

things that come before the House floor have been bipartisan pieces of legislation.

We spend a lot of time on legislation and almost always come to the House floor with unanimous votes, or mostly unanimous votes, on the committee level. We work very well on these issues because these are not partisan issues; these are American issues that we are talking about.

Mr. Speaker, there are about 61 designated foreign terrorist organizations that our State Department has said are foreign terrorist organizations and, to prevent individuals in America who side with these organizations, who support these organizations, who are part of these organizations from traveling around the world and coming back home, based upon their activities, this legislation by Mr. KEATING is introduced. Keep them from traveling, because we know who those people are, and keep them, especially, from coming back to the United States.

So what would happen if a passport is revoked and some American is in Syria and is radicalized and he tries to get on a plane? Well, he is not allowed to get on the plane. He is stopped, and then he is turned over, eventually, to Department of Homeland Security and our Justice Department and handled that way.

Now, there are only a few places under our law where a person's passport can be revoked. Not paying your child support, drug trafficking, sex tourism—those are three of the examples. So we are not talking about a lot of examples, but we are talking about this example.

I am a former judge, and I know Mr. KEATING is a former prosecutor. Due process for Americans is always important. The Supreme Court has already ruled on whether or not passports can be revoked under certain circumstances, and they have affirmed the authority of the State Department to revoke passports in specific cases based upon national security reasons.

This bill allows for due process of those people who have their passports revoked. This is a good step in protecting the United States. This is bipartisan legislation. I think it is very important that we take this step.

Once again, my prayers, our prayers, are for those folks in New York. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to allow terrorists to have their day. We are not going to allow them to have their way. And that is just the way it is.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 425—the FTO Passport Revocation Act of 2017—by my friend and colleague Chairman TED POE. I cannot help but see this measure as a common sense tactic to prevent terrorists from entering or re-entering our country. However, more needs to be done to build on this useful foundation for security from terrorists originating in this country or foreign-based terrorists.

Just yesterday, the streets of New York were the scene of carnage caused by a man

from Uzbekistan who won a diversity visa lottery to enter this country in 2010. He has lived here for seven years before going on the murderous rampage that killed 8 people and injured 12 others. Clearly, we need to look closer at the background of those admitted through this lottery as they could eventually obtain a U.S. passport. That was the conclusion by the Government Accountability Office ten years ago—three years before New York terror suspect arrived in this country.

The GAO report in 2007 called the diversity visa program “an open door” for terrorists. According to the report 9,800 people from countries designated by the State Department as State Sponsors of Terrorism had used the program to enter the country. These people could eventually qualify for a U.S. passport.

We also must be more vigilant about people coming from countries not designated as State Sponsors of Terrorism. The 9/11 Commission reported back in 2004 that as many as six of the hijackers of the three planes—who were from Saudi Arabia, Egypt, United Arab Emirates and Lebanon—had used fraudulent or manipulated passports to enter the United States. In 2013, a Saudi citizen entering the United States through the Detroit airport was detained because he couldn't satisfactorily explain why he was carrying a pressure cooker like the one used in the Boston marathon bombing. However, upon inspection, his passport suspiciously had a missing page. Would that have been caught without the presence of the pressure cooker? We are told that even the slightest tweak to a passport will be caught, but one failure could result in a terrorist entering our country, and they could eventually become terrorist sleepers who acquire a U.S. passport.

Finally, in order for the FTO designation to be effectively used to stop terrorists from getting passports or having their passport revoked, our government must make that designation in the first place. I tried for two years to get the previous administration to designate Boko Haram as a terrorist organization. They finally did so in 2013, but how many potential terrorists may have gotten through before then and acquire sufficient status to receive a U.S. passport? We also need to use the FTO designation to identify those giving support to terrorist organizations, especially in cases of such support coming from those living in the United States who could be or potentially could be U.S. passport holders.

As I said earlier, I consider H.R. 425 a common sense measure on which to build, but we must take steps to make this bill as meaningful as it must be for our security. I ask my colleagues to approve this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 425, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

URGING ADHERENCE TO THE “ONE COUNTRY, TWO SYSTEMS” POLICY BETWEEN THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON THE QUESTION OF HONG KONG

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 422) urging adherence to the “one country, two systems” policy as prescribed in the Joint Declaration between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of the Hong Kong, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 422

Whereas the People's Republic of China assumed the exercise of sovereignty over the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region 20 years ago, on July 1, 1997;

Whereas the Joint Declaration between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of the Hong Kong (in this resolution referred to as the “Joint Declaration”) required China's National People's Congress (NPC) to pass the “Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China” (in this resolution referred to as the “Basic Law”) consistent with the obligations contained in the Joint Declaration, which was approved by the NPC on April 4, 1990;

Whereas relations between the United States and Hong Kong are fundamentally based upon the continued maintenance of the “one country, two systems” policy stipulated in the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-383; 22 U.S.C. 5701 et seq.) and established by the Joint Declaration;

Whereas under the “one country, two systems” policy established by the Joint Declaration, Hong Kong “will enjoy a high degree of autonomy except in foreign and defense affairs” and “will be vested with executive, legislative and independent judicial power including that of final adjudication”;

Whereas Hong Kong's autonomy under the “one country, two systems” policy, as demonstrated by its highly developed rule of law, independent judiciary, and respect for the rights of individuals, has continued to make Hong Kong the preferred residence for over 85,000 United States citizens, and at least 1,400 United States businesses operate in Hong Kong;

Whereas the Joint Declaration and the Basic Law declare that the lifestyle and social and economic systems in Hong Kong will remain unchanged for 50 years after the 1997 reversion;

Whereas the Basic Law guarantees Hong Kong residents the freedoms of speech, press, publication, association, assembly, demonstration, religious belief and activity, academic research, and the rights to form unions and to strike, among others;

Whereas the Basic Law also guarantees Hong Kong residents the right to vote and to stand for election;

Whereas although the Basic Law states that “the ultimate aim is the selection of the Chief Executive by universal suffrage upon nomination by a broadly representative nominating committee in accordance with democratic procedures”, the actual process

for nominating eligible Chief Executive candidates remains heavily influenced by the Government of China;

Whereas widespread frustration with the lack of progress toward a democratic selection of candidates for Chief Executive provoked large-scale public demonstrations in late 2014, popularly known as the “Umbrella Movement”, that involved hundreds of thousands of demonstrators and the occupation of certain public spaces for as long as 79 days;

Whereas, although Hong Kong continues to enjoy high levels of economic freedom and judicial independence, certain recent actions by the Government of China are inconsistent with its stated commitments to Hong Kong’s high degree of autonomy and the preservation of the rule of law;

Whereas international press reported that from October through December 2015, four employees of Mighty Current publishing house and its affiliated bookstore, Causeway Bay Books, a Hong Kong seller of publications critical of Chinese leadership, disappeared under suspicious circumstances from Hong Kong, Thailand, and mainland China, in potentially the most serious breach of the “one country, two systems” policy since 1997, which has had a chilling effect on the freedoms of speech and publication in Hong Kong;

Whereas international press reported that—

(1) Gui Minhai, a Swedish citizen and the co-owner of Mighty Current, was last seen in Thailand in October 2015;

(2) The general manager of Mighty Current, Lui Bo, and the business manager, Cheung Jiping, disappeared while on a visit to mainland China around October 2015; and

(3) Lee Bo, who holds British and Chinese citizenship and is a permanent resident of Hong Kong, disappeared from Hong Kong on December 30, 2015;

Whereas Mr. Lui, Mr. Cheung, and Mr. Lee each briefly returned to Hong Kong in March 2016 to ask Hong Kong police to drop their missing persons’ cases before immediately returning to mainland China;

Whereas Lam Wing Kee, another Causeway Bay Books bookseller, testified before the Congressional-Executive Commission on China that he was detained by officials in Shenzhen, China on October 24, 2015, moved to a detention facility more than 1,300 miles away, and held incommunicado and subjected to “endless interrogation” for seven and half months, during which he was forced to produce multiple, coerced confessions of “selling books illegally”;

Whereas on November 7, 2016, while the Hong Kong High Court was considering its final ruling to determine if the oaths sworn by certain Legislative Council candidates were in accordance with Article 104 of the Basic Law, the Standing Committee of the NPC issued its own interpretation of Article 104 of the Basic Law in an attempt to foreclose the opportunity for the legislators-elect to retake their oaths and assume office;

Whereas that interpretation of Article 104 by the Standing Committee of the NPC represented the first time it had issued such an interpretation while a Hong Kong judge was deliberating on the case in question and only the second time it had done so in the absence of a request from Hong Kong authorities;

Whereas according to the Hong Kong Bar Association, that preemptive interpretation was “unnecessary and inappropriate” and “created the impression that the [Standing Committee] is effectively legislating for Hong Kong, thereby casting doubts on the commitment of the Central People’s Government to abide by the principles of ‘one country, two systems’”;

Whereas on November 15, 2016, the High Court ruled that the oaths taken by Yau Wai-ching and Baggio Leung Chung-hang were invalid, and barred the two from serving as members of the Legislative Council;

Whereas on December 16, 2016, then Chief Executive Leung Chun-ying and Secretary of Justice Rimsy Yuen Kwok-keung filed for judicial review of the oaths taken by Lau Sui-lai, Nathan Law, Leung Kwok-hung, and Edward Yiu Chung-yim;

Whereas on July 14, 2017, the High Court ruled that the oaths taken by Lau Sui-lai, Nathan Law, Leung Kwok-hung, and Edward Yiu Chung-yim were invalid and barred the four of them from serving as members of the Legislative Council;

Whereas in August 2017, the Hong Kong Government appealed the original sentences of three “Umbrella Movement” leaders, Joshua Wong, Nathan Law, and Alex Chow and asked for prison time after they had already completed their previous community service sentences;

Whereas the Hong Kong Court of Appeal subsequently imposed prison sentences on Joshua Wong, Nathan Law, and Alex Chow of six, seven, and eight months respectively, which effectively bars them from running for political office for five years; and

Whereas these developments have called into question Hong Kong’s highly developed rule of law, independent judiciary, and respect for individual rights, which are fundamental to its way of life and economic prosperity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes, consistent with the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, that—

(A) Hong Kong continues to play an important role in today’s regional and world economy, with strong economic, cultural, and other ties to the United States;

(B) respect for civil liberties, open markets, rule of law, and judicial independence are all integral aspects of Hong Kong’s lifestyle and social and economic systems; and

(C) the authority of the United States Government to treat Hong Kong as a non-sovereign entity distinct from China, for the purposes of United States laws relating to trade, finance, transportation, economic and cultural exchange, travel, law enforcement cooperation, export controls, and other matters, depends on Hong Kong remaining sufficiently autonomous; and

(2) urges adherence to the “one country, two systems” policy established by the Joint Declaration and the Basic Law with respect to—

(A) Hong Kong’s exercise of a high degree of autonomy;

(B) its enjoyment of executive, legislative, and independent judicial power; and

(C) the robust protection of the fundamental rights of Hong Kong residents guaranteed by Chapter III of the Basic Law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize Ranking Member ENGEL for authorizing this important measure on Hong Kong, the city once known as the Pearl of the Orient.

I commend the gentleman for strongly advocating for Hong Kong’s continued adherence to the “one country, two systems” policy that has allowed for Hong Kong’s autonomy and prosperity for so long. I was happy to join him as an original cosponsor of this important measure.

During a recent trip that I led to Hong Kong, I heard firsthand how measures like this are helpful in keeping the pressure on Beijing to keep its commitment to the Joint Declaration.

Twenty years have now passed since the handover of Hong Kong from the United Kingdom to the People’s Republic of China. At the time, the U.S. Congress played a vital role in the continuity of the U.S. relationship with Hong Kong by passing the Hong Kong Policy Act in 1992. This act established that the U.S. would treat Hong Kong as a nonsovereign entity distinct from China on commercial, cultural, and law enforcement matters so long as it remained “sufficiently autonomous.”

Since the handover, Hong Kong has continued to be a global economic force and a financial hub. In recent years, however, it has also begun to face increased social, economic, and political challenges, including external pressures.

Mr. Speaker, we saw the Umbrella Movement protest in 2014, which was led by youth seeking to liberalize the electoral system and introduce true universal suffrage to Hong Kong in accordance with the Joint Declaration between Great Britain and China. In the intervening years, we have witnessed booksellers kidnapped from Hong Kong, Thailand, and Mainland China; legislator oaths being invalidated; and the jailing of protest leaders.

For many of us here in Congress, there is growing concern about the apparent increased role of Beijing in the affairs of Hong Kong. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is important to reiterate here today that our special treatment of Hong Kong is dependent upon it remaining sufficiently autonomous. We want to see Hong Kong’s highly developed rule of law, independent judiciary, and respect for individual freedoms remain as the lifeblood of Hong Kong and its economic prosperity as guaranteed, again, by China and Great Britain in the Joint Declaration.

Passage of this resolution demonstrates our support for the continuation of the “one country, two systems” policy in Hong Kong, so I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of this measure.

Let me start by thanking our chairman on the Foreign Affairs Committee, ED ROYCE of California, for his leadership and for working with me to bring this measure forward.

I introduced this resolution with Representatives CHABOT, YOHO, SHERMAN, and SMITH, and I want to thank them all for their partnership.

I really listened intently to Mr. YOHO and also know that we make progress on the Foreign Affairs Committee because, as Mr. POE of Texas said, we work in bipartisan measure, and we try to agree on the language and we try to make sure that the U.S. Congress speaks with one voice so that both our friends and adversaries around the world will understand that we put partisanship aside. We leave it at the water's edge, and I think that is very important.

I think the kind of people the Foreign Affairs Committee attracts to serve on the committee, on both sides of the aisle, are the kind who keep perpetuating this bipartisan spirit because we have differences in policies, for sure, but we are all Americans. We all want to keep each other safe, and we all want to make sure that America does the right thing and that others do the right thing to America as well.

So when we have the incident like we had yesterday with the terrible terrorist attack in Manhattan, it makes us pause, as a Congress, and think about what this all means.

People in Hong Kong were made promises as well. They were made promises years ago that China would be one country, including Hong Kong, but two systems, that Hong Kong would be its independent system. And, of course, the Chinese officials and Beijing regime have tried every which way to go after student protesting, curbing the rights and values of the people of Hong Kong, so this resolution is really very, very important.

I thank, again, Representatives SMITH, SHERMAN, YOHO, and CHABOT. But I also want to recognize Doug Anderson and Sean O'Neill on the chairman's staff for their contributions to this resolution, and Jennifer Hendrixson-White on my staff. It is a great example, again, of bipartisanship when it comes to foreign policy. We work together and we produce what I regard as superior products.

For decades, Mr. Speaker, the United States has shared an important, unique relationship with Hong Kong. That relationship has been based on Hong Kong's autonomy from Mainland China. This resolution underscores our national security interest in seeing Hong Kong remain autonomous at a time when we have seen some troubling trends.

Twenty years ago, at the time of the handover, China made a commitment that Hong Kong would continue to enjoy its special status. Today, China claims that the 1997 Joint Declaration is a so-called "historical document" that has, again, "no practical signifi-

cance." But the UK and the United States believe in international law, and we are committed to holding China to its word, again, a "one country, two systems" form of government in Hong Kong.

This approach was experimental when the Chinese and British first devised it. You may remember that Hong Kong was a British colony. The Chinese Government essentially said that Hong Kong would continue to have its own executive, legislative, and judicial rights, that the people of Hong Kong would continue to enjoy fundamental rights guaranteed in Hong Kong's laws. But Beijing is now backing away from its commitments, even declaring the Joint Declaration a historical document with no relevance today.

Meddling in Hong Kong's elections by China's National People's Congress led to the Umbrella protests in 2014. Hong Kong residents critical of the People's Republic of China have disappeared, while the presence of the People's Liberation Army has grown.

The credibility of Hong Kong's courts has suffered following decisions to send Umbrella Movement student leaders to prison after they had already served their previous sentences. Academic freedoms have eroded. Self-censorship has grown, and journalists face regular harassment.

So we are worried, Mr. Speaker. We are worried about Chinese encroachment, about what is going to happen to the people of Hong Kong, and about the way China's newly aggressive posture is going to affect our relationship with Hong Kong in the future.

Twenty years after accepting the so-called "one country, two systems" model, China's objective now seems to be making Hong Kong and the mainland "one country, one system." This is not what the government in Beijing, the international community, the United States, Great Britain, or the people of Hong Kong signed up for.

So this issue raises bigger questions, Mr. Speaker:

To what degree will the Chinese Government live up to its international commitments as China continues to expand economically and grow in stature on the global stage?

This measure says, "Enough." It sends a message to China that we in the United States Congress expect Beijing to keep its word. That is not asking too much. It reiterates that our special bond with Hong Kong is based on our shared values, the values of democracy, and that we want to see that relationship endure for years to come.

So I am grateful to my colleagues for working on this measure with me, especially Mr. YOHO. I ask support from all Members.

□ 1900

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me again remind everyone that Hong Kong is special because of its judicial independence and strong rule of law that is supposed to be protected under the "one

country, two systems" approach. That is also the reason why the United States shares such a strong strategic relationship with Hong Kong.

This resolution is a reminder of why our ties with Hong Kong are so important, and a call for all parties to respect the decades-old commitments that have underpinned Hong Kong's autonomy. At a time when China is growing more and more aggressive in its neighborhood, the United States cannot be seen as ceding ground. We need to stand up for our friends. We need to stand up for our values. We need to stand up for our interests. We need to hold all countries to their commitments, just as the United States lives up to our own.

I ask for all Members to support this measure. I thank our chairman, ED ROYCE, and Mr. YOHO for their remarks.

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

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

I, too, want to thank the ranking member, Mr. ENGEL; Mr. ROYCE, the chairman of the committee; Doug Anderson; and, of course, Hunter Strupp. I chair the Asia and the Pacific Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee. It has been a bipartisan committee, and to see everybody come together to work on these different situations, and different bills and resolutions, it is so important that we project a unified body.

I would think China, as they move forward, would look hard to honor their commitment that they made because it is not just Hong Kong they are influencing. It is all of the other countries in the world, and it will determine future negotiations on how China, Beijing, honors their commitment that they made with Hong Kong that the other nations will look at.

Hong Kong plays an important role in today's regional and world economy. Its open market and strong rule of law have served as an example to the region of how freedom and a rules-based society can foster a positive environment for its people's happiness and prosperity.

The U.S. has benefited greatly from strong economic cultural ties to Hong Kong, and I would venture to say, the world has benefited from that. We want to continue this relationship, but to do so, Hong Kong must remain sufficiently autonomous. Our President is headed on a 5-country, 12-day tour of the Asia area at the end of the week, and it will be his first time visiting China as President.

With this resolution, we send a strong message from Congress about our support for Hong Kong's continued prosperity and special status. Thus, we urge faithfulness to the "one country, two systems" policy, as established by the joint declaration and the basic law with respect to Hong Kong's autonomy and its enjoyment of the executive, legislative, and judicial powers. Hong

Kong's independent judiciary must be sacrosanct.

In closing, I would like to thank Ranking Member ENGEL again and the original cosponsors: Mr. SMITH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I commend Ranking Member, Mr. ENGEL, along with Chairman YOHO, Mr. CHABOT, and Mr. SHERMAN, for introducing H. Res. 422.

I am an original cosponsor of this legislation. As the Cochair of the bipartisan and bicameral Congressional-Executive Commission on China, I have been gravely concerned by the Chinese government's efforts to curtail Hong Kong's autonomy and crush pro-democracy voices in this city.

Twenty years ago, China promised to guarantee Hong Kong's autonomy and freedoms for 50 years through the Sino-British Joint Declaration. These promises have been needlessly strained in recent years, calling into question the viability of a 'One Country, Two Systems' model that has provided great benefits to both China and the world.

The threats to Hong Kong's autonomy and its freedoms are progressing. At the recent 19th Party Congress, Communist Party General Secretary and President Xi Jinping reiterated the fact that Hong Kong's autonomy is limited by Beijing's "comprehensive jurisdiction"—meaning that Beijing has the final say on what freedoms are exercised in Hong Kong and who gets to lead the city's government.

On October 11, 2017, a British human rights activist, Benedict Rogers, was denied access to Hong Kong by the Chinese government. Mr. Rogers was also warned not to continue meeting with pro-democracy supporters in Hong Kong by the Chinese Embassy in London.

Beijing is now telling foreigners with whom they can meet in Hong Kong and barring entry to those who will not comply.

This is a chilling development that should be a concern from all countries and corporations that have an interest in Hong Kong's freedoms. Maintaining these freedoms and the rule of law are vital economic interests of the United States.

The governments and legislatures of the UK and the United States should work together to ensure that the Sino-Declaration Joint Declaration remains in force to protect Hong Kong's unique way of life.

Xi Jinping also said recently about Hong Kong that he would "never allow anyone, any organization, or any political party, to separate any part of Chinese territory from China . . . and that attempts to endanger China's sovereignty and security, to challenge the power of the central government . . . [crosses] the red line."

Given Beijing's expansive view of its own security to include anyone peacefully seeking political reforms or rights protections, these are ominous words indeed.

Beijing has ramped up efforts to destroy the pro-democracy movement in Hong Kong. This past year, six elected legislators were disqualified after the National People's Congress intervened in Hong Kong's judiciary. Then, in August, a Hong Kong court issued heavier sentences for Joshua Wong, Nathan Law, and Alex Chow, leaders of the peaceful Umbrella Movement of 2014.

Mr. Wong, Mr. Law, and Mr. Chow should now be considered Hong Kong's first political

prisoners. Though Joshua Wong and Nathan Law are out on bail at the moment pending an appeal, they face other charges and may be put back in prison in the future. They likely will not be the last political prisoners in Hong Kong, as other Umbrella Movement leaders were convicted recently, including Professor Benny Tai.

Senator MARCO RUBIO and I, with whom I cochair the CECC, have announced our intention to nominate Hong Kong pro-democracy Umbrella Movement for the 2018 Nobel Peace Prize. I hope all Members will consider signing on to that initiative.

I support this resolution, but it should not be our last word. In 1992, the U.S. Congress passed the Hong Kong Policy Act, saying that U.S. policy toward Hong Kong was contingent on the preservation of Hong Kong's autonomy and freedoms. With these fundamental elements being diminished by the Chinese government, we should consider amending a bill passed 25 years ago to better protect U.S. interests.

That is why I introduced, along with Congressman TIM WALZ (a fellow CECC Commissioner), the Hong Kong Human Rights & Democracy Act (H.R. 3856)—a bill that I introduced in the last Congress and which has been introduced by Senator MARCO RUBIO and Senator BEN CARDIN in the Senate.

If Hong Kong is to be just another Chinese city, then we have the responsibility to reassess whether Hong Kong warrants special status under U.S. law.

We all have a stake in ensuring Hong Kong remains an open city, with the rule of law and guaranteed rights currently unavailable in Mainland China.

I support passage of this bill and thank the gentleman from New York for his leadership on this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 422, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution urging adherence to the 'one country, two systems' policy as prescribed in the Joint Declaration between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING THE PASSING OF STANLEY COOLIDGE AND ROSEANN HANNAH

(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, it is with great sadness I rise tonight to honor the passing of Stanley Coolidge and his fiancée, Roseann Hannah.

Their lives were tragically lost on October 9, 2017, while trapped in their

northern California home as it was destroyed by wildfire. What began as the faint smell of a distant fire quickly turned to tragedy as the area surrounding Stanley's longtime home was ignited rapidly by a fast-approaching fire. As Stan and Roseann attempted a hurried evacuation, the house was engulfed by flames before they could escape.

Stan was a retired attorney, born in San Francisco, but lived his last 50 years in the mountains of Loma Rica, California. Roseann was a resident of Grass Valley, California. Both she and Stan were very valued members of their communities.

Our thoughts and prayers are with the Coolidge and Hannah families as we ask the Lord's blessings for comfort and healing at this very tragic, very sad time, as well as the families of all who we have lost as a result of the fires in the West.

Stan and Roseann, you will be missed.

TAX REFORM NEEDS TO BE NEGOTIATED OPENLY

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying to my brother, Steve, back in Ohio: I am so very proud of you, your courage, your goodness, and your honor.

Mr. Speaker, meanwhile, President Trump and the Republicans are doing everything to railroad tax breaks through this Congress to the top 1 percent with no open hearings, with deals being cut in the Speaker's office. So I say: Whoa.

It is worth taking a step back to talk about what a good tax plan contains. A good tax plan puts money back in the pockets of middle class working families and small business owners. A good tax plan spurs job creation right here in the U.S.A. Yet everything we have seen and heard from the Republicans does exactly the opposite.

The goal should be to create more stability in our economy, not raise the deficit. We have got to stop businesses from shipping jobs overseas as companies hold their money offshore. They should bring it back home.

Tax reform shouldn't be negotiated in secret. Why should lobbyists know more about the bill than Members of Congress? A tax bill shouldn't explode our deficit or threaten your 401(k) plan or hurt Medicare and Medicaid.

It is time for Republicans to do their jobs, put forward a budget-balancing tax plan that helps American families, not just billionaires and multimillionaires; and bring the plan forward in sunlight, not backroom dealings.

STOP HABITUAL ILLEGAL BORDER CROSSERS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)