leadership decides—an energy bill ought to be on the President's desk waiting for his signature. Any less performance than that is an inadequate performance on the part of the Congress.

I think we do have that opportunity. The reason we have a colleague on the floor saying he wants to put one on the Defense authorization bill is to cause the leadership of the Senate not to stonewall the issue but to give us a time certain when that issue can come to the floor.

THE VALUE OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. CRAIG. If I could for a few moments talk about something that is near and dear to my heart, that is public lands. My State of Idaho is 63-percent public land. Last Saturday was a time for all Americans to recognize the value we have in our public lands and a time for all of us to give a little something back, by volunteering a Saturday to lend a helping hand to improve our public lands. Last Saturday was National Public Lands Day.

This year, National Public Lands Day focused on ''Keeping the Promise'' by asking Americans to come together to improve the nation's largest resource, our public lands, and to honor the work and sacrifice of the members of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

They are unsung heroes who built over 800 of America's national and state parks.

Between 1933 and 1942, 3.5 million Corps members planted almost 4 billion trees, and they built parks, roads, and hiking trails.

They laid the foundation for the public lands system that America enjoys today.

This year the Corps held their final national reunion on National Public Lands Day.

The ceremony remembered the efforts of the Civilian Conservation Corp at Virginia's Shenandoah National Park, and the Corps Alumni symbolically passed the responsibility of caring for public lands to a new generation of concerned citizens.

This year, this new generation totaled approximately 50,000 volunteers, who took some of their precious time and performed over a million dollars worth of improvements to our public lands.

I believe National Public Lands Day is an opportunity to build a sense of ownership by Americans—through personal involvement and conservation education.

In recognition of National Public Lands Day and this sense of ownership we should all have for our public lands, I want to spend a few minutes today and reflect on the value of our public lands and on what the future holds for them.

There are around 650 million acres of public lands in the United States. This represents a major portion of our total land mass.

However, most of these lands are concentrated in the West, where as much as 82 percent of a state can be comprised of Federal land. In fact, 63 percent of my own home state of Idaho is owned by the Federal Government.

This can be beneficial, as our public lands have a lot to offer.

For starters, there is a great deal of resources available on our public lands—from renewable forests to opportunities to raise livestock to oil and minerals beneath the surface—public lands hold a great deal of the resources we all depend on and that allow us to enjoy the abundant lives we live in this country.

Having resources available on public lands affords us the opportunity for a return on those resources to help fund government services, from schools to roads to national defense, and ease the burden on taxpayers.

Just as important, though, is the recreation opportunities our public lands offer.

Every day, people hike and pack into the solitude of wilderness areas, climb rocks, ski, camp, snowmobile, use off-road vehicles, hunt, fish, picnic, boat, swim, and the list goes on of the abundance of recreation on these marvelous lands.

Because the lands are owned by all of us, the opportunity has existed for everyone to use the land within reasonable limits.

However, times are changing. We are in the midst of a slow and methodical attack on our access to public lands.

It started with the resources industries. It will not stop there.

At the same time some radical groups are fighting to halt all resource management on our public lands, they are working to restrict and, in some cases, eliminate human access to our public lands for recreation.

Yes, we must manage our public lands responsibly, which includes restrictions on some activities in some areas.

What we must not do is unreasonably restrict or eliminate certain activities.

Some people like to hike in backcountry areas where they can find peace and solitude while others prefer to ride ATVs into the wilderness.

Some prefer to camp in more developed facilities while others prefer primitive spots.

The point is that recreational opportunities on our public lands should be as diverse as the American public's interest.

On the same note, we can use the natural resources we need in an environmentally responsible manner and still have plenty of opportunities to recreate.

In fact, recreation resource, and environmental interests can team together to help each other out. In my own State of Idaho, on the Nez Perce National Forest, representatives of these interests and many others have come together though a stewardship project.

These groups are working with the Forest Service to implement a project that works for everyone and addresses all of their needs in some fashion.

In order to achieve such success, each group has had to compromise to agree on a prescription that works for everyone. No one gets their way all of the time.

This is just one example of differing interests working together to help each other out and improve the opportunities on our public lands for everyone and to secure a sound environment.

We need to see more of this around the country.

Public land management has become embroiled in fights, appeals, and litigation. The result is that the only ones who are winning are those who want to ensure we don't use our public lands.

This must stop. Differing interests have to come together and realize that we all have one common goal—use of the land in a responsible and environmentally sound manner.

We can not continue to make the same mistakes of the past on these marvelous public lands.

That being said, I would like each of my colleagues to think about how public lands benefit their State and how they might work to support the new generation of Americans who are just beginning to find the wonders of our public lands.

Last Saturday was National Public Lands Day, and many walked upon those lands and rode water equipment on the lakes of those lands. Some even cut down a few trees to make a home or to provide saw timber to a sawmill. Some were herding cattle on the public lands of Idaho, taking them from the summer range to the fall range and heading them home for the winter season. Soon many will be hunting on the public lands of the West—hunting the elusive elk, or the deer, or other forms of wildlife species that are abundant and managed both in balanced and purposeful ways.

That is the great story of our Nation's public lands. It is not simply to lock them up and look at them, to call them, as medieval Europe once used to call them, ''the King's land.'' The lands of the public are not the King's lands, and they are not the Government's lands; they are the people's lands.

These lands must be managed in a way that ensures their environmental integrity while allowing all Americans to enjoy them in their lifetime and in their style.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, since we were unable to reach agreement on a

list of finite amendments to the Defense Authorization Act last week, the leadership filed a cloture motion on the bill. The Senate will vote on cloture on the bill at 10 a.m. tomorrow. I certainly hope the Senate will invoke cloture on the bill because we have so many important items in this bill relating to our national security. It is essential that we act in the Senate so we can go to conference with the House and bring back a conference product.

So far we have adopted 47 amendments to the bill. We have had two rollcall votes. And one amendment has been offered and then withdrawn. Over the last few days of last week, and over the weekend, we and our staffs have worked through more of the amendments that have been filed on the bill.

Senator WARNER and I have another package of cleared amendments that we will be offering later today in the form of a managers' package. We are continuing to work to clear amendments, and we expect to have more cleared later this afternoon. I encourage Senators who have amendments to bring them down and to work with our staffs to try to get them cleared.

Completing action on this bill tomorrow would send a powerful signal to our allies and our adversaries around the world of our sense of national unity and determination and of our strong support for our Armed Forces. Failure to complete action on this bill would send the opposite message. So I urge all of our colleagues to put aside controversial issues that do not relate to this bill and to work with Senator WARNER and with me to complete action on this important legislation.

The ranking minority member of the committee, Senator WARNER, is at the White House with the President this afternoon. We were scheduled to begin at 2 o'clock, but that meeting with the President obviously takes precedence.

RECESS

Mr. LEVIN. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 3:15. At that time, we will be in this Chamber to discuss amendments that Senators might wish to offer. And the managers will stay as late today as is necessary to discuss any of those amendments.

I thank the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:07 p.m., recessed until 3:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. DORGAN).

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

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

USE OF FORCE AUTHORITY BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, up until a few days ago, the Senate was moving with lightning-like speed to complete consideration of the Defense authorization bill. Complications arose last week and slowed the bill down, but it appears that the Senate may be poised to shift back into high gear—or something like it—tomorrow and attempt to finish the bill. A cloture motion was filed last week. If cloture is invoked on Tuesday, passage of the bill will be more nearly assured.

Clearly, the Senate has many weighty matters to consider, both in this bill and in other measures waiting in the wings. We should proceed with all due haste to complete our work. The September 11 terrorist attack on the United States reordered our priorities and imposed a new measure of urgency on much of the business that is yet to come before the Senate.

But in the heat of the moment, in the crush of recent events, I fear we may be losing sight of the larger obligations of the Senate. Our responsibility as Senators is to carefully consider and fully debate major policy matters, to air all sides of a given issue, and to act after full deliberation. Yes, we want to respond quickly to urgent needs, but a speedy response should not be used as an excuse to trample full and free debate.

I am concerned that the Defense bill may be a victim of this rush to action, despite the respite offered by last week's delays. For example, the Defense bill, as reported by the Senate Armed Services Committee, contained language conditioning the expenditure of missile defense funds on U.S. compliance with the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, the ABM Treaty. I worry that that language—which was somewhat controversial in committee and which was only narrowly approved—was dropped without a word of debate being uttered on the Senate floor. I understand the reluctance to engage in divisive public debate at a time when we are all seeking unity, but I caution that debate over such an important subject as the ABM Treaty is not to be lightly dismissed. There is no question about the unity. The unity is here. And certainly, insofar as I am concerned, debate over an issue of this kind is not going to be an apple of discord thrown into the mix. We may just happen to disagree on some matters with respect to the ABM Treaty.

So I cannot understand why there needs to be such ''unity'' that it would require keeping our voices completely mute on a matter of this kind. It would be no indication of disunity in this country and our need to be unified in dealing with the terrorists or nations that harbor terrorists. As a matter of fact, the mere fact that we would disagree on a matter before the Senate—the ABM Treaty, for example—is no indication of disunity when it comes to facing the common foe. Not to me, at least.

The Defense authorization bill provides up to $8.3 billion for missile defense, including activities that may or may not violate the ABM Treaty in the coming months. Many experts believe the ABM Treaty is the cornerstone of international arms control and that to abrogate or withdraw from the treaty can only lead to a new, dangerous, and costly international arms race. Other experts, on the other hand, are of the opinion that the ABM Treaty has outlived its usefulness, that it is a relic of the cold war that makes it impossible for the United States to protect its citizens against a new world order of rogue nations armed with ballistic missiles and transnational terrorists who may very well be armed with chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons.

This is a major policy issue. That is what it is—a major policy issue. I am not sure where I stand on the ABM Treaty, but I do know I am not prepared to trade it in on a still-to-be-developed, still-to-be-proven national missile defense program without giving the matter a great deal of thought and consideration.

The language that was dropped from the Defense bill would have provided Congress the opportunity to vote on funding any missile defense expenditure that would violate the ABM Treaty. It was a sensible provision, as I see it. I would have supported it, probably, and I would have been eager to engage in debate over it. Although I might have little to say, I would still like to hear it. I would like to hear others. That opportunity was given away to avoid what? To avoid a debate that some might have called divisive on this bill. So be it. But having postponed that debate on this bill, we have an obligation to find another venue in which to have that debate. And we should have that debate sooner rather than later.

The resolution granting the President the authority to use force to respond to the September 11 terrorist attack is another example of Congress moving quickly to avoid the specter of acrimonious debate at a time of national crisis. The resolution Congress approved gives the President broad authority to go after the perpetrators of the terrorist attack regardless of who they are or where they are hiding. I am not saying we ought to debate that ad infinitum, but at least we could have had 3 hours or 6 hours of debate. Why do we have to put a zipper on our lips and have no debate at all?

It also authorizes the President to take all appropriate actions against nations, organizations, or persons who aided or harbored those perpetrators. In his address to Congress following the attack, President Bush vowed to take the battle against terrorism to those persons, such as Osama bin Laden; to those organizations, such as the Taliban; to those networks, such as Al-Qaida, and to any nations that acted as conspirators in the attack on the United States.