

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