitulate while we were pushing our economy. This growing, dynamic free enterprise economy was competing against the managed economy, the communist economy of the Soviet Union.

And what happened was, the monopoly game, the monopoly winners won out, and the Soviet Union was bankrupted, and because of that, the country collapsed and imploded upon itself around about 1991, and they had to reform back around to—they could say former Soviet Union, Russia—Russia and some of its federation countries, safer for the world because that clash of the two huge ideologies has been diminished significantly. The threat of a nuclear war has been diminished significantly thanks to Ronald Reagan, Margaret Thatcher, Pope John Paul II, and some will say Gorbachev.

Those four personalities engaged together were the leadership that brought about the dynamic that brought an end to the Cold War. In the aftermath of the Cold War, there were those sitting around—cold warriors—to celebrate the end of the Cold War, a

victory for the free world. Not only the United States, but our allies. A victory for the free world,

As they celebrated, they got ready to raise their glasses, one of them, one of them said, Just a minute. Don't be too soon to celebrate because think of this: The world will not long tolerate a lone superpower. There will be allegiances and alliances made that you have not imagined that will line up against the United States, and if those forces line up against the United States—and they will—we will find ourselves with competition and enemies that we have not seen before in the world. Some of those will be an alliance that does include Islamic nations lined up against the United States.

That statement was made in the late part of 1991, I believe it was, and that would be at least a decade, roughly a decade before the attack on the United States on September 11, 2001. That very prescient comment that was made before they celebrated the end of the Cold War, before the glasses went up, Mr. Speaker, there was a realization that we would have new enemies that would form, and they would form coalitions against us.

So because of that, we should be aware of where we are today. Those enemies that have formed against us, a lot of them have been radical Islamists that have decided that they want to kill Americans because they disagree with our ideology. We should not believe that somehow it is just a matter of, we live in one place on the globe, and others live in another place, and we end up at war with each other with people trying to kill us. That is not the circumstances in that way.

Instead, it is competing ideologies. People that have a different belief system. People that believe that they need to have enemies so that they could demonize those enemies and mobilize their people, and if they can mobilize their people against a demonized enemy, they have a better chance of hanging onto power.

Those are the circumstances in Iran, where they describe the United States of America as being “the great Satan,” and it is the public policy of Iran to declare America to be the great Satan. They teach it in their schools, and they are spinning centrifuges for the purposes of developing nuclear weapons and a means to deliver them. The President has contended that his negotiations with Iran have slowed down their nuclear weapons effort, and perhaps they will be able to talk Iran into stopping their nuclear efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I will take you back to September of 2003, where I sat in on a meeting with Ambassadors to the United States from France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, and they sat around with a group of Members. The discussion was about whether we should open up negotiations with Iran on their nuclear capability, and after I listened to the three of them and every Member that was around that table, of

which there were not very many. I was the low man on the seniority totem pole at the time. I had to wait my turn to speak, of course. Then I asked the Ambassadors, Why are you here? What is your objective in meeting with us to have this discussion about opening up negotiations or a dialogue with Iran? Their answer was, We want to you open up dialogue with Iran so that you can help us because we think that our three countries—France, the United Kingdom, and Germany—at the table with the United States, we have a chance of convincing the Iranians not to continue any further with their nuclear endeavors. September 2003.

I listened to that response, and I said, If we open up negotiations or open up dialogue with Iran, what are you prepared to do, then, if we take step one into these negotiations? Their answer was, We want to open up dialogue. That is our objective, as if there wasn't a step two, three, four, or five.

But we know that once you have opened up the dialogue, you have to be willing to follow through with something. So I said, If the United States steps up to negotiate with Iran, and it is clear that they have an objective to develop a nuclear weapon and a means to deliver it, if the United States steps up and opens that dialogue, then you are suggesting that we enter into formal negotiations. In those negotiations, you understand that if we fail to convince Iran that they should stop nuclear development, are you prepared, then, to go to the United Nations for a resolution? Are you permitting sanctions against Iran? If the sanctions aren't effective, are you prepared to blockade Iran? If you are prepared to blockade Iran, and the blockade is not effective, and they continue to develop a nuclear weapon, and somebody has got to step up to that line in the sand with men and equipment and munitions and military supplies and put blood on the line along with the treasure, are you prepared to step up to that line in the desert sand? Of course the Ambassadors were real nervous about that discussion long before I got to the part about the line in the sand in the desert.

As they expressed their will, which was, Let's just open up dialogue, they had to also recognize that when you open up dialogue, you start down the path of dialogued negotiations, United Nations resolution, sanction, blockade, and eventually, if Iran is committed, there is going to be a showdown.

I said to them, You see, if we start down this path, we have to be prepared to follow all the way through, and let's understand that we are prepared before we start because I will tell you that Iran is committed to developing a nuclear weapon and a means to deliver it. They are committed. It isn't just a feint on their part. It isn't just a motion in that direction. They are committed, and if we aren't committed to go all the way to putting that line in the sand and lining up on that line in

the sand and following through—and I said these words this way—then Iran will play us like a fiddle, and when this is all done, they will have their nuclear weaponry, and they will have their means to deliver it, and we will just look like a bunch of foolish negotiators.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this up because now here we are, these 10-plus years later. Iran is in a position where they would like to have the rest of the world think that they have slowed down and maybe given up on their efforts to develop nuclear. They still take a public position that they never really were developing a nuclear weapon, that they were just enriching uranium for the purpose of generating electricity in their oil-rich country. Of course no one should have ever bought that from the beginning.

But our administration seems to think that if they negotiate in good faith, the Iranians are going to negotiate in good faith. I think it indicates some naivete about the minds of the people that want nuclear weapons.

A nuclear weapon capability is far more valuable to Iran in their negotiations than talking nice to the United States. Especially, why do they care about us four friends if they are teaching their children to hate us? If we are the great Satan, they don't have a lot to gain in public opinion in Iran by talking to the United States.

So we should understand their motives. Their motives are to dominate that part of the world with a nuclear capability to threaten that part of the world. They have already said that they have targets chosen in the United States. That is an Iranian public position today, and if you look at the method that they could have to deliver a nuclear weapon, which might only be weeks or months away—

We can have inspectors in Iran that are examining anything that we want to examine, but that doesn't mean the Iranians don't decide that they are going to throw a public relations tantrum and kick all of the inspectors out of Iran and only be 2 or 3 months from having that nuclear weapon.

So they can choose now when the time is right for them, when the time is right for them politically to make that move. Even if they have slowed this down and even if they are not putting more centrifuges in place, the question is, are they still spinning? What happened to the enriched uranium? Even if they dilute their enriched uranium down below 20 percent, it is another chemical reaction to enrich it again—it doesn't take very long—at best, they have slowed their operations down in order to pick up \$4 billion or more into their economy that they need. Their economy is suffering because of the sanctions.

So we are being played again. It is just part of the fiddle. We are being played like a fiddle. We have been played like a fiddle for the last 10 years. The conviction and the resolve

from our leaders isn't strong enough, and I have said from this floor, Mr. Speaker, that if I were the lead guy, the lead person on negotiations with Iran—and I will just take us back to the Ahmadinejad era so we can think of the personality on the other side of that—we would do it this way:

I would just simply back-channel information probably through the Swiss in the diplomatic channel, back channel in to the Ahmadinejad and the mullahs, and it would be this, presuming that I were calling the shots here on foreign policy.

It would be, Mr. Ahmadinejad and Iranian mullahs, I have decided—we, here in the United States—but I have decided the date beyond which you will not be allowed to continue your nuclear endeavor, and I have taken the liberty to put an "X" on the calendar that sets that date. Now, you don't know that date, but I do, and beyond that date, you will not be allowed to continue your nuclear endeavor whatsoever it takes to do so, and it will be dramatic, and the world will know. You will certainly be the ones to get the first announcement because that is when the kinetic action starts. That is the implication—not the word.

Then I would say, But, you know, if you hustle up and decommission and tear down your nuclear development equipment and you do that with our inspectors to our satisfaction or with an intermediary that we can trust, we will help you with that, and we will help you with some resources to do so. We will even help you with public opinion so that you can save face as you back up from this clash of civilizations that is bound to come if we let you go down this path.

Again, Mr. Ahmadinejad, you don't know that date, but I do, and we can forestall the inevitable if you decommission and tear this down. But you have got to mean it. It can't be a bluff. It has got to be a real "X" on the calendar. It has got to be a real date. Maybe no one else knows it. Maybe only the leader of the free world knows that date. But he has got to mean it.

Short of that, we get played like a fiddle, and here we are, stretching this thing out again, with the world an ever more dangerous place in that part of the world. I can stand there and listen to the intellectuals and say—Europe, for example, and I mentioned the foreign travel, and listen to them say, Well, of course a nuclear capable Iran is preferable to a military strike to take it out. They utter that in the same fashion that people in this country would utter, Well, of course it is the CO₂ emissions from U.S. industry that is one day going to cause the Earth's temperature to go up, as if somehow that was the conventional knowledge that was accepted by everyone.

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, I reject that way of thinking. The idea that a nuclear-capable

Iran is peripheral to a military strike to take it out isn't a rational conclusion that one can draw. You have to start with a flawed premise to get to that conclusion and say it is rational. There are a lot of rational conclusions that are built upon false premises, I might add, and that would be one.

A nuclear-capable Iran threatens all of the Middle East. Their immediate target would be Tel Aviv. And Tel Aviv, by the way, is not very highly populated with anything other than Jewish people, which would be their ideal target. So it is a short missile strike from Iran to Tel Aviv. They know that. They certainly know that in Israel. And today what they know is they don't have the level of confidence that the United States is standing quite as strongly next to Israel as we have in the past. That message has been sent by our President in our foreign policy for some time.

The idea that Israel should go back to the '67 borders, as if somehow the '67 borders were defensible, well, they were defended in '67 and they were defended in '73, but they expanded their defensive borders because of that. Israel traded some land for peace. It didn't work out very well. The Gaza Strip is a place to launch attacks on the Israelis from Lebanon, and Hezbollah is occupying large chunks of Beirut in Lebanon. That becomes a place where there are now some tens of thousands of missiles that are lined up there aimed at Israel, an ever more dangerous place.

Somehow we think that we can talk nice to the Iranians and they are going to treat us nice and somehow good reason is going to get something accomplished with negotiations. Mr. Speaker, it is very rare to ever see a diplomatic error take place in negotiations. Instead, you have to have leverage, and that leverage is going to be economic, military, or perhaps political. It could come mostly from other entities. If you don't have those forces in place and something that you can give, do, or give up, you are not going to just get, well, we like you, Mr. President, and you said that if we unclenched our fist, you will extend your hand. I didn't see Iran unclench its fist, but I saw our hand extended. And some of our hand was played, and some of our hand—or whole cards have been seen now and shown to the other side. It is a very, very dangerous proposition.

Looking over there in the same neighborhood as Syria, it became the issue du jour that Syria had weapons of mass destruction. It is hard to make the case in this Congress that Syria had weapons of mass destruction, that, of course, none of them came out of Iraq, because it is conventional belief over on this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, that Iraq didn't have weapons of mass destruction, regardless that Saddam gassed his own people, regardless that we did secure yellowcake uranium in Iraq. We did take it out of Iraq

and transport it across the Atlantic Ocean, down the St. Lawrence Seaway and up to Canada so it could be converted into power generation. In spite of all that, nobody seems to think that any of that could have gotten across the border or any weapons of mass destruction, such as gas, could have gotten across the border into Syria, even though we all agree that Assad used gas against his own people.

We would like to put an end to that. But once the President showed his hand on that and the British lost the vote on the floor—I believe it was in the House of Commons—the President came to Congress and said, well, now I want to strike Syria, and why don't you give me the authority to do that? That was an implied directive, Mr. Speaker, not a direct one, not a formal one. It was clear that neither the House nor the Senate had an appetite to go into military action in Syria.

So we fell back on Putin and the Russians to be the negotiators with the weapons of mass destruction in Syria. We saw the promise that the gas was going to be accumulated, picked up and transported out of Syria by the end of the year. That was the end of last year, not the end of this year, Mr. Speaker. So now it is going to take perhaps another 6 months and another and another and another.

It is a static position in the world now where Syria has digressed down to the point where it is hard to find a friend in Syria. The President said here in this very Chamber at his State of the Union address last week that we are going to oppose the regime and we are going to support our friends in Syria. It is hard to find friends in Syria. This conflict may have gotten to the point where there is nobody. Neither side is a side that is either going to support us or one that we should support. My message is that Syria has devolved downward into a very difficult, static, and ugly situation with a lot of blood and death that threaten to spill over.

Of course, we have the nuclear threat that has slowed down but not necessarily been suspended in Iran. In the rest of our foreign relations around that part of the world, we are 2½ years or more into the Arab Spring, and in almost every one of those changes—some regime changes, some civil war, and some that reached a static impasse—the result of that hasn't been favorable to U.S. interests, and you can go country after country, the conflicts around.

So several Members and I took a trip over into that part of the world right before Christmas to assess the situation. We need to do that because assessing the situation from here, it turns out that there is a lot of information that is not very reliable that comes out of the White House and the State Department with regard to that part of the world. So we traveled into Egypt, into Lebanon, into Libya, and into Israel, among other places. We

met with their top leaders in most all of those countries and on down the line. Of course, we met with our State Department and got the in-country briefing.

It works out that the short version is that Lebanon is a mess. I think it is intractable, and I don't know how you resolve it. In Libya, the civil war didn't resolve it. The radical militant Islamists still control Benghazi, and it is not safe enough to go there for their government, let alone for representatives of our government. So Libya is at an impasse. They would like to be able to put together a functioning government in Libya, and I am impressed with some of the people that are in leadership there. But if they can't control Benghazi, Benghazi militants can come in and threaten Tripoli, for example, and have.

Egypt, though, Mr. Speaker, has turned, I think, in a very good and positive direction in that they rose up and threw Morsi out. Morsi—the face and the voice of the Muslim Brotherhood in the country of the origin of the Muslim Brotherhood—was rejected by the Egyptian people, and 30 to 33 million of 80 million Egyptians went to the streets mid last summer to demand that Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood be taken down and out of the government. It was a popular uprising. And with the pleadings of the popular uprising, then you saw the Egyptian military take charge. We have met with them, myself eye to eye at least twice and at different levels within the government and two different trips over there.

They have written a constitution, one that protects even Christian religious interests there and commits resources to rebuilding our burned churches in a place like Egypt. They have ratified a constitution in that election the 14th and 15th of January. Now you have elections set up for a parliament, and behind that, a Presidential election. I expect we will see a legitimate civilian government in Egypt sometime in less than a half a year. At that point, the voice of the Egyptian people at least is structured to be heard through the government, a relatively new experience for the Egyptians.

So there is a lot that has been turning in the world, Mr. Speaker. I mentioned the threat to Israel, that we need to stand more closely with them, shoulder to shoulder, and make an even stronger commitment to support them. They are going to have to face up to and they are going to have to decide if they have to take action against an existential threat, which is a nuclear-capable Iran.

We need to decide whom we are going to be friends with. It is not the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. Even though it looks like this administration has lined up with the Muslim Brotherhood, it is not the Muslim Brotherhood. The American people don't support the Muslim Brotherhood, and they don't

support the militant wings and arms that are components of the Muslim Brotherhood and those affiliates of those militant wings and arms that might say they are not but operate in concert, especially in places like Syria.

We need to understand that this world is lined up to some degree against us. We have had friends in that part of the world that go back deep and long. Egypt is one of those countries. It was 1954 when President Eisenhower made it clear that he was going to stand with the Egyptian people. We have had them as allies, and we have worked military operations in the Sinai for a long time. We need to restore those relationships with the Egyptian people and I think the soon-to-be-legitimized civilian government of Egypt. We need to let people know, like the United Arab Emirates, that we are going to stand with them as they are going to stand with us. We want to stand with the moderate interests in the Middle East that want to engage in petroleum production, diplomacy, and the growth of their own economies.

We have had a good strong interest in the Middle Eastern part of the world, and it has been fractured time after time after time by the results of radical Islamists and Muslim Brotherhood coming into these countries throughout this long, long period of the Arab Spring, summer and fall times 2.5.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is looked to by the rest of the world to lead. That means we need to have a strong State Department, a strong foreign policy, and a clear and coherent moral message. It has got to be that we stand with our friends. We should understand that just because there is an election in a country, that doesn't mean that democracy is going to be manifested or it is going to be the solution.

Mr. Speaker, we need a stronger foreign policy, we need more Members of this Congress taking an interest, and we need a President that gets it right.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2954, PUBLIC ACCESS AND LANDS IMPROVEMENT ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3964, SACRAMENTO-SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY EMERGENCY WATER DELIVERY ACT

Mr. BISHOP of Utah (during the Special Order of Mr. KING of Iowa), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-340) on the resolution (H. Res. 472) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2954) to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3964) to address certain water-related concerns in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, and for other purposes, which was referred to