relations from 1967 to 1981, and while in that role he was instrumental in the University establishing an overseas campus in Luxembourg, named the John E. Dolibois European Center;

Whereas John Dolibois was responsible for funds raised in the late 1940s through early 1980s that helped build Miami University's art museum, conference center, chapel, and alumni center, and helped provide numerous scholarships;

Whereas John Dolibois authored major sections on alumni programming and college public relations in the International Encyclopedia of Higher Education and contributed articles to the State Department's ''Exchange Magazine'' on international education;

Whereas John Dolibois received the Miami University's highest honor, the Benjamin Harrison Medal, and the ''Citizen of the Year'' award from an Oxford, Ohio, committee of residents in 1963, in part for his service as a trustee to the Lane Public Library and as a director of the Community Chest;

Whereas John Dolibois was 1 of 12 United States citizens named by President Richard Nixon to the Board of Foreign Scholarships, which he served on for 3 terms, supervising the Fulbright Program and playing a major role in the development of the Fulbright Alumni Program;

Whereas John Dolibois' personal and diplomatic skills further distinguished his ability to communicate effectively, allowing him to serve as the United States Ambassador to Luxembourg from 1981 to 1985, upon the request of President Ronald Reagan;

Whereas John Dolibois, as a member of Luxembourg's Board of Economic Development, encouraged United States business in Luxembourg and stimulated trade between Luxembourg and Ohio;

Whereas John Dolibois has been decorated twice by the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for his wartime service and his contributions to international education and tourism;

Whereas John Dolibois has stayed connected to youth via 50 years of activity with the Boy Scouts, including becoming an Eagle Scout, serving as a vice president for the Dan Beard Scout Council in Cincinnati, and receiving scouting's highest honor, the Silver Beaver Award;

Whereas John Dolibois earned critical acclaim for his memoir, ''Pattern of Circles'', in which he professed his gratitude for the United States of America, his adopted country; and

Whereas John Dolibois was inducted into Ohio's Veterans Hall of Fame in 1998 and has been noted in ''Who's Who in America'' and ''Who's Who in the World'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends John E. Dolibois for superior lifetime achievements, an indisputable resolve to contribute, and an inspirational legacy of service to this country and to the global community; and

(2) expresses its appreciation for his lifelong service.

RUNAWAY, HOMELESS, AND MISSING CHILDREN PROTECTION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1925 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1925) to reauthorize programs under the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. I urge the Senate to take up and pass H.R. 1925, the Runaway, Homeless, and Missing Children Protection Act. The Senate version of this bill—which was identical—passed unanimously in the Judiciary Committee last Thursday, and this bill deserves the support of every Senator. I joined with Senator HATCH in introducing the Senate legislation to reauthorize and improve the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and to extend the authorization of the Missing Children's Assistance Act. This bill follows in the footsteps of the recently enacted PROTECT Act legislation and presents another milestone in our efforts to safeguard all of our children.

In the 29 years since it became law, the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act has helped some of the most vulnerable children in our country. I have worked in the past to extend the program, most recently in the 106th Congress, when I cosponsored S. 249, the Missing, Exploited, and Runaway Children Protection Act, which extended the Act through this year. I am pleased to help extend it once again.

A Justice Department report released last year estimated that 1.7 million young people either ran away from or were thrown out of their homes in 1999 alone. Other studies have suggested an even higher number. This law and the programs it funds provide a safety net that helps give these young people a chance to build lives for themselves. It is slated to expire at the end of this fiscal year, and we should not allow that to happen.

In my State, both the Vermont Coalition for Runaway and Homeless Youth and Spectrum Youth and Family Services in Burlington receive grants under this law, and they have provided excellent services both to young people trying to build lives on their own and to those who are struggling on the streets. Reauthorizing this law will allow them to continue their enormously important work.

This bill would improve the law by extending the period during which older homeless youth can receive services under the Transitional Living Program, to ensure that all homeless youth can take advantage of services at least until they turn 18. The bill would also make permanent the Secretary of Health and Human Services' authority to make grants explicitly to help rural areas met the unique stresses of providing services to runaway and homeless youth. Programs serving runaway and homeless youth have found that those in rural areas are particularly difficult to reach and serve effectively, and this bill recognizes that fact.

The improvements proposed in this bill to the Missing Children's Assistance Act build on provisions included in the PROTECT Act legislation that we enacted earlier this year. In that bill, we authorized National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, NCMEC, activities through 2005 and authorized the center to strengthen its CyberTipline to provide online users an effective means of reporting Internet-related child sexual exploitation in distribution of child pornography, online enticement of children for sexual acts, and child prostitution. This bill would extend NCMEC through 2008. Now more than ever, it is critical for Congress to give the Center the resources it needs in order to pursue its important work. A missing or abducted child is the worst nightmare of any parent or grandparent, and NCMEC has proved to be an invaluable resource in Federal, state, and local efforts to recover children who have disappeared.

Although this is a good bill on the whole, I am disappointed that it includes a provision that prohibits grantees from using any funds provided under this program for needle distribution programs. This is a superfluous provision that simply repeats what is already law. In addition, it is unnecessary because no grantee under this program operates needle exchange programs or has expressed interest in doing so. I ask Senator HATCH to leave it out of the Senate version of this bill, and was disappointed when he refused. The inclusion of this needless provision, however, does not change the fact that this is still a very good bill.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs have received tremendous bipartisan support over the years. The House passed this bill by a vote of 404–14, and the Senate bill passed by unanimous consent last Friday. I urge the Senate to pass H.R. 1925 and send it to the President today.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 1925) was read the third time and passed.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2003

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1680, an original bill reported by the Banking Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1680) to reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of passage of the Defense Production Reauthorization Act of 2003. This bill will reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950 for an additional 5 years.

Mr. President, the Defense Production Act of 1950 was originally passed in response to the outbreak of war on the Korean Peninsula. The U.S. defense industrial base that had provided the fighter planes, tanks and ships that were so crucial to the outcome of World War II had been largely scrapped following the end of that horrific conflict. The prevailing view, of course, was that such an industrial base was no longer needed in light of the defeat of Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan and the introduction into the American arsenal of atomic weapons.

As we learned literally within hours of the crossing of the 38th Parallel by the first North Korean Army units, that view was catastrophically wrong. The Defense Production Act was the recognition by the executive and legislative branches of Government that a large industrial base oriented toward national defense was still vital to our national security and that the usual process by which weapons and other equipment are procured would not suffice in a genuine crisis.

As in June 1950, the United States remains dependent upon the ability to respond to crises in a manner appropriate to the circumstances. That is where the Defense Production Act of 1950 continues to play a vital role in providing for the national defense. Its authorities allow the President to prioritize and reallocate contracts when the United States is confronted by an imminent threat to its well-being, and to respond to those threats after they've materialized. It provides the authority for the Department of Defense to go into factories that can not afford to maintain a critical capability due to insufficient demand and provide the means for that factory to continue to produce the required item. It indemnifies contractors against legal actions taken as result of U.S. Government directives issued under Defense Production Act authorities, as was needed during the first Persian Gulf War when Civil Air Reserve commercial aircraft were drafted into the war effort at the expense of their commercial obligations.

Over time, the Defense Production Act has been expanded to include natural disasters as well as man-made events like terrorist attacks, and disasters resulting from accidents and equipment failures that can result in large sections of the United States being blacked-out by a major utility failure. In short, it is an emergency capability that we keep in our back pocket and hope it is never needed.

But the Defense Production Act is routinely needed. I have alluded to the Transportation Security Administration's use of it in the wake of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. It has also been used by the Department of Defense in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan to procure vital military equipment like Predator UAVs and military satellite communications technology vital for the conduct of joint operations. And with the scale of contraction in the U.S. defense industrial base over the past decade, the act's authorities will remain as vital as ever for the foreseeable future.

In drafting reauthorizing legislation, it was the committee's intent to modernize the Defense Production Act to take into account the dramatic changes that occurred since the act's last update in 1994. The emergence of terrorism, evident in the U.S. Embassy bombings in East Africa, the attack on the USS Cole in the Gulf of Aden, and the tragic events of 9–11, as the central focus of U.S. national security planning has created an imperative that the Defense Production Act be adapted to that reality. That is why the Banking Committee-passed bill includes new findings and a declaration of policy: because the war on terrorism and the growth in scale of threat to the nation's critical infrastructure of telecommunications, transportation, energy, banking, and other sectors of society the security of which are vital to our national security and our economic and social well-being.

The committee-passed bill, in line with the recommendations of the President's Report to Congress on the Modernization of the Defense Production Act and the Report of the President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection, included in its findings and declaration of policy this emphasis on the war on terrorism and critical infrastructure protection. In addition, language was added intended to further strengthen the linkage between critical infrastructure and the authorities provided by the Defense Production Act during committee consideration of this bill.

Unfortunately, this modernization of the act was more than the other chamber could swallow right now. That is why the ranking member of the Banking Committee, Senator SARBANES, and I will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute. Because the Defense Production Act expires today, there would be no time for a protracted conference. Consequently, the Banking Committee and its House counterpart have agreed to a more modest update of the Act. The amendment by the ranking member and me does the following:

Reauthorizes the Defense Production Act for five years, as requested by the Defense Department;

Provides funding the department requested for hardening electronics against the effects of radiation;

Clarifies the President's authority to obtain information needed for the performance of assessments of the U.S. defense industrial base—a provision requested by the Department of Commerce; and

Formally incorporates the concept of critical infrastructure protection under Defense Production Act authorities by including it under the definition of ''national defense.''

Mr. President, I cannot emphasize enough the importance of the Senate passing the amendment in the nature of a substitute and then voting on final passage as soon as possible. The minute the Defense Production Act lapses, vital authorities for the conduct of military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq disappear. I urge my colleagues' support for the amendment and for final passage of the bill.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Defense Production Act Reauthorization of 2003.

The Defense Production Act provides the President with important authorities to ensure the availability of industrial resources to meet national security needs and to deal with domestic civil emergencies. This is obviously a period in which the authorities of the DPA are being actively utilized. The DPA expires today, September 30. The Administration has made clear that the reauthorization of the DPA is a high priority.

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs marked up and reported out this bill last week by unanimous consent. The House Financial Services Committee, our counterpart Committee, has also reported out a reauthorization of the DPA that is pending on the House floor. Both bills are essentially simple extensions of the DPA with minor changes requested by the Administration. The imminent expiration of the authorities of the DPA led the staff of the two committees to meet last week to reconcile the few differences between the two bills. That has been accomplished, and Senator SHELBY and I will shortly offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute reflecting that agreement.

Both bills contained provisions requested by the Administration to correct the industrial resource shortfall for radiation-hardened electronics, and to clarify the President's authority under the DPA to obtain information in order to perform industry studies assessing the capabilities of the United States industrial base to support the national defense.

The Senate bill also contained a provision sponsored by Senator Bennett, which makes explicit that the authorities of the DPA can be used to protect and restore critical infrastructure. This authority takes on a heightened sense of importance in the aftermath of 9/11, and is retained in the substitute amendment with the strong support of the Administration. The Senate bill provides for a 5 year authorization, as requested by the Administration, and the House bill provides for a 4 year authorization. Senator DODD has raised a concern about the need to address the issue of offsets, which falls under the authority of the DPA. As a result, the

substitute will provide for a 1 year authorization. This is essentially the package.

I would like to commend Chairman SHELBY and his staff for working cooperatively to bring this bill and the substitute amendment before the Senate today. I hope the Senate can act promptly to pass this legislation and send it over to the House. I believe the House will then be in a position to take up the Senate bill, pass it, and send it to the White House for the President's signature. That would ensure the continued availability of the important authorities of the Defense Production Act.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Banking Committee for all his efforts to bring the reauthorization of the Defense Production Act to the floor. It is excellent legislation, and I support it wholeheartedly. I particularly want to express my appreciation for the agreement that was reached to reconsider this piece of legislation in 1 year. That will allow the Defense Production Act to continue uninterrupted, while also providing us with the opportunity to address the very grave concerns that are shared by many Senators about the issue of foreign offset arrangements over the next year.

According to the General Accounting Office and Department of Commerce, these arrangements serve no positive purpose. And yet, offsets are displacing 9,500 American workers annually. In 2000, the Commerce Department reports that out of $5.6 billion exported by the U.S. aerospace and defense industries, $5.1 billion was ''offset'' by these arrangements. In other words, offset arrangements imposed on contracts with American firms amounted to nearly 90 percent of their export value. And in the years 2002 and 2003, the total value of offsets are projected to be close to 100 percent of the value of those contracts—virtually eliminating any gains from U.S. exports of these goods.

Once again, I appreciate the willingness of the chairman and ranking member of the Banking Committee for agreeing to work with me on this issue as we assess additional reauthorization legislation for the Defense Production Act in the coming months.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I appreciate the words of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and look forward to continuing work with my colleagues on these important issues concerning the needs of our military industrial base. The Defense Production Act is an important piece of legislation that provides vital authorities to the Departments of Defense, Homeland Security, Commerce, and Energy to prepare for and respond to crises. These provisions are particularly important during this time as the nation prosecutes its war on terror. The act's authorities allow government agencies to allocate contracts and re-prioritize contracts to meet emergency requirements. And it also provides authority to these agencies, especially the Defense Department, to work with private industry to ensure they have the industrial capabilities required to meet national security requirements that economics alone would otherwise allow to atrophy.

I am pleased the Senate will act on this legislation before it expires at midnight tonight. My hope is that it will be passed by the other body and signed into law by the President shortly.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The amendment (No. 1792) was agreed to, as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Defense Production Act Reauthorization of 2003''.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The 1st sentence of section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2166(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''sections 708'' and inserting ''sections 707, 708,''; and

(2) by striking ''September 30, 2003'' and inserting ''September 30, 2004''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 711(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2161(b)) is amended by striking ''through 2003'' and inserting ''through 2004''.

SEC. 3. RESOURCE SHORTFALL FOR RADIATION-HARDENED ELECTRONICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the limitation contained in section 303(a)(6)(C) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093(a)(6)(C)), the President may take actions under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to correct the industrial resource shortfall for radiation-hardened electronics, to the extent that such Presidential actions do not cause the aggregate outstanding amount of all such actions to exceed $200,000,000.

(b) REPORT BY THE SECRETARY.—Before the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives describing—

(1) the current state of the domestic industrial base for radiation-hardened electronics;

(2) the projected requirements of the Department of Defense for radiation-hardened electronics;

(3) the intentions of the Department of Defense for the industrial base for radiation-hardened electronics; and

(4) the plans of the Department of Defense for use of providers of radiation-hardened electronics beyond the providers with which the Department had entered into contractual arrangements under the authority of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CLARIFICATION OF PRESIDENTIAL AUTHORITY.

Subsection (a) of section 705 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2155(a)) is amended by inserting after the end of the 1st sentence the following new sentence: ''The authority of the President under this section includes the authority to obtain information in order to perform industry studies assessing the capabilities of the United States industrial base to support the national defense.''.

SEC. 5. CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION AND RESTORATION.

Section 702 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2152) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (17) as paragraphs (4) through (18), respectively;

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

''(3) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term 'critical infrastructure' means any systems and assets, whether physical or cyber-based, so vital to the United States that the degradation or destruction of such systems and assets would have a debilitating impact on national security, including, but not limited to, national economic security and national public health or safety.''; and

(3) in paragraph (14) (as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section), by inserting ''and critical infrastructure protection and restoration'' before the period at the end of the last sentence.

SEC. 6. REPORT ON CONTRACTING WITH MINORITY- AND WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESSES.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Before the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives on the extent to which contracts entered into during the fiscal year ending before the end of such 1-year period under the Defense Production Act of 1950 have been contracts with minority- and women-owned businesses.

(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The types of goods and services obtained under contracts with minority- and women-owned businesses under the Defense Production Act of 1950 in the fiscal year covered in the report.

(2) The dollar amounts of such contracts.

(3) The ethnicity of the majority owners of such minority- and women-owned businesses.

(4) A description of the types of barriers in the contracting process, such as requirements for security clearances, that limit contracting opportunities for minority- and women-owned businesses, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary of Defense may determine to be appropriate for increasing opportunities for contracting with minority- and women-owned businesses and removing barriers to such increased participation.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms ''women-owned business'' and ''minority-owned business'' have the meanings given such terms in section 21A(r) of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and the term ''minority'' has the meaning given such term in section 1204(c)(3) of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989.

The bill (S. 1680), as amended, was read the third time and passed.