

Going back to June, the CBO projected that servicing our debt over the next 10 years would cost 10.4 trillion; however, that projection was made before rates on treasury bonds used to finance our debt surged to a 16-year high. The rate on a 10-year treasury bond is now a full percentage point higher than what CBO assumed this spring. All of that adding to our deficit problems. But these higher than expected borrowing costs persist. It will be trillions more spent simply servicing that debt.

What is more, we haven't yet hit the precipice of the fiscal cliff that CBO and other nonpartisan experts have been warning will result due to the aging population. And, of course, that involves Social Security and Medicare. And the trustees of these two programs say the trust funds for both programs will be insolvent within the next 10 years. Moreover, CBO projects that spending for major health programs will skyrocket from 32 percent of Federal revenue this day to 45 percent of revenue at midcentury.

We can no longer afford to kick the can down the road. We must put an end to governing crisis to crisis and get back to the fundamentals of government. And the fundamentals of government for Social Security and Medicare should cause us to look at the success that Reagan and then-Democratic speaker Tip O'Neill of the House of Representatives said: We can't let Social Security go bankrupt. And they fixed it to this very day by tough decisions that we ought to be making today to fix it for the next 50 years like they did. And I will bet maybe they, at that time, thought maybe they were only fixing it for 10 or 20 years. But that is from 1983 till now. Social Security is supposed to run out of resources, reserves by, I think, 2033.

So what I am saying is it means actually managing the government instead of doing it from crisis to crisis and to do it by not chasing an elusive partisan ideal. That will require implementing honest budget and appropriations practices that will enable us to begin to chip away at this daunting debt.

According to the well-regarded Penn Wharton Budget Model, the United States has about 20 years to take corrective action to avoid fiscal disaster. I almost hate to say 20 years—but Penn Wharton is respected—because that means that maybe we won't take the necessary action in the near term. And it is always easier to solve these problems yesterday than it is tomorrow. The longer we wait to take these actions, then, obviously, I am saying the more painful those actions will be.

In Penn Wharton's estimation, if we put off corrective action until the fiscal crisis is at our doorstep, no amount of future tax hikes or spending cuts will enable us to avoid defaulting on our debt.

When I just said—as I did—until a fiscal crisis is upon our doorstep, Iowans

at my 99-county meetings that I hold every year would say that we are already at that point. And when you talk about maybe it can be done or not done, then you can imagine the cynical people of Iowa—just like the cynical people of the United States as a whole—are even going to have less confidence in our government institutions.

Now, we all know there is plenty of blame to go around for how we got into our current fiscal situation, but no amount of finger-pointing—political or otherwise—will change where we find ourselves today. We must now make a choice. We can either continue down the path to fiscal ruin, or we can begin to rein in a bloated Federal Government in pursuit of a more prosperous tomorrow.

Well, remember what I said about Ronald Reagan 59 years ago tomorrow, also in the words of Ronald Reagan:

You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children this, the last best hope of man on earth or we will sentence them to take the last step into a thousand years of darkness.

We see on television a lot of times people saying how God-awful this country is. And yet on that same television day, you can see 10,000 people crossing the border to come to our country. For those people that live in America and have lived here all their life and find that America is not such a great place, they ought to wonder why people all over the world want to come to America.

Or sometimes I tell people at citizenship ceremonies in the courthouses of Iowa when I am able to go there, I say to this group—many of them have come from autocracies to America where they have less freedom than they have in America today—and I say to those people, I hope when you hear somebody that was born in America bellyaching about the God-awful wrongs we have in this country, I hope you will remind them as a person born in another country how great this country is because people that were born here lose sight of how great America is.

So getting back to this fiscal issue I have been talking about, whether Ronald Reagan says it or I say it or each of my 99 colleagues say it—because I think, to some extent, we are all on the same page—maybe not how to solve the problem, but that there is a problem—then I say, like Reagan said: The choice is clear. It is time we do what our constituents sent us here to do. And that basically means to lead—to lead us out of this fiscal crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

CONDEMNING HAMAS AND ANTISEMITIC STUDENT ACTIVITIES ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 418.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 418) condemning Hamas and antisemitic student activities on college campuses in the United States.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAWLEY. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 418) was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of October 19, 2023, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, 1 week ago, I came to this floor to try and pass this very resolution that condemns the violent, genocidal, anti-Semitic rhetoric and actions on our college campuses all across this country. Sadly, I was blocked by one of my Democratic colleagues. And since then, the situation at our universities has only worsened.

I offer you just two examples. I could multiply these examples, sadly, but let's just take two.

On Tuesday of this week, just 2 or 3 miles from where we stand now on the floor of the U.S. Senate, at the George Washington University, pro-Hamas students projected onto the side of the university library various anti-Semitic, anti-Israel, pro-genocide slogans, including "Glory to Our Martyrs," in reference to the terrorists who attacked the State of Israel, and not just the State of Israel, but who committed cold-blooded murder of babies, cutting off their heads, shooting women and children in their homes, executing soldiers as they lay sleeping in their barracks.

These same students projected other slogans onto the library wall: "Free Palestine From the River to the Sea".

What does that mean? Well, it is a reference to Hamas's longstanding call for the extermination of the State of Israel.

Let's just be clear. This is a reference to their call for genocide of Jews in the Middle East and everywhere they can get their hands on them. This is what is going on, on our college campuses.

If you talk to the students who were there at George Washington University

that night, what they will tell you is, they feared for their safety; they feared for their lives; they don't know if they are any longer welcome on campus or physically safe on campus.

What did the university do in the wake of this attack? Well, the answer has become all too familiar. Virtually nothing. They issued a statement saying that the students weren't authorized to project these genocidal slogans onto the library wall, and that is about it.

We have to do a heck of a lot better than that.

Last night, at Cooper Union, an institution of higher education in the State of New York, Jewish students were barricaded inside their own library as a pro-Hamas group rampaged through the building shouting violent slurs at these students and then pounded on the library doors seeking to gain entrance.

This morning's New York Post reads: "Cooper Union barricades Jewish students inside library as pro-Palestinian protesters bang on [the] doors."

The students who were there last night spoke of being herded into the library, of campus security saying they didn't think they could protect them; campus security then locking the doors to the library to try and keep the Jewish students inside and an angry mob assembling.

There are photos of this. Don't take my word for it. The video is available everywhere. Go look for yourself.

An angry mob of pro-Palestinian, pro-Hamas students were banging on the windows—the glass windows—of the library at the Jewish students who were literally barricaded inside.

These students were calling 9-1-1, calling their relatives, asking for help. Eventually, an hour or more later, campus security reportedly took them out through the back door. They couldn't walk out the front door of a library in their own school. They had to be taken out the back for fear, I guess, of their safety, perhaps also for appearances.

I can't help but think, 50 years ago, 60 years ago, the President of the United States had to activate the 101st Airborne Division to make sure African-American students could go to class in this country without being physically assaulted. Is that what it has come to now on America's college campuses?

Are we going to have to activate the National Guard to see that Jewish students can go to class in safety without being in fear of their lives?

I would just say this: As a nation, we must speak with one voice and say that there is a right, and there is a wrong; there is good, and there is evil; and threatening to kill an entire class of people is wrong and it is evil.

Speaking up, shouting in support of genocide is wrong, and it is evil. Threatening the lives of your fellow students because they are Jewish is wrong, and it is evil.

Plainly, these institutions of so-called higher learning have failed these

students. These students have clearly no idea what right and wrong means. You project stuff like this on a library wall while your Jewish classmates stand in fear for their lives, you don't have any idea about what right and wrong is.

Clearly, these institutions have failed these students, which is why we need to speak with moral clarity now. This is a teachable moment. This is a moment for us to say that genocide is wrong, that terrorist attacks against Jews are wrong, that threats on the lives of Jewish people anywhere—the Middle East, in this country, Europe, anywhere—is wrong.

This shouldn't be hard. But we have to do it so that these students and everywhere within the sound of our voice can understand what right and wrong means—can understand the moral gravity of the situation we are now confronting.

That is why what we are doing today matters, and that is why I am pleased today that we are able now, finally, to pass this resolution that explicitly names the rhetoric, explicitly calls out the language of pro-violence, pro-genocide, and says that is wrong.

Now, I want to be clear. Our First Amendment—of which I am a great defender—our First Amendment allows people to say the most terrible things—vile, horrible, reprehensible things. The First Amendment, as I have often said, is the right to be wrong. And these students are absolutely wrong.

So they may have the right to say these things—although I must add, nobody has the right to threaten violence against other Americans or anybody within their ambit. They may have the right to say terrible things, to say that they are in favor of genocide, to say that they want to see Jewish people killed. They may have the right to say those things, but that doesn't mean that we have to agree with it. That doesn't mean that we have to say: Oh, that is morally neutral. Sure, you can say it, fine. We have no opinion.

No, no, no. The answer to that kind of hateful, virulent, dangerous speech is speech with moral purpose. It is language with moral clarity. It is a moral stand that says: No, that is wrong. That is not us. That is not the United States of America. That is what we are doing right here, right now, on this floor today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES 44

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, so much senseless violence, so much death and destruction, shouldn't we at least avoid wars of choice? Shouldn't we at least not go looking for trouble in every corner of the planet?

With the Middle East on fire, what sense does it make to have over 1,000 troops in Niger? Does it make sense to station over 1,000 troops in a country ruled by a military junta? Does it make sense to scour the back roads of Africa droning potential villains?

Today, the Senate will debate and vote on whether U.S. troops should remain engaged in hostilities in Niger. It should not go unnoticed that Congress never voted to send troops to Niger in the first place.

Presidents of both parties have used the September 11, 2001, authorization to use military force to justify wars in dozens of countries from Afghanistan to Libya, to Syria, to Somalia, to Yemen. Niger is but 1 of over 20 countries that the U.S. conducts military operations in, supposedly justified by the 9/11 authorization to use military force.

The impetus for this War Powers Resolution in 2001 has nothing to do with the situation of Africa today. This War Powers Resolution today, though, is related to the July 26 coup in which members of Niger's Presidential Guard, including some officers who were trained in the United States, removed the democratically elected President, Mohammed Bazoum, from power.

Now, the surrounding states around Niger are unhappy with this. The Economic Community of West African States is an organization of 15 countries. They have declared their intention to intervene militarily in Niger if President Bazoum is not restored to power.

We are in the middle of a potential war, with 1,100 troops in Niger, where a democratically elected President has been deposed, and they are being ruled by a military junta and still our troops are there.

In September, two other countries—Mali and Burkina Faso—that have experienced their own armed coups in recent years, signed a mutual defense pact to defend the military junta in Niger.

Niger's new leaders have put its military on maximum alert, citing an increased risk of attack. For its part, the Economic Community of West African States—15 countries—has imposed sanctions, instituted a no-fly zone, and closed border crossings. Recent reports indicate that Nigerian troops have been deployed along the border of the country Benin.

The Sahel is a powder keg, and we have over 1,000 military troops and personnel sitting in the middle of it. The Middle East is on fire, and yet we have 1,100 troops sitting in the middle of a potential war that we could be drug into. American forces face a very real