around something that helps the economy grow in our ski resort areas across the country.

As so many times on issues of even greater importance, there is a fork in the road for this House, a decision to make, between the partisan-charged route of job-destroying Republican water-grabbing legislation or the opportunity to fix this bill and come together to make sure that our ski resort communities are secure in their water rights and can continue to justify their capital investments and grow. That is the choice we have with the Polis amendment.

This amendment improves the bill. It helps turn the bill from a controversial bill into something that I think the vast majority of this body can and will agree on.

The amendment ensures that any U.S. Forest Service directive will not condition ski area permits on the transfer of title of any water right or require any ski area permittee to acquire a water right in the name of the United States.

That is the issue from the directive on 2011 that gives us a reason to even have the bill; but instead of addressing that issue in a focused way, this bill has tried to essentially rewrite centuries of water law in a superficial 2-page bill that has the impact of destroying jobs in Colorado and other mountain resort communities across the country.

We can and we must do better—better for my district in Colorado. Many of the ski resort counties—like Pitkin County represented by Mr. TIPTON, and Eagle, Summit, and Grand Counties that I represent—that benefit directly from the ski resort economy have come out opposed to this bill because it actually hurts their economy rather than helps it.

If the very folks that this bill was supposedly written to help oppose this bill, what on Earth are we doing here?

Thankfully, we have an amendment right now that can fix this bill. We tried in committee, we tried through the manager's amendment, and now, we are trying on the floor. Let's do it. Let's fix the bill.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and, unless it is incorporated, oppose the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I have to say, the debate on the underlying bill in this amendment I find rather interesting—no, maybe bizarre is better than that.

The issue here is whether we should protect the State's responsibility to write water law or allow the Federal Government to extort from private individuals that water. That is what the issue is all about here.

He had bipartisan support when the bill was heard in committee, but then it changed for some reason. Now, we have in front of us the Polis amendment, which would very narrowly put this protection only to ski areas and not to everybody else that has private property rights.

The consequences if this were to become law—which it is not going to, I am convinced, with this amendment—but the effect of this would be this: okay. Ski areas are protected this year. Next year, it will be a rancher that is abused, so we will come back, and we will write a law to protect the rancher.

Next, it will be a water conservation district someplace that will be affected because of the directive, so we will come back and fix that. Then it will be some municipality someplace that will be affected because they don't have water rights because it was extorted by the Federal Government, so we will have a fix for that.

Madam Chairman, there is a better way to do that. Let's just simply respect states' rights to regulate water law and to codify that with this language.

Finally, just let me make this observation. The effect of adopting this, as I mentioned in my opening statement, as it relates to tribal rights, what this amendment really does more than anything else is it puts ski resorts' water rights above tribal rights. That is really what the adoption of this amendment does.

So I would say that the underlying bill is a bill that is the responsibility of us as the legislative branch in this Congress. It deserves our support. This amendment does nothing to advance that at all and should be defeated.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''no,'' and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado will be postponed.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YODER) having assumed the chair, Ms. FOXX, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3189) to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer, relinquishment, or other impairment of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, had come to no resolution thereon.

DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO MAKE TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3370

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 93

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 3370) an Act to delay the implementation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) In section 12—

(A) in the matter preceding the new subsection added by the amendment made by such section, strike '', as amended by the preceding provisions of this Act, is further'' and insert ''is''; and

(B) in the new subsection added by the amendment made by such section, strike ''(e)'' and insert ''(d)''.

(2) In section 14, before the closing quotation marks that immediately precede the period at the end insert ''and''.

(3) In section 30—

(A) in the matter that precedes paragraph (1), strike ''is'' and insert the following: '', as amended by section 27 of this Act, is further'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter that precedes subparagraph (A), strike ''subparagraph (B)'' and insert ''subparagraph (C)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) strike ''subparagraph (A)'' and insert ''subparagraph (B)''; and

(II) strike ''subparagraph (D)'' and insert ''subparagraph (E)'';

(C) in paragraph (2), strike ''and (C) as subparagraphs (D), (E), and (G)'' and insert ''(C), and (D) as subparagraphs (D), (E), (F), and (H)'';

(D) in paragraph (3), in the matter preceding the new subparagraphs inserted by the amendment made by such paragraph, strike ''subparagraph (B)'' and insert ''subparagraph (D)''; and

(E) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the matter preceding the new subparagraph inserted by the amendment made by such paragraph, strike ''subparagraph (E)'' and insert ''subparagraph (F)''; and

(ii) in the new subparagraph inserted by the amendment made by such paragraph, strike ''(F)'' and insert ''(G)''.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FAITHFUL EXECUTION OF THE LAW ACT OF 2014

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 3973 will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered