

will come back to the United States at the end of this month.

Nowhere is the potential for our strategic relationship greater than in our bilateral defense relationship, which again has seen great progress over the past decade. Last year our two nations signed the framework that will advance military-to-military exchanges. We are also proceeding with joint development of defense technology, which seeks to increase defense sales and to create a cooperative technology and industrial relationship that can promote both capabilities in the United States and in India.

I viewed with some concern last month when the administration announced the sale of these eight F-16s to Pakistan. And again I want to commend the leadership of the Foreign Relations Committee for making very clear that even if this sale should go forward, the financing of this sale is still subject to further American review.

What brings me to wanting to support Senator PAUL's resolution is the fact that as recently as January of this year, Pakistani-based terrorists claimed responsibility for an attack against an Indian military base at Pathankot. The attack on this air force base, which resulted in the killing of Indian military forces, was a great tragedy. So far, Pakistan has refused to share intelligence or to turn over those suspects to the Indian Government.

With those kinds of actions, I cannot go ahead and continue this policy where we continue, in effect, to give Pakistan a pass, whether it is actions in the region vis-à-vis Afghanistan or within their own country but also in terms of their unwillingness to meet India even halfway in terms of trying to bring a greater stability to one of the regions that could potentially become a tinderbox in terms of the border regions between India and Pakistan.

So I will be supporting Senator PAUL's resolution. I hope the Government of Pakistan hears the concern of this Senator and other Senators. I hope they will act aggressively in terms of bringing justice to those terrorists who invaded Indian space and attacked the Indian Air Force base. Showing that kind of responsible behavior might lead to at least this Senator taking a different view in terms of future military sales.

With that, I yield the floor, and I recognize my colleague, who I believe will bring this resolution to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES.

31

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act of 1976, I move to discharge the Committee on Foreign Relations from further consideration of S.J. Res. 31, re-

lating to the disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Pakistan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is debatable for up to 1 hour.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I rise in opposition to the American taxpayers being forced to pay for fighter jets for Pakistan. Over \$300 million from the American taxpayers will be designated to go to Pakistan to pay for eight new F-16s for Pakistan. We have a lot of problems here in our country, my friends. We have a lot of things going on in our country that need to be taken care of, and we don't have enough money to be sending it to Pakistan. I can't in good conscience look away as America crumbles at home and politicians tax us to send the money to corrupt and duplicitous regimes abroad.

When I travel across Kentucky and I see the look of despair in the eyes of out-of-work coal miners, when I see the anguish in the faces of those who live in constant poverty, I wonder why the establishment of both parties continues to send our money overseas to countries that take our money, take our arms, and laugh in our faces.

We have given \$15 billion to Pakistan—\$15 billion over the last decade—yet their previous President admits that Pakistan armed, aided, and abetted the Taliban. You remember the Taliban in Afghanistan that harbored and hosted bin Laden for a decade? Pakistan helped them. Pakistan was one of only two countries that recognized the Taliban. Why in the world would we be taxing the American people to send this money to Pakistan?

Remember when bin Laden escaped? We chased him and he escaped. Where did he go? To Pakistan. He lived for a decade in Pakistan. Where? About a mile away from their military academy. Somehow they missed him. There in a 15-foot-high walled compound, bin Laden stayed in Pakistan while we funneled billions upon billions of dollars to them.

Pakistan to this day is said to look away, to not look at the Haqqani network. In fact, it is accused that many members of their government are complicit with the Haqqani network. Who is the Haqqani network? It is a network of terrorists who kill Americans. We have American soldiers dying at the hands of Pakistani terrorists while that government looks the other way.

GEN John F. Campbell testified before Congress that the Haqqani network remains the most capable threat to U.S. forces in Afghanistan. Yet we are asked to send F-16s and good money after bad to a government in Pakistan that looks the other way.

Pakistan is, at best, a frenemy—part friend and a lot enemy. If Pakistan truly wants to be our ally, if Pakistan truly wants to help in the war on radical Islam, it should not require a bribe; it should not require the American taxpayer to subsidize arms sales.

They already have 70 F-16s. They have an air force of F-16s. What would happen if we didn't send them eight more that we are being asked to pay for? Maybe they would listen. Maybe they would help us. Maybe they would be an honest broker in the fight against terrorism.

We are \$19 trillion in debt. We borrow \$1 million a minute. We don't have any money to send to Pakistan to bribe them to buy planes from us. We don't have the money. We have problems at home. Our infrastructure crumbles at home. We have longstanding poverty at home. We have problems in America, and we can't afford to borrow the money from China to send it to Pakistan.

In my State, in Kentucky, we have a dozen counties with unemployment nearly double the national rate. In Magoffin County, KY, 12.5 percent of people are out of work. Today, those who will vote to send money to Pakistan need to come with me to Kentucky. They need to come to Magoffin County, and they need to look people in the face who are out of work in America and explain to them why we should send money to Pakistan. We have people hurting here at home.

In Harlan, the President's war on coal has led to longstanding double-digit unemployment. In Harlan, KY, people are out of work. People live in poverty, and they don't understand why Congress is sending money to Pakistan.

In Leslie County, high unemployment prompts their citizens to ask: Why? Why is the government spending billions of dollars for advanced fighter jets for foreigners? They don't understand it. They can't understand, when they live from day to day, why their government is sending money to Pakistan.

As I travel around Kentucky, I ask my constituents: Should America send money and arms to a country that persecutes Christians? I have yet to meet a single voter who wants their tax dollars going to countries that persecute Christians.

In Pakistan, it is the law; it is in their Constitution that if you criticize the state religion, you can be put to death. Asia Bibi has been on death row for nearly 5 years. Asia Bibi is a Christian. Her crime? She went to the well to draw water, and the villagers began to stone her. They beat her with sticks until she was bleeding. They continued to stone her as they chanted "Death, death to the Christian."

The police finally arrived, and she thought she had been saved, only to be arrested by the Pakistani police. There she sits on death row for 5 years. Is it an ally? Is it a civilized nation that puts Christians to death for criticizing the state religion? I defy any Member of this body to go home and talk to the first voter. Go outside the Beltway. Leave Congress and drive outside the Beltway and stop at the first gas station or stop at the first grocery store

and ask anybody—Republican, Democrat, or Independent: Should we be sending money to a country that persecutes Christians?

Asia Bibi sits on death row for criticizing the state religion, and your money goes to support her government. What will happen to Pakistan if they don't get eight more F-16s? They will have only 70 F-16s.

Most of the politicians here simply don't care. They don't care whether Pakistan persecutes Christians. They know only one way. The one way is to open our wallet and bleed us dry and hope that someday Pakistan will change its behavior. Guess what. If you are not strong enough to vote for this resolution, if you think some kind of cajoling, flattery, and nice talk with empty words are going to change the behavior of Pakistan, you have another thought coming. It has been going on for decades.

When I forced a vote in the Foreign Relations Committee to say that countries which put Christians to death for criticizing the state religion—there are about 34 of these countries, a couple of dozen of them who received money from us, American tax dollars going to countries that persecute Christians. When I introduced the amendment to say: Guess what. Let's not do it anymore. Any country that has a law that compels a Christian and puts a Christian to death, that country would no longer receive our money. Do you know what the vote was? It was 18 to 2 from Washington politicians to keep sending good money after bad because they say: Oh, the moderates there are going to change their minds someday.

We have given them \$15 billion, and I see no evidence of change in behavior. I see insolence, arrogance, and people who laugh as they cash our checks.

Is Pakistan our ally in the War on Terror? Well, not only did they help the Taliban that hosted Bin Laden for a decade, but when they finally got Bin Laden, we got him with evidence that was given to us by a doctor in Pakistan. His name is Shakil Afridi. Where is he now? Pakistan has locked him away in a dark, dank prison from which he will probably never be released.

Shakil Afridi has essentially been given a life sentence by Pakistan for the crime of helping the United States and helping all civilized nations get to Bin Laden. He sat under the noses of the Pakistani Government for a decade. We finally got him when Shakil Afridi helped us.

People aren't going to continue to help America if we don't help them, if we don't protect our human intelligence, if we don't protect those who are willing to help America. He sits and rots in a prison. What message do we send to Pakistan if we send them eight more F-16s and we tell you, the American taxpayer, you are paying for it? What message does that send to Pakistan? The message to Pakistan is that we will just keep thumbing our

nose at America, we will keep cashing their checks, and we will laugh all the way to the bank as we do nothing to release the Christians on death row or to release the doctor who helped us.

Should we give planes to a country that imprisons these heroes—heroes who helped and put their lives on the line for our country?

Today we will vote on whether the American taxpayers should foot the bill. I have yet to meet a voter in my State of Kentucky or across America who thinks it is a good idea to send more money to Pakistan. We have a \$19-trillion debt. We borrow \$1 million a minute. We have no money. It is not even a surplus. They say we are going to influence Pakistan or they may rise up and say: Oh, the resolution will not stop the money. The heck it will not. If my resolution passes, if it becomes law, the eight jets will not go to Pakistan, they will not be subsidized, and not one penny of American tax dollars will go to Pakistan. That is the absolute truth. No matter what they tell you, this stops the sale. It stops the subsidy.

We have to borrow money from China to send it to Pakistan. Such a policy is insane and supported by no one outside of Washington. You go anywhere in America and ask them: Should we give money? Should the taxpayer be forced to give money to Pakistan, a country that persecutes Christians? Nobody is for it. Yet the vast and out-of-touch establishment in Washington continues to do it. Is it any wonder that people are unhappy with Washington? Is it any wonder that Americans are sick and tired of the status quo, sick and tired of people not listening to them?

We have no money in the Treasury. We are all out of money. This influences nothing, other than to tell the Pakistanis they can continue doing what they want. I urge my colleagues to vote against subsidized sales of fighter jets to Pakistan.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Can the Chair tell me how much time I have remaining?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator has used 14 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. So I have 16 remaining?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to say a few remarks about this resolution of disapproval.

While I oppose this measure, I share the junior Senator from Kentucky's frustration with some aspects of our relationship with Pakistan. Notably, I think the jailing of Dr. Shakil Afridi for 23 years under highly questionable charges is an outrage.

For those of you who don't remember, Dr. Afridi helped the United States locate Osama bin Laden. His approach may have been debatable, but one thing is clear—he doesn't deserve to languish in a Pakistani jail for more than two decades on manufactured charges.

I have also been troubled by the Pakistani military and intelligence serv-

ice's support for militant groups that work against U.S. interests in the region. In fact, I would argue that many of these groups are also working against the long term interests of our friends in Pakistan as well, as evidenced by its own domestic terrorist problem.

I am also concerned that, despite important foreign aid given to Pakistan, there remains a troubling failure to address basic and urgent development needs—particularly education and schooling for girls. We also see continued cases of extreme religious intolerance, including death sentences for dubious charges of blasphemy.

At the same time, I also want to take a moment to acknowledge that Pakistan has suffered horrible losses in taking on militant groups within its own borders—something I don't think we always recognize.

And most importantly, I want to stress the importance of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—let's allow it to do its work and thoroughly consider this resolution first, rather than rush it through the Senate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to table the motion to discharge.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) would have voted "nay."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 35 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Carper	Donnelly
Baldwin	Casey	Durbin
Barrasso	Cassidy	Enzi
Bennet	Coats	Ernst
Blumenthal	Cochran	Feinstein
Blunt	Coons	Fischer
Boozman	Corker	Flake
Burr	Cornyn	Franken
Cantwell	Cotton	Gardner
Cardin	Crapo	Graham

Hatch	Menendez	Sasse
Heitkamp	Merkley	Schumer
Hirono	Mikulski	Sessions
Inhofe	Murkowski	Shaheen
Isakson	Murray	Shelby
Johnson	Nelson	Stabenow
Kaine	Perdue	Sullivan
King	Peters	Thune
Klobuchar	Portman	Tillis
Lankford	Reed	Toomey
Leahy	Reid	Whitehouse
Markey	Risch	Wicker
McCain	Roberts	Wyden
McConnell	Rounds	

NAYS—24

Ayotte	Grassley	Paul
Booker	Heinrich	Schatz
Boxer	Heller	Scott
Brown	Hoeben	Tester
Capito	Kirk	Udall
Collins	Manchin	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Warner
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warren

NOT VOTING—5

Cruz	McCaskill	Sanders
Lee	Rubio	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, today I would like to address a very important issue, which is the right for American citizens to know what is in their food. I am going to be talking about the topic of genetically modified ingredients in food. I will be pointing out that there are genetic modifications that are largely considered to have been beneficial and others that are largely considered to be causing significant challenges. In both cases, there is science to bring to bear around the benefits and there is science to bring to bear around the disadvantages. Ultimately, I will conclude—to give a preface here—that this is not a debate about the pros and cons. There is information on both sides, different aspects. What is at debate is whether our Federal Government wants to be the large, overbearing presence in the lives of Americans and tell them what to think, or whether we believe in our citizens' ability to use their own minds and make their own decisions. To be able to do that, they have to be able to know when there are genetically modified ingredients in the foods they are consuming.

Let's start with the point that there are significant benefits from various GM modified plants. One example is golden rice. Golden rice, as seen here, has been modified in order to produce a lot more vitamin A. So growing this in an area where there is a vitamin A deficiency has been beneficial to the help of local populations.

Let's take, for example, a certain form of carrot. It has been modified to produce an enzyme that helps rid the body of fatty substances. When you can't do that, you have Gaucher's disease. We have a lot of trouble with Gaucher's disease, with brain and bone damage, anemia, and bruises. But through the modification of these carrots, there is a solution, and should

you be afflicted with Gaucher's disease, you would be very happy about that.

Let's take another example. These are sweet potatoes that have been modified to resist a number of viral infections common in South Africa. So a place where otherwise you may not be able to grow these sweet potatoes, where the local population might not be able to benefit from nutrition in these sweet potatoes, they can now do so. These are some of the examples of some of the benefits that have come from some forms of genetic modification of plants.

But just as there is science that shows benefits, there is also science showing concerns. I am going to start by explaining that the largest modification in America—the largest deployed modification—is to make plants such as corn, soybeans, and sugar beets resistant to an herbicide called glyphosate.

The use of glyphosate has increased dramatically over the last two decades. In 1994 we are talking about 7.4 million pounds—not very much. But by 2012, we are talking about 160 million pounds of this herbicide being put onto our crops.

Well, one's reaction may be this: OK, but is there any downside to that massive deployment of herbicides? Yes, in fact, there is. This herbicide is so efficient in killing weeds that it kills milkweed. Well, milkweed happens to grow in disturbed soil. So it has been a common companion to our agricultural world. Milkweed is the single substance that monarch butterflies feed on. So as the glyphosate expansion has increased over this time period, the monarch butterfly has radically decreased because its food supply has been dramatically reduced. This is not the only factor considered to affect the Monarch butterfly, but it is an example of a significant factor. That is something of which you think: What else could happen in the natural world as a result of changing dramatically the variety of plants that surround our farm fields?

Let's turn to another impact. Millions of pounds of glyphosate go on the fields, and much of it ends up running off the fields and running into our streams and rivers. It is an herbicide. So it has a profound impact on the makeup of organisms in those streams and rivers.

For example, it can have an impact on microorganisms, algae, and things that feed on that up the food chain—fish, mussels, amphibians, and so forth. We don't understand all the impacts of massive amounts of herbicides in our streams and rivers, but scientists are saying: Yes, there is an impact. Studies are underway to understand those impacts more thoroughly. Of course, we care about the health of our streams and rivers.

Let's take another example. Sometimes you just can't fool Mother Nature. One impact of the massive application of glyphosate is that weeds start to develop a resistance to it, and then you have to start to use more of it.

Also, that is true in a different sphere. I am talking about a particular genetic modification that goes into the cells of plants and is designed to fend off the western corn rootworm.

The western corn rootworm eats corn when it is in the larvae stage—that is the worm stage—and it does so when it is in the beetle stage. Some beautiful examples are shown here. It can eat the pollination part of the corn so that the corn doesn't produce healthy kernels as well. It can eat the leaves. It pretty much loves the entire corn plant.

This genetic modification produces a pesticide inside the cell and was in the beginning very effective in killing these corn rootworms. But guess what. Mother Nature has a continuous stream of genetic mutations, and if you apply this to millions and millions of acres and millions of pounds, eventually Mother Nature produces a mutation that makes it immune to this pesticide. Then those immune rootworms start multiplying, and you have to start applying a pesticide again, and maybe you have to apply even more than before because they develop a resistance to it. That is exactly what is happening here. So that is a significant reverberation.

All I am trying to point out here is that this is not really an argument about science. Science can tell us that there have been occasions in which genetic modifications have had an initial beneficial impact, and science will tell us that there are situations in which the reverberations of using the genetically modified plants are having a negative impact. So that is where it stands. It is like any other technology. It can be beneficial. It can be harmful.

So the question is this: Does our government—the big hand of the Federal Government—reach out and say to our cities, our counties, and our States that there is only one answer to this and that is why we are going to ban you from letting citizens know what is in their food. Of course, there is no one answer. We have seen there are benefits and there are disadvantages. Quite frankly, I think it is just wrong for the Federal Government to take away our citizens' right to know. That is why I am doing all I can to publicize this at this moment.

Various States have wrestled on whether to provide information to citizens so that the citizens can decide on their own whether they have a product that has genetically modified ingredients. Most of our food products do because virtually all of our corn, sugar beets, and soybeans are genetically modified, but citizens can look at what type of genetic modification. They can respond and use their minds with information.

This is really what is beautiful in democracy. Government doesn't make up your mind for you. Government doesn't impose a certain framework in which you have to view the world.

Yet, right now, at this very moment, there are a group of Senators in this