

into the office petitioning, asking, begging, pleading for the majority leader to take care of them, and he did.

If we started corporate tax reform with the Patriot Corporation Act, we would have seen rising wages. Instead, we see exploding stock buybacks. Again, we know why. Depending on the size of the companies, stocks can account for as much as half of an executive's compensation. An executives' personal interest influences decision making.

One study of 2,500 companies found that the greater the percentage stock options in executive compensation packages, the more likely a company was to do stock buybacks. No kidding. If I am a CEO, and I see that my compensation depends on stock buybacks, I am going to maybe cash in and do stock buybacks. That is at least what we have seen.

We shouldn't be surprised that when the President and Leader McCONNELL handed them a windfall, those executives turned around, plowed their money right back into stock buybacks and into their own pockets.

A good example of that is really close to home for me. It is what happened to General Motors. General Motors pays almost no taxes anyway. It is a profitable corporation. Ten years ago, in this Senate, I was proud of what I did. I worked with Senator Voinovich, Republican from Ohio; I worked with President Bush, the second; and worked with President Obama in saving those two plant companies, Chrysler and GM. It meant that a lot of Ohioans and a lot of people around the country continued to have decent jobs.

What happened 10 years later? They closed their plants. They do major stock buybacks. The executives get richer, and because of this Trump tax law, more production goes to Mexico.

How do we stop this never-ending cycle of corporate greed and make sure the workers share the profits they created? It may not seem like it, but there are already regulations in place to prevent stock price manipulation.

The problem is, the SEC rule put in place in 1982 has big loopholes. We need to strengthen the SEC rules to ban buybacks and provide more transparency.

Some have suggested we ban buybacks altogether. That might sound good, but it will not do anything to put that money in the pockets of workers where it belongs. The goal is not to tax the rich. The goal is to quit giving them tax breaks, and the goal is to plow money into the middle class, to help American workers get their fair share, to help American workers share in the wealth they create for corporate America.

My proposal is simple. If corporations want to transfer wealth to Wall Street, workers simply get a proportionate share of the pie. For every \$1 million passed on to shareholders in the form of stock buybacks or dividends, corporations will have to pass

on \$1 to every worker in that company. I am calling it a worker dividend, and all public corporations would be required to pay it.

I will be introducing legislation to strengthen SEC rules and to establish the worker dividend in the coming weeks. It simply comes back to the dignity of work. We should honor work. We should respect work. It means better wages. It means retirement benefits. It means healthcare. It means more control over your work schedule. It means a safe workplace. It means childcare. It means all the values that we appreciate as Americans. With the dignity of work and respecting and honoring work, we would see a worker dividend.

Wall Street so often doesn't recognize that all work has dignity. Whether you swipe a badge or punch a clock, whether you work for tips, whether you work on salary, whether you are caring for an aging parent, whether you are raising your children, all work has dignity. Dr. King said there is no job that is menial if it has adequate compensation.

Wall Street considers shareholders' equity in a company to be all that matters. Workers have equity in a company too. It is called sweat equity. For the first time in years in this country, it is time that workers are rewarded for their work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, we are 8 months away from the first primary of the 2020 election. There is a false belief that the 2020 election is a year and a half away when it is 8 months away.

In his May 29 speech, Robert Mueller made the statement that there were multiple systematic efforts to interfere in our election. That allegation deserves the attention of every American. FBI Director Chris Wray made the statement that the 2018 election was a dress rehearsal for the big show.

There are a few statements that we can argue about in this body. I find absolutely no one arguing in this body that the Russians didn't try to interfere in our election of 2016. If you go all the way back in history to 2012, the Russians actively engaged in the Ukrainian election. In that election, they found multiple ways to interfere and to change the stories on social media. They found multiple ways to interfere in their election internally. That interference in 2012 was their practice run for what they launched on the United States in 2016.

It is not just against us. The Russian Federation has attacked every single NATO country's election—every one of them. It just happened to come to us last. I have no doubt that this will not be the last time the Russians will try to interfere in our elections.

As I walk through the entire first section of it over and over again, what

is clear from the Mueller report is they repeat what they have found and how they went through the process of what the Russians were trying to do in working with social media entities to try to create fake American accounts in order to put out fake information online and in trying to find as many different places as they could in order to put out stories to create confusion and chaos.

I have had multiple folks back in my State who have asked me, why would the Russians do this? It is because the Russians cannot match us militarily, economically, or culturally, so they use alternative ways of doing warfare. For them, their favorite type is just stirring up chaos. They look for every time Americans or any free democracy argues with another, and when they find democracies arguing with each other, they reach in and take both sides and try to elevate the arguments.

Basically, what I have told folks at home is that it is like two kids on the playground who are fighting. There is always a third kid on the edge of the playground who screams "fight, fight, fight" in trying to get as many people as possible to come to the fight. Well, the Russians are that other kid on the playground. They are not actually one of the kids fighting; they are just trying to make it louder and bigger.

The Russians have actively engaged in trying to stir up any kind of controversy, and elections are just one place in which a democracy has controversy. They stir up controversy just as much anywhere else they find it, but it is easier at election time when Americans are making decisions and taking sides on their own. They do this on social media, but we also know from the Senate Intelligence Committee and its excellent work in its bipartisan process, as well as from the Mueller report, of what they were trying to do in their reaching into election systems.

There were 21 States that had their elections systems probed by the Russians. That means, electronically, the Russians went in to see if the doors were locked. If they found that a door was locked and they couldn't easily get into the system, they would move on to another State and see if they could find a way to get into its system. The good news in this process is that the Russians were not able to get into a single election as far as their affecting any of the votes.

Through all of the investigations from every single State, from an intelligence investigation, from our intelligence community and its investigations, from the FBI and its work, and from the Mueller report, there were no votes that were changed. We know that. We also know that the Russians were looking and what they were trying to find. What they did find is access to voter databases. That tells us, for the next election, they will be looking to see if they can get to that again. This is the lesson we need to learn from this as they do their spearfishing—as they reach out to different election systems.

Here is what I think we can do in the days ahead and what we can have as our basic findings. As a nation, we need to be prepared for this. There are a couple of ways we can do it, and we have made very clear proposals in order to take this on.

We need to give security clearances to each and every State so that if we discover something on the Federal side and if anyone in the intelligence community identifies there is a problem, one can rapidly get to a State and ask, are you aware of this? That was not present in 2016. We didn't have points of contact between the Department of Homeland Security and every secretary of state in each State so they could also maintain rapid security, not only just normal communication but at the classified level as well.

We need the DHS to voluntarily engage with every single State and ask, would you like an additional layer of cyber protection? I can't imagine a State would not choose to add an additional layer on top of its existing cyber protection.

We also need to encourage States to be attentive to any vulnerabilities they have in their election systems. This is not something we can do at the Federal level. At the Federal level, we don't tell States and counties and precincts how they should do their elections; that is a State's unique responsibility.

We have a different election system in Oklahoma than what they have in Louisiana and in Texas and in Kansas. Although there are border States right around us, you would think we would all share and do it exactly the same, but we don't. That is actually a strength of our system. The Russians can't get into one system, hack into it, and then get into our entire election system, because States do it differently across the country. Yet we do need to be attentive if any State has a vulnerable system.

Right now, the greatest challenge we have is with the States that actually use paperless voting systems, for there is no way to verify the accuracy of those votes. If all of the votes are done electronically—and there are States that don't do it, like mine. We don't do it that way, but some States do. In fact, there are five States that do it that way. You are basically walking up to an iPad, pushing different buttons, and then walking away. That all looks very clean, and there is no threat like there was in 2000 of hanging chads because you can see it there. The problem is, if there were a problem with that software, there would be no way to verify that vote.

In my State, you mark on a paper ballot, and you run it through an optical scan. At the end of election day, they count up all of the things from the optical scan, and the paper ballots are secured away. If there is a question about a machine and its count, we can go back and verify it.

In other States, they have systems that are very similar to that of an iPad

in which you can kind of push your way through the buttons on it, do it all electronically, and look at it. When you decide "this is exactly how I voted" and you push the final button, it prints a paper receipt, basically, that is kept there. Then you can verify how you voted on the paper, which is stored on the machine, and you can also look at it electronically. It is very clean and very easy. There are other places that only use paper and count it all by hand because they are in the rural areas.

Any of those systems work. There is no reason for the Federal Government to tell each State how to do its local elections, but we do need to encourage those States to have systems that allow them to go back and audit and verify. We don't need to have anything at the end of election day that makes Americans doubt the strength of our democracy or the capability of our democracy to hold an election.

So here are the basic recommendations that are coming from the Senate Intelligence Committee and with which I will concur:

States should continue to run elections. We do not need to federalize elections, and we do not need to require that there be Federal certifications for election machines. There is no reason to play Mother May I? with someone in Washington, DC, on how it works. States need to run their elections, but the Federal Government should always be there to assist States and to say: If you have a question or if you want a second opinion, we can offer that.

The DHS should continue to create clear channels of communication between the Federal Government and appropriate officials at the State and local levels. Again, in 2016, when Jeh Johnson contacted State officials and said there was a problem with the election that was coming, State election officials pushed him away and said: We don't know who you are, and we don't know why you are calling us. We can't ever have that again.

The DHS should expedite security clearances for appropriate State and local officials.

The intelligence community should work to declassify information quickly. The last time the warnings came out about the Russian engagement in our election, it took over a year for States to learn that it was the Russians who had been trying to reach into their systems. That can never happen again.

On a national level, we should create voluntary guidelines on cyber security, best practices for public awareness campaigns, promote election security awareness, and work through the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, the National Association of Secretaries of State, and the National Association of State Election Directors. All of them have a role. We should have active communication among each other and among the DHS. States should also rapidly replace outdated, vulnerable election systems.

I have had some folks say to me: Do you know what? Those five States that don't have auditable systems are going to need Federal assistance because it is going to be expensive. That seems like a great argument unless you look at the 45 other States that have figured out how to do it without Federal assistance. This argument that it is going to take \$1 billion to help those last five States do what the other 45 States have found a way to do without Federal assistance just doesn't wash with me. Those five States can do the same thing that the other 45 States have done and have auditable, efficient election systems.

We don't want Russia, Iran, or North Korea to tamper with our elections in 2020 or, for that matter, for there to be any domestic interference. We need to be able to prove the accuracy of our elections, and it shouldn't be a challenge for us in the days ahead. We are 8 months away from these elections, and we need to complete what we have started.

I do need to mention one thing. I am exceptionally proud of the DHS and the work it did in 2018. There were no grand stories about election problems in 2018 because the DHS officials worked tirelessly to help States and walk alongside them. State secretaries of state and local volunteers all around the country worked exceptionally hard to pay attention to the election issues. We cannot stop focusing on that. We need to be aware that the Russians don't just do it once; they do it over and over again, as every one of our European allies can tell us. They will keep coming with misinformation, and they will keep coming to try to destabilize. We, as well, can be clear and push back on this in the days ahead.

I have a bill called the Secure Elections Act, which we worked on for a couple of years, that answers all of these questions, and I look forward to its passage. In the meantime, I am grateful that those at the DHS are paying attention to this, and I encourage them to continue to not only consider these recommendations but to apply them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 2019

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following leader remarks on Thursday, June 13, 2019, the Senate be in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak up to 10 minutes each; further, that at 10:45 a.m., Senator PAUL or his designee be recognized to make motions to discharge S.J. Res. 20 and S.J. Res. 26 and that the motions to discharge be debated concurrently until 11:30 a.m., with 7 minutes reserved for the chairman and ranking member, respectively; further, that at 11:30 a.m., the