

longer being honored. The proposal offered by my colleague from Texas, on behalf of Senate Republicans, responds with a bill targeted at one candidate, a proposal that all our true national security experts have said would harm America's security. The briefing of our Presidential candidates is not just for their benefit, it is for the benefit of the American people so we have a smooth, democratic transition of power without risk to our national security.

This attempt to hide the violation of a tradition of openness and accountability behind a political witch hunt ought to tell Americans all they need to know about Senate Republicans at this point. For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I join with Senator WYDEN in my deep disappointment that the Republicans have objected to the continuation of a policy that has voluntarily been done for 40 years; that is, those who are running for President of the United States release their tax returns. I want to underscore a couple of points that were made by Senator WYDEN. I thank him very much for his leadership on this issue.

I just came from a hearing at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—where I have the privilege of being the ranking Democrat—on Afghanistan. A large part of that hearing dealt with transparency, good governance, corruption, and anti-corruption. That is a key fundamental for Afghans' success. This morning I also had a chance to meet with the new leader of Burma. She has tremendous challenges in that emerging country. Transparency and anti-corruption are critically important to the success of that democracy.

When the United States stands internationally for good governance, anti-corruption, and transparency, we first have to deal with our issues at home. It is hard for us to demand transparency globally when we ourselves fall victim to the failure to make information available to the public that they desperately need. Let me tell you why that is important. This is not theoretical. The Panama Papers indicate that heads of state—current heads of state and former heads of state—have used ways to avoid public disclosure of the gains of their office, the connections they have had.

There is a reason why for 40 years we have seen the release of tax returns by those running for President. Before they vote, the public has a right to know about the potential conflicts that individual brings to the Office of the Presidency, the highest office in the land.

Senator WYDEN pointed out accurately that that tax return could very

well show international contacts, international business, and offshore activity that the public has a right to have debated during the course of the campaign. It may show a Presidential candidate's use of the provisions within our Tax Code to pay a different tax rate or no taxes at all. The public has a right to know that before they cast their vote so they can ask questions about that. The tax return may show that certain statements made in regard to the use of charities are either appropriate or not appropriate. They have the right to debate that before they cast their vote.

Senator WYDEN's bill carries out current practice. I don't think anyone thought 6 months ago that someone would step forward to run for the Presidency of the United States and accept the nomination of a major political party without disclosing their tax returns. I don't think any of us thought that was at issue.

Senator WYDEN has been very patient with this bill. We have given all the Presidential candidates that opportunity. Secretary Clinton has disclosed her tax returns. Secretary Clinton has made available her emails through appropriate channels. That has been done. That transparency has been made. But there is a person running on the Republican side who has refused to disclose his tax returns. That is wrong. That denies the American people the transparency they need to judge the candidates and to engage in political discourse during the campaign, which is critically important to their decision as to who the next President of the United States should be.

I am extremely disappointed that there has been an objection to Senator WYDEN's request that we require those who want to be President of the United States—the highest office in this land, the highest office in the free world—to disclose their tax returns.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY ACT

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I am on the floor today to talk about the Presidential Tax Transparency Act. It is a simple proposal that would require every Presidential candidate of a major party to release their tax returns. Hillary Clinton has already done it. In fact, every single general election candidate in the past nine elections has done it.

I will be honest. This is not the kind of legislation that I thought Congress would ever need to pass, but, like a lot

of people, I never thought that someone like Donald Trump would be the nominee of a major political party. Donald Trump makes a big show, strutting around, pretending to be tough, but he is too chicken to show his tax returns to the American people. He has had a million excuses, but we all know why Donald Trump isn't releasing his taxes. He is hiding something.

For a long time I wasn't sure what he was hiding. But thanks to the tireless work of journalists and experts, we at least have some clues about what he is hiding. We don't know everything, but slowly some of his secrets are starting to leak to the public, and they are not pretty.

Let's start with the tax scams that we know about. Here are just three of them.

The first scam is claiming tax credits for homeowners who make less than \$500,000 a year. He wasn't eligible, so he lied—nothing fancy. Eventually, the press caught wind of it, and Trump paid up. And if he hadn't been caught, he would still be lying about it today.

Here is another Trump tax scam. Scoop up hundreds of millions of dollars in real estate developer subsidies, then skip out on paying any income taxes. In 1978, 1979, 1991, and 1993, Trump paid zero dollars in income taxes—zero, and that is not a comprehensive list of his zero-tax years. It is just the years when, for one reason or another, his tax returns were public.

Here is the third Trump tax scam. In this campaign, Trump claims the charitable deduction when he gives money to his own foundation, and then he uses that foundation for personal expenses and campaign fundraising.

That is just the stuff we know about. So how bad are the things we don't know about? The American people should see Donald Trump's tax returns so they can decide for themselves if his shameful and, in some cases, illegal behavior disqualifies him from being President.

The tax scams are awful, but they are a sideshow compared to what else is probably tucked away in his tax returns. Those tax returns would show his personal deals with foreign governments, arrangements that could put him in direct conflict with American interests.

We already know about some of Trump's foreign dealings. We know he has gotten Russian oligarchs with close ties to Vladimir Putin to fund his businesses. Is he still doing that?

We know he has financial ties to political dynasties in Turkey. We know he is wrapped up in aggressive pipeline plans in North and East India.

The list of countries where Trump has financial conflicts is staggering: South Korea, India, Turkey, Libya, Russia, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates.

Remember the Libyan dictator Qadhafi. Back in 2009, Trump was set to lease his own estate to the dictator,

but local protests shut that down. So who else has he been leasing his home to—Putin? I mean, maybe Trump's next business will be Airbnb for dictators.

Tax returns will not tell us everything, but we know that they will tell us something about what Trump is hiding. Donald Trump praises brutal dictators and murderers. He threatens our allies. He denigrates democracy right here at home. He is right out front with all of that stuff.

What is so bad that Donald Trump has to hide it? Would his tax returns show how deeply Donald Trump's personal, financial interests run directly counter to the national interests of the United States of America?

It is 8 weeks before a national election. Everyone wants Donald Trump to do what other candidates—Republican candidates and Democratic candidates—have done and disclose his financial information to the American people.

George W. Bush's IRS Commissioner has said: Trump should release his taxes, period.

The IRS Chief Counsel for Ronald Reagan has said the same thing: Trump should release his taxes, period.

TED CRUZ has released his taxes. John Kasich released his taxes. Jeb Bush released his taxes going all the way back to 1981.

Look, it is no surprise that Trump thinks the rules don't apply to him; he never does. But the American people are not going to buy a pig in a poke. He should release his taxes voluntarily. But since he will not, then we should pass the Presidential Tax Transparency Act and make him release those taxes.

No one knows what he is up to with Russia, Libya, or any other country. Let's take a look at his taxes and find out.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MINERS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, yesterday I joined Senator MANCHIN, Senator WARNER, Senator CAPITO, and others about the mine workers' pension. I come to the floor again today as I just cannot believe that my colleagues are going to go home. Some wanted to go today and make this the last day of session. Others are saying next week.

I think there is no excuse for this Senate to leave without taking care of the longtime—starting with Harry Truman—agreement we have made with the people who go down into coal mines and do their work. They powered this

country and have for decades. It is one of the most difficult, least safe jobs in the country.

On my lapel I wear a depiction of a canary in a bird cage that was given to me at a workers' Memorial Day rally. The mine workers stuck a canary down in the mines. One hundred years ago they had no union to protect them. They had no government that cared enough to protect them and their safety. They relied on this canary. If the canary died, they got out of the mines. They were on their own.

We know this proud history of mine workers in Ohio, West Virginia, Kentucky, Western Pennsylvania, and Southwest Virginia. We have an obligation—the anti-labor sentiment in this body, particularly in Republican leadership—to these mine workers. When they negotiated their wages at the bargaining table, they gave up wages 20 years ago, 30 years ago, or 40 years ago. They gave up wages then so they would have pension and health care later. They were some of the most patriotic people—and have been.

When we had our rally the other day outside of the Capitol to at least push Senator MCCONNELL to do his job, to push this Senate to do its job. This is a Senate that has been out of session more than any Senate in the last 60 years. They simply don't want to do their job. Even forgetting about nominating, confirming, or at least having hearings on a Supreme Court nominee, forgetting about the Zika virus for a moment—this Senate simply isn't doing its job, and it starts down the hall in the majority leader's office.

They are simply refusing to bring to a vote this very simple bill to protect miners' pensions and health care. It doesn't cost taxpayer dollars. It is moving money from the abandoned mine fund into this UMW pension and health care fund.

It is a betrayal of those workers. It is simply saying we don't care about those workers. I can't believe that this body doesn't seem to care much about workers, doesn't seem to care much about people who work with their hands, doesn't seem to care much about the safety of workers, doesn't seem to care much about the air they breathe and the conditions they work in.

This is finally a chance for this body to go on record saying: Yes, we actually think mine workers have dedicated their lives to working some of the most difficult jobs in our country, and we should live up to our obligation. Other than that, it is a betrayal of those workers, and it is coming straight out of the majority leader's office.

It is shameful that this Senate is thinking about going home without doing its work. I again ask the leader to schedule this bill so we can move forward.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as you hear in Montana and I hear in Wyoming weekend after weekend as we go home and we travel our States over the summertime, we are hearing from more people and seeing more articles in the newspaper about how the Obama health care law is falling apart. Every Member of this body—every Member of this body—probably hears the same stories I hear and have heard again today visiting with people from Wyoming—stories from people who can no longer afford their health care premiums, their health care coverage, the copays, the deductibles, and all of the things that have happened because of the Obama health care law.

I think it is interesting to reflect on that new survey done by the Gallup organization, a well-known pollster from around the country with a long history. They released numbers last week about what people are seeing around the country with regard to ObamaCare—the things we have been hearing at home every weekend.

The first thing we found is that more Americans disapprove of ObamaCare than approve of it. Now, it is interesting because the Senate minority leader, HARRY REID, was on the floor yesterday saying repeatedly: Isn't ObamaCare great? Well, I would say to my friend and colleague from Nevada: No, as a matter of fact, more Americans disapprove—thumbs down—of the Obama health care law than people who approve.

That is not what was supposed to happen—oh no. When the now minority leader—then the majority leader—came to the floor a number of years ago with a bill that was written behind closed doors in his office, when they forced this through the House and the Senate, they said it would be great. Senator SCHUMER, who may likely become the new leader of the Democrats in a new Senate after the minority leader retires, predicted from the floor—right over there—that the law was going to be much more popular as time went on. He said: "When people see what is in the bill, and when people see what it does, they will come around."

Well, it has now been 6 years. People have seen what is in the bill. Remember NANCY PELOSI saying: First you have to pass it before you get to find out what is in it. People have seen what is in it. They have not come around. People disapprove of the President's health care law—thumbs down—by 51 percent.

It is interesting that the numbers have actually gotten worse, in spite of