

Eleven days after these attacks, the Department of Homeland Security was created to make a more secure America that is better equipped to confront the range of threats that we face.

As the current chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, I am working to ensure that the Department is provided with the resources to accomplish their mission. Working to keep our Nation safe is one of my top priorities, and one of the primary roles of the Federal Government.

Together, we must work to make sure that terrorist attacks like 9/11 never happen again.

**PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6691, COMMUNITY SAFETY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2018, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES**

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1051 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

**H. RES. 1051**

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6691) to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the definition of “crime of violence”, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 13, 2018, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the under-

lying legislation. This rule makes in order one bill dealing with a pressing legal issue.

Mr. Speaker, under the Immigration and Nationality Act, or INA, an immigrant convicted of certain felonies is subject to deportation. In order to qualify for this particular provision of the INA, an immigrant must be convicted of a crime of violence.

The statute defines “crime of violence” as an offense that, “by its nature, involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person or property of another may be used in the course of committing the offense.”

This has been a longstanding and roundly accepted policy of the U.S. Government. For years, we have deported dangerous criminal immigrants.

However, earlier this year, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that how the law defined “crime of violence” was impermissibly vague. The result of the ruling threw all of these kinds of deportation cases into question.

Historically, this realm of immigration law has never been an area of law to which the Court has applied constitutional rights. But writing the ruling for the majority, Justice Elena Kagan applied due process rights afforded by the Constitution to the removal process of criminal immigrants. Because the Court applied the Constitution in this manner, it concluded that the term “crime of violence” could be applied arbitrarily and unpredictably.

Chief Justice John Roberts warned of the path down which this ruling could lead as it pertains to other provisions of Federal criminal law. In fact, his concerns were justifiable.

In May, the Tenth Circuit struck down a similar provision in another portion of Federal law relating to using weapons in the commission of a crime. That particular case resulted in the sentence of a man convicted for firebombing a store with a Molotov cocktail being vacated.

Then again, in August, the D.C. Circuit struck down convictions of two men who were convicted for a violent criminal act. This ruling opened up the possibility that convictions for criminal acts involving firearms can be overturned.

Mr. Speaker, this is the backdrop against which we consider this bill today. This legislation, the Community Safety and Security Act, plugs the gaps in Federal law created by these recent court rulings.

It specifies the circumstances by which a criminal offense should be construed as a crime of violence. In particular, a crime of violence will include crimes of murder, sexual abuse, kidnapping, robbery, domestic violence, human trafficking, and many other types of violent acts.

By clearly outlining Congress’ intent of what constitutes a violent crime, this bill will eliminate the Court’s concerns about ambiguity and will allow our law enforcement agencies to con-

tinue carrying out their duties to protect the American public.

Mr. Speaker, law and order is a crucial component of a healthy society. We are beginning to see the effects of feel-good policies in some locales on the crime rate in those areas, particularly the violent crime rate. When law and order breaks down in our communities, the residents suffer.

I am confident there is no intention to erode law and order or embolden criminals. However, the effects are just the same. That is why this legislation is so critical.

We need to ensure that there is a clear definition of violent crime, so that courts across this country are not boxed in by this Supreme Court ruling and do not have to vacate sentences or release violent criminals onto our streets.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent more than 2 decades fighting crime, both at the Federal level and in my own community. The impact of crime, and violent crime in particular, on victims is heartbreaking. Watching someone suffer the worst of societal ills is bad enough when justice is served. But watching a victim suffer not just the crime, but the lack of justice, is infuriating.

We need to fix this loophole carved by these rulings and defend our communities from criminals. We need to stand up for victims of violent crime and see that the justice that we all want for them is served.

I support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman, my friend from Colorado, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate, and I am proceeding under the assumption that we will conclude this pretty rapidly.

Once again, my Republican colleagues have decided that the best way to govern is through a rushed and closed process, all in an obvious attempt to throw red meat to their base. Let’s not parse words. This is an ill-thought-out bill trying to score cheap political points with the Republican base.

Mr. Speaker, this bill takes up no small feat. It attempts to utterly redefine what is meant by “crime of violence” in our criminal code. Our need to revisit the definition is due to the fact that the United States Supreme Court has now twice held that what is known as the residual clause under this particular area of our criminal code is unconstitutional because it is so broad it violates a person’s constitutional right to due process.

Such a reality does not invite this body’s attention, but demands it. However, with that demand comes a great responsibility, a responsibility to take the time necessary to do it right; a responsibility to ensure that members of the committee of jurisdiction, and other Members of Congress, are consulted; a responsibility to ensure that

we hear from public defenders, prosecutors, judges, and criminal justice and immigration reform experts, for this bill touches upon all of these areas, and not one person, let alone an expert, has been consulted in the drafting of this bill, at least not in the light of day.

Ostensibly, this bill was dropped to address the Supreme Court decisions just noted, the most recent of which was handed down in April of this year. I presume the composition of the bill was started soon after the Court dropped its decision, and, therefore, the author had from that time until last Friday to prepare today's bill. I think it only fair, then, that we have a similar amount of time to consider such an important matter.

Of course, I know that is not going to happen. No, instead, my friends across the aisle have, once again, insisted on engaging in fly-by-night legislating and, in so doing, shutting out not only Democrats but Republicans, and not only Democrats and Republicans, but the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 96th closed rule of this session, and that is record-breaking in and of itself. That means that Members don't have an opportunity to have input to substantive legislation, and somehow or another, with no hearings, or any markup or anything, a measure like this is before us.

While home for the district work period, my constituents didn't talk to me about replacing the definition of a "crime of violence" in the Federal criminal code. They did talk to me about a number of circumstances, but they didn't talk to me about liquefied natural gas, one of the other bills the House is going to consider this week.

On the other hand, they did ask about what Congress is going to do to address the gun violence epidemic ravaging our country, including, regrettably, today, in Cincinnati, Ohio.

They asked about what Congress is doing to ensure that DACA, the Dream recipients, and temporary protected status holders have a pathway to citizenship, and they asked what Congress is going to do to address the Nation's need for serious and sustained investments in our infrastructure.

□ 1230

And high among the things that I heard from my constituents was about the cost of drugs and the rising cost of insurance.

Let us also include with those very important issues, including today, there are nine legislative days until the government runs out of money. I had representatives from the National Association of Air Traffic Controllers visit me an hour and a half ago explaining to me what a government shutdown would do to that particular agency.

We once again are forced to stare down the very real possibility of another government shutdown. And what are my friends across the aisle doing to thwart that inevitability? Nothing.

Mr. Speaker, we have some serious issues to tackle, and so I am discouraged to be on the floor today focusing on yet another messaging bill. I call on my Republican friends to put their perplexing fear of governing aside in the final days before we leave Washington, so that we may get to the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would make an inquiry of my friend. I have no Members here to speak, and I am prepared to close if my friend is.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We were supposed to have a speaker speak to the previous question, and she may not be here to discuss it.

Mr. Speaker, last night at the Rules Committee, I heard my colleague, Mr. BUCK, discuss how one of the root causes of rising crime in this country is our broken education system.

And now I will say to the gentleman that Ms. BONAMICI has arrived, and like him, she was just a little bit delayed. So she will speak to this issue once I finish my comments, and then that will be our only speaker, I would urge my friend.

I also would like to say, it is not often in this body that Members say that they made a mistake. In an exchange last night in dialogue with my friend from Colorado, he commented that Florida's violent crime had gone down, and I mistakenly said to him that he was in error.

He was correct. It has gone down. I indicated to him last night that I would speak with him more about it. And there are some particulars that I will share with him, not so much in this particular setting, but I will get a chance to talk to him. There are some things where crime did go up, and Florida still ranks fifth in the Nation in violent crime, but I do want to say to him that I was mistaken when I spoke last evening.

Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with my friend from Colorado about education, and I believe every Member of this House is concerned about the education of our children in this country. We are failing our younger generations. We need to make monumental strides in this country to better our education system, and I believe that starts with childcare.

And I always make a caveat there, because when I am asked about education at home, and my opponent brought it up often in the election that I was involved in, and I constantly reminded her that the Federal Government only provides less than 7 percent of the budgets of our local communities. So this is largely a matter where we talk a lot up here, but the local communities are where the rubber hits the road.

We need to make these strides because of the problems that we are seeing. We obviously need more pre-K, we obviously need more Head Start, but in

the past decade, the cost of childcare has increased by 25 percent. In 33 States and the District of Columbia, infant care costs exceed the average cost of a 4-year in-state college tuition. This is a huge financial burden that is only worsening.

Mr. Speaker, families need access to a system that provides high quality, affordable early learning and care that will prepare children for success without breaking the bank.

That is why, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Education and the Workforce Committee Ranking Member SCOTT's bill, H.R. 3773, the Child Care for Working Families Act. This bill will establish a new Federal-State partnership to provide high quality, affordable childcare from birth through age 13.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is bipartisan consensus that our Nation's families, on behalf of our Nation's children, who are our future and our future leaders, must be able to access affordable, high quality childcare and other early learning opportunities to fulfill their potential and succeed in college and career and in life. In fact, a recent poll done by the First Five Years Fund found that 89 percent of voters, including 82 percent of Republicans, support making quality early childhood education more affordable for working families.

Last year, I joined Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT and more than 120 of my colleagues to introduce the Child Care for Working Families Act.

This bill would ensure universal access to quality early learning programs for all families making less than 150 percent of their State's median income.

Today, the average annual cost of full-time, center-based childcare in the United States exceeds the average annual cost of in-state tuition.

In Oregon and other places around the country, lower and middle-income families are forced to pay up to 30 percent of their annual income on childcare, with many of the lowest income families unable to afford care at all.

The Child Care for Working Families Act is a bold solution to fix this national problem. The legislation would mean that no family of four earning an annual household income below \$139,000 per year would pay more than 7 percent of that income for quality childcare.

This legislation would also ensure that early learning teachers and caregivers finally get the time, attention, training, and resources they deserve. Whether in childcare, preschool, pre-kindergarten, or in other early learning environments, every child should receive quality care.

Parents are out working hard. They deserve the peace of mind that comes from the confidence of knowing that childcare and early learning professionals are well trained, and that means well paid. No longer would a full-time early learning professional have to enroll in public assistance to make ends meet.

Decades of research shows that properly nurturing children in the early years of life is instrumental in supporting enhanced brain development, cognitive functioning, and emotional and physical health. Research also shows what all of us know: investing in quality early learning programming leads to better educational outcomes, stronger job earnings, and lower crime rates.

Quality early learning helps prevent and mitigate academic achievement gaps, it provides indisputable long-term benefits for our Nation. And nothing returns more money to the Treasury than investments in early learning programs. Our Nation receives \$7 in economic benefit for every \$1 invested in these programs. That, my colleagues, is a good investment in our future, our children. This bill is not only the right thing to do, but also the smart thing to do.

The Child Care For Working Families Act lays out the path of what early learning in America could and should look like. If we want a promising future for our children, if we want strong and stable families, we must make sure that all families can access high quality early learning opportunities. Quality childcare is a national priority. This bill deserves immediate attention and, importantly, bipartisan support. Our future is at stake.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the people's House should be approaching our work in a manner that is fair to all Americans, in a manner where the committees of jurisdiction hold hearings and markups, in a manner where experts in the field are consulted, in a manner where members of both parties have an opportunity to offer amendments and debate the contents of the bills that come before this body.

None of that happened with today's bill.

Instead, for reasons beyond understanding, we have to vote on a bill that no person in this body had sufficient time to understand, let alone time to consider the far-reaching consequences it could have on people living in this country and on our Constitution. The fact that Republican leadership insists

on governing in such a manner is, as always, as disappointing as, in my opinion, it is shameful.

Now, listen: 96 closed rules. I am fond of talking about when I first ran for Congress in 1992, the then leadership of the Republican Party did an effective job saying to the American public that the then leadership of the Democrats were having closed rules and closing out the process.

Newt Gingrich was the person that was the author of that, in many respects in retrospect, brilliant strategy. That was one of the tenets that he put forward, that it was not right for Democrats to have as many closed rules as they had at that time. I don't remember the exact number, it was a number, but it didn't come close to 96. And now, if we flip the script, what we have is 96 closed rules.

I serve on that Rules Committee with my friend from Colorado. And repeatedly, you look around this room, on an ordinary, regular order process, we would have at least five or six speakers on either side to substantive legislation, or we would have had an opportunity for Members to offer amendments that could have been considered in a germane or non-germane manner to be able to come out here on the floor.

The American people are being shut out, not just Republicans and Democrats. It is not right, and we shouldn't go forward that way.

I promise you that we are doing a disservice when we do not allow for measures of this consequence. We don't know what the outcome of this is going to be.

I can't disagree with a thing my friend from Colorado said with reference to the measure and the clarification that is needed after the two Supreme Court decisions, but please know this: the proper way to do that would have been for the committee of jurisdiction to hold hearings and then to have a markup and then come to the Rules Committee. But what we saw was, bam, right straight to the Rules Committee, no hearings, no markup, no experts, no prosecutors, no public defenders, no input, and the public not having an opportunity to participate. It is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate my friend from Florida and his views on open and closed rules and the importance of open rules and the importance of amendments and the importance to an open process.

The fact is the Democrats continue to focus on closed rules versus open rules, ignoring the structured amendment process, which has routinely been used by both majorities.

If we are going to use that metric for measuring openness, I want to clarify a couple of points for the record. Sixteen of the closed rules cited by the minor-

ity were rolling back regulations under the Congressional Review Act, which does not allow for amendments, to ensure that only a majority vote is required in the Senate.

□ 1245

Another 12 closed rules were for bills where the majority put out a call for amendments but received no amendments.

And if my friends from the other side of the aisle believe that open rules are the only measure of success, it is only fair that we clarify for the American people the Democrat majority's record.

In the 111th Congress, under Speaker PELOSI, the majority had zero open rules. However, as we have already stated in the past, comparing open to closed rules ignores the structured amendment process. This majority has made it a priority to make in order large numbers of amendments for floor consideration, a majority of those with a Democrat sponsor and/or cosponsor.

In fact, as of July 24, 2018, Republicans in the 115th Congress, in which we serve now, have provided for the consideration of over 1,650 amendments on the House floor; over 745 Democrat amendments, or 45 percent of the total number of amendments; over 630 Republican amendments or 38 percent of the total amendments; and over 280 bipartisan amendments, or 17 percent of the total amendments.

In the 114th Congress, the last Congress to have served, the Republican majority allowed over 1,700 amendments to be considered on the House floor.

In the 113th Congress the Republican majority allowed over 1,500 amendments to be considered on the House floor.

And in the entire 111th Congress, Speaker PELOSI, and the Democrats allowed less than 1,000 amendments to be considered on the floor.

I just wanted to make sure that we put into perspective the arguments from my friend.

Mr. Speaker, it is really fairly simple. Law and order is being jeopardized as it relates to the term, "crime of violence." This bill plugs the gap left in our laws by the court's ruling.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of different viewpoints across this country about our criminal justice and immigration system, but there are two nearly universally held beliefs by Americans: one, criminals should receive justice; and two, criminal immigrants should be deported.

While we can debate many aspects of our criminal code, we must not waiver in our commitment to protect the American people from criminals and to bring justice to victims. There have been numerous cases lately of immigrants committing violent crimes against Americans. Some of these cases are too recent to even mention by name here today. We must stand with victims and their families and remove criminal immigrants from this country. It is unjust to do anything else.

Our country is great, in part, because of our commitment to law and order. It is wrong to pursue a softening of our response to violent crime. To do so would invite more crime and produce more victims.

We must uphold the rule of law in America. Americans want it. Americans deserve it. That is exactly what this bill does. It defines violent crimes so that our immigration and criminal justice systems will have the tools necessary to remove violent immigrants from our country.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support this bill. Uphold law and order. Vote “yes” on the previous question. Vote “yes” on the resolution. And vote “yes” on the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1051 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3773) to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 and the Head Start Act to promote child care and early learning, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3773.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that

“the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida) at 1 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1051; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1051, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6691, COMMUNITY SAFETY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2018, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1051) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6691) to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the definition of “crime of violence”, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 181, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—224

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Cramer
Aderholt	Buchanan	Crawford
Allen	Buck	Culberson
Amash	Bucshon	Curbelo (FL)
Arrington	Budd	Curtis
Babin	Burgess	Davidson
Bacon	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Balderson	Calvert	Denham
Banks (IN)	Carter (GA)	DesJarlais
Barr	Carter (TX)	Diaz-Balart
Barton	Chabot	Donovan
Bergman	Cheney	Duffy
Biggs	Cloud	Duncan (SC)
Bilirakis	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Bishop (MI)	Cole	Dunn
Bishop (UT)	Collins (GA)	Emmer
Black	Collins (NY)	Estes (KS)
Blum	Comer	Faso
Bost	Comstock	Ferguson
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Fitzpatrick
Brat	Cook	Fleischmann
Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)	Flores