processed dairy proteins, such as casein and whey, into nonfat dry milk to boost its protein content. This is being done solely for the purpose of avoiding the U.S. tariff-rate quota for nonfat dry milk. This practice, specifically cited in the GAO report, circumvents statutory regulations designed to restrict imports of nonfat dry milk powder.

I have introduced legislation, S. 847, that would close this loophole by regulating MPC imports in the same manner all other dairy product imports are regulated, by establishing new tariff-rate quotas on MPC. It also would close a similar loophole that exists for casein used in the production of food or feed, while continuing to allow unrestricted access for imports of casein used in the manufacture of glues and for other industrial purposes.

The Minnesota Farmers Union, the Minnesota Milk Producers, the National Milk Producers Federation, and the National Farmers Union strongly support this bill. I have worked closely with these organizations over the past year to find an appropriate legislative vehicle for my bill, and that is why I am now offering this legislation to the Senate Farm Bill.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his hard work on behalf of U.S. dairy farmers. This bill, however, properly falls under the jurisdiction of the Senate Finance Committee. As chair of the finance Committee, I will work with the Senator from Minnesota to bring the issue to the attention of the Finance Committee members and to find an appropriate legislative vehicle for his proposal this session.

Mr. DAYTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana for his strong support for U.S. dairy farmers. I respectfully withdraw my plans to offer this amendment.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for a period not to exceed 5 minutes each.

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

CHANGES TO THE 2002 APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS AND THE BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, Division C of Public Law 107–117, the Department of Defense and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States Act of 2002, increased the statutory limits on discretionary spending for fiscal year 2002. Specifically, it raised the cap on general purpose discretionary budget authority to $681.441 billion and the cap on general purpose discretionary outlays to $670.206 billion. The legislation also increased the cap on outlays for conservation programs to $1.473 billion. Accordingly, I am adjusting the Appropriations Committee's allocation and the budget aggregates to reflect the revised statutory caps.

In addition, Mr. President, section 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, requires the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee to adjust the budgetary aggregates and the allocation for the Appropriations Committee by the amount of appropriations designated as emergency spending pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended. Public Law 107–38, the 2001 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Recovery from and Response to Terrorist Attacks on the United States, authorized $40 billion in emergency funding. Public Law 107–38 made the first $20 billion immediately available in fiscal year 2001 and the second $20 billion contingent on the enactment of a subsequent appropriation.

Mr. President, I previously adjusted the committee's allocation and the budget aggregates for the 2002 impact on outlays from the first $20 billion provided in 2001. Public Law 107–117, which was signed into law on January 10, 2002, made available the second $20 billion in emergency spending. That budget authority will result in new outlays in 2002 of $8.223 billion. Consequently, I am making further adjustments to the committee's allocation and to the budget aggregates.

Pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby revise the 2002 allocation provided to the Senate Appropriations Committee in the concurrent budget resolution in the following amounts:

TABLE 1.—REVISED ALLOCATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE, 2002

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Current allocation:		
General purpose discretionary	549,744	551,379
Highways	0	28,489
Mass transit	0	5,275
Conservation	1,760	1,232
Mandatory	358,567	350,837
Total	901,071	937,212
Adjustments:		
General purpose discretionary	154,496	141,338
Highways	0	0
Mass transit	0	0
Conservation	0	241
Mandatory	0	0
Total	154,496	141,579
Revised allocation:		
General purpose discretionary	704,240	692,717
Highways	0	28,489
Mass transit	0	5,275
Conservation	1,760	1,473
Mandatory	358,567	350,837
Total	1,064,567	1,078,791

Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget At, I hereby revise the 2002 budget aggregates included in the concurrent budget resolution in the following amounts:

TABLE 2.—REVISED BUDGET AGGREGATES, 2002

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays
Current allocation: Budget resolution	1,520,019	1,498,600
Adjustsments: Emergency and cap increases	154,496	141,579
Revised allocation: Budget resolution	1,674,515	1,640,179

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY in March of last year. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to describe a terrible crime that occurred January 31, 1994 in Pensacola, FL. A gay man was struck by a car driven by a man who shouted anti-gay slurs. The driver, James Griffin, 18, was charged with aggravated battery in connection with the incident.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

ASIAN NEW YEAR

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, today, February 12, 2002, is the first day of the new lunar year. Americans of Asian heritage are celebrating the beginning of the Year of the Horse. This is an occasion for Asian Americans to gather with their families, think of those who have passed away, enjoy symbolic foods, and usher in good luck and health for the year to come.

As a Nation of immigrants, we all share in this time of celebration and salute the rich customs and energy that people of Asian descent have contributed to America. I am proud that the State of New Jersey is home to over 480,000 Asians and Asian Americans, representing the fifth largest community in the United States. Asian American New Jerseyans are an important and valued part of our diverse and vital community. In these troubled times, I hope you will join me in sharing in celebration and remembrance and help to reaffirm the importance of mutual respect and diversity in our Nation.

ECO–TERRORISM—DOMESTIC TERRORISM HURTS OUR NATION

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I rise today to address the subject of eco-terrorism and the assault on our public lands. Eco-terrorism is described as any crime committed in the name of saving nature. And these ''crimes'' range from civil disobedience to crimes

officially designated as a terrorist act by the FBI. In January a band of criminals who call themselves the Earth Liberation Front (ELF) and the North American Animal Liberation Front (ALF), released a report on their combined crime spree during 2001. They also chose to announce a day of national action for February 12th apparently to protest Congressional hearings on their activities.

While I agree that our public lands needs to be saved for the use of future generations, I believe this should be accomplished through active lands management that promotes the mission statements of our public lands agencies. I denounce those who believe that saving nature means driving metal spikes through trees or burning buildings, actions that threaten human lives.

While these folks characterize burning down research centers, homes, and businesses as a form of self-expression protected by the First Amendment, most Americans would question these wrongheaded beliefs. Neither our government nor the American public will support the activities of ELF and ALF.

These groups of eco-terrorist hide from the law, there organizations have no rosters, no board of directors; they work in ''cells''; and they use guerrilla warfare tactics so as not to inform on others. They carry out their acts and then anonymously take credit on behalf of the Earth Liberation Front. They feel it is their duty to commit life-threatening crimes against society to protect nature. Yet they post guidelines on underground websites and give directions as to how to spike trees and build bombs.

Insurance companies are also starting to recognize the risk of eco-terrorism by broadening their definitions of ''terrorist activities/organizations'' and increasing premiums. As a result, the timber industry is bearing a greater financial burden. If a group that meets the insurance industry definition burns or destroys any equipment, it is NOT covered by insurance. Insurance companies intend to include Earth First!, ELF, and ALF in these new definitions.

Let me give my colleagues, an example of this change. The coverage premium for a helicopter was $10,200 for $5,000,000 liability coverage. The premium increased to $24,000 for $1,000,000 worth of coverage. This is a 140 percent increase in premium for an 80 percent decrease in coverage. This is outrageous! Even the insurance companies recognize the dangers involved in eco-terrorism.

The destruction by ELF and ALF has not been directed at just timber companies, though. Land grant universities are also a target because of the research they provide. To those struggling to pay for the education of their college-age children, the recent ELF and ALF 2001 action report makes for interesting reading. The ELF and ALF claim to have destroyed parts, or all, of several buildings at four major land grant universities and to have attempted to burn down additional buildings at several other universities.

Administrators faced with the cost of rebuilding facilities as well as recreating important research surely now question ELF's definition of ''non-violent.'' The list of ELF and ALF actions against our educational system is sobering. It includes the University of Washington—Center for Urban Horticulture, $5.6 million; the Oregon State University—destroyed poplar trees and cottonwood trees, $200,000; the University of Arizona—Mt. Graham International Observatory power line, equipment and vehicles monkey wrenched, $200,000; the University of Idaho—Biotech building spray painted and survey stakes pulled, $20,000; the Ohio State University—locks on doors super-glued and spray painted, no cost estimate; the Michigan Tech University—Noblet Forestry Building and Forest Engineering Lab attempted arson, no cost estimate; and the Cornell University—Duck Laboratory ducks stolen, no cost estimate.

The ELF continued its reign of terror as recently as February 3 when it set fire to heavy equipment and a trailer at the University of Minnesota's new plant genetics laboratory.

We're not just talking about the destruction of inanimate public property here. What of the thousands of hours of research that were destroyed in these senseless not-so-random acts of violence? Is it fair to the scientists whose work was destroyed in these facilities, to tell them the American public thinks so little of their work that we will accept these acts as legitimate political statements? Some of these scientists have spent a career working on this research, working to discover ways to make our world and our lives better.

Some advocates demand we protect bio-diversity by setting aside vast areas of forests because they believe a potential cure for cancer or some other disease may be found in these forests. Shouldn't we also be concerned about the potential cures for cancer and other diseases, or other technological advances, that might have been under development at these research centers? The destruction of these buildings and the research housed within these institutions is no less important than the bio-diversity harbored in our forests. The American people, the press, the Congress cannot stand by and ignore these events.

Given the number of training sessions carried out each summer by these organizations, as well as the more mainline environmental groups that teach impressionable young people how to destroy property, I expect our federal government to put more effort into ending this domestic terrorism. I'm also concerned about the financial support groups such as ELF, ALF, the Ruckus Society, and others receive from the large environmental trusts, and others, who support this unlawful behavior. Grants to these organizations that result in the destruction of public and private property make the funding organizations accessories to these crimes.

When we turn a blind eye to these types of activities, and we tell ourselves that these are just young people searching for meaning in their lives, or that these folks are only participating in the political process, we do ourselves and our neighbors a disservice.

When we stand idly by and tell ourselves that these are just timber companies or giant corporations that can afford these events, we diminish ourselves, our society, and the freedom that we enjoy in this great country. The simple fact is: burning down buildings and destroying research facilities and the research housed in those facilities, is a crime, and there is no reason, political or other, that this type of behavior should be accepted by anyone.

''THE OTHER HALF OF THE JOB''

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, last week the Washington Post ran an opinion piece authored by Michael McFaul, a professor of political science at Stanford University, entitled ''The Other Half of the Job.''

Professor McFaul's thesis is that while the budget presented by the President last week contained a significant, and needed, increase in resources for the Department of Defense, it failed to provide a significant, and needed, increase for ''the other means for winning the war on terrorism.'' The budget, Professor McFaul writes, ''builds[] greater American capacity to destroy bad states, but it adds hardly any new capacity to construct good states.''

I share Professor McFaul's concerns about the inadequacy of the international affairs budget, that is, the funds for the State Department and foreign assistance. The President's budget request for foreign affairs for Fiscal Year 2003 is actually less than the amount provided in Fiscal Year 2002, if the funds provided in the emergency supplemental after September 11 are included in the calculation. America's armed forces are doing a brilliant job in the military campaign in Afghanistan. But it will take American diplomats, and our assistance agencies, working with other partners, to win the peace. We cannot win the peace there, or prevent other failed states from becoming havens for terrorism, without giving our people the tools they need.

I commend Professor McFaul's article to my colleagues. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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