

pay. That is the law, and we are all supposed to abide by it, but what happens when the Department in which the IRS is centered will not follow the same rules? I am talking about the Department of Treasury. The IRS is under the Department of Treasury. Now, what is good for the goose is supposed to be good for the gander.

The U.S. Department of Treasury is sitting on \$26 billion—not million, billion. That is nine zeros of matured, unclaimed savings bonds that belong to the people of this country. They have the names, and they have the addresses. Do you know what they are doing to try to contact these Americans? Nothing. Zero. Nada. Zilch. They just sit there holding on to the money.

We know what a savings bond is. We couldn't have won World War II without savings bonds. A lot of Americans took their hard-earned money, and they bought savings bonds. You know how it works. I am just making these numbers up, but you buy a savings bond. You give the Federal Government 100 bucks. You don't get anything every month. You give up 100 bucks, and in 20 years you go back and redeem your bond and it is now worth \$200. In the meantime, the Federal Government gets this loan to use your money. When that 20 years is up, the bond matures. It doesn't pay interest anymore.

Some people lose their bonds. Some people forget about their bonds. Some people pass on, and their kids inherit their bonds. They are lost, but you can always count on the Department of Treasury to keep a list of who owns bonds and which ones have been redeemed and which ones haven't. The U.S. Department of Treasury has that list, and there are millions of Americans whose names are on that list. They have names and addresses, and they don't do anything to give it back. They just stand there sucking on the teat.

Let me give you some examples. We are talking real money. I will just pick a couple out: New Jersey, \$695 million belongs to the people of New Jersey—not the politicians in New Jersey, not the government, the people—that the Treasury is holding.

Let me see if I can find—Washington State, \$560 million belongs to the people of Washington State—not the big dogs, not the mayors, not the politicians, the real people who get up every day and go to work and pay their taxes. For Hawaii, they have \$113 million. In my State, Louisiana, there is \$337 million. There is \$3 billion belonging to people in California.

We are going to get up in the morning, and the IRS—they are just doing their job. You better pay your taxes. They will take your firstborn. But when they have \$26 billion of the American people's money, you can't find them with a search party. It is not right. It is not right.

I sued them when I was State treasurer, and I got a bunch of other State treasurers to sue them too. I don't like

suing people, but the Department of the Treasury has spent tens of billions of dollars fighting the American people. They just don't want to give the money back—and you wonder why people hate the government.

I have a bill to try to do something about it. It is not personal. I think the world of our Treasury Secretary. I would think a whole lot better of him if he would start writing checks to the American people. I am not going to give up on this issue. All we are asking is that the Treasury Department share the names with the States. Every State has an unclaimed property program. They have a great one in Washington, a great one in Hawaii. Usually it is a State treasurer. They know to give money back to people. They don't charge a fee. Right is right, and this is wrong. The Department of Treasury needs to give the money back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

EMERGENCY FUNDING

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, it is not a rhetorical flourish to say that Senate Republicans are being fully obedient to the President of the United States. The evidence of the last few days has confirmed that Republicans are not standing up for American institutions when they are tested, and they will not defend the American people when it counts the most. Through their silence, through their legislative actions, and through their votes, Republicans are allowing funds appropriated to the Department of Defense—funds that address critical military needs in their own home States—to be stolen in order to pay for the President's wall.

Let me explain. The way we do MILCON, military construction, is nonpartisan. It is not bipartisan; it is nonpartisan. That means there is zero politics involved in selecting military construction projects for funding.

The process goes like this: The base commanders decide what projects they need in order to support their missions and military communities. These projects are set up through the chain of command from the base command to the installation command. If the installation command says the project meets the cut and is important enough for military readiness, it is sent to the Service Chief, the Marine Corps Commandant, the Secretary of the Navy, and so on.

From there, each Service Chief decides what projects to present to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and then the Office of the Secretary of Defense racks and stacks these projects. It is a rigorous process, and not a single Member of the U.S. Senate gets to intervene during this process. They figure out which ones get addressed in the fiscal year, and some projects make the cut and others don't. The only thing we get to decide, once the matrix is sent to us, is how much money we have to deal with all of our military construc-

tion needs. Again, there is zero political involvement—no politicians, no side deals, no partisan uniforms. So by the time the Congress receives the final list of projects from DOD, every project has been thoroughly vetted. We recognize that at that point, every project is essential for the safety and security of the Nation, and every Secretary of Defense, every Secretary of the Army, every Secretary of the Navy, and so on looks us in the eye in the Senate Armed Services Committee and in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and says: This is essential. There is not a penny out of place. We need this, and we need this badly.

Shame on the Republicans for allowing this argument over whether to build a border wall to do two things; first, to infect the institution of the Department of Defense with politics and to start to undermine the credibility of the Department and its interactions with the legislative branch; second, and very importantly, to diminish funding for critical military projects.

What kind of projects are we talking about? There are 127 projects that are being raided that we funded. We enacted a law, the President declared an emergency, and the Republicans upheld that emergency. Now these projects are being defunded.

Let me give you a couple of examples out of these 127. This is the form that comes in. These are the words of the Department of Defense.

The first project, Fort Bragg, NC, "Butler Elementary School Replacement." There is a section that is called "IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED." In other words, this is what happens if we don't provide this funding. This is what the Department of Defense says:

The continued use of deficient, inadequate, and undersized facilities that do not accommodate the current student population will continue to impair the overall educational program for students. If a new facility is not provided, the substandard environment will continue to hamper the educational process and the school will not be able to support the curriculum and provide for a safe facility.

Let me take this example of the Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, Laurel Bay, SC. The impact if funding is not provided:

[Fire and emergency service] personnel assigned to Laurel Bay will continue to work from a significantly undersized and unsafe facility. Because the structure does not meet seismic requirements, complete structural collapse is probable during a seismic event, causing death or major injury to emergency personnel, and thus preventing timely response to the [Marine Corps] housing community following the event.

Finally, and this is going to be 3 out of 127 projects rated: Fort Greely, AK, "Missile Field #1 Expansion." These are the ground-based interceptors designed to enhance our missile defense in the case of an attack from North Korea, "IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED." This one is succinct and scary:

Planned enhancements and capabilities of the BMDS to meet emerging threats will not

be available for our Nation's homeland defense.

Those are 3 out of 127 projects.

I just want to ask my Republican colleagues: Where do you draw the line? I understand you can't stand up to the President every time or even most of the time, but my goodness, when they take funding from military families, from bases and installations, from missile defense, from military schools, can't you draw the line there? There has to be a point at which you say enough is enough. There has to be a point when you decide that agreeing with the President under any and all circumstances—and in this case, the most extreme of circumstances—is not how you are going to lead and govern on behalf of your home State.

Let me say this in closing: I still hold out hope for a bipartisan solution to this issue. Democrats and Republicans may have very different goals, and we have different ideas about how to reach them, but there has to be a better way forward than raiding military funds for the wall. If there is anything that can bring the Senate together, it should be ensuring the safety, security, and well-being of our Nation's servicemembers and their families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me thank Senator SCHATZ for his comments. I hope every Senator will follow the points he is making because I think they are critically important.

First and foremost, we are talking about the appropriate power of the legislative branch of government. We have the power to appropriate. We are the article I branch of government. We have appropriated money for border security. We have appropriated money for military construction. Congress clearly intended the monies that we appropriated for military construction to go to our military installations and our military families. We made that conscientious decision.

Now the President is transferring funds from military construction that help our service personnel to the border wall. I say that because it is an unconstitutional grasp of power. It compromises the checks and balances that are in our Constitution. It is an abuse of power, but it is also affecting the quality of life of the men and women who have voluntarily agreed to join our military to protect our country. We can give you many examples.

We are talking about \$3.6 billion of funds that were taken from military construction that are now being used by the President to fund the border wall. It is not Mexico that is paying for this wall; it is the men and women who are serving our Nation who are going to pay for this wall and our military service. That is outrageous, and every Member of the Senate should be concerned about that.

Let me talk about my own State of Maryland and the military construc-

tion projects in Maryland that would be directly affected. There is a road project at Fort Meade for \$16.5 million. Fort Meade is just a few miles away from the Nation's Capital. For any of you who have had the opportunity to travel between Baltimore and Washington, it is about halfway when you come to Fort Meade. You will notice the challenges of trying to get onto Fort Meade's base. The mission being done at Fort Meade is a national security priority for this country, and these roads are critically important for our national security. It has been backed up a long time. Now, thanks to the President—if this goes forward—it will be backed up a lot longer.

The second cut is \$37 million to Joint Base Andrews for a HAZMAT cargo path. This is a matter of safety for the men and women who work at Joint Base Andrews.

I hope all of you are familiar with Joint Base Andrews, which is located just a few miles from here. The Air Force is there. Many of us go through that facility. It is critical that they have the facilities to protect our Nation's Capital and protect the Members and personnel who use that facility. The President, again, is taking away from the safety of the mission at Joint Base Andrews.

The one issue I want to talk about that really highlights the hypocrisy of this transfer is the cut of \$13 million to a child development center at Joint Base Andrews. I want to read for my colleagues the justification given by the Air Force for this request. I am quoting:

The existing child development center was originally constructed as a medical clinic in 1943, renovated to serve many purposes over the last 74 years and is inadequate for current needs. Presently, base child development center has over 37 children on a waiting list for enrollment. The existing facility has suffered from sewage backups, a leaking roof, HVAC failures, along with mold and pest management issues. Work orders continue to pile up despite heavy focus from [engineers], making it more difficult to ensure accreditation each year. The bathrooms are constantly flooding and drainage issues in [the] kitchen result in monthly backups.

The justification continues by saying that the child development center "either needs to be recapitalized due to condition, or taken out of service."

Then they wrote:

IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED: Not providing this facility forces members to use more expensive, less convenient and potentially lower quality off-base programs. These off-base child development centers typically cost \$9400 more than on-base, creating a severe financial strain on military personnel. Quality of life will be severely degraded resulting in impacts to retention and readiness because Airmen and their families will not have a safe and nurturing environment for child care.

This is the Air Force's justification for this project. As they point out, it will cost military families an additional \$10,000 a year. Who is paying for the wall? Our military families are paying for the wall, not the Govern-

ment of Mexico. That is what is involved here.

We cannot let this go forward. Every Member of this body should be aware of what is happening. I just mentioned three of the projects that are on that list of \$3.7 billion that are being transferred to fund the wall that Congress intentionally provided the money for military families. That is wrong. We should stand up for our military families.

I enjoy the fact that we all say we support our military. We are very proud of their stepping forward to defend us, and now we are telling them they have to pay an extra \$10,000 for childcare. That is what is involved here. I hope every Member of this body will voice their opposition to what the President is attempting to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor this afternoon with my Democratic colleagues to voice my strong opposition to this administration's move to take money away from our military to fund President Trump's wasteful border wall.

I often say that we make a promise as a nation to take care of our servicemembers and their families sacrificing to defend our freedoms. But the Pentagon's announcement this week that it plans to move billions of dollars away from critical military construction projects across our country is more than a broken promise to our troops; it is an egregious abuse of power that undercuts Congress's constitutional obligation to set our Nation's budget, and it compromises critical national security priorities.

Earlier today, Democrats on our Appropriations Committee and I supported an amendment to the Defense appropriations bill that would prevent the President from undermining Congress's authority. I was very disappointed to vote against that bill because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would not join us to pass that necessary amendment and stand up against this outrageous plunder.

This Executive overreach is deeply disturbing. It is particularly relevant to my home State of Washington, one of the States most impacted by the Pentagon's reckless decision this week. We learned that efforts to update the pier and maintenance facility at Naval Base Kitsap—a project essential to ensuring the safety and readiness of our military's nuclear submarines—are now deferred indefinitely because the nearly \$89 million that Congress appropriated specifically for that priority are now being moved to build Trump's wall.

As a reminder, this is a wall that the majority of the American people did not ask for and do not want and that President Trump originally claimed Mexico was going to pay for. It is a wall that Congress has time and again decided not to fund on a bipartisan

basis, to the point that President Trump decided to make a bogus national emergency declaration and side-step Congress to raid the Federal coffers for his reckless vanity project.

It is not just Naval Base Kitsap. We also learned that President Trump and the Pentagon are more than happy to fund this wall by slashing other military priorities, like strengthening access to military childcare, repairing vital military assets that were damaged by recent natural disasters, and more that enable our troops and their families to serve our country as we ask them to do.

Here is the bottom line: I—and Senate Democrats—will not stand by while this President steps over Congress to build his wall on the backs of our troops and their families because they deserve a lot better for this country. I will not let up until this is made right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, in this day and age, it would be easy to grow cynical and simply tune out the noise of a 24-hour cable news cycle that feeds off the latest Trump tweet. From Donald Trump's recent decision to invite the Taliban to join him for a retreat at Camp David for the weekend of the anniversary of the 9/11 terrorist attacks to his earlier statements caught on tape, bragging about sexually assaulting women, I fear that too many—including Members of this Chamber—have become numb to this repeated debasing of the Presidency, numb to a President who lacks even a hint of remorse or shame as he spews lies to the people he was elected to serve.

We cannot afford to be numb. We cannot let this become normal. No, we must hold Donald Trump accountable for his false promises and for his lies. We must ask what happened to Mexico's paying for the wall. Trump promised every American over and over again that they wouldn't have to spend a dime on his wall, pledging that Mexico would pick up the tab 100 percent. He even said, "It's an easy decision for Mexico: make a one-time payment of \$5-\$10 billion."

Of course, it wasn't so easy, and now Trump has done a 180, falsely claiming that he never said Mexico would write that check, trying to gaslight us all with every lie that he tells. We simply can't let him get away with it.

The truth is that Donald Trump already revealed whom he really wants to pay for his wall. He discloses it every time his administration begs Congress to spend billions of your tax dollars building it. He doesn't care that many who live on the border believe building a wall from sea to shining sea is the least effective and most expensive way to secure the border. Trump may not care, but that helps explain Trump's failure to convince Congress to fund his vanity project—even when Republicans controlled both Chambers for 2 years.

His outrageous response to his failure revealed another sad truth: The Presidency hasn't changed Donald Trump one bit. President Donald Trump is the very same old Donald Trump whose true character was revealed on the leaked "Access Hollywood" tapes.

In Trump's mind, when you are the President, you can do anything. Congress didn't appropriate funds for your ineffective wall? Well, just grab funds that Congress authorized for more important programs. Tired of failing to convince Congress to spend American tax dollars on your wall? Well, just declare a fake emergency. Senate Republicans will let you do it.

Listen, Trump's decision to build his vanity wall with funds stolen from military construction projects and Homeland Security initiatives isn't really about border security; it is about politics. If he actually wanted to secure our Nation's border, he wouldn't be stripping away funding from the dedicated men and women who are responsible for defending it: the U.S. Coast Guard. Yet that is exactly what he has done—ripped tens of millions of dollars away from Coast Guard programs. He has ignored that his actions could endanger our national security, and he has ignored that we are right in the middle of hurricane season.

As if that were not bad enough, he has also defunded facilities that are dedicated to cyber warfare operations and bomb defusing training. He is slashing money from schools and childcare centers for our servicemembers' children too.

Donald Trump told us over and over again that Mexico would pay for his wall. That was a lie. Mexico isn't paying for his wall. Our servicemembers and their families are. The families at Fort Campbell are, as their children will now have to keep eating lunch in their school's library because President Trump decided that revving up his political base was more important than upgrading an aging military school. My blood boils when I hear that the children of U.S. servicemembers are being forced to learn in makeshift classrooms within classrooms. No child should have to learn in that kind of environment. In my view, that is the true national emergency.

Let me tell you about three other cases in which the President is stealing money in order to pay for his wall. One is at the Channel Islands Air National Guard Station in California.

The project that is losing funds will supply the Colorado Air National Guard with an adequately sized and properly configured space to support a Space Control Squadron functions in accordance with force structure changes. The facility must provide adequate space to support the squadron's operations, maintenance, security, command and administration, and storage areas. The facility must have an unobstructed view of the southern horizon.

The current situation is that this Space Control Squadron, most likely

happening at Peterson Air Force Base, does not currently exist, and there is no adequate facility located at either Peterson or Buckley Air Force Base for this Space Control Squadron.

The only solution that meets all mission requirements is to construct a new facility on Peterson Air Force Base. If this facility is not provided, the squadron will be unable to beddown the space control mission and equipment, with operational and strategic mission impacts due to inadequate facilities.

This is what he is stealing money from in order to build his vanity wall.

A second project is at Fort Greely, AK. The impact of taking the money from this project will mean that Fort Greely, AK, will not have the enhancements and capabilities for the Ballistic Missile Defense System.

The mission of the Agency is to develop and field an integrated, layered Ballistic Missile Defense System to defend the United States, our deployed forces, allies, and friends against all ranges of enemy ballistic missiles in all phases of flight. This expansion project will provide the BMDS with increased ground-based interceptor capabilities, to allow for operational capability.

What happens if the funds are not provided? The planned enhancements and capabilities of the Ballistic Missile Defense System to meet the emerging threats will not be available for our Nation's homeland defense.

He is stealing money away from our Nation's homeland defense to build his vanity wall.

Finally, at Fort Huachuca, AZ, the current situation is that the facilities do not meet the current mandatory criteria specified for vehicle testing and maintenance facilities. The current facilities date back to the 1930s and 1940s and have surpassed their estimated life expectancies. The facilities violate current antiterrorism/force protection standards. Existing utility systems, such as water, sewer, electric, and gas, require replacement. There are no other suitable buildings on the installation that are available in support of this mission.

If they lose the funding for this project, the personnel will continue to work in substandard and unsafe facilities. The motor pool facilities do not comply with current life, safety building codes and quality-of-life standards. The current HVAC, fire suppression, the existing AT/FP and infrastructure deficiencies jeopardize the personnel's health, security, and safety.

This is what he is taking money from to build this wall. The Senate could put a stop to this. It is up to us and our actions, and this very Chamber will determine whether the children of Fort Campbell, whether the personnel at Fort Huachuca, and whether the staff at Fort Greely, AK, can do their jobs. We can defend the power of the purse or we can be complicit in its destruction.

Look, I am not naive. I know some don't share my outrage, that some believe that overcrowded military schools, a decrease in our national security defense, and our ability to defend against hostile ballistic missiles are not a crisis, let alone a national disgrace. These Trump loyalists cower to his bullying tactics, and in the coming days, they will try to reward his abuse of power. They will not stop Trump and return the stolen taxpayer dollars. Rather, they will argue that we should dig even deeper into the Nation's funds to spend more of your tax dollars to replace the money Trump stole. This is wrong. The Constitution entrusts Congress to authorize and to appropriate funds, not the President.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in condemning this raid of taxpayer funds. We must block these outrageous cuts that will harm military readiness, weaken our border security, and hurt the families of those who are brave enough to serve.

I yield the floor.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate having received the papers with respect to S. 1790, notwithstanding the passage of the bill, amendment No. 938 is agreed to, and the measure will be returned to the House.

The amendment (No. 938) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

In section 6943(a), strike paragraph (2).

After section 6966, insert the following:

Subtitle D—Other Matters

SEC. 6971. EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this title or the amendments made by this title shall not include the authority or requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(b) GOOD DEFINED.—In this section, the term “good” means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply, or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

EMERGENCY FUNDING

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I start by thanking my friend and colleague the Senator from Illinois, Ms. DUCKWORTH, for her service to our country many years ago in the military, for her serving in Iraq, and now for her serving our country in a different capacity; that of standing up in the U.S. Senate to defend the Constitution and to defend this institution against what is clearly an unconstitutional power grab by the President of the United States.

When I took my oath of office—when we took our oaths of office—we all swore to support and defend the Con-

stitution of the United States. Back in March of this year, 59 Senators kept that promise when we stood together, on a bipartisan basis, to say no to a gross abuse of Executive power—to an unconstitutional power grab—when we said: No, Mr. President, you may not ignore the will of the Congress. You may not ignore the appropriations that were passed by both Houses of Congress and signed by you. You may not ignore them and rob critical military projects across the country to fund an unnecessary wall.

Now, we can all debate—we have debated many times—the merits of this wall, but there really should be no debate about the fact that the way the President has gone about it undermines the Constitution and undermines the powers given in that Constitution to the Senate and to the House. We made that statement on a bipartisan basis back in March—59 Senators.

Mr. President, don't go robbing military construction accounts and defense accounts to finance the wall.

Yet here we are, 6 months later, and the President is attempting to do exactly that. He is diverting important investments in our military in places across Maryland and around the country.

As has been pointed out, the President said repeatedly that Mexico was going to pay for this wall. Instead, taxpayers are having to pay for this wall, and service men and women and the families of service men and women are bearing the brunt of the President's latest raid.

I see the majority leader is on the floor. Just yesterday, the majority leader said he was going to fight the President's effort to take money away from a middle school in Kentucky to build the wall.

I have a question for the majority leader and all of my colleagues who want to fight to protect the projects in their States. Are they willing to stand up for projects in every State that hurt military families?

Here is what the Air Force wrote about a Maryland project. It is one that is not very far away from here—at Andrews Air Force Base. It is an air force base that, I dare say, every Member of this Senate has had the occasion and honor to visit from time to time. I have in my hand the budget request from the Air Force for a project at Andrews to help the service men and women who work there.

Their article reads:

Not providing this facility forces members to use more expensive, less convenient and potentially lower quality off-base programs. These off-base child development centers typically cost \$9,400 more than on-base, creating a severe financial strain on military personnel.

That is what the Air Force writes—an additional \$9,400 a year for military men and women who we know are not getting big paychecks.

That is not all the Air Force wrote. It went on to write in its justification

for this investment: “Quality of life will be severely degraded, resulting in impacts to retention and readiness because Airmen and their families will not have a safe and nurturing environment for childcare.”

That is from the U.S. Air Force.

I invite all of our colleagues to visit that base and look at the current conditions there because here are the current conditions at the current childcare center that the Air Force is seeking to remedy with this investment.

Again, this is a quote right from the Air Force:

The existing facility has suffered from sewage backups, a leaking roof, HVAC failures, along with mold and pest management issues. Work orders continue to pile up . . . making it more difficult to ensure accreditation each year. The bathrooms are constantly flooding, and drainage issues in the kitchen result in monthly backups.

That is from the Air Force. Those are the conditions our men and women at Andrews are currently facing in the childcare center. That is why the Air Force asked for this money that the President is now trying to take away.

It turns out that when you do the math and when you look at the cost, the money being taken away from this childcare center that would address these awful conditions that exist would build about a half a mile of a wall—a wall that is unnecessary. Yet, even if you believe we need to build this long wall, you should agree that we should not be robbing moneys out of the accounts that help the families of our service men and women.

That was one of the projects in Maryland the President raided. He also raided two others, including one to address traffic congestion at Fort Meade, which is the home to many facilities, including, of course, the National Security Agency. In all, \$66 million was robbed from service men and women in the State of Maryland.

That was just Maryland. We have heard about other States. We have also heard about cuts around the world—cuts from a program that was originally known as the European Reassurance Initiative—funds that we were investing, along with our allies, to deter Russian aggression in places like Ukraine. We called it the European Reassurance Initiative. I don't know what is reassuring now about robbing those accounts. That will have a direct negative impact on our national security and the readiness of the U.S. forces and those of our allies.

We are going to have a lot of opportunities in the coming weeks to address this issue. I hope we will address it on a bipartisan basis. I hope we will address it as U.S. Senators who recognize that the President's actions here are a direct assault on article I—that they are a direct assault on the spending powers given to Congress under article I.

We have our differences. We had a markup in the Appropriations Committee today. Members had a chance to