

something about it over a year ago when we passed the Excellence in Mental Health Act. What did the Excellence in Mental Health Act do? The Excellence in Mental Health Act set up an eight-State pilot where in those eight States the facilities that met the requirements that the act specifies—community health centers, federally qualified health centers, community mental health centers that have the right kind of staff and have that staff available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, and meet other criteria—in those centers and in those eight States, behavioral health would be treated like all other health.

What I think we will find out that happens in those eight States is that there is no increase in cost. There are a few studies that would lead me to believe that. They are going on around the country right now. Nobody will argue that if you treat behavioral health like all other health, the overall societal cost is going to more than pay for whatever you invest in treating that mental health issue. But I think what we are likely to find out, and what studies are beginning to prove, is that even with the health care space itself, if you treat behavioral health like all other health, your overall health spending doesn't increase. It decreases because the other issues are so much easier to deal with. If you are taking your medicine, if you are feeling better about yourself, if you are eating better, if you are sleeping better, if you are seeing the doctor, suddenly the cost that was being spent on your diabetes or the cost that was being spent to deal with hypertension gets so much more manageable that your overall cost goes down.

What we think will happen is that the eight States that move in this direction will never go back even though it is a 2-year pilot. We think all the facts are going to show that it should be a permanent commitment. In fact, what happened was that we didn't have just 8 States apply or 10 States apply or even the 20 States that the Senator from Michigan and I were told would be the maximum if we made this mandatory for the whole country from day one. We might have as many as 20 States that would be willing to participate, but 24 States applied to come up with the framework to hope to be one of the 8 States. Those 24 States have all been given a little planning money. They will have a few more months to come up with a plan that says: Here is what we would like to try to prove—that if you treat behavioral health like all other health, good things happen, and it is the right thing to do.

The more I talk about that and the more others talk about that, the more I think we all wonder why would we even think we have to prove this. But these pilot States are going to prove that. I am beginning to wonder why we don't figure out how to make all 24 States pilot States. A very small commitment leads to a very big result.

What we would find out is that doing the right thing produces the right kind of results. If half the States in the country not only went on this 2-year pilot program but find out that this is really what you need to do, half the States in the country would permanently be on a program that for the first time begins to achieve the goals of the Community Mental Health Act.

There are great discussions going on in both the House and Senate about how the Senate bill can focus on expanding some of the grant programs that will encourage people to become behavioral health professionals. The House legislation talks about how we can get families more involved so they are able to keep up with the family member who has a behavioral health challenge. However, none of those things actually matter very much if they don't have anywhere to go. We can have all the mental health professionals we can imagine we would want to have, but if there is no access point for mental health treatment, it doesn't do any good to have all those mental health professionals.

What the Excellence in Mental Health Act does and will do is create an access point where everybody can go. Based largely on the community federally qualified health center model, those expenses will be submitted to the person's insurance company or they may have some other capacity to pay. Some individuals will have a copayment for every visit, which is part of that system. They can use whatever government program they might apply for, and then the difference will be made up when they submit their legitimate expense, and those payments will be carefully audited.

The goal of the federally qualified center is year after year to get the money back that they have invested in treatment so that it then becomes an access point for those people.

I wish to point out that the access point is what really matters here and is the underpinning for everything else. There is no reason to have a big debate about how they share somebody's record with the people who are closest to them if they don't have anywhere to go and get that analysis. There is no reason to think about how many mental health professionals we could use in the country if there is no facility for people to go to so they can meet their mental health professional.

This is a real opportunity for us. Congress has agreed to do this. I will be searching—and I hope my colleagues will join me in ways to search—to see what we can do to not only have an 8-State pilot program but to see if we can expand it and have a 24-State pilot program, assuming that all 24 of those States come back with a credible plan on how we can meet the goals of not just the Excellence in Mental Health Act but, frankly, the goals the country set for itself 50 years ago on the last day of October in 1963.

We are still woefully short of meeting the potential we need to meet in

order to bring people fully into society based on what happens if you treat their behavioral health issue the same way you would treat every other single health problem they may have. There is no reason not to do that. We have the capacity and ability to do that. We have the program Congress has agreed to, and suddenly the number of States that are taking this seriously exceeded everybody's estimation of States that would want to be a part of this program.

I think one could argue that 50-plus years later, we may have finally come to a moment when everybody is willing to talk about this issue and do something about it. We shouldn't miss this moment. It is never too late to do the right thing. We are not doing the right thing now. Treating behavioral health like all other health issues and fully utilizing the skills and potential of mental health caregivers by giving them just a little more assistance than they currently have will enable those suffering from a behavioral health issue to become a full part of a functioning society.

I am proud that my State has always been forward-leaning on these issues, whether it is Mental Health First Aid or trying to involve different kinds of care that work. I hope my State will be one of the pilot States. Frankly, I would like to see every State do this that wants to do this and can put together a planning grant that shows they have made the local investment that is necessary so they, too, can be a part of the program that is moving forward to improve behavioral health issues.

We still have one or two opportunities this year. We have the rest of this Congress if we don't get it done this year, but let's not miss this moment to improve mental health issues. We are already 50 years behind. Let's not get any further behind when there is a chance to do the right thing for the right reasons at the time we have to do it in.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—NOMINATIONS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise again today to support Adam Szubin's nomination to serve as Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes at the Treasury Department, as well as to support several other nominees whose nominations have been pending before the Senate banking committee for many months—some for almost a full year—with no vote.

All of these nominees have had hearings. They have all completed a thorough committee vetting process and

they are ready to be approved. Yet the Senate banking committee is the only committee in the Senate that has not yet held a single vote on any administration nominee in this Congress—not one vote on any of the more than a dozen nominees this Congress.

There are 13 nominees pending before the committee. Here we are in the final month of the year, and Republicans still have not held a vote on any of them.

This inaction stands in stark contrast to this committee's record on nominees over the past 15 years. When we look at this chart, we see for the 107th, 108th, 109th, 110th, 111th, 112th, 113th, 114th—eight Congresses, 15 years—this Congress is only half completed—Republican Presidents during much of this time and Democratic Presidents during much of this time; a Republican majority in the banking committee during some of this time and a Democratic majority in the banking committee during some of this time. Yet when we look at these numbers, we see lots referred to committee, but when we look at the number of approved by committee for this Congress: zero. The number confirmed by the Senate coming out of banking for these nominations: zero. The number returned to the President: zero. The number withdrawn: zero.

In other words, time after time, year after year, President after President, Senate majority after Senate majority, we have seen the Senate banking committee actually do its work, until the 114th Congress, 2015: nothing in terms of approval. In this Congress, the committee has failed to carry out its duty to consider and act upon the President's nominees.

Let me start with Mr. Szubin, who is currently serving in his critical position in an acting capacity. Despite having bipartisan support—the Presiding Officer I know is also on the banking committee—his nomination has languished for 200 days because of Republican obstruction.

This is a critical national security post that must be filled permanently. Mr. Szubin heads what is in effect Treasury's economic war room, managing U.S. efforts to combat terrorist financing and fight financial crimes. He can do his job better if he is not acting but if he is in fact the confirmed nominee of the President of the United States. He is helping to lead the charge to choke off ISIL's funding sources. We are introducing legislation today, in part, answering the threat of ISIL and the threat of terrorism and, in part, by coming up with new ways to choke off funding for the terrorists. Nobody is in a better position in our government—nobody—than Mr. Szubin, and I want him confirmed so he can do his job better. It would prevent developing additional capacity to strike war targets around the world. He is working to hold Iran—regardless of how one voted on the Iran nuclear deal, he is going to hold Iran to its commitments under

the nuclear deal and lead a campaign against the full range of Iran's other destructive activities.

Mr. Szubin has served in senior positions first in the Bush administration and now in the Obama administration. I don't know if he is a Democrat or Republican. I don't really care. He is an acknowledged expert in economic sanctions and counterterrorist financing. There is no question—no question—that he is qualified for this position. Over the last 15 years he has distinguished himself as an aggressive enforcer of our Nation's sanctions laws against Russia, against Iran, against North Korea, and against money launderers, against terrorists, and against narcotics traffickers. Given all the concerns surrounding terrorist financing—legitimate concerns that Senator SHELBY has and that I have and probably all other 98 Members of the Senate have—one would think a nomination would be a priority. In the past, it has been.

Szubin's mentor, Bush Under Secretary Stuart Levey, was confirmed by the Senate just 3 weeks after his nomination came to the banking committee. The Senate took just 2½ months to consider Mr. Szubin's immediate predecessor.

Mr. Szubin has support across the political spectrum. Even many groups opposed to the Iran nuclear deal support his nomination. The banking committee chairman, Senator SHELBY, my friend who is in the Chamber, described Mr. Szubin as "eminently qualified." He deserves the strong backing of the Senate. Without it, his ability to operate here and abroad is less than it should be.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and the banking committee be discharged from further consideration of PN371, the nomination of Adam J. Szubin to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes; that the Senate proceed to its consideration and vote without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I am frustrated that my colleagues have chosen to continue to object without giving a reason why we are not going to vote on this nomination; not talking about Mr. Szubin's lack of qualifications—because that just wouldn't be true—and not ultimately helping us deal with terrorism around the world

in this critical national security nomination.

Let me turn to another key Treasury official who has been nominated to serve in a dual economic security and national security role, Adewale Adeyemo, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Markets and Development. The person in this role is responsible for key national security issues and recommendations made in the CFIUS process, which assesses the major national security implications of large investments in the United States made by foreign firms.

Like Mr. Szubin, Mr. Adeyemo has been waiting for months for the banking committee to act on his nomination.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and the banking committee be discharged from further consideration of PN86, the nomination of Adewale Adeyemo to be Assistant Secretary for International Markets and Development; that the Senate proceed to its consideration and vote without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHELBY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I am further frustrated because of a lack of information as to why we are not confirming this nominee. We have had hearings and they have been vetted. There is no opposition to qualifications. There is no dispute over how important these positions are.

Let me turn to a nomination for another key economic security position in the administration: Patricia Louis-Schmicker to serve on the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank.

The Export-Import Bank has been around since the days of Roosevelt. There were efforts by tea party Republicans to put the Export-Import Bank out of business. They did, for a period of time, even though for 75 years it has been reauthorized, kept in existence, helped our country, made a difference in creating jobs, helping big companies such as Boeing and GE and others, and helping all kinds of small companies. Many of the companies they have helped people haven't even heard of, that are in Ohio and that are part of the economic supply chain, the supply chain for these companies.

This week I was with a group of people who do this kind of work in Ohio. They were just flabbergasted that because of intransigence on the part of

tea party Republicans, we can't get them—we didn't authorize it for months and months, and now, when we finally did and it can operate, the Ex-Im Bank can't operate because the Senate banking committee will not do its job.

So I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and the banking committee be discharged from further consideration of PN288, the nomination of Patricia Loui-Schmicker to be a member of the Board of Directors for the Ex-Im Bank of the United States; that the Senate proceed to its consideration and vote without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHELBY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the objections from my Senate colleague, my friend Senator SHELBY, costs us American jobs. When you shut down the Export-Import Bank, it means that workers get laid off, it means that companies can't expand, it means companies can't do what they want.

So the first objection means our country is less safe, the second objection causes us all kinds of problems with making sure our companies and national security is what it should be, and this third objection costs us American jobs. None of these do I understand.

Mr. President, I want to turn to another Treasury Department nominee. Amias Gerety has been nominated to be Assistant Secretary for Financial Institutions, Department of the Treasury. Mr. Gerety has played an important role since the beginning of the current administration, helping our country recover from the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. He deserves the full backing of the banking committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and the banking committee be discharged from further consideration of PN208, the nomination of Amias Moore Gerety to be Treasury's Assistant Secretary for Financial Institutions; that the Senate proceed to its consideration and vote without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately no-

tified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHELBY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I will move on to another nomination.

This nomination is for the Federal Transit Administration. This distinguished nominee, Therese McMillan, has been awaiting confirmation since January of this year. She joined FTA as the Administrator in 2009. She has been Acting Administrator for a year and a half.

Apparently the Republican majority doesn't want anybody in the Obama administration because the President they don't much like has nominated these people. It is pretty hard to understand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and the banking committee be discharged from further consideration of PN41, the nomination of Therese McMillan to be Administrator of the Federal Transit Administration; that the Senate proceed to its consideration and vote without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHELBY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, a nominee to be inspector general of the FDIC, Jay Lerner, has been awaiting confirmation since January of this year.

We know the Republican majority doesn't much like Obama nominees, even though President Obama is one of, I believe, two Democrats in the last 150 years who has actually—correct me if I am wrong—won at least 51 percent of the country's votes twice. Since the Civil War, the only other was Franklin Roosevelt, who won more than half of the popular vote four times in the country. I know some of my colleagues don't seem to want to recognize that he is the President of the United States and, as we have always done in this country, the President gets to nominate people. If they are qualified, they should be confirmed. Even if there is disagreement on their qualifications, they should be voted on and voted down. We are even asking you to do that if that is what you choose to do. But, particularly since they don't much like the people the President

puts on the FDIC, maybe we need an inspector general who can find out if they are doing things wrong. That is the whole point of the inspector general—to root out corruption and other problems, such as incompetence, in an agency. That is what Jay Lerner would do as the inspector general of the FDIC.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and the banking committee be discharged from further consideration of PN65, the nomination of Jay Neal Lerner to be inspector general of the FDIC; that the Senate proceed to its consideration and vote without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHELBY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I guess that is the conclusion of my efforts today. Senator SHELBY can return to the Republican luncheon if he would like or debate me a little bit on this, but I don't get this—first of all, in terms of our national security, the importance of Adam Szubin; in terms of honesty in government, the importance of Jay Lerner; in terms of creation of jobs, the nominee to the Export-Import Bank.

I will not belabor this process anymore. I will not raise nominees anymore for reasons of time. I think I have made my point, but especially for critical national and economic security, the nominees on this list should move forward.

I don't understand this. I haven't seen anything quite like this in the Congress of the United States. I continue to press this case. I am willing to talk one-on-one with Senator SHELBY on this. He has been open to that in the past. I hope my colleagues will join me in bipartisan approval of these national and economic security nominees who will matter for the continued greatness of our great country.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARIS CLIMATE CHANGE
CONFERENCE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, this week the United Nations climate change conference is continuing in Paris. I understand over the weekend a number of Democrats went to Paris to watch a part of the discussion.

I have been talking to folks back home in Wyoming about this climate conference and what the Democrats are proposing, and I will tell you, the people in Wyoming are not happy. They are not happy about President Obama's plan to destroy American energy jobs and also to destroy the communities that depend on these jobs.

They are not happy about the President's plan to give away billions of U.S. taxpayer dollars to other countries. They are not happy about the President's plan to ignore the will of the American people and to sign an expensive, destructive treaty on climate change in Paris. That is what they think the President is planning to do, and I believe they are exactly right.

Last Friday, the Foreign Relations subcommittee that I chair released a new report called "Senate Outlook on United States International Strategy on Climate Change in Paris 2015," a new report on President Obama's plan to bypass Congress and transfer American taxpayer funds overseas. This report shows how President Obama is supporting an effort to bypass Congress and to sign a climate deal that gives money to developing nations.

The subcommittee report found four things.

First, the report says that the President is making false promises to other countries about his ability to meet his own greenhouse gas reduction targets. President Obama has promised to cut back American energy production dramatically. The administration is pushing powerplant regulations that will destroy jobs and make electricity more expensive and less reliable. Bipartisan majorities in Congress, in the House and in the Senate, have rejected these regulations. President Obama wants to use this international agreement to force new regulations on the American people.

This administration has been doing all that it can to cripple American energy producers all across the country. It has piled new regulations on coal producers. It is blocking exports of American crude oil and liquefied natural gas. It set emission standards that are designed to put powerplants out of business, and that is the second thing that the report found—that the President's unrealistic targets and timetables for reducing targeted emissions are threatening jobs and threatening communities all across America.

The third main point in this report is that the President is forcing American taxpayers to pay for it—to pay for our past economic successes through his contributions to the so-called Green Climate Fund. I did a townhall event the other day in Wyoming and asked

what they thought about the President's plan of using their taxpayer dollars in this way, and 94 percent of the people in the townhall said they opposed President Obama's plan to send their hard-earned taxpayer dollars to the United Nations climate slush fund.

President Obama doesn't care. He says he wants the money anyway. He knows American emissions have actually been declining over the last decade. He knows we are not the biggest source of carbon dioxide in the world. Far more emissions are coming from developing countries. We see it in China; we see it in India. Those countries say that if they are going to be part of President Obama's plan, somebody else is going to have to pay up. They expect developed countries such as the United States to foot the bill.

How much money do they want? What are we talking about? So far, developing countries have said they want—the number is astonishing—at least \$5.4 trillion—not million, not billion, but trillion. That is what 73 developing countries are demanding over the next 15 years. It doesn't even count another 90 developing countries that haven't made their demands public yet. The reality is a great deal of this money is going to end up lining the pockets of government officials in these developing countries. The American people know it. They see through it, even though the Obama administration will not admit it.

That brings up the fourth thing that this report found. Our subcommittee found that the President plans to reach a climate change deal that ignores the American people and cuts them out of the process entirely. The American public doesn't want these policies. Congress has passed laws to change these policies. The Obama administration just goes on and on and makes the rules that it wants anyway. This administration refuses to have accountability to the American people.

What are we talking about with regard to the money? It is interesting because just today, this morning from Paris, there is a report from the New York Times: "U.S. Proposes Raising Spending on Climate-Change Adaptation."

Here is the byline from France:

In an effort to help smooth the passage of a sweeping new climate accord here this week, Secretary of State John Kerry announced on Wednesday a proposal to double its grant-based public finance for climate-change adaptation. . . . Mr. Kerry's announcement came as the momentum toward a deal appeared to have hit a momentary snag.

Why? Well, reading further: "The issue of money has been a crucial sticking point in the talks, as developing countries demand that richer countries open up their wallets. . . ."

So John Kerry is there to open up the wallet of the American taxpayers—because it is not his money—doubling what he is offering, to try to buy a solution that he wants to accomplish

even though it is directly in opposition to the American public. This administration, President Obama and Secretary Kerry, are out of touch with the American people, who reject this expensive and destructive energy and climate policy.

The Obama administration is also out of touch with the rest of the world. The Obama administration says that some parts of the agreement reached in Paris will be legally binding and other parts will not because, obviously, we are the Congress. We are the elected representatives of the American people, and we have a say. So the President is saying that parts of the agreement are binding and parts are not. China says the whole thing is binding. The European Union says the entire thing is binding. Who is right? President Obama or the rest of the world?

The Obama administration says it is going to give billions of our taxpayer dollars to these countries, including to a lot of countries that don't like us very much. That doesn't seem to matter to the President. The developing countries say they want trillions. John Kerry is in Paris today, doubling the amount of money, doubling to try to buy support for something the American people don't support.

It is interesting because, if you think back just a couple of months, President Obama was frantic—desperate—to get a deal with Iran over its nuclear programs because of his legacy. He signed a terrible deal—by all accounts, a terrible deal.

Now he is doing it again. He is once again frantic, once again desperate, to get a climate deal in Paris. Why? Because of his so-called legacy. He is planning once again to sign a terrible deal, and he has his Secretary of State, John Kerry, there giving the speeches and making promises that the American public will have to pay for if they get their way.

Iran says it will play the Obama administration's game on emissions and reduce its carbon emissions as the President wants, but before it does, it expects the Obama administration to lift all of the remaining sanctions from the Iranian deal. It wants the United States and other countries to give them \$840 billion over the next 15 years. That is what is at stake, and those are the things the President continues to give away as he surrenders our energy security, our energy reliability, our energy jobs—a surrender by the President. He is desperate for approval by the other countries when he should be focusing on the United States. He seems to want to promise any policy, pledge any amount of money to get it, but the American people oppose sending their money to a United Nations climate slush fund. As their elected representatives, Congress must not allow the President to continue to try to buy popularity for himself using American taxpayer dollars.

Congress must not allow the President to use this meeting in Paris to advance his own legacy at the expense of