

(Mr. AKAKA) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2938 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2976

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2976 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2993

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2993 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2997

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2997 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3073

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3073 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3085

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3085 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3136

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3136 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3227

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3227 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3228

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3228 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3241

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. GREGG) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3241 intended to be proposed to H.R. 3590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. FEINGOLD):

S. 2886. A bill to prohibit certain affiliations (between commercial banking and investment banking companies), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joining my friend and colleague from Washington, Senator CANTWELL, to introduce the Banking Integrity Act of 2009. My reasons for joining this effort are simple—I want to ensure that we never stick the American taxpayer with another \$700 billion tab to bail out the financial industry. If big Wall Street institutions want to take part in risky transactions—fine. But we should not allow them to do so with federally insured deposits.

Paul Volcker, a top economist in the Obama administration and former Federal Reserve Chairman, wants the nation's banks to be prohibited from owning and trading risky securities, the very practice that got the biggest ones into deep trouble in 2008. The administration is saying no, it will not separate commercial banking from investment operations. Mr. Volcker argues that regulation by itself will not work. Sooner or later, the giants, in pursuit of profits, will get into trouble. The administration should accept this and

shield commercial banking from Wall Street's wild ways. "The banks are there to serve the public," Mr. Volcker said, "and that is what they should concentrate on. These other activities create conflicts of interest. They create risks, and if you try to control the risks with supervision, that just creates friction and difficulties" and ultimately fails.

The bill we are introducing today precludes any member bank of the Federal Reserve System from being affiliated with any entity or organization that is engaged principally in the issue, flotation, underwriting, public sale or distribution of stocks, bonds, debentures or other securities. Essentially, commercial banks may no longer intermingle their business activities with investment banks. It is that simple.

Since the repeal of the Glass Steagall Act in 1999, this country has seen a new culture emerge in the financial industry: one of dangerous greed and excessive risk-taking. Commercial banks traditionally used people's deposits for the constructive purpose of main street loans. They did not engage in high risk ventures. Investment banks, however, managed rich people's money—those who can afford to take bigger risks in order to get a bigger return, and who bore their own losses. When these two worlds collided, the investment bank culture prevailed, cutting off the credit lifeblood of main street firms, demanding greater returns that were achievable only through high leverage and huge risk taking, and leaving taxpayers with the fallout.

When the glass wall dividing banks and securities firms was shattered, common sense and caution went out the door. The new mantra of "bigger is better" took over—and the path forward focused on short-term gains rather than long-term planning. Banks became overleveraged in their haste to keep up in the race. The more they lent, the more they made. Aggressive mortgages were underwritten for unqualified individuals who became homeowners saddled with loans they couldn't afford. Banks turned right around and bought portfolios of these shaky loans.

Sub-prime loans made up only five percent of all mortgage lending in 1998, but by the time the financial crisis peaked in late 2008, they were approaching 30 percent. Since January 2008, we have seen 159 state and national banks fail. In my home State of Arizona, five banks have shut their doors, leaving small businesses scrambling to find credit from other banks that may have already been overleveraged.

Banks sold sub-prime mortgages to their affiliates and other securities firms for securitization, while other financial institutions made risky bets on these and other assets for which they had no financial interest. As the market grew bigger, its foundation became shakier. It was like a house of cards waiting to fall, and fall it did.

In October 2008, the financial system was on the brink of collapse when Congress was forced to risk \$700 billion of taxpayer dollars to bail out the industry. These financial institutions had become “too big to fail.” In fact, the special inspector general of the Troubled Asset Relief Program, TARP, testified before Congress earlier this year that “total potential Federal Government support could reach \$23.7 trillion” to stabilize and support the financial system. Ironically, some of these “too big to fail” institutions have now become even bigger. An editorial from yesterday’s New York Times stated:

The truth is that the taxpayers are still very much on the hook for a banking system that is shaping up to be much riskier than the one that led to disaster.

Big bank profits, for instance, still come mostly courtesy of taxpayers. Their trading earnings are financed by more than a trillion dollars’ worth of cheap loans from the Federal Reserve, for which some of their most noxious assets are collateral. They benefit from immense federal loan guarantees, but they are not lending much. Lending to business, notably, is very tight.

What profits the banks make come mostly from trading. Many big banks are happy to depend on the lifeline from the Fed and hang onto their toxic assets hoping for a rebound in prices. And the whole system has grown more concentrated. Bank of America was considered too big to fail before the meltdown. Since then, it has acquired Merrill Lynch. Wells Fargo took over Wachovia. JPMorgan Chase gobbled up Bear Stearns.

If the goal is to reduce the number of huge banks that taxpayers must rescue at any cost, the nation is moving in the wrong direction. The growth of the biggest banks ensures that the next bailout will have to be even bigger. These banks will be more likely to take on excessive risk because they have the implicit assurance of rescue.

Excess was a common theme for banks/financial institutions in the mid-2000s—excessive risk, excessive bonuses. Times were good at Merrill Lynch in 2006 when the firm’s risky mortgage business was booming. The firm made record earnings of \$7.5 billion that year and paid out bonuses of \$5 billion to \$6 billion. Fast forward to late 2008 when Merrill’s gambling left it in deep financial despair with losses exceeding \$27 billion. Yet we witnessed the firm pay out another \$3.6 billion in bonuses just before it was acquired by Bank of America.

Merrill Lynch wasn’t alone in excess and greed. Citigroup posted a net loss of nearly \$28 billion in 2008, yet paid out \$5.3 billion in bonuses. Although Goldman Sachs earned only \$2.3 billion, it paid out \$4.8 billion in bonuses. Morgan Stanley earned \$1.7 billion, and paid out nearly \$4.5 billion in bonuses. JPMorgan Chase earned \$5.6 billion and paid \$8.7 billion in bonuses. If a company doesn’t make money, how can it pay these bonuses? In this case, each of these firms was a recipient of billions in taxpayer-funded TARP money.

The Federal Government has set a dangerous precedent here. We sent the wrong message to the financial industry: you engage in bad, risky business

practices, and when you get into trouble, the government will be there to save your hide. Many would call it a moral hazard. I call it a taxpayer-funded subsidy for risky behavior.

The consolidation of the banking world was also riddled with conflicts of interest, despite the purported firewalls that were put into place. If an investment bank had underwritten shares for a company that was now in financial trouble, the investment bank’s commercial arm would feel pressure to lend the company money, despite the lack of merits to do so. The Banking Integrity Act of 2009 would eliminate some of these conflicts.

Today, it is time to put a stop to the taxpayer-financed excesses of Wall Street. No single financial institution should be so big that its failure would bring ruin to our economy and destroy millions of American jobs. This country would be better served if we limit the activities of these financial institutions. Banks should accept consumer deposits and invest conservatively, while investment banks engage in underwriting and sales of securities.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mr. FEINGOLD:

S. 2890. A bill to amend the Buy American Act to increase the requirement for American-made content, to tighten the waiver provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to help American workers and companies.

The bill that I am introducing, the Buy American Improvement Act, focuses on the Federal Government’s responsibility to support domestic manufacturers and workers and on the role of Federal procurement policy in achieving this goal. The reintroduction of this bill, which I first introduced in 2003, is part of my ongoing efforts to support American workers and manufacturing.

The Buy American Act of 1933 is the primary statute that governs Federal procurement. The name of this law accurately describes its purpose: to ensure that the Federal Government supports domestic companies and domestic workers by buying American-made goods. Regrettably, this law contains a number of loopholes that make it too easy for government agencies to buy foreign-made goods.

My bill, the Buy American Improvement Act, would strengthen the existing law by tightening its waiver provisions. Currently, the heads of Federal departments and agencies are given broad discretion to waive the act and buy foreign goods with little or no accountability. We should ensure that the Federal Government makes every effort to give Federal contracts to companies that will perform the work domestically. We should also ensure that certain types of industries do not

leave the U.S. completely, thus making the Federal Government dependent on foreign sources for goods, such as plane or ship parts, that our military may need to acquire on short notice.

With unemployed workers in the U.S. facing a double-digit unemployment rate, the highest rate since 1983, it is critical Congress back efforts to support American workers. Many unemployed American workers are currently facing persistently long periods of unemployment; data from the Department of Labor showed that in October of this year, over 35 percent of unemployed workers had been without jobs for at least 27 weeks. Since December of 2007, the number of unemployed workers in the U.S. has grown by over 8 million, with manufacturing and construction workers being particularly hard-hit. We need to do all we can to promote fiscally responsible Federal policies that support the creation of American jobs to help get the unemployed and underemployed back to work. A strong Buy American Act should be part of the Federal effort to create and retain American jobs.

During another period of economic upheaval in the 1930s, Congress passed a series of laws designed to promote job growth in the U.S., including the Buy American Act of 1933, 41 U.S.C. §10a-10d. The Buy American Act requires the Federal Government to support domestic manufacturers and workers by purchasing American-made goods. Over the years, other domestic sourcing legislation has been passed to help support American industry, including the Buy America Act, 23 U.S.C. §313, which applies to Federal transportation funding. In addition, Congress included domestic sourcing requirements in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, P.L. 111-5, earlier this year because it recognized the importance of supporting American workers and American industry. My legislation would help American industry by making it more difficult to waive the Buy American Act and help ensure the Federal Government does all it can to support American workers.

I have a long record of supporting efforts to help taxpayers get the most bang for their buck and opposing wasteful Federal spending. I don’t think anyone can argue that supporting American jobs is “wasteful.” We owe it to American manufacturers and their employees to make sure they get a fair shake. I would not support awarding a contract to an American company that is price-gouging, but we should make every effort to ensure that domestic sources for goods needed by the Federal Government do not dry up because American companies have been slightly underbid by foreign competitors.

The gaping loopholes in the Buy American Act and the trade agreements and defense procurement agreements that contain additional waivers of domestic source restrictions have combined to weaken our domestic

manufacturing base by allowing—and sometimes actually encouraging—the Federal Government to buy foreign-made goods. Congress can and should do more to support American companies and American workers. We must strengthen the Buy American Act and we must stop entering into bad trade agreements that send our jobs overseas and undermine our own domestic preference laws.

By strengthening Federal procurement policy, we can help to bolster our domestic manufacturers during these difficult times. As I have repeatedly noted, Congress cannot simply stand on the sidelines while tens of thousands of American manufacturing jobs

have been and continue to be shipped overseas. While there may be no single solution to this problem one way in which Congress should act is by strengthening the Buy American Act.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. ENSIGN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2891. A bill to further allocate and expand the availability of hydroelectric power generated at Hoover Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2891

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2009”.

SEC. 2. ALLOCATION OF CONTRACTS FOR POWER.

(a) SCHEDULE A POWER.—Section 105(a)(1)(A) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)(1)(A)) is amended—

- (1) by striking “renewal”;
- (2) by striking “June 1, 1987” and inserting “October 1, 2017”; and
- (3) by striking Schedule A and inserting the following:

“SCHEDULE A

Long term Schedule A contingent capacity and associated firm energy for offers of contracts to Boulder Canyon project contractors

Contractor	Contingent capacity (kW)	Firm Energy (thousands of kWh)		
		Summer	Winter	Total
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	249,948	859,163	368,212	1,227,375
City of Los Angeles	495,732	464,108	199,175	663,283
Southern California Edison Company	280,245	166,712	71,448	238,160
City of Glendale	18,178	45,028	19,297	64,325
City of Pasadena	11,108	38,622	16,553	55,175
City of Burbank	5,176	14,070	6,030	20,100
Arizona Power Authority	190,869	429,582	184,107	613,689
Colorado River Commission of Nevada	190,869	429,582	184,107	613,689
United States, for Boulder City	20,198	53,200	22,800	76,000
Totals	1,462,323	2,500,067	1,071,729	3,571,796”.

(b) SCHEDULE B POWER.—Section 105(a)(1)(B) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)(1)(B)) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) To each existing contractor for power generated at Hoover Dam, a contract, for delivery commencing October 1, 2017, of the amount of contingent capacity and firm en-

ergy specified for that contractor in the following table:

“SCHEDULE B

Long term Schedule B contingent capacity and associated firm energy for offers of contracts to Boulder Canyon project contractors

Contractor	Contingent capacity (kW)	Firm Energy (thousands of kWh)		
		Summer	Winter	Total
City of Glendale	2,020	2,749	1,194	3,943
City of Pasadena	9,089	2,399	1,041	3,440
City of Burbank	15,149	3,604	1,566	5,170
City of Anaheim	40,396	34,442	14,958	49,400
City of Azusa	4,039	3,312	1,438	4,750
City of Banning	2,020	1,324	576	1,900
City of Colton	3,030	2,650	1,150	3,800
City of Riverside	30,296	25,831	11,219	37,050
City of Vernon	22,218	18,546	8,054	26,600
Arizona	189,860	140,600	60,800	201,400
Nevada	189,860	273,600	117,800	391,400
Totals	507,977	509,057	219,796	728,853”.

(c) SCHEDULE C POWER.—Section 105(a)(1)(C) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)(1)(C)) is amended—

(1) by striking “June 1, 1987” and inserting “October 1, 2017”; and

(2) by striking Schedule C and inserting the following:

“SCHEDULE C

Excess Energy

Priority of entitlement to excess energy	State
--	-------

First: Meeting Arizona’s first priority right to delivery of excess energy which is equal in each year of operation to 200 million kilowatthours: Provided, That in the event excess energy in the amount of 200 million kilowatthours is not generated during any year of operation, Arizona shall accumulate a first right to delivery of excess energy subsequently generated in an amount not to exceed 600 million kilowatthours, inclusive of the current year’s 200 million kilowatthours. Said first right of delivery shall accrue at a rate of 200 million kilowatthours per year for each year excess energy in an amount of 200 million kilowatthours is not generated, less amounts of excess energy delivered.

Arizona

"SCHEDULE C—Continued

Excess Energy

Priority of entitlement to excess energy	State
Second: Meeting Hoover Dam contractual obligations under Schedule A of subsection (a)(1)(A), under Schedule B of subsection (a)(1)(B), and under Schedule D of subsection (a)(2), not exceeding 26 million kilowatthours in each year of operation.	Arizona, Nevada, and California
Third: Meeting the energy requirements of the three States, such available excess energy to be divided equally among the States.	Arizona, Nevada, and California".

(d) SCHEDULE D POWER.—Section 105(a) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2)(A) The Secretary of Energy is authorized to and shall create from the apportioned allocation of contingent capacity and firm energy adjusted from the amounts authorized in this Act in 1984 to the amounts shown

in Schedule A and Schedule B, as modified by the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2009, a resource pool equal to 5 percent of the full rated capacity of 2,074,000 kilowatts, and associated firm energy, as shown in Schedule D (referred to in this section as 'Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy'):

"SCHEDULE D

Long term Schedule D resource pool of contingent capacity and associated firm energy for new allottees

State	Contingent capacity (kW)	Firm Energy (thousands of kWh)		
		Summer	Winter	Total
New Entities Allocated by the Secretary of Energy	69,170	105,637	45,376	151,013
New Entities Allocated by State				
Arizona	11,510	17,580	7,533	25,113
California	11,510	17,580	7,533	25,113
Nevada	11,510	17,580	7,533	25,113
Totals	103,700	158,377	67,975	226,352

"(B) The Secretary of Energy shall offer Schedule D contingency capacity and firm energy to entities not receiving contingent capacity and firm energy under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1) (referred to in this section as 'new allottees') for delivery commencing October 1, 2017 pursuant to this subsection. In this subsection, the term 'the marketing area for the Boulder City Area Projects' shall have the same meaning as in Appendix A of the General Consolidated Power Marketing Criteria or Regulations for Boulder City Area Projects published in the Federal Register on December 28, 1984 (49 Fed. Reg. 50582 et seq.) (referred to in this section as the 'Criteria').

"(C)(i) Within 18 months of the date of enactment of the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2009, the Secretary of Energy shall allocate through the Western Area Power Administration (referred to in this section as 'Western'), for delivery commencing October 1, 2017, for use in the marketing area for the Boulder City Area Projects 66.7 percent of the Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy to new allottees that are located within the marketing area for the Boulder City Area Projects and that are—

"(I) eligible to enter into contracts under section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (43 U.S.C. 617d); or

"(II) federally recognized Indian tribes.

"(ii) In the case of Arizona and Nevada, Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy for new allottees shall be offered through the Arizona Power Authority and the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, respectively.

"(iii) In performing its allocation of Schedule D power provided for in this subparagraph, Western shall apply criteria developed in consultation with the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California.

"(D) Within 1 year of the date of enactment of the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2009, the Secretary of Energy also shall allocate, for delivery commencing October 1, 2017, for use in the marketing area for the Boulder City Area Projects 11.1 percent of the Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy to each of—

"(i) the Arizona Power Authority for allocation to new allottees in the State of Arizona;

"(ii) the Colorado River Commission of Nevada for allocation to new allottees in the State of Nevada; and

"(iii) Western for allocation to new allottees within the State of California.

"(E) Each contract offered pursuant to this subsection shall include a provision requiring the new allottee to pay a proportionate share of its State's respective contribution (determined in accordance with each State's applicable funding agreement) to the cost of the Lower Colorado River Multi-Species Conservation Program (as defined in section 9401 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1327)), and to execute the Boulder Canyon Project Implementation Agreement Contract No. 95-PAO-10616 (referred to in this section as the 'Implementation Agreement').

"(F) Any of the 66.7 percent of Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy that is to be allocated by Western that is not allocated and placed under contract by October 1, 2017, shall be returned to those contractors shown in Schedule A and Schedule B in the same proportion as those contractors' allocations of Schedule A and Schedule B contingent capacity and firm energy. Any of the 33.3 percent of Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy that is to be distributed within the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California that is not allocated and placed under contract by October 1, 2017, shall be returned to the Schedule A and Schedule B contractors within the State in which the Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy were to be distributed, in the same proportion as those contractors' allocations of Schedule A and Schedule B contingent capacity and firm energy."

(e) TOTAL OBLIGATIONS.—Paragraph (3) of section 105(a) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)) (as redesignated as subsection (d)(1)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking "schedule A of subsection (a)(1)(A) of this section and schedule B of subsection (a)(1)(B)

of this section" and inserting "pursuant to paragraphs (1)(A), (1)(B), and (2)"; and

(2) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking "any" and inserting "each";

(B) by striking "schedule C" and inserting "Schedule C"; and

(C) by striking "schedules A and B" and inserting "Schedules A, B, and D".

(f) POWER MARKETING CRITERIA.—Paragraph (4) of section 105(a) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)) (as redesignated as subsection (d)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) Subdivision E of the Criteria shall be deemed to have been modified to conform to this section, as modified by the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2009. The Secretary of Energy shall cause to be included in the Federal Register a notice conforming to the text of the regulations to such modifications."

(g) CONTRACT TERMS.—Paragraph (5) of section 105(a) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(a)) (as redesignated as subsection (d)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

"(A) in accordance with section 5(a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act (43 U.S.C. 617d(a)), expire September 30, 2067;"

(2) in the proviso of subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking "shall use" and inserting "shall allocate"; and

(B) by striking "and" after the semicolon at the end;

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(D) authorize and require Western to collect from new allottees a pro rata share of Hoover Dam repayable advances paid for by contractors prior to October 1, 2017, and remit such amounts to the contractors that paid such advances in proportion to the amounts paid by such contractors as specified in section 6.4 of the Implementation Agreement;

"(E) permit transactions with an independent system operator; and

“(F) contain the same material terms included in section 5.6 of those long term contracts for purchases from the Hoover Power Plant that were made in accordance with this Act and are in existence on the date of enactment of the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2009.”.

(h) EXISTING RIGHTS.—Section 105(b) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(b)) is amended by striking “2017” and inserting “2067”.

(i) OFFERS.—Section 105(c) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(c)) is amended to read as follows:

“(c) OFFER OF CONTRACT TO OTHER ENTITIES.—If any existing contractor fails to accept an offered contract, the Secretary of Energy shall offer the contingent capacity and firm energy thus available first to other entities in the same State listed in Schedule A and Schedule B, second to other entities listed in Schedule A and Schedule B, third to other entities in the same State which receive contingent capacity and firm energy under subsection (a)(2) of this section, and last to other entities which receive contingent capacity and firm energy under subsection (a)(2) of this section.”.

(j) AVAILABILITY OF WATER.—Section 105(d) of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) WATER AVAILABILITY.—Except with respect to energy purchased at the request of an allottee pursuant to subsection (a)(3), the obligation of the Secretary of Energy to deliver contingent capacity and firm energy pursuant to contracts entered into pursuant to this section shall be subject to availability of the water needed to produce such contingent capacity and firm energy. In the event that water is not available to produce the contingent capacity and firm energy set forth in Schedule A, Schedule B, and Schedule D, the Secretary of Energy shall adjust the contingent capacity and firm energy offered under those Schedules in the same proportion as those contractors’ allocations of Schedule A, Schedule B, and Schedule D contingent capacity and firm energy bears to the full rated contingent capacity and firm energy obligations.”.

(k) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 105 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (e) and (f); and
(2) by redesignating subsections (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (e), (f), and (g), respectively.

(l) CONTINUED CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT.—Subsection (e) of section 105 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a) (as redesignated by subsection (k)(2)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “the renewal of”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “June 1, 1987, and ending September 30, 2017” and inserting “October 1, 2017, and ending September 30, 2067”.

(m) COURT CHALLENGES.—Subsection (f)(1) of section 105 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a) (as redesignated by subsection (k)(2)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “this Act” and inserting “the Hoover Power Allocation Act of 2009”.

(n) REAFFIRMATION OF CONGRESSIONAL DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—Subsection (g) of section 105 of the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984 (43 U.S.C. 619a) (as redesignated by subsection (k)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking “subsections (c), (g), and (h) of this section” and inserting “this Act”; and

(2) by striking “June 1, 1987, and ending September 30, 2017” and inserting “October 1, 2017, and ending September 30, 2067”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 376—HONORING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN, THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACCESSION TO THE THRONE OF HIS MAJESTY KING ABDULLAH II IBN AL HUSSEIN, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. INOUE (for himself, Mr. GREGG, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 376

Whereas the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan achieved independence on May 25, 1946;

Whereas the United States recognized Jordan as an independent state in a White House announcement on January 31, 1949;

Whereas diplomatic relations and the American Legation in Jordan were established on February 18, 1949, when United States diplomat Wells Stabler presented his credentials as Chargé d’Affaires in Amman;

Whereas, for 60 years, the United States and Jordan have enjoyed a close relationship and have worked together to advance issues ranging from the promotion of Middle East peace to advancing the socio-economic development of the people of Jordan, as well as the threat to both posed by al Qaeda and violent extremism;

Whereas, from 1952 to 1999, King Hussein charted a moderate path for his country;

Whereas, for decades, the United States has been Jordan’s strongest international partner;

Whereas, throughout his reign, King Hussein looked for opportunities to realize his dream of a more peaceful Middle East by working to solve intra-Arab disputes and engaging successive Prime Ministers of Israel in the search for peace;

Whereas King Hussein and Prime Minister of Israel Yitzhak Rabin signed the historic Jordan-Israel peace treaty in 1994, ending nearly 50 years of war between the neighboring countries;

Whereas the United States lost a close friend and a crucial partner when King Hussein passed away in 1999;

Whereas King Hussein was succeeded by his son, King Abdullah II, who has continued his father’s work to improve the lives of the people of Jordan while also seeking to bring peace to the region;

Whereas, in the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, the Government of Jordan has been an instrumental partner in the fight against al Qaeda, has provided crucial assistance in Iraq, and has shouldered a heavy burden in providing refuge to a significant portion of the Iraqi refugee population;

Whereas, through his 2004 Amman Message, King Abdullah II has been a leading Arab voice in trying to reaffirm the true path of Islam;

Whereas, in November 2005, al Qaeda terrorists struck three hotels in Amman, Jordan, thereby uniting the people of Jordan and the United States in grief over the lives lost at this act of terrorism; and

Whereas King Abdullah II begins his second decade on the Hashemite throne by redoubling his efforts for peace in the region as the Jordan-United States partnership enters its seventh decade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the 60th anniversary of the close relationship between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan;

(2) expresses its profound admiration and gratitude for the friendship of the people of Jordan;

(3) congratulates His Majesty King Abdullah II on 10 years of enlightened and progressive rule; and

(4) shares the hope of His Majesty King Abdullah II and the people of Jordan for a more peaceful Middle East.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 48—RECOGNIZING THE LEADERSHIP AND HISTORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF DR. HECTOR GARCIA TO THE HISPANIC COMMUNITY AND HIS REMARKABLE EFFORTS TO COMBAT RACIAL AND ETHNIC DISCRIMINATION IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. MENENDEZ submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 48

Whereas Dr. Hector Garcia changed the lives of Americans from all walks of life;

Whereas Dr. Hector Garcia was born in Mexico on January 17, 1914, and immigrated to Mercedes, Texas, in 1918;

Whereas Dr. Hector Garcia is an honored alumnus of the School of Medicine at the University of Texas Medical Branch, Class of 1940;

Whereas Dr. Hector Garcia fought in World War II, specifically in North Africa and Italy, attained the rank of Major, and was awarded the Bronze Star with six battle stars;

Whereas once the Army discovered he was a physician, Dr. Hector Garcia was asked to practice his profession by treating his fellow soldiers;

Whereas Dr. Hector Garcia moved to Corpus Christi, Texas, after the war, and opened a medical practice; rarely charged his indigent patients, and was recognized as a passionate and dedicated physician;

Whereas he first became known in south Texas for his public health messages on the radio with topics ranging from infant diarrhea to tuberculosis;

Whereas Dr. Hector Garcia continued his public service and advocacy and became founder of the American G.I. Forum, a Mexican-American veterans association, which initiated countless efforts on behalf of Americans to advance opportunities in health care, veterans’ benefits, and civil rights equality;

Whereas his civil rights movement would then grow to also combat discrimination in housing, jobs, education, and voting rights;

Whereas President Kennedy appointed Dr. Hector Garcia a member of the American Treaty Delegation for the Mutual Defense Agreement between the United States and the Federation of the West Indies;

Whereas in 1967, President Lyndon Johnson appointed Dr. Hector Garcia as alternate ambassador to the United Nations where he gave the first speech by an American before the United Nations in a language other than English;

Whereas Dr. Hector Garcia was named member of the Texas Advisory Committee to the United States Commission on Civil Rights;

Whereas President Reagan presented Dr. Hector Garcia the Nation’s highest civilian