

Alongside all the action on Capitol Hill today, President Trump continues to fabricate a false narrative about deep-state bias against his Presidency. This is what a child does. You look at them like they are doing something wrong, and they blame something else. They try to divert your attention. That is how the President is acting.

Yesterday, he tweeted: "Look at how things have turned around on the Criminal Deep State." Well, Mr. President, I direct you to your own Secretary of State. You just appointed him, promoted him. Here is what he said yesterday:

I don't believe there's a deep state at the State Department. . . . The employees . . . at the CIA nearly uniformly were aimed at achieving . . . America's objectives.

That is the President's own Secretary of State, his own former CIA Director, dispensing with this fantastical notion of a deep state.

The President says there were spies in his campaign. It is all in the same vein of his other conspiracy theories. Remember, President Trump said that Obama tapped his phones. That was false. He said before that Russia did not interfere in our elections. That was false. Why should we think the claim that there were spies in his campaign is any different? He makes it up as he goes along to divert attention from the real issue: that Russia tried to influence our election; did influence our election; and there may, may, may—we don't know for sure, but we have to find out—have been collusion with members of President Trump's campaign and even President Trump in that regard. That is serious stuff. We have already had 13 indictments. It is beyond any doubt that Russia did try to influence our election. We need to find out who participated. That is imperative to the future of this country.

The President, acting like he has something to hide, keeps trying to subvert the investigation by simply inventing enemies out of shadows and sowing division in our country. If it were anyone else, we would call it paranoia.

Meanwhile, the President continues to risk our national security by using an unsecured cell phone for some of his communications. When the Washington Post asked a national security expert the odds of a foreign adversary having gained access to the President's unsecured cell phone, the expert responded: "100 percent, the question is how many foreign powers."

So while President Trump points the finger of blame in every direction and was relentless that Hillary Clinton broke security protocols, he is guilty of creating a real national security threat every time he picks up his cell phone to call Sean Hannity or Rudy Giuliani. It is amazing. It is utterly amazing, the times we are living in, and it amazes me so that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle still remain silent—still remain silent. Who would have thought.

## EBOLA FUNDING

Madam President, in early May, President Trump proposed rescinding \$250 million meant to combat the Ebola virus and other infectious diseases. Not only are these rescissions a slap in the face of the bipartisan budget process, but they are dangerous to our national health and security.

Just last week, a new case of the Ebola virus was confirmed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and at least two dozen people have already died in this most recent outbreak.

Let's not forget how vociferously our friends on the other side of the aisle criticized President Obama on how he handled the Ebola outbreak in 2014. Once again, Donald Trump totally contradicts what he said in the past with what he is doing now.

Here is what Donald Trump tweeted in 2014:

Ebola has been confirmed in NYC with officials frantically trying to find all of the people and things he had contact with. Obama's fault.

Well, does he now say that it is Trump's fault? What mind-bending hypocrisy.

Now President Donald Trump proposes rescinding the same funding that Congress passed to help handle the Ebola crisis in 2014 and that continues to keep America safe. God forbid this funding is rescinded and Ebola outbreaks reemerge. It would actually be President Trump's fault.

The President should withdraw his rescission request for this funding, as Senator LEAHY and his colleagues on the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee asked in a letter this week. That funding should be free for USAID to use as Congress intended. And Donald Trump ought to learn from his past statements. If he can blame Obama for not fully going after the Ebola outbreak in 2014, why is he cutting money for Ebola now?

## MEMORIAL DAY

Finally, Madam President, on a solemn note, before the Memorial Day weekend, I want to express my deep and abiding gratitude to the men and women in the armed services who gave their last full measure of devotion in defense of our Nation and our freedoms. This morning, I am thinking of one veteran: Larry Reilly, Sr., of Syracuse, NY. He was known to us by his naval rank: Chief Reilly. Chief Reilly served on the USS *Frank E. Evans*, along with his son who carried his name, Larry Reilly, Jr. The *Frank E. Evans* sunk, tragically, in a training accident just outside the combat zone during the Vietnam war, killing 74. Chief Reilly survived the accident; Larry Reilly, Jr., did not.

Because the Department of Defense did not consider the *Frank E. Evans* disaster a wartime casualty—it was a short distance outside the combat zone—we will not find the name of Larry Reilly, Jr., on that wall of black stone a few miles from here. None of the names of the 74 sailors who died

that day grace the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Chief Reilly spent much of his energies in the years since the war trying to right that wrong, to get his son and his son's fellow shipmates who passed away in that tragedy their rightful place in our Nation's history.

Chief Reilly, I regret to inform everyone, passed away earlier this week. We who knew Chief Reilly remember him fondly. We send our condolences to his friends and his family, along with the message that his cause does not die with him. In his honor, we will continue to pressure the Pentagon to recognize the *Frank E. Evans*, and those who were killed when it suffered this tragedy, on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

This weekend, as we honor our fallen veterans in big cities and in small towns throughout this grand country, I will be thinking of Chief Reilly and his son. May we never forget the sacrifices they made, along with so many others, so that we may all enjoy the full blessings of liberty.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

(The remarks of Mr. WICKER pertaining to the introduction of S. 2955 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. WICKER. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## ABORTION

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, last week, the Trump administration proposed new rules to finally bring Federal policy back in line with Federal law. This should not be controversial in a republic committed to the rule of law. But this new policy touches the question of abortion, which tempts all three branches of our Federal Government to turn truth, justice, and the law inside out in the service of violence. President Trump, to his credit, is resisting those temptations and affirming what the law should do—affirming the fact that the law should do what the law says.

The particular law in question is the Public Health Service Act. Every year, it allocates hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars to public health centers across the country. Under the 1970 statute, no Public Health Service dollars "shall be used in programs where abortion is a method of family planning." That is, the bill was expressly written to fund healthcare for lower income communities, including family planning services, but not to fund or facilitate abortion, which, of course, is the opposite of healthcare.

Yet in the 1980s, the General Accounting Office found that abortion providers were colocating their non-abortion and abortion-providing services and just keeping two different sets of books. This put patients, policymakers, and taxpayers in an impossible position. So regulations correcting this obvious abuse of the law were implemented; then they were upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Subsequent Democratic Presidents rescinded these regulations, leaving the abortion industry free to indulge its ever-growing appetite for Americans' blood and treasure. This is the unacceptable status quo that the Trump administration would correct.

By reinstating some of those prior regulations, President Trump is following through on his campaign promise to the American people to get taxpayer money out of the abortion industry. This is to his great credit. Wherever you stand on the question of legalized killing of unborn children, it is essential that we draw the line at taxpayer funding of it.

The new rule would indeed reduce the flow of Federal dollars to abortion providers, including the billion-dollar behemoth of the grisly industry, Planned Parenthood. Even a modest step in this direction—in this case, about 15 percent—is to be commended.

In addition to incremental reform, this new rule is also a clarifying asset. After all, it does not deny Planned Parenthood or any colocated clinics anything. It doesn't deny anything to them. It simply offers them a choice, and given Planned Parenthood's protestations that abortions are just a tiny fraction of what Planned Parenthood does, the choice should be easy enough.

If, despite their billions of dollars of taxpayer subsidies and private donations, Planned Parenthood and its accomplice organizations can't afford two local facilities—one for abortion and one for nonabortion care and counseling—they will just have to choose which clinic to keep open. They will have to decide—or, perhaps, just publicly admit—what business it is that they are really in: healthcare or abortion, life or death. Of course, we already know the answer. That is why Planned Parenthood is widely expected to lead a lawsuit to block the regulation just as soon as it is implemented.

As the New York Times recently put it, abortion is to Planned Parenthood what the internet is to Facebook; that is, like justice and the rule of law are to the American Republic.

Our abortion-on-demand legal regime today is doubly unjust, first, because it was created by judges rather than elected lawmakers and, second, because it denies the undeniable humanity of the unborn. President Trump's new policy would improve the law on both counts. First, it would bring the administration of the law back into line with Congress's clear, statutory text. Second, it would signal that in this White House, the protection of in-

nocent human life will be the guiding principle that it should be in any civilized society.

The new rule will protect Americans' right to protect themselves and the unborn from taxpayer-funded abortions and, hopefully, create just a little more space for the weakest and the most vulnerable among us to grow, to thrive, and to hope that we will one day see that inevitable day not so far from now when our laws and our hearts answer the immutable call of justice, love, and respect for the dignity of the human soul.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Massachusetts.

CONFIRMATION OF BRIAN MONTGOMERY

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, Donald Trump promised during his inaugural address to fight for "the forgotten men and women of our country," but in Donald Trump's Washington, the Senate sits on its hands as the revolving door spins faster and faster. Brian Montgomery is just the latest in a line of bankers, lawyers, investors, and consultants who cashed in on their big-time public service and now want back in.

Mr. Montgomery has just been confirmed to be the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, the FHA, which provides taxpayer-backed insurance that helps millions of Americans buy homes they might not otherwise be able to afford. Lenders make loans to these families because the FHA gives them some protection in case the families default. Like any insurance, there are strict rules about who qualifies. Unless it is managed well, the FHA could expose taxpayers to a risk of billions of dollars in losses.

Mr. Montgomery knows something about the FHA. He was the Commissioner from 2006 to 2009 while the housing market was flying high and when it all came crashing down. Since almost the day he left, he has been making buckets of money selling his knowledge to banks who broke the rules and are trying to escape the consequences.

Here is what I mean. One month after leaving the FHA, Mr. Montgomery founded and became vice chairman of a new company called Collingwood Group which, according to reports, was known in the housing finance industry as a specialist in helping firms navigate FHA-related penalties and lawsuits. Who better to navigate the rules of the FHA than the guy who used to be in charge of the FHA?

One of Collingwood's clients was Wells Fargo. They were in trouble for defrauding FHA, and in 2016 paid HUD a \$1.2 billion fine. That is billion with a "b." Wells Fargo admitted that from 2001 to 2008, it had lied to the FHA about whether certain loans were eligible for FHA insurance. Mr. Montgomery was in charge of the FHA from 2006 to 2008 and let that fraud happen. After he left, he went to the other team, giving Wells Fargo the inside scoop on how to beat the rap.

Collingwood also represented U.S. Bank. In 2014, U.S. Bank paid \$200 million for defrauding FHA. In its settlement, U.S. Bank admitted that "from 2006 through 2011, it repeatedly certified for FHA insurance mortgage loans that did not meet HUD underwriting requirements." The taxpayers paid Mr. Montgomery to manage the FHA for 3 of those years, and he didn't stop the fraud. When he left, U.S. Bank paid him to help them get away with it. I guess it pays to be an inside guy.

I have seen some amazing cases of people spinning through the revolving door, but this one might take the cake. First, Montgomery runs an agency that puts taxpayer money on the line. While there, he looks the other way as the banks submit piles of fraudulent mortgages. The government then loses millions and millions of taxpayer dollars. Then, Mr. Montgomery waltzes right out the door and 1 month later starts a company advising the same big banks on how to pay the government back as little as possible for frauds they committed on his watch.

Look, he may have the best of intentions, but we can never expect the American people to trust Washington if we approve nominees like Mr. Montgomery. It is bad enough that he put taxpayer money at risk by looking the other way as the banks committed fraud and then bad enough that he got rich working for those same banks. Now the Senate is letting him go back and do it all over again? No way. It is finally time to crack down on the revolving door.

Mr. President, 10 years ago, as the economy lurched toward a financial crisis, millions of American families braced for the impact. Over the next few years, almost 9 million families lost their jobs and millions more lost their homes and their savings. Giant banks—pillars of Wall Street for generations—crumbled, bringing communities across this country with it.

In the aftermath of the crisis, Congress passed commonsense rules to make sure Wall Street could never again crash the economy and leave American families with the wreckage, but Donald Trump thinks that Dodd-Frank is "a disaster," and he has promised to do a "big number" on the safeguards it created. He hired an army of bankers and bank lawyers from Wall Street to do the deed, and now Jelena McWilliams is the latest piece in the puzzle.

Here is just one example. In the runup to the crisis, giant banks proved to be terrible judges of risk and ended up sucking down billions of dollars in taxpayer bailouts just to survive. To fix this, Dodd-Frank directed the banking regulators to set strong capital standards that limited how much risk the big banks could load up on and required them to hold enough cushion to survive in case their bets went bad.

Policymakers and regulators from both sides of the aisle agree that these financial regulations made our economy safer. Former FDIC Chair Sheila