

free from foreign interference? Why would Leader MCCONNELL and every one of our Republican colleagues, who now have failed to step up to the plate even though some of them work with our colleagues on bills, ignore the admonitions of the Founding Fathers, who said that foreign interference is a grave danger to democracy? What could be the downside of ensuring our elections are fair and free? I ask that question of Leader MCCONNELL.

The only excuse I have heard is he says that additional action isn't necessary. Well, Mr. Mueller, who has done far more investigative work on this than just about anybody else, cleared up all of that yesterday. He didn't say we have done enough already. He didn't say we are on top of it. He said that much more needs to be done.

Leader MCCONNELL, do you disagree? Is Mueller wrong? Are all the experts wrong—the FBI, appointed by President Trump; the NSA, appointed by President Trump; and all those leaders who say we need to do more? We have heard them.

We are going to continue our fight for election security. We are not going to let Leader MCCONNELL put the bills passed by the House into his legislative graveyard without a fight. You are going to hear from us on this issue over and over again.

The legislative graveyard of Leader MCCONNELL is known from one end of the country to the other. Americans know he doesn't want to help them. He doesn't want to help middle-class Americans.

The graveyard of our Republican colleagues, in obeisance to powerful and special interests, gets larger, more stunning, and more debilitating to this country every day.

Yesterday, Democratic Senators requested unanimous consent to pass some election security legislation that they have worked on, much of which was bipartisan. The Republican majority blocked them. Soon—I believe in about an hour—I will be asking unanimous consent on the House-passed election security bill. It is sitting here. It is in the leader's drawer. Is he going to let this go to the legislative graveyard? We will see in an hour. I hope at least one of my Republican colleagues will come to the floor and urge that we vote on this or at least debate it and amend it—one.

The Republican leader's intransigent resistance to this effort is inexplicable. Why he wants to put election security in his legislative graveyard is impossible to explain on a logical basis. I believe his intransigence and his resistance are untenable.

When I move in about an hour for unanimous consent to bring the House bill to the floor, maybe something will be chirping in some of the brains of some of my colleagues here and say: We can't allow the Russians to interfere, and we have to do something.

If they don't agree with what the House passed, let them propose amend-

ments or let them propose an alternative, but let us debate. This is a national security issue of paramount importance.

I urge my friend the leader to stand down and let election security come to the floor. If he doesn't, all of America will know, when Russia interferes, why.

#### BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on another matter—this is on deficits. I am not in the habit of commenting on every opinion issued by newspapers I don't typically agree with, but this week, the Wall Street Journal wrote such a howler of an editorial that I feel compelled to.

The Wall Street Journal editorial board criticized the latest budget agreement for its increase in domestic spending, wringing its hands over the effect on deficits, while simultaneously praising defense spending, which the editorial board believes, for some reason, has nothing to do with deficits.

This, by the way, is the same editorial board that played head cheerleader for the Republican tax bill, which contained such mammoth tax cuts for the biggest corporations and the already wealthy that it will add \$2 trillion to our deficits—\$2 trillion. Huge tax cuts contributed more to the deficit than all of these spending programs put together, but the Wall Street Journal cheered on the tax cuts and now says: Don't spend for the middle class on things like education and infrastructure that have broad support in America and helping kids go to college. Don't spend on that because it increases the deficit, but it is OK to pass massive tax cuts for the rich and the big corporations that are already profitable.

So, for the sake of the record, the Wall Street Journal editorial board believes deficits are really bad but only if they are caused by investments in Americans' healthcare or education or infrastructure. When deficits are caused by defense spending and when deficits are caused by tax cuts for the wealthy, they are peachy.

The truth is, so many of my Republican friends have engaged in the same egregious bit of hypocrisy. So I have a few words this morning for my deficit-scolding friends Mick Mulvaney and the Wall Street Journal editorial board: A deficit is a deficit is a deficit. They try to make the argument that massive tax cuts won't create a deficit, but all the numbers that are coming in now and are projected in the future say that is just not true. If the Wall Street Journal really cared about deficits above all, they wouldn't have supported the tax bill.

When the Senate debated these tax cuts in 2017, there were several proposals on the table—many Democrats and Republicans supported them—that would have reduced taxes on corporations while remaining deficit-neutral.

Many would have changed the Tax Code in ways I didn't support, but nonetheless they would have held revenues and expenditures in line. We didn't hear a peep out of the Journal to support those proposals—oh, no. Democrats even put together a deficit-neutral middle-class tax cut at the time, but Republicans ignored it and pushed through Congress a bill that lined the pockets of the wealthy—blowing a \$2 trillion hole in our deficit. The Wall Street Journal could have said something then. They didn't. They were asleep at the switch. They were asleep at the switch then, and they are crying now.

The fact is, Republican tax cuts for the wealthy and endless wars in the Middle East, championed by George Bush and the Republican Party, are the big drivers of the Nation's debt and deficit, not nondefense domestic spending.

President Obama, to his credit, cut the budget deficit in half during his term. The last time we had a surplus was under a Democratic President, Bill Clinton. In fact, every single Republican administration has added to the deficit, while every single Democratic administration has shrunk it since 1981—Reagan, deficit increased; H. W., deficit increased; Bill Clinton, deficit goes down; George Bush, deficit increased; Obama, deficit goes down; Donald Trump, deficit going up. What does that say?

So, to the Wall Street Journal editorial board and my Republican friends who are silent about Trump-era deficits but rail against domestic spending, I say: Spare us. Enough. Enough with this deficit hypocrisy.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, on climate, I want to congratulate my dear friend, one of the most intelligent, hard-working, articulate Senators we have, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, on reaching a rhetorical milestone. Usually "rhetoric" and "milestone" don't go together, but in his strong eloquence on the environment, they do.

Yesterday, Senator WHITEHOUSE gave his 250th speech on the subject of climate change. Many Members of this Chamber have yet to speak 250 times on the floor in total, much less on a single topic. Senator WHITEHOUSE's speeches have covered everything from sea level rise to polar cap ice melting and the effect of climate change on our economic security and our national security. He has diligently shone a light on the impediments to legislative progress on climate change, and he waxes fervent and poetic, condemning the web of dark money that funds fraudulent climate research and lobbies against climate action.

Much more important than Senator WHITEHOUSE's milestone, of course, is the issue he is talking about. Each passing week brings another proof point that climate change is happening