

the aisle—6 Republicans and 6 Democrats—who have been part of this process. We hope to be able to get this legislation on the floor this week because it is a good bill and it deserves to be passed.

When we have come to the floor before and we have talked about it, we have talked about the fact that it helps manufacturers in Ohio and around the country to take advantage of energy savings techniques and the best technology, allowing them to save more money so they can invest more in plants and equipment and in people, adding more jobs. That is why, by the way, over 270 businesses and business organizations—from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the National Association of Manufacturers—and a lot of other trade groups on both sides of the political spectrum—have endorsed this legislation.

We have also come to the floor and talked about how provisions in this legislation will save the equivalent of taking 80 million homes off the grid by the year 2030—a cumulative energy savings, by the way, of up to \$100 billion. It is called the Energy Security and Industrial Competitiveness Act. Again, it makes a lot of sense.

We talk about how taxpayer dollars will be saved because we require the Federal Government to practice what it preaches; in other words, to make the Federal Government, the largest energy user in the United States, much more efficient in its own energy practices.

The time for talking about this legislation, however, has gone. It is now time to pass it. When we do, we can then work with the other body—the House of Representatives—because they have already passed significant parts of our legislation earlier this year. We can bring together the legislation we would pass here on the floor with the House legislation and send it to the President for signature.

At a time when people are understandably concerned about the partisan gridlock here in the Senate, and in Washington in general, this is an example of something we can actually get done. Again, it has been bipartisan from the start. It came out of the committee with a big vote—18 to 3. It is one to which we have added more bipartisan support over the last 6 months by adding more amendments.

Let's do something that will actually surprise the American people. Let's do something that will help move our country forward, create more jobs, help the environment be cleaner, also helping our energy security and therefore our national security, and saving taxpayers a lot of money.

Some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle are skeptical of any energy legislation they have seen in the past, that this Senate and the Congress have passed some proposals that are top-down proposals that impose mandates on the American people. They have also seen costly legislation that fun-

nels subsidies to preferred industries, companies, technologies, distorting the market and ending up in what have sometimes been some very expensive failures. That is not this legislation.

This legislation on energy efficiency contains no mandates. The bill is about giving people access to information they can use, not about making the American people or businesses do something.

Not only does it have no mandates, but it does not add to our deficits. Every authorization contained in this bill is fully offset by savings elsewhere in the budget. In fact, the reforms made in this legislation will save taxpayers a lot of money.

Some of it can be scored. There is a \$10 million savings, for instance, on the mandatory side by some of the legislative changes we are making. A lot of it won't get a score because it is additional savings we will see by having the Federal Government be much more energy efficient, which saves money for us all as taxpayers.

Unlike some of these previous energy initiatives which were costly and I think inappropriate, this legislation relies on the market and on the States—not the Federal Government—to drive efficiency improvements.

There is a reason this legislation received this strong vote out of the energy committee, 19 to 3. It has been improved since then with the addition of these 10 bipartisan amendments. It is going to create new jobs, it is going to save money for the taxpayers, and it is going to help with regard to the environment.

By the way, our economy is going to be helped because we rely on affordable and reliable energy in this country. It is our responsibility to do everything in our power to secure more affordable and more reliable energy by adopting what a lot of people talk about is an all-of-the-above energy strategy.

To me, that means producing more energy—yes, including oil and natural gas. In my own State of Ohio, we have a great opportunity there. It also includes being sure that we are using the coal resources we have, nuclear power, and renewables. We should be making it easier to take advantage of these resources and to bring more of these resources to market at lower costs.

But at the same time, we should be taking steps to reduce waste. This is complementary. This is not something that should be either you are for producing more energy or you are for more energy efficiency. We should be for both. We should be producing more and using less. That helps grow the economy, create jobs, and makes us more competitive in the global economy in which we find ourselves.

Energy efficiency, by the way, of all those energy sources, is the lowest-hanging fruit. Think about it. It is the least expensive form of energy—the energy we don't end up having to use.

I think this is a commonsense approach which should be able to be de-

bated on the floor in an honest way, with other energy-related amendments; and then, after that process, to pass it here in the Senate, get it over to the House, work on a compromise with the House with their legislation and our legislation, get it to the President for signature, and actually move on with an opportunity to truly begin the process of putting in place a national strategy that has this all-of-the-above approach—producing more and using less.

I look forward to working with my colleagues this week on engaging in this debate, passing this legislation, and helping the constituents whom we represent on issues that are important to them—jobs, saving taxpayer money, making the environment cleaner, ensuring that America has a secure energy future, which is important to our national security.

I thank the Presiding Officer for allowing me to speak, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO TERRY GAINER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Terry Gainer, the Senate's skilled and energetic Sergeant At Arms, is leaving the Senate family, after 8 years of devoted service to the Senate and the Nation in this vital role.

Overseeing the Senate's largest administrative office, Terry Gainer has led during a difficult time of change, as the Senate has continued to adjust to a wide range of challenges, from burgeoning technology, to budget squeezes, to the shadowy threat of terrorism. I have watched the way he has handled these duties, and I have admired not only his talent and ability but also the style of his leadership. He has been a credit to this body.

Terry Gainer is a decorated veteran of the Vietnam war. He was a captain in the U.S. Navy Reserve, and he went on to serve as an accomplished law enforcement officer.

Appointed to the post of Sergeant At Arms in 2006, Mr. Gainer came to the Senate with an admirable record of public service. He cut his teeth as a homicide detective on the streets of Chicago, and while working on the Chicago force he earned both a master's and a law degree. From there, he rose

through the ranks to be appointed as director of the Illinois State Police.

In 2002, he assumed the role of chief of the U.S. Capitol Police. It was just a few, short years later, when the Senate was attacked with ricin poison, that Terry Gainer's calm disposition, professionalism, and experience guided the Senate through a malicious act of terrorism.

Chief Gainer then carried over this experience as he took on his new role as the 38th U.S. Senate Sergeant At Arms. Frequently described as a jack-of-all-trades, he fit right in. From overseeing security, to escorting foreign dignitaries, and leading the largest administrative office in the Senate, Terry Gainer was a valued leader and a trusted presence within the Senate family.

As he returns to the private sector, Marcelle and I offer Terry, his wife Irene, and the Gainer family our thanks and all best wishes in the years ahead.

WASHINGTON ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to the work of the Washington Electric Cooperative, which provides power and electricity to thousands of Vermonters, including to Marcelle and me at our home in Middlesex. This year the co-op, as it is better known to Vermonters, celebrates its 75th anniversary. The co-op formed in the midst of the rural electrification movement of the 1930s. On December 2, 1939, my predecessor in the Senate, then-Vermont Governor George Aiken, flipped the switch that brought electricity to 150 farms. I doubt that anyone could have imagined back then that the co-op would grow to serve the 11,000 members it serves today, covering about 2800 square miles in parts of 41 towns in north-central Vermont.

The Washington Electric Co-Op has indeed grown, from the setting of the first poles on the McKnight Farm in East Montpelier, to operating 1200 miles of distribution lines with eight substations today. I am proud of the Washington Electric Co-Op, both as a customer and as a Vermonter.

In honor of this important occasion, I ask that the article "How the Washington Electric Co-op Began" from the 1964 Washington Electric Co-op annual meeting be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THE WASHINGTON ELECTRIC CO-OP BEGAN
(REMINISCENCE BY A CO-OP MEMBER PRINTED IN
THE 1964 WEC ANNUAL REPORT)

One July day Harmon Kelly called on Lorie and Elizabeth Tarshis to suggest their writing to Washington to ask about rural electricity. Raymond Ebbett and Lyle Young met with them. They decided to try to form an REA Co-op. Meetings followed in people's living rooms. On July 14th the first public meeting, conducted by Harmon Kelly, was

held in the Grange Hall, Maple Corner. It had been hard to get people to come. Meetings had been held before about getting Green Mountain Power and had always ended in disappointment. As Mr. Kelly talked, people became optimistic and began to suggest sources of water power. We even considered the radical idea of a diesel engine. Several strangers sat listening in the dark shadows at the back of the lamp lit hall. One made a long rambling speech against socialistic schemes ending: "And you'll have to admit I told you."

We found out who our visitors were when they went to the owners of the best farms and promised them Green Mountain Power within three weeks if they would "give up this nonsense." Harmon Kelly was told to give it up or lose his job. Neither bribes nor threats worked. On July 29th the REA Co-op was formed with Harmon Kelly, Lyle Young, and Elizabeth Kent Tarshis as incorporators.

My diary for October 7th 1939 reads: "Autumn color splendid. Electricity booming. Stakes set to mark where poles will be." On October 12th, the first pole was set on the McKnight farm in East Montpelier. I remember it, well braced, standing black against a cold sky with bright leaves whirling in the wind and a man from Washington saying: "You folks don't know what you've started. I wouldn't be surprised if you had a thousand members some day." The first hundred looked at each other in disbelief. No one imagined there would be more than three thousand in 1964.

On a May night in 1940, for the first time since the power was turned on, I drove along the County Road. In houses, dark last year or with lamps dimly burning, every window was a blaze of light. There was music everywhere—cows listening to records, housewives to radios. I stopped, found one friend happily running a new vacuum cleaner over an already immaculate rug. I hurried on to my own dark house and turned on every one of our new 100 watt bulbs. The miracle had come.

BUDGET COMMITTEE SUBMISSIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 passed in December not only provided relief to families and the economy from the harmful effects of sequestration but also put an end to the recent fiscal crises and uncertainty by establishing a bipartisan congressional budget for 2 years. Specifically, the act authorizes the chairmen of the Senate and House Budget Committees to file allocations, aggregates, levels, and other enforcement mechanisms in the Senate and the House for budget years 2014 and 2015.

On January 15, I filed the first of the two budgets in the Senate for fiscal year 2014. Today, pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, I am filing the budget in the Senate for fiscal year 2015. Specifically, for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 116 directs the chairman of the Budget Committee to file: allocations for fiscal years 2014 and 2015 for the Committee on Appropriations; allocations for fiscal years 2014, 2015, 2015 through 2019, and 2015 through 2024 for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations; aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2014 and 2015; aggregate rev-

enue levels for fiscal years 2014, 2015, 2015 through 2019, and 2015 through 2024; and aggregate levels of outlays and revenue for fiscal years 2014, 2015, 2015 through 2019, and 2015 through 2024 for Social Security. That authority to file allocations, aggregates, levels, and other enforcement tools exists from April 15 through May 15.

In the case of the Committee on Appropriations for 2014 and 2015, the allocation shall be set consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in the Bipartisan Budget Act, which imposes limits only on the amount of budget authority and divides those limits on budget authority between the revised security category and the revised nonsecurity category.

In the case of allocations for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations and for the revenue and Social Security aggregates, the levels shall be set consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office. The CBO last updated its baseline on April 14, 2014.

In the case of the spending aggregates for 2014 and 2015, the levels shall be set in accordance with the allocation for the Committee on Appropriations and the allocations for committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, as described previously.

Pursuant to section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the allocations to the Committee on Appropriations and the spending aggregates can be revised for certain adjustments specifically authorized by section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. The authorized changes include adjustments for overseas contingency operations and the global war on terrorism, disaster funding, emergency appropriations, and program integrity initiatives in the areas of continuing disability reviews and redeterminations and health care fraud and abuse control. These adjustments will be made after the reporting of a bill or joint resolution or the offering of an amendment thereto or the submission of a conference report thereon that includes language that qualifies for one or more of the authorized adjustments.

In addition, section 116(c) of the Bipartisan Budget Act authorizes the filing for fiscal year 2015 of deficit-neutral reserve funds included in sections 114(c) and (d) of the act, updated by 1 year to match the new enforcement windows. Accordingly, I am hereby filing and updating by 1 year each of the reserve funds included in sections 114(c) and (d) of the Bipartisan Budget Act. The reserve funds are updated to cover the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2024 in the case of the reserve fund authorized in section 114(c) and the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2019 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2014 through 2024 in the case of the reserve funds authorized in section 114(d). In the case of section 114(d), the reserve funds filed and updated here include sections 302,