

for school lunch and the school breakfast program.

The bill also contains provisions for lifting the statute of limitations contained in the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, thus allowing black farmers who have complaints of discrimination against the Department of Agriculture to have a hearing either before the department or before the courts. Where relief is merited, it will now be granted even for the cases dating back to 1983. The plight of the black farmers in America is a plight not unlike that of other groups, with one very significant exception.

The very department designed to help them has over the last several years indeed harmed them. There has been a 64 percent decline in black farmers, just over the last 15 years, from 6,996 farmers in 1978 to 2,498 farms in 1992.

The Department of Justice ruled earlier this year that legal and technical arguments should prevent these farmers from recovering for damages done to them, taking the position that even in cases where the discrimination had been proven, documented and demonstrated, recovery was indeed possible. However, the Reagan administration had eliminated the investigating unit within the USDA which would have investigated their complaints of discrimination.

Yet the department continued to receive the complaints and in fact in its literature encouraged farmers to submit their complaints to them. Black farmers relied on this representation and indeed it was an empty process to their detriment.

It was not until the complainants failed to get relief from USDA and filed lawsuits that the Department of Justice raised the statute of limitations as a defense. Because the department formally took the position, I and others call upon our colleagues in Congress to provide swift and effective legislative remedies. I am glad to say that our Congress passed that. It was a historical day.

#### STANDING UP FOR FREEDOM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Speaker talked about the historic moment that we had 50 years ago in this country when the Berlin airlift took place. He said a couple things that I wrote down here.

He talked about the importance for America to continue to, quote, reject Communist oppression across the globe. And secondly, he talked about the importance of standing up for freedom.

I think that is very important, and I think it is critical today, 50 years later, that we do that, that we look and

see what America is doing, to see if they are continuing to defend freedom across the globe the way that those that came before us did 50 years ago and the way that our Founding Fathers thought we should do.

Unfortunately, today I am concerned, as are a lot of other Republicans and Democrats, about what this administration is doing halfway across the globe in Communist China. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) who has worked on human rights issues with myself and others said this today:

There is no improvement in human rights there. The President can say that China has improved its human rights record because it exiled forcibly two dissidents. But we don't call that progress.

Earlier this week the Washington Post, on Tuesday June 23rd, had this to say about human rights in China:

Li Hai, 44 years old, a former teacher at the Chinese Medical College, is now serving a 9 year prison sentence in Beijing's prison. His crime, assembling a list of people who were jailed for taking part in pro-democracy demonstrations in Tiananmen Square in 1989. From the Beijing area alone, he documented more than 700. Of those, 158, mostly workers rather than students, received sentences of more than 9 years and are presumed to still be held for protesting for democracy in Tiananmen Square back in 1989. Many were sentenced to a life in prison, from a 22 year old to a 76 year old. Li Hai himself was convicted for prying into and gathering state secrets.

Now, in China, in Tiananmen Square, in the land where the President goes to talk about China's great progress on human rights, what the Communist government calls prying into and gathering state secrets is one individual, one citizen trying to find out who the Communist Chinese drug off to prison after they shot down and killed hundreds and maybe even thousands of demonstrators in Tiananmen Square.

The Washington Post goes on to say, We thought of Mr. Li as we read President Clinton's explanation in Newsweek yesterday of, Why I am going to Beijing. Mr. Clinton wrote of the real progress that China has made in human rights during the past year. That progress, according to the President, consists of the release of several prominent dissidents. How meager these accomplishments in human rights really are becomes clear when you stack them up against the administration's own decidedly modest goals going back to 1996, when it had already downgraded the priority of human rights.

The Washington Post concludes, Tomorrow Mr. Clinton will leave for China. He is the first President to visit since the Tiananmen Square massacre in 1989. His aides promise that he will speak out on human rights there and that there is a chance that he will meet with the mother of a student killed in Tiananmen Square. The first could be valuable if his remarks are broadcast on Chinese television. The second, an important symbol, especially because many relatives of Tiananmen victims continue to be persecuted and harassed. But Mr. Clinton's comments should above all be honest. For the sake of Li Hai, the 158 documented and the many that still cannot be found, Mr. Clinton should not trumpet real progress in human rights where no human rights record of progress exists.

Going back to 1992, it is very interesting to follow what the President has said on human rights in China. I remember back during the campaign of 1992, when the President talked about the need to stand up to the butchers of Beijing, that is a position that I actually applauded because I was surprised that those of us in Congress and the administration did not do more following the brutal massacre in 1989.

The President made that vow, but soon after he got elected, he forgot about that vow, just like he forgot about the promise to link human rights with trade. And he forgot to do that very quickly. And the result, as reported by A. M. Rosenthal in the New York Times, was disastrous.

Religious freedoms and political speech continue to be crushed in China. Protestants and Catholics are thrown in jail. In fact, thrown into jail up to 2 years for simply having a bible at home and leading a bible study.

□ 1900

Over 400,000 are jailed right now. The New York Times and A. M. Rosenthal has reported that Christians and Buddhists continue to be savagely beaten, tortured in front of their families, and even killed for simply worshipping God as they choose.

This past week, I went to a Tibet freedom rally on the west lawn. We heard Tibetans talk about what has happened in their culture and how the Tibetan culture continues to be crushed. Yet, in America, we ignore some stark numbers.

We ignore the number 50. That is about how long the Communist Chinese have occupied Tibet. We ignore the number 1.2 million. That is the number of Tibetans that have been killed since the Chinese occupation. We continue to ignore the number 130,000. That is how many Tibetans today have been forced into exile. The number 250,000 is important because that is the number of Chinese troops occupying Tibet.

And 60 million is a frightening number when you want to really gauge what type of regime the President is dealing with today in Tiananmen Square. To give all Americans a little historical perspective, 60 million is the number of Chinese that have been killed by their own government since 1949, 60 million. The number is so high that it boggles the imagination.

Let us put it into this perspective: Adolph Hitler was accused of killing 6 million Jews in the Holocaust. Hitler killed 6 million Jews, and has been termed as one of the most evil men of, not only this century, but in the history of western civilization, the history of the world. Yet, we have a regime that has murdered 10 times that amount of people, murdered 60 million.

But that is a number that continues to fall on deaf ears in the United States. Why is that? I think it has something to do with another number, and that number is 9,000. And 9,000 is a very interesting number, you see, because that number is a number that mesmerizes politicians in Washington,

D.C. and in State capitals across this country. Nine thousand is a number that mesmerizes the wizards of Wall Street. Nine thousand is a number that mesmerizes those that work on Madison Avenue.

Yes, 9,000 is the number that the Dow Jones continues to float around. It is about money. We are obsessed with finance. Let me tell you, there is nothing wrong with a strong Wall Street. There is nothing wrong with a Dow Jones over 9,000.

I have been termed as a right wing fanatic, too conservative on fiscal issues. I believe in cutting taxes. I believe in abolishing the capital gains tax. I believe in abolishing the inheritance tax. I believe in cutting government spending radically. I believe in the free enterprise system.

Socialism and Marxism as political theories lie on the dust bin of history. They are dead. Capitalism won. Pure unadulterated capitalism prevailed over the socialism and the communism of the Soviet Union.

I like profit. I think profit is good for America. But we have to balance that with a few of the values that this country is supposed to be about. But everybody is so busy chasing profits across the globe to get the Dow Jones even higher that sometimes finance takes a front seat to freedom. Finance seems to take a front seat to American self-interest.

There is one defense contractor who is reported in the Wall Street Journal last year who actually was so rabidly pursuing a deal with China to sell airplanes to China that they sent their engineers over to China to talk to the engineers that worked on Chinese jet fighters, because they wanted to help the Chinese.

To prove that they were good partners, and to prove that they deserved to get this deal, they wanted to help the Chinese engineers learn how to make their jet fighters more competitive with our jet fighters. All in pursuit of a deal.

We have the CEO of another defense industry who wants to build more airplanes, that has supported me in the past, who continues to defend the actions of the Communist Chinese, despite the fact that all credible reports coming out of there continually show that oppression continues to reign.

His quote last year was that there is more democracy and freedom in China than there is in America, because, after all, more Chinese vote. That is frightening logic. But it shows how desperate companies are to go over there, make bigger profits, help their stocks go up higher.

If that affects the national security of the United States of America, or if that affects freedom, this esoteric concept that Thomas Jefferson once talked about, so be it.

We have the PAC community, BIPAC, the business PAC openly critical of Republican and Democratic Members that continue to fight against

extending MFN, Most Favored Trade Nations Status to the Chinese. They claim that it shows that we are antibusiness.

When I got elected here in 1994, I had never been involved in politics before. I decided it was time to get up off the couch and do something. But it seemed to me, before I got up here, that Members of Congress and administrations did not have to choose between freedom and finance, that we could somehow walk sort of that middle road. But it is not that way anymore. The President tells us. The BIPACs of the world tell us that it is all or nothing.

You either completely engage with China, give them whatever they want on their terms, or else you are a dangerous knuckle dragging isolationist that just does not understand the economic and political realities at the end of the 20th Century. That argument is patently false.

There was an editorial in the New York Times, an op ed last week that said as much. It is written by Robert Kagan and William Kristol. The headline said "Stop Playing by China's Rules." Their editorial said the following: "In defending his China policy, President Clinton says America faces historic choice: engage China as his Administration has done or isolate it. But that is a false choice."

As the op ed goes on to say, nobody is arguing that we isolate China. China is going to be one of the great powers in the 21st Century. We will share the world stage with the Chinese people until everyone that is living today has passed away and died. That is the political reality. That is the demographic reality.

The 21st Century will not be the American century alone. It will be the American and Asian century. A power shift is happening, and we will be sharing the world stage, and we understand that.

But the question is, do we join into this partnership by China's rules, or do we try to meet in the middle ground with them? What Kagan and Kristol conclude is the following: "Mr. Clinton seems determined to cast his critics as backward-looking isolationists spoiling for a new cold war. In fact, the Clinton Administration's current policy invites Chinese adventurism abroad and repression at home. At the end of this bloody century, we all should have learned that appeasement, even when disguised as engagement, doesn't work."

How many people have read the history, or how many Americans still alive remember what happened in 1938 when Neville Chamberlain went to Munich, and he was so desperate to avoid war, so desperate to avoid any conflict with Adolph Hitler that he engaged in what was later termed an appeasement policy, a policy that Winston Churchill and his conservative allies aggressively fought against.

But Chamberlain was dead-set against fighting Hitler because Hitler

was too powerful. Britain was not ready for that type of a war. So he came back, after appeasing Hitler, talking about how he had found "peace for our time."

Of course Adolph Hitler, like the Chinese today, did not see appeasement as a show of strength, but rather a show of weakness. Soon after that, peace in our time ended with Hitler going into Austria, going into Poland and beginning the bloody, bloody Second World War.

We cannot capitulate. If we continue to capitulate, BIPAC, Wall Street, and the other business leaders that are accusing us of isolation may make a short-term profit but, in the end, will pay the ultimate price.

What do the Chinese leaders think of us for this appeasement policy we have been engaging? Let me read to you from yesterday's Investor's Business Daily, a quote from a U.S. official who was negotiating with the Chinese.

It goes like this: "In March 1996, China started lobbying missiles within 100 miles of Taiwan as a signal on the eve of the island's first democratic elections. The Clinton administration said nothing publicly at the time, even though the Chinese insulted U.S. officials when they privately promised a military reaction if Taiwan was attacked."

This is what the Chinese said after that threat, "No, you won't. We've watched you in Somalia. We have watched you in Haiti. We have watched you in Bosnia and you don't have the will," a Chinese officer told U.S. negotiators. China has nuclear weapons, and "you are not going to threaten us again, because, in the end, you care a lot more about Los Angeles than Taipei," a U.S. official recalled the Chinese officer saying.

So they understand that we are a paper tiger. They understand that they can even threaten nuclear annihilation on Los Angeles, California and not face the consequences. Yet, silence is deafening from Wall Street. Silence is deafening from many in the PAC community. The silence is deafening from the halls of Congress and the administration.

Why? The Dow is over 9,000. China is, after all, the next great export market. In the end, let us face it, the economy is strong in part because the prices on consumer goods are low.

Why are they low? Because China provides us with what Americans would call slave labor. Their workers only make \$30 a month. So they can make the items that we buy and wear very cheaply. This is an arrangement we do not want to fool around with.

I guess it was brought home to me just how bad the situation is in China yesterday when I heard a speech by Bill Greider in the Capitol talking about a plant that he visited over in China. They talked about how they, the workers made \$30 to \$60 a month if they were productive.

If they were not productive, he found out that they actually took money out

of this envelope at the end of the month if they were not doing as good a job. Greider said that sounds kind of inhumane, does it not? Only \$60 a month, and they still dock their pay.

The foreman said, "Well, it is better than what happened a couple of years ago." Greider said, "Well, what is that?" He said, "Well, we lined them up on the wall and shot them," and told the story of how seven workers were not simply as productive as they should have been and were taken outside and shot.

Wall Street, a lot of the business community, a lot of the lobbyists will tell you that does not exist. Yet, just about every credible journalist, whether it is the New York Times or the Washington Post, will tell you they have seen it with their own eyes, that it does exist.

□ 1915

A.M. Rosenthal better than anybody else over the past few years has documented human rights abuses.

I had a lobbyist for an organization that I respect tell me with a straight face that there is no religious persecution in China, that there is no religious persecution in Tibet. That is a big lie.

There is a song out that is called "Novocain for the Soul." I think that is what 9,000 points on the Dow Jones Industrial has done. It has numbed us. It has numbed the soul of Americans to the grave injustices that are occurring across the globe. Maybe I am overreacting. Maybe we should not worry about it. Maybe America in the 21st century is not what America was in the 18th century. Maybe freedom, liberty and the things that Thomas Jefferson talked about and James Madison talked about does not matter. Maybe they are not relevant. But I tend to believe they are. I believe in such quaint notions as what Russell Kirk said. Kirk said, "No matter the volume of its steel production, a nation which has disavowed principle is vanquished."

And Winston Churchill in the 1950s, talking about a similar shift in his country and in his party, a similar shift where old concepts of the Constitution and freedom were transplanted with commerce and simply commerce, had this to say:

The old conservative party, with its religious convictions, and constitutional principles, will disappear and a new party will rise, perhaps like the Republican Party in the United States, rigid, materialist and secular, whose opinions will turn on tariffs and who will cause the lobbies to be crowded with the touts of the protected industries.

I hope that does not happen to our Republican Party. I hope we will have the courage to stand up and be counted where others sit down and simply shut up and are silenced because the lure of new prosperous markets are too inviting. But the question is up in the air right now on how we are going to respond. I must say we have not been responding as well over the past few years as I would have liked. I think what we not only in the Republican

Party but like-minded people in the Democratic Party must fight for are the first principles that our Founding Fathers based this Constitution and this constitutional republic upon, concepts like freedom, concepts written in the Declaration of Independence when Jefferson helped pen that incredible phrase that "we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among those life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

There is not a lot of ambiguity there. The belief was all men, not people in America, but all are endowed with certain unalienable rights. From where? According to the Declaration of Independence, from God. It is non-negotiable. It does not matter whether the Dow Jones is over 9,000 or under 900. It does not matter if China is the next great export market or not. That we in America believe that all are created equal. And whether we are fighting for civil rights in Birmingham or Beijing, it is non-negotiable. Regrettably we have negotiated away too many of those freedoms and too many of those rights for a higher Dow Industrial and a lower price on consumer goods. Jefferson's idea that America was the last great hope for a dying world seems quaint 222 years later. And Ronald Reagan's belief that America was to be a city shining brightly on the hill for all the world to see seems to be a belief that has been dimmed. In fact, right now there is an exhibit that almost seems quaint. Mr. Speaker, it is in the Library of Congress and it is called "Religion and the Founding of the American Republic." It is right behind us, across the street, where the Library of Congress pulled together all the papers of our Founding Fathers when talking on the issue of religion. This is a summary of the exhibit, what the Library of Congress wrote in the chapter "America as Religious Refuge, the 17th Century." It talks about how "many of the North American colonies that eventually formed the United States of America were settled by men and women who in the face of European persecution refused to compromise passionately held religious convictions. The great majority left Europe to worship God in the way that they believed to be correct."

To worship in the way that they believed to be correct. Is that a notion that can be negotiated away in Tiananmen Square? Is that a notion that depends on how well the Dow Jones is doing? Is that a quaint notion that depends on whether we are talking about the next great export market? I do not think so. Again, that is a notion that is non-negotiable. For those on Wall Street, for those lobbyists on K Street, for those apologists on Main Street that want to turn a blind eye to oppression in China, I say facts are stubborn things. Facts are stubborn things.

We cannot turn our eyes away from the world's ills, to the growing evi-

dence of how China has aided in nuclear proliferation, how they gave nuclear secrets to Pakistan, to Libya and now possibly even to Iran. The results obviously are dangerous. Pakistan just exploded publicly several nuclear devices that now endangers all the world as a new nuclear arms race is escalating in Asia. The technology transfers that we heard about a month or two back, where the DOD themselves said, quote, America's national security has been jeopardized, has been compromised, because this administration gave technology to the Chinese that helped make their nuclear missiles more accurate towards America. The Pentagon said national security was jeopardized.

Just today, there was testimony from a Pentagon aide who criticized Chinese policies. This is by John Diamond with the Associated Press:

A veteran adviser with the Pentagon agency charged with reviewing proposed exports testified today before a Senate committee investigating whether the administration helped China gain military capacity that should have been restricted.

Speaking in a hoarse whisper, he told the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee how senior defense officials glossed over concerns in the lower ranks that U.S. businesses were being allowed to sell China and other countries technology with military applications. Senior defense officials sometimes instructed subordinates to soften or reverse their recommendations that certain technology not be exported, he said.

That's happened on several occasions. Sometimes it happens in your face and sometimes it happens when you're on vacation and somebody tampers with your database under your name.

In 1996, Leitner said, he returned from a 3-week vacation to find that his recommendation against the export of supercomputer technology to Russia had been rewritten to a neutral position. Although approval for the export eventually was denied, Russia later announced it had obtained the U.S.-built computers without an export license. The case now is under investigation.

We heard reports in this House in an investigating committee that people that were charged with stopping military technology from being transferred to China would make recommendations not to export that technology to China and they would then be pressured to change their recommendations. We find out now that the President asked the Secretary of State to allow these technology transfers. The Secretary of State said no, this damages America's national security in its relationship with China. The President asked the CIA. They said no. The President asked the National Security Council. They said no. In fact, they continued shopping to try to find somebody that would approve this technology transfer.

Finally they went to the right department. They asked the Department of Commerce, who said, "Sure, go ahead, it's great for business." Now,

the heck with the national security. It does not matter what our Secretary of State says. But go ahead and send it to Commerce. And now we find out this past week that the Commerce Department allowed technology transfers without telling other agencies about what was going on. Because, we see again, national security recently has taken a back seat to finance, to quick profits, and it is dangerous, extraordinarily dangerous.

The question is, with nuclear proliferation exploding across the globe because of China and because of our lack of response to China, with technology transfers that our own Pentagon has said compromises national security continuing to move forward, with human rights violations that are continuing in China as reported by the New York Times, the Washington Post, Newsweek, Time and just about every other major news outlet, with these human rights abuses continuing, what can be done when Wall Street, when official Washington, and when too many other people across the country are simply not paying attention, turning a blind eye to it or engaging in this conspiracy of silence. What can be done to make a difference?

I am at times cynical, but I do believe that we can make a big difference. I believe that we can fight the good fight, and I think that if people will start speaking out on this floor and speaking out, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we have a chance the next time MFN is debated to talk about human rights and talk about technology transfers, to talk about nuclear proliferation and maybe even make a difference.

Bobby Kennedy back in 1966 went to Johannesburg and at the time he was talking about ending apartheid. A lot of people thought that it was a mission that could not be done, thought it was too difficult, thought the walls of oppression would continue there. But Bobby Kennedy continued the fight. Even though he was killed in 1968, 15 years later, many of the things that he talked about in that speech in Johannesburg came true.

In talking about ending apartheid, this is what Robert Kennedy said:

It is a revolutionary world that we live in. It is young people who must take the lead. We have had thrust upon us a greater burden of responsibility than any generation that has ever lived.

"There is," said an Italian philosopher, "nothing more difficult to take in hand, more perilous to conduct, or more uncertain in its success than to take the lead in the introduction of a new order of things."

There is the belief there is nothing one man or one woman can do against the enormous array of the world's ills, against misery and ignorance, injustice and violence. Yet many of the world's great movements, of thought and action, have flowed from the work of a single man or woman.

It is from numberless diverse acts of courage and belief that human history is shaped. Each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from

a million different centers of energy and daring those ripples build a current which can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance.

□ 1930

It is my prayer tonight, with the President halfway across the world in Beijing, that those who respect and honor human rights in China, those who respect and honor human rights in Europe, those who respect and honor human rights in this country will start acting in ways that will strike out against injustice and send forth ripples of hope and that together, today, we can begin a movement that will help end the human rights abuses in China and Tibet and across the world and help America reconnect with its proud and noble past.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HUTCHINSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. BRADY of Texas (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. HULSHOF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for after 11:15 a.m. today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. MCDADE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for Wednesday, June 24 and today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. LAMPSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. TURNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CONYERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MYRICK) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. KELLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. FROST, and to include therein extraneous material, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost \$2,274.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 297 of the 105th Congress, the House stands adjourned until 12:30 p.m., Tuesday, July 14, 1998, for morning hour debates.

Thereupon (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 297, the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 14, 1998, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

#### OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 105th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

Honorable HEATHER WILSON, First, New Mexico.

#### RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON MILITARY/COMMERCIAL CONCERNS WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The Hon. CHRISTOPHER COX, Chairman of the Select Committee on U.S. National Security and Military/Commercial Concerns with the People's Republic of China, submitted the following rules of procedure:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY AND MILITARY/COMMERCIAL CONCERNS WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA—RULES OF PROCEDURE

(Adopted June 25, 1998)

##### 1. CONVENING OF MEETINGS

The regular meeting date and time for the transaction of committee business shall be at 8 o'clock a.m. Wednesday of each week, unless otherwise directed by the chairman.

In the case of any meeting of the committee, other than a regularly scheduled meeting, the clerk of the committee shall notify