

"very potent reform" and went on to observe that "forcing Members to live under the laws they pass may also have a useful, modifying effect on what Congress decides to pass."

Mr. Speaker, all of us, I'm sure, have received—and welcome—thousands of constituent communications imploring us to keep faith with provisions of the Contract With America. Even before this Congress began, one of my constituents, Mel Cellini of Madera, CA, shared with me a copy of his letter to Speaker GINGRICH. Noting Mr. Cellini's statement that there must be a change in the fact that "Congress has exempted itself from mandates imposed on the rest of society," I take pleasure in making the text of his letter a part of my statement of support for our passage of the Congressional Accountability Act.

The letter follows:

DECEMBER 4, 1994.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SIR: My wife and I are approaching 50 years of age. We have been increasingly disillusioned with the operation of the federal government. The future our two children face is of great concern to the two of us. As long as I can remember the federal government has continued to intrude into our lives via control and taxation. The programs have not only been intrusive, but also quite expensive.

Now one child is in college and the other will soon be going to college. Our dismay with the evaporation of the American dream has been discussed in our family. It is hard to relate to the dream since all we hear from the media are the issues of why we need to contribute and do more for those that refuse to help themselves.

Congress has exempted itself from mandates imposed on the rest of society. This must change.

I backed our local Republican candidate with the fervor that this was our last chance. Yes, George Radanovich won. I truly believe this is a new dawn. The opportunity for a refocused government is here. Just Make Sure the Government Is Out of Our Lives and Our Pocketbook.

Please, do not back down on the ten point contract that the Republicans agreed to fulfill in the First 100 days.

Finally, ignore the personal attacks the media is doing to you. We are behind you 'all the way.' I can hardly wait for the 1995 congress to begin.

Again, Congratulations, and thank you.

Sincerely,

MEL CELLINI.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend

their remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Senate bill, S. 2.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLMOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GILLMOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MARTINI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

MONETARY CRISIS IN MEXICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 30 minutes as the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the crisis in Mexico today is very serious and has a direct effect on the United States. But if the American people are going to be asked to guarantee billions, up to \$40 billion in loans in Mexico, we have a right to demand that Mexico meet certain conditions in return.

The primary question we have got to answer is simply this: How can we address the problem in Mexico in such a way that ensures that working families on both sides of the border are helped and not hurt by this deal? The Mexican system is riddled with deep structural, political, and economic problems. If allowed to continue to go unchecked, these problems will not only continue to hurt Mexican workers, they will also continue to have a direct impact on the jobs and the wages and the living standards of American workers.

The last time Mexico experienced a similar crisis in the early 1980's, they responded by cutting wages in half for Mexican workers. That was their response, even though Mexican manufacturing profits went through the roof.

In effect it created a situation where Mexico had a boom in billionaires. Members heard me right, billionaires, not millionaires. Yet American workers were forced to compete with Mexican workers who were earning 58 cents an hour. We lost over a half million jobs as a result of that policy, 500,000 American jobs. And all indications today are that Mexico is reading from that exact same playbook, even though Mexican wages are already too low. The devaluation of the peso has driven down their purchasing power by another 40 percent. Yet rather than pledging to raise the standard of living, President Zedillo's economic plan calls for a freeze on wages.

At this rate Mexico is never going to be able to afford to buy the products that we make, and of course that has been the great success of America, that we built a middle class with the purchasing power to purchase.

We have got to find a way to export products to Mexico, not just our jobs and our capital. We had a chance to address this problem when we negotiated the NAFTA agreement. We had a chance to tie wages to productivity and give the Mexican workers more power to bargain for better wages, but NAFTA was a missed opportunity to make real reform. I do not think we can afford to miss that opportunity again.

I would suggest that before we ask American taxpayers to send a dime to Mexico, we should insist that Mexico meet five specific conditions. Let me enumerate them for my colleagues this afternoon.

First, we should insist that Mexico agree to tie wages to productivity. Now what do I mean by that?

□ 1230

In the past decade, Mexican workers have not, and I repeat they have not, reaped the rewards of their hard work, and they do work hard. They are very productive workers. Their productivity increased by 64 percent since 1980.

What happened to their wages? Their wages actually dropped by 31 percent. Prior to the devaluation of the peso over the last several weeks, the wage of a Mexican worker was 69 percent—69 percent—of what it was back in 1980. It was not even worth the value of what it was in 1980.

Former President Salinas recognized this problem when he pledged to tie wages to productivity 2 years ago during the negotiations within his own country, and the debate over NAFTA. But that link has not materialized, and we, I think, should insist that it does.

Now, second, we should insist that the Mexican Government extend fundamental rights to the workers that

they do not have now: the right to organize independently—and I emphasize the word “independently”—the right to bargain collectively, and the right to strike. These basic worker rights help propel a middle class in this country and elsewhere in the Western world, and again, the reason we negotiated a labor side agreement on NAFTA was that there was a recognition that structural problems existed, but the side agreement left out the most fundamental reforms, so nothing will go further toward developing a Mexican middle class that can afford to buy our products that we will make, and we should insist on these reforms.

Now, third, we should insist that Mexico make more of an effort to buy American. Since NAFTA went into effect, Mexico has increasingly looked to Japan and Europe first. While Mexican exports to the United States have gone up, their imports from Europe and Japan have exploded. At the same time our trade surplus with Mexico has decreased by 60 percent in the past 2 years, 60 percent reduction in the surplus that we had with Mexico.

If American taxpayers are going to be asked to guarantee billions in a bailout of Mexico, I think we need to demand that Mexico make more of an effort to buy American products.

Now, fourth, we should insist that Mexico not only continue democratic reform but that it renew its pledge to resolve the uprising in Chiapas in a just and in a peaceful way. The situation in Chiapas today is a proving ground for the Government of Mexico and how they go about resolving the crisis in Chiapas will go a long way toward determining the depth of their commitment to democratic reforms in human rights.

Recently there have been reports that President Zedillo was under immense pressure to take decisive military actions in Chiapas. I would suggest that cracking heads and sending in tanks is no way to demonstrate a commitment to human rights. The American people do not want their tax dollars backing up a military operation against Mexico's own people. The only way to resolve the situation in Chiapas is to address the underlying structural and economic problems which caused the crisis in the first place, and that is why we must insist upon economic reforms, not military ones.

Fifth, before we pass an aid package to Mexico, we should pass an American workers' aid package to help American families who lose their jobs as the result of the crisis in Mexico. Now, with the devaluation of the peso, the price of American products in Mexico has soared up to 40 percent. In the weeks to come, as exports increase, many Americans will lose their jobs.

We cannot afford to turn our backs on our own working families who are affected by the problems in Mexico. I would suggest there are two things we can do immediately to help.

First, we can pass the lifetime job training program that was proposed by the President in his middle-class bill of rights. This bill will make available up to \$3,000 for each person who loses their job and can be used to help them get training, the training that they need to find a new job, so they will have an account, their own account with their own name on it, that they can draw from to pay for training to upgrade their skills so that they can reenter the labor market.

Second, we should immediately pass the \$10,000 tax deduction for tuition and other educational expenses. Many of the people who lose their jobs have kids trying to further their education, and there is no reason why children should be denied that chance because of the crisis in Mexico today.

Now, again, if the American people are going to be asked to send billions to Mexico or potentially underwrite billions to Mexico, we have a right to ask certain conditions be met in return. Before we send a dime, we should insist that these five conditions be met.

We missed a very historic, real opportunity last year to address the serious underlying economic and political problems in Mexico today, and we cannot afford to miss that opportunity again. We are not merely sending money to Mexico to prop up a nation with the fastest growing number of billionaires in the world, we are sending money with the hopes that by helping the working people of Mexico we will help build a Mexican middle class that can afford to buy the products that our workers make and that can stop competing against each other.

In the end, I think that is going to help both of us, and after all, I think that is what free trade is supposed to be all about anyway.

I yield to my friend who was here first, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], and then the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], and then my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief.

Thank you for taking this special order.

It is my understanding that very shortly, perhaps by the end of this week, there will be a package on the floor authorizing and approving perhaps as much as a \$40 billion loan guarantee program, yes, I stress the word “guarantee,” but it means the taxpayers can be on the hook potentially for that amount.

To my recollection that may be the largest amount taxpayers have been asked to be even potentially liable for since the S&L situation in setting up the Resolution Trust Corporation.

There are several questions that need to be answered on this that I have not been able to get answers to that I have been asking.

How much are we talking about? We started at \$9 billion, then we went to

18, the Treasury a couple days ago was saying 25, and today it is \$40 to \$45 billion.

Second, it is my understanding there is already an existing line of credit. Has any of this been drawn down yet? It is my understanding probably some has already.

Mr. BONIOR. It is my understanding there was \$9 billion that has been drawn.

Mr. WISE. There is a guarantee of that. In sum, they have already gone out, because of meeting the default provisions or whatever. These are questions that need to be answered.

We have been expressing concerns over bills that basically we all agree with on the floor, not coming to the floor with a hearing, for instance, unfunded mandates will be on the floor, the Congressional Accountability Act just passed. This is something extremely serious. All taxpayers are going to be living with it for a long time.

Third, I have got trouble, I say to the whip, explaining at home why it is that in a couple of weeks on the floor of the House there will probably be a rescission package. The appropriation bills will try, for instance, to take out the Economic Development Administration which basically does nothing but help create jobs. There will be language to take out highway projects, road projects, bridges, airports, water and sewer.

I was in a town just Saturday, where they are \$300,000 short on a \$1.4 million project to build a sewer which is mandated in which they can actually create jobs if that sewer line is built. Nobody will give them a loan guarantee.

I wonder if we are going to have to put this legislation out, whether or not it would be possible to join with the loan guarantee program for perhaps American citizens, American workers, as the gentleman suggests, with a lifetime job training act, something that says to the American taxpayer, “We understand, and we hear you as well.”

I think that there needs to be great questions raised about this before this House willy-nilly embarks on such a large package. Otherwise, I think this is something that is going to be coming home to roost for many, many years.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for his comments.

While I recognize his concern with regard to time, I am perplexed by the speed at which we hear that the Republicans want to move on this package. They are talking about bringing this to the floor on Friday, if you can imagine that, without any hearings, without any discussion.

We understand the tenderness and the sensitivity this issue will have with respect to markets and other Latin and so-called second tier nations as well as some developed nations, but it seems to me that if we are going to be asked in a responsible way to come cast our votes on this issue that we really need to know what is in it, the effects it will

have, the probability of success or the possibility of failure, and what is in it for the American worker. I mean, is the American worker going to be affected by all of this if the peso has fallen 40 percent and Mexican imports of American products drop off in large numbers, which I expect will happen? I mean we have already lost 60 percent of our trade surplus with Mexico just over the last 2 years. We can expect more of a drop, it seems to me, as a result of this.

What is going to happen to those workers who are producing those products for Mexico? Why are we not addressing that piece of it as well?

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

□ 1240

I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank my friend for yielding and taking this time to discuss this issue.

On the point that the gentleman raised on what is going to happen to United States workers with the Mexican economic crisis is a very important question. Just a few short months ago, the administration and others came to the well of the House and to the Senate and told us that the NAFTA Agreement was a win-win situation for American workers and that not only would the jobs that are lost to Mexico be recreated in new industries in this country, but the broad power to open up the country of Mexico to United States exports would create additional jobs in this country so that we would be a net winner. And when those of us raised concerns about the disparity between the wages in Mexico and the United States, we were told that was not a factor, that in fact the peso was strong, that things were going well, and they presented Mexico as a First World country in terms of economics. That has turned out not to be true. Not only has it turned out not to be true now, but it turned out to not true quite a while ago. But between the Governments of the United States and Mexico, they kept up the facade that Mexico was strong, Mexico was ready to participate in First World economics, and that was done to get past the Mexican presidential elections and also to get past the vote on NAFTA on the floor of the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

What was then presented as a win-win situation, we are now confronting our constituents, the American workers, with a lose-lose situation. Not only will their wages be now less competitive with manufacturing and other occupations in Mexico, but we see the fact that those wages are going to be discounted by perhaps 30 percent. At the same time, the same Federal Reserve Board that is coming in here and asking us to support the economy of Mexico, to make these concessions and to put taxpayer dollars at risk, is talking about jacking up interest rates for the seventh time, interest rates that

have the potential of closing off the economic recovery, of taking the newly hired people and putting them on layoffs, of dampening the appetite of American manufacturing to engage in expansion of new plants and facilities and job creations.

So the American worker is put at a disadvantage because of the Mexican economic crisis and then he is put at a second disadvantage because his or her job is threatened or the potential for a job is threatened because the same Federal Reserve Board is going to hike interest rates in the American economy.

We have already seen the National Association of Manufacturers and others state, "Don't do this, because it precludes the kind of growth that is necessary in durable goods, in automobiles, home construction," those things that drive the fundamental job makeup in this country.

So we have Mexican goods coming in cheaper than ever before, Mexican labor being cheaper than ever before, and the comparative advantage of Mexican workers at a much greater level than ever before.

Then you put on top of that the willingness of the Mexican Government to thwart any attempts by Mexican workers to organize so they can better their standard of living, so that they can participate in a decent standard of living, and a decent workplace so that all of a sudden we do start to get some comparables. Then we have the use of troops to keep unionization from happening, keep workers from organizing, and what you really have now is the same old group of people in Mexico, the very wealthy families, the new billionaires sitting on top of the shoulders of the Mexican workers and telling them if they want a job they are going to have to be unorganized and they are going to have to work at historically low wages so that they can send their cheap goods into the United States and displace American workers.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is asking exactly the right question, and that is what the Republican leadership and others have got to respond to: What does this do for American workers?

You promised us one thing a few months ago and did not deliver on that promise, and the situation is far worse than you ever represented to the American workers it would be, and now you are telling us to trust you again, trust you and the Federal Reserve. They seem to have a real problem with Americans going to work. Every time we get unemployment down to 6 percent, they want to close off the recovery and say, "That is all the jobs, folks. Everybody will have to wait until the next time around, everybody else will not be able to provide for their family." I think this bailout of the Mexican economy to put money into this system—you know, if you were in Las Vegas, they would tell you not to do this because this is called putting

good money after bad. As was pointed out already, we already have billions and billions of dollars' worth of pesos sitting in Fort Knox. We have no more gold in Fort Knox, there is only the Mexican peso. We have to think of what the ramifications of that are for the American workers.

I thank the gentleman for raising this issue.

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my friend for his comments on this issue as well and for recapping for us some of the history of this.

You know, we have been told time and time again how this was going to work for the American workers, how it was going to work for this country, how it was going to work for certain industries in this country. I am speaking about the NAFTA deal today. Also, how this was going to be a win-win for both countries.

Well, the fact of the matter is that it is a win-win for nobody. What we have got, if you look at what happened in the tomato industry in Florida, those people are just about busted and out of work while the American automobile industry is doing very well today because of the pent-up demand and the real effort on their part to get their act together, which they have done very, very well.

The fact of the matter is that while we have shipped close to 25,000 cars to Mexico during the first year of NAFTA, they have shipped to the United States over a quarter of a million cars, about 260,000 cars.

So I mean we have got some real problems ahead of us in the future, and we have to be cognizant of the fact that American workers in the future have a real stake at what we do with respect to this loan guarantee.

I yield to my friend from Ohio, who has been such a champion on the issue of worker rights.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from yielding.

The Republican leadership says this is not a bailout, this \$40 billion; they say it is a line of credit. But if history is any indication, that line of credit will fairly quickly turn into a loan and that loan will fairly quickly evolve into a forgiven loan, and that forgiven loan will evolve very quickly, if history is any indication, into a \$40 billion aid package.

I have sent a letter to Speaker GINGRICH this morning calling for hearings, that we need to slow down, that if we are going to consider this \$40 billion aid package, that we as a Congress need the input of the American people, that we as a Congress need to understand better some of the issues involved in this \$40 billion foreign aid package.

I have outlined to Speaker GINGRICH about a dozen questions that I would like to briefly mention, information that I think the American people need and this Congress needs before we can

make a decision on this \$40 billion foreign aid bailout for Mexico and Mexican wealthy investors.

First, what is the precise amount of the loan guarantee? I do not think we know that yet. What is the precise amount of the loan guarantee?

What is the risk that Mexico will actually default on the loans? What is the historical record of repayment, as the gentleman from Michigan alluded to earlier, to United States taxpayers on other loan agreements, whether it was Mexico a dozen years ago or other loan agreements over the years that this country has generously offered to other nations that are facing fiscal and economic problems?

What is the collateral for the loans? For instance, will Mexico pledge oil receipts, proceeds from the auction of container terminals or other assets? This is clearly a sensitive issue in Mexico, with Mexican public opinion not so wild about turning over some of their Mexican oil company receipts—a government oil company—to the Americans as collateral.

Next, what conditions should we attach to the loan guarantees? Should one of those conditions, as the gentleman implied or suggested earlier, involve immigration control, immigration controls, rights of Mexican workers, or other social issues?

Sixth or seventh, given the many commentators, including Federal Reserve officials and even members of the Zedillo administration in Mexico, have raised question concerning the handling of the currency crisis, should we demand as a condition of the loans an investigation into the performances, as the gentleman from California mentioned, the performance of the Mexican Government, including the role of the Salinas government, in order to prevent a repeat of the situation?

Also, why are other nations, particularly those in our hemisphere, not contributing, not rushing to come forward in this bailout in the same manner and magnitude as is the United States?

Also, is the Mexican economic crisis relevant to a discussion of the balanced budget amendment in the United States which proposes to cut drastically appropriations for the International Monetary Fund? That begs the question of where are the deficit hawks on this \$40 billion, from both sides of the aisle? Those are the people who talked about the balanced budget amendment—I support the balanced budget amendment—how are we going to do that if we are going to provide a \$40 billion aid bailout package to the Mexicans?

Also, what provisions are there to insure that the large numbers of billionaires in Mexico do not unduly profit from the bailout? Mexico is fourth in the number of billionaires; the United States first; Japan second; Saudi Arabia third; Mexico fourth. And they are there at the expense of the middle class in Mexico, some very, very wealthy families as talked about a couple of

summers ago discussing NAFTA, and lots and lots of very, very poor Mexicans, and a small middle class.

Mr. BONIOR. As the gentleman will recall, what happened in the early 1980's when they hit the same type of situation, the wealthy went in and gobbled everything up and they became extremely wealthy. And, of course, they had the Government help them divvy up the spoils at a further point in the process.

The question is where are they now? What sacrifices are they making? There are rumors to the effect that they have all liquidated their national currency and got their assets in dollars now and really have not had to face this crisis.

That ought to be looked at to see if in fact that is a factor or if it is not.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And coupled with that, what about American corporations that have benefited from NAFTA, have built plants in Mexico, have seen economic problems as a result of the peso devaluation? Are we rushing forward, in part, to bail out those investors? Are they going to be part of a plan in this economic liberalization, will they participate financially in the bailout in the same sense that Congressman GEPHARDT suggested they help finance NAFTA, with across-the-border transaction fees? That is something that we need to address.

Last, thinking the unthinkable, what happens, what steps should we be prepared to take in the event the bailout package fails to stop the hemorrhaging of confidence in the Mexican Government and in the Mexican economy?

The issues here, Mr. Speaker, is to slow down, to have extensive hearings, not to delay for 3 to 4 months. We do not need to do that, but there is no reason to rush into this. Investors around the world, the international finance community do not expect the U.S. Congress to address this this week. We need to slow down, we need to have extensive hearings, we need to discuss these questions, explore these answers, and find out what in fact is the situation all around this \$40 billion bailout.

I again say I hope, Mr. Speaker, that Speaker GINGRICH makes the decision to slow down, particularly for all the new Members of the new Congress, some 85 new Members that are not really familiar with this issue. We cannot be spending American taxpayer dollars the way we have so profligately in the past, we have to slow down and look at this so that all of us can understand it better.

□ 1250

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I was a new Member of this institution, and I was being asked in the first 30 days of my service to the country as a Member of Congress. I, sure as heck, would want to know the ins and outs of this, especially given the disastrous effect of this country with respect to the savings and loan situation. I would want to know just exactly what we were

buying with regards to this package, and second, I would demand to know what effect it will have on the fellow who is working at the car company in my town, or the fellow or woman who might be working in a facility in my district whose job is tied to products that are sent down to Mexico for export purposes. You know, what is going to happen to those folks? I have got people working the automobile industry that will be affected by this, and no doubt in my mind; I mean the automobile industry likes to say that, you know, we are proud that we are shipping more cars down to Mexico now. What they do not say is that we may have shipped 30,000 automobiles to Mexico in the first year of NAFTA. The Mexicans, as I said just a second ago, ship back here about 260,000 cars. So, there is a big difference, but nonetheless they are proud of the increase that they have had in the number of cars that they have shipped to Mexico. That undoubtedly is going to be affected drastically by the peso devaluation.

I say, if you're a middle-income family or working family in Mexico, you can just picture yourself, the value of your dollar being 30 percent less that what it was about a month ago, and that's what they are facing down there. So, everything is 30 percent more to them.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I drive a Thunderbird, a car that is made in my district.

Mr. BONIOR. Congratulations. Glad to hear it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Good car, and, if they talk about selling Thunderbirds in Mexico, if it cost \$14,000 today in Mexico, 3 weeks ago in Mexico, today it will cost about \$4,000 more than that, and people—think about it yourself. I say to my colleague, you are not going to buy a car where the price has gone up \$4,000, and the relatively few cars we are selling in Mexico that are made in America, that number is going to shrink. Going the other way it is going to increase with the way prices have shifted because of peso devaluation, and I think, as the gentleman from California says, it's a lose, lose, lose situation where not only are we losing American jobs, not only are we losing jobs before the peso devaluation, it is getting worse with devaluation, and they are asking for taxpayers dollars to bail them out.

We have got to examine this question much more carefully.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] for joining me this afternoon.

LINE-ITEM-VETO AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I took out this special order