

of 1994. The United Nations has warned of a long-term humanitarian crisis, and it has called for massive aid for the refugees.

President Obama's administration took a proactive role in providing humanitarian aid to the internally displaced people. The administration's recent announcement to provide \$110 million in additional humanitarian aid was the beginning of a new era of friendship and trust between the governments and the people of Pakistan and the United States. Although this funding was a significant first step, it is only a fraction of what is required to repatriate the internally displaced people to their homes and to reestablish some degree of normalcy in their lives.

All efforts must be made for the safe and early return of the internally displaced Pakistanis to their homes. The United States, along with the international community, must come together and provide the needed assistance.

Recently, I sent a letter to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to ask that she immediately increase her appeal of help to the international community from the current \$500 million to \$1 billion in humanitarian aid to provide immediate assistance to the internally displaced people from Swat. Lending support of this magnitude equates to a small pledge of approximately \$400 per IDP.

The second concern is the impression the Pakistani people have about the United States' interest. We must work to dispel the image the Pakistanis have about our country. The time has come to establish a long-term, consistent policy to close the trust deficit in our relationship by making investments in Pakistan's future.

I believe that the United States needs to take immediate action which translates into goodwill in the eyes of the Pakistanis. Effective ways to accomplish this goal by directly impacting people's lives include providing more humanitarian aid, investing in infrastructure development projects such as electrical power plants, road construction and railway improvements, and contributing to bilateral trade. It is imperative that we focus on projects with a tangible outcome that improve the well-being of Pakistanis. Pakistanis are putting faith into democratic movements. Now we must learn how to relate to them and how to build their confidence in our ability to deliver on our promises.

My discussion with the Pakistani Americans in my district was an eye opener that allowed me to gain their perspectives on the current situation in Pakistan. I encouraged Ambassador Holbrooke to and he has agreed to sit down with a small group on June 12, 2009, so that he, too, can get a better understanding of the complex issues that the people of Pakistan now face.

I also encourage each of you to reach out to the Pakistani Americans and to their affiliated organizations within

your districts. I encourage you to really listen to what they have to say. You will be amazed by what they will tell you. Let us seize the moment by delivering President Obama's promise of hope to the people of the great nation of Pakistan.

PARTISAN POLITICS IN AUTO DEALERSHIP CLOSURES?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just south of Houston, there is a town called Alvin, Texas, where a Chrysler dealership called Rogers Dodge is making a lot of money selling Chryslers; but on June 9, they are going to close down because the auto task force gang has notified them that they have to close.

Rogers Dodge is on the list of 789 Chrysler dealerships around the country that are being closed down under questionable circumstances. There are five in the Houston area alone. The question remains: What are the criteria for closing down these dealerships?

The auto task force gang picks winners and losers, but they refuse to tell America how those decisions are made. Well, neither they nor the administration is talking. The blissful silence makes us wonder what's going on. Some of these Chrysler dealerships being ordered to close are profitable—others are not—but according to some news reports, there's one thing they all have in common except for one single exception found so far: they all have connections in some manner to making campaign contributions to Republicans.

Chrysler, an American institution, is no longer being run as a private-sector company. It has been taken over by the auto task force tyrants appointed personally by the administration. These individuals tell Chrysler what to do, and they have to do it because Chrysler took all that bailout money before they went into bankruptcy. Now the auto task force gang gets to run the company.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, we still don't know where that wasted bailout money went.

According to the Federal Election Commission Web site, there are reporters and bloggers around the country who have been digging through lists of donations. They have been comparing donor names on the lists with the names of owners of the Chrysler dealerships that have been forced to close. Some of these reports say that campaign contributions went to GOP candidates or to political action committees from the Chrysler dealerships that are being forcibly shut down.

Did this group of auto task force individuals discriminate against Republican dealerships in Chrysler-style or in Chicago-style paybacks? We don't know. How in the world can we square

that with the reports that only one dealership being ordered to close down so far contributed to the administration's campaign—and that was only for \$200? Campaign contributions appear to be the common thread in all of these ordered closures. That's some coincidence.

Rogers Dodge in Alvin, Texas, is one of the more profitable dealerships. Newspaper reports say they have increased their new car sales by 50 percent in just the last 4 months. That's a big accomplishment in this economy. They paid cash for their brand-new \$3.7 million building 3 years ago. Along with many other dealerships, they bought millions of dollars of inventory after being pressured by Chrysler to help the company's financial situation so that Chrysler wouldn't go bankrupt. Now all of these assets paid for by these dealerships will be worth mere pennies on the dollar. One report in the Houston Chronicle said this inventory of cars that the dealerships were pressured to buy now will have to be sold as used cars.

□ 1945

Some of these dealerships are fighting back against the Auto Task Force with a lawsuit of their own. According to the Houston Chronicle article, Nicholas Parks, the president of Rogers Dodge and a lawyer, says he's fighting the closure because he doesn't think the bankruptcy court should be used to close these vendors, especially those that are making money. How can you use the bankruptcy laws to shut down a vendor who is making a profit for Chrysler? This is very interesting. The American people are starting to ask a few questions on their own.

Are these Auto Task Force tyrants picking the winners and losers based on campaign contributions? Does the administration have a Nixon-style enemies list? All these questions because the Auto Task Force guys aren't talking and aren't telling us why they closed down certain dealerships and why they let others remain open.

We are now living in a time where the government controls both Chrysler and GM, which we should call Government Motors. And the government alone, not the free market, decides who wins, who loses, who stays in business and who must be forcibly closed down. Meanwhile, 100,000-plus Chrysler workers at auto dealerships who did nothing wrong will be out of work on June 9 thanks to government control. So much for the promise of new jobs.

And that's just the way it is.

ENDING THE NUCLEAR THREAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, when the Cold War ended, the people of the world hoped that the threat of nuclear war would end also, but that hasn't

happened. Today, more nations than ever have nuclear weapons. North Korea's powerful underground nuclear explosion last week reminded us that testing continues. And there are great fears that terrorists could get nuclear weapons through the black market. Tragically, the United States has not done enough to stop the threat.

The previous administration turned its back on arms control. It practically laughed at America's obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It refused to push for Senate ratification of the comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and it proceeded with plans for the United States to develop new nuclear weapons, which undermined our ability to deal with North Korea and Iran.

Mr. Speaker, we must do better. The United States must lead. We must lead a new global effort to make the world nuclear free. It's the moral thing to do, and it's also smart politics. If we are seen as leading the fight for non-proliferation and disarmament, we will be in a much better position to convince the world community to put peaceful pressure on North Korea and Iran to give up their nuclear ambitions.

President Obama is already moving the right direction. In his speech in Prague on April 5, he promised to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy. He announced the new diplomatic effort with Russia to reduce warheads. He promised to work for ratification of the Test Ban Treaty, and he said he would seek a new treaty to end the production of fissile materials for use in nuclear weapons. I welcome all of these policies.

In fact, 3 days before the press speech in Prague, I introduced Resolution 333, which is called No Nukes. It calls upon the United States to take a number of important actions to end the nuclear threat. It calls upon the United States to pursue multilateral negotiations to produce verifiable steps that every country should take to eliminate their nuclear weapons. It calls for the United States and Russia to work together to end the deployment of nuclear weapons that are currently operational and can be launched on short notice. It urges the President to declare that so long as the United States has nuclear weapons, we will not—and I say we will not—use them first. It calls for ending the previous administration's policy of preventative warfare and ending our development of new weapons of mass destruction, and it calls for a ban on weapons in outer space.

I've also introduced House Resolution 363, which describes my Smart Security Platform for the 21st Century, which includes several initiatives to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction. It calls for beefing up inspections and regional security arrangements to stop proliferation. And it advocates more funding for the programs designed to keep Russian weapons and

materials from falling into the wrong hands.

I urge my colleagues, please examine both of these resolutions and support them. There is no time to waste. The world is getting more dangerous every single minute. And if there is a nuclear attack, we won't be able to save our lives by ducking under our desks like we were taught in grade school.

Mr. Speaker, America must move aggressively to end the nuclear menace. It's the most important thing we can do for our country, and it is the most important thing we can do for our children and our grandchildren.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STOP AWARDING NO-BID CONTRACTS TO PRIVATE COMPANIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, just moments ago I gave notice of my intent to offer a privileged resolution asking that the House Ethics Committee look into the relationship between earmarks and campaign contributions and the link between PMA, the PMA Group that is currently under investigation by the Justice Department.

Now, it has been raised several times that this privileged resolution is a blunt instrument and that the Ethics Committee is really not designed to deal with such a resolution. And let me be the first to concede that point. These resolutions that I've offered—this is the ninth one that was offered tonight—they are a blunt instrument. The Ethics Committee is not designed to deal with an investigation of this magnitude, but it's the only instrument we've got at this point. We are really out of other options.

Right now as it stands, when Members of Congress request earmarks, they have to sign a statement saying that they have no financial interest in the earmark that they are pursuing; in other words, that a family member doesn't work on or for the firm receiving the earmark. But to receive campaign contributions in close proximity to that earmark request is not considered financial interest by the House Committee on Ethics, and the guidance that they've issued to Members is that that does not necessarily constitute financial interest. Yet we know that there are numerous investigations going on outside of this body by the Justice Department that have to do with earmarks and campaign contributions.

So out of an abundance of caution, I would hope that this institution would

say we need to stay above this fray, that when you can—when a Member of Congress has the ability to award a no-bid contract to a private company, and then executives in that private company—and the lobbyists that are retained by them—can turn around and make sizable campaign contributions to that same Member who awarded the no-bid contract, we are going to have problems here and we're going to have investigations go on. And it will continue to represent a cloud over this body, a cloud that rains on Republicans and Democrats alike.

This is not a partisan resolution. This is not a partisan problem. No one party is above this. Both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party have Members who are requesting earmarks for companies who then turn around and make sizable—I'm sorry—individuals in those companies turn around and make sizable contributions back to those same Members. And it is unbelievable that we continue to allow that to happen.

Now, I have said before, and I will say again, that I will stop offering this resolution as soon as we have an agreement not to allow the awarding of no-bid contracts for private companies. As soon as the leadership—both the Republicans and Democrats—agree in this body to stop that practice, to not have Members of Congress have the ability to award no-bid contracts—in other words, to get earmarks for private companies—then I will stop offering this resolution. It is a blunt instrument. I recognize that. The Ethics Committee is not really meant to deal with issues of this magnitude, but as long as we continue this practice and allow this to happen, then this institution is going to be under a cloud, as it is now.

So, again, I've noticed this resolution tonight. I don't have to call it up later this week. I would prefer not to. I would prefer not to have another vote on this resolution. But as long as we continue the practice of allowing Members of this body to award no-bid contracts to companies, private companies, who can then turn around and have their executives and the lobbyists they retain make sizable contributions to those same Members, and as long as we allow that practice to continue, we're going to need to address it somehow; and this is the only forum, this is the only vehicle that we're allowed right now.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can bring this resolution to some type of conclusion, that we won't have to offer a 10th next week or in some week to come, that we can actually deal with this meaningfully. This institution deserves far better than we are giving it.

I think when most of us were elected, we believed that we had a higher purpose than to come here and grovel for crumbs that fall from appropriators' tables, that we're here to debate the great issues of our time. And when you