

get this done, we will develop wind, solar, geothermal, solar thermal, we will develop not only hybrids but plug-in hybrid cars. No one on this side has said no to that. We've been promoting alternatives over here.

In our Utah papers today was a little company in Utah called Raser Technologies that will have a truck, and they are talking about fleets of trucks that can get up to 140 miles per gallon. These would be plug-in trucks with up to 140 miles a gallon. Tesla Motors has developed a car that gets 120 miles per gallon. My Clear Act that we passed in the 2005 Energy bill provides for an accentuation of hybrid vehicles. It gives incentives to do that—not just hybrid vehicles but alternative fuel vehicles and alternative fuel infrastructure. You have seen the ads, you have seen the Honda ad talking about a fuel-cell vehicle they have already developed. What does that mean? It is a hydrogen vehicle. Nuclear power is one of the ways we can produce a lot of hydrogen in this country. But we have stopped nuclear development for so long now that we do not have the hydrogen to be able to service those. We can put those vehicles out within the next 5 to 10 years, and Americans could be driving them. There is not one drop of pollution, not one ounce of pollution in all of those vehicles. But we cannot get the hydrogen because we do not have nuclear power and some of the other power we have to have. It is going take time to get us there. In the interim, meantime, we have to have oil.

The last time I heard, as I have said many times on this floor and otherwise, our cars, our trains, our planes, our ships, our trucks—they run on oil. Until we can get all of these other things going, we need to have oil. And we have it within our power to be able to have oil domestically so that we are not throwing \$700 billion away every year and funding some people who are our enemies.

That is what is amazing to me, that some are so locked up with these extremists that they cannot—they know it is true, but they cannot do anything to promote any oil development. There is something terribly sick about that in a body this important. Should not this body be brave enough to do its best in the interests of our country to create more energy and use less as we develop all of these other alternative forms?

They have even distorted T. Boone Pickens' words when he said we cannot drill ourselves out of this problem. He did not mean we should not be drilling; he said we need to do all of these things. That is his pitch. That is his energy program. He happens to be right. But until we get all of those other alternative forms going, and these alternative vehicles, we have to have oil, and we will continue to need oil. Without it, the people who are left the most poor, the people who are left without, the people who will struggle the most are the poor. I do not under-

stand why my colleagues cannot see that. I do not understand it because they claim to be for the poor. But these extremists take precedence over the poor.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

---

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—  
S. 3001

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 732, S. 3001, the DOD authorization, at a time determined by the majority leader, following consultation with the Republican leader, and that when the bill is considered, the only first-degree amendments in order be those that are germane to S. 3001, H.R. 5668, the House companion measure, and items within the jurisdiction of the House Armed Services Committee, and that the first-degree amendments be subject to second-degree amendments which are germane to the amendment to which it was offered; that upon the disposition of all amendments, the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill; that upon passage, it

then be in order for the Senate to consider, en bloc, the following calendar items: Nos. 733, 734, and 735; that all after the enacting clause of each bill be stricken and the following divisions of S. 3001, as passed by the Senate, be inserted as follows: Division A—S. 3002, Division B—S. 3003, Division C—S. 3004; that these bills be read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, en bloc; further, that the consideration of these items appear separately in the RECORD; provided further, that the Senate then proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 758, H.R. 5658, the House companion; that all after the enacting clause be stricken and the text of S. 3001, as amended and passed by the Senate, be inserted in lieu thereof; the bill be read a third time, passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table; that the title amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that upon passage of H.R. 5658, as amended, the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing vote of the two houses, and the Chair be authorized to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate, with the above occurring with no further intervening action or debate; finally, that in order for a first-degree amendment to be considered in order to the bill, it must be filed at the desk, and comport to the requirements specified above, by 2 p.m., Wednesday, July 30, 2008; pro-

vided further that the bill would not be considered prior to the filing deadline of first-degree amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I may not personally have an objection to this, this consent would limit the rights of Senators to offer amendments to the Defense authorization bill. This is an agreement that would need to be cleared by all Senators on both sides. Given the detailed limitations of what can be offered to this bill, I will have to object on behalf of the Members on this side of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. I would say to my friend, the only requirement was that the amendments be germane. There were unlimited amendments as long as they relate to what we are dealing with on our side.

Mr. HATCH. On behalf of our side, I have been asked to object. I apologize to my dear friend from Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. REID. I understand the objection. The Senator from Utah is certainly not supposed to be totally aware of all that is in the Defense bill. But this agreement would allow scores of amendments because it would be anything that is germane. That is certainly nothing unusual. So I understand.

---

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

---

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the 18th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act. We have much to celebrate on this occasion. Signed into law 18 years ago, the ADA has fundamentally strengthened our Nation with its promise of equal rights and opportunity for individuals with disabilities.

We can see the ADA's transformative effects on society, with our public facilities, services, transportation, and telecommunications now accessible to millions who were excluded in the past. Even though the results are easy for most of us to take for granted, they can mean the difference between exclusion and full participation for a person with a disability. The ADA has ushered in a new era of opportunity in the workplace as well. After all, this legislation was intended to prohibit discriminatory job decisions in the same spirit of the other great civil rights laws of our country.

The ADA both reflects and reinforces our commitment to the inclusion, understanding, and acceptance of all people—no matter their ability or disability.

I have met countless Nevadans with disabilities over the years whose stories breathe life into the ideals set forth by the ADA. They want to live, work, and pursue the American dream on equal footing with everyone else, and the ADA has paved the way for them to do so.

Nonetheless, the struggles that people with disabilities continue to face show that we still have a long way to go before the ADA's promise is fully realized. Economic independence, affordable health care, and the dignity of equal treatment are still beyond the reach of too many, and poverty and isolation still afflict the majority of people with disabilities. Unfortunately, court rulings in recent years have exacerbated these challenges by narrowing the ADA's coverage contrary congressional intent. It is time to restore the ADA to the law it was meant to be.

So let us renew our efforts to build upon the founding principles of this landmark civil rights law. I look forward to continuing this vital work in honor of all those who fought for its passage and on behalf of everyone today who cherishes the equality of opportunity promised by the Americans with Disabilities Act.

#### TOOLS OF PERSUASION AND INSPIRATION

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a speech on July 15 by Secretary of Defense Robert Gates before the U.S. Global Leadership Campaign here in Washington, DC. In this remarkable speech, Secretary Gates makes the case for the improvement of the Nation's diplomatic and developmental capabilities—what he calls the “tools of persuasion and inspiration”—that are as “indispensable” to our security and prosperity as are our Armed Forces.

If we have learned anything over the last 7 years it is that turning to our capable and proven military cannot be our only or dominant way of dealing with the challenges of a dangerous world. Secretary Gates warns us of the “creeping militarization” of our Nation's foreign policy.

Too often, and especially in a crisis, we turn to the military as the only agency with the capacity and resources necessary and available for meaningful action. Secretary Gates acknowledges this reality but challenges us to make the changes that will improve the capacity, readiness and availability of the Nation's nonmilitary agencies.

Secretary Gates calls for increasing the Nation's investment in the capacity and capability of the Department of State and other development agencies. I agree; we have undermanned and un-

derfunded them for too long and we realize today more than ever the unwelcome consequences of that neglect. This is a striking observation coming from the Secretary of Defense and should demand our attention.

More money alone, however, is not enough to bring our diplomatic and development agencies up to the capability and capacity levels needed for the complexities and scope of the dangers around us. Secretary Gates also calls for a greater integration of diplomatic and developmental agencies with the military, international partners, and private groups. Current operations have demonstrated the disappointing results of the lack of a fully integrated planning and execution system that takes appropriate advantage of all the tools—diplomatic, developmental, military, international, and private—necessary to resolve conflict.

Secretary Gates has laid before the Nation a very thoughtful and convincing assessment of where we are and where we need to go in achieving the right balance of diplomatic, economic, and military capability to deal with an uncertain and threatening world. I commend his remarks to all Senators and ask unanimous consent that the July 15, 2008, speech of Secretary Gates before the U.S. Global Leadership Campaign in Washington, DC, be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### SPEECH TO THE U.S. GLOBAL LEADERSHIP CAMPAIGN AS DELIVERED BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT M. GATES, JULY 15, 2008

Thank you very much for the introductions.

Thank you Condi Rice for the kind words, and above all, for your principled and visionary leadership of the Department of State.

One of the reasons I have rarely been invited to lecture in political science departments—including at Texas A&M—is because faculty correctly suspect that I would tell the students that what their textbooks say about government does not describe the reality I have experienced in working for seven presidents. Organization charts, institutions, statistics, structures, regulations, policies, committees, and all the rest—the bureaucracy, if you will—are the necessary pre-condition for effective government. But whether or not it really works depends upon the people and their relationships. For significant periods since I entered government 42 years ago, the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense were not on speaking terms. The fact that Condi and I actually get along means that our respective bureaucracies understand that trying to provoke us to fight with one another is not career-enhancing. Such efforts still occur, of course. After all, this is Washington. But the bureaucratic battles are a good deal more covert.

Of course, the human side of government is always a source of both humor and embarrassment. Will Rogers once said, “I don't make jokes. I just watch the government and report the facts.” And the conduct of diplomacy, where—as Secretary Rice can attest—protocol and propriety are so very important, provides an especially fertile ground for amusement.

For example, there was the time that President Nixon met with Israeli Prime Min-

ister Golda Meir, shortly after Nixon had appointed Henry Kissinger as Secretary of State. With Golda Meir in that meeting was her very erudite foreign minister, Abba Eban, a graduate of Cambridge. At one point in the meeting, Nixon turned to Golda Meir and said, “Just think, we now both have Jewish foreign ministers.” And without missing a beat Golda Meir said, “Yes, but mine speaks English.”

Then there was the time that President Nixon visited Italy and had a meeting with the Pope. Kissinger and Nixon had along with them Secretary of Defense Mel Laird, but they decided that Laird as, in effect, secretary of war shouldn't be invited to meeting with the Pope. So, Nixon the next morning went in for his private audience with the Pope, and the other Americans waited outside for the general audience. And who should come striding down the hall of the papal apartments but Mel Laird smoking an enormous cigar; he had decided he wanted in on the meeting. Kissinger was beside himself, but finally said, “Well, Mel, at least extinguish the cigar.” And so Laird stubbed out his cigar and put it in his pocket.

The rest of the American party a few minutes later went in to their meeting with the Pope, everyone took a seat. A couple of minutes into the Pope's remarks, Kissinger heard this little patting sound going on, he was in the second row with Laird on the end, there was a wisp of smoke coming out of Laird's pocket. Everything seemed under control. A couple of minutes later, Kissinger heard this loud slapping noise. He looked over smoke was billowing out of Laird's pocket. The Secretary of Defense was on fire. Now the rest of the delegation heard this slapping noise, and they thought they were being cued to applaud the Pope. And so they did. And Henry later told us, “God only knows what his Holiness thought, seeing the American secretary of defense immolating himself, and the entire American party applauding the fact.”

I am honored to receive this award, and I consider it a privilege to be associated with the United States Global Leadership Campaign. It is a truly remarkable collection of “strange bedfellows”—from Save the Children to Caterpillar, from Catholic Relief Services to AIPAC, and even Boeing and Northrop Grumman. This organization has been a prescient, and often lonely, advocate for the importance of diplomacy and international development to America's vital national interests—and I commend you for that.

Though my views on these subjects have become better known through recent speeches, in many ways they originated and were reinforced by my prior experience in government during the Cold War. Looking back, it is clear that the strength of America's military forces and intelligence capabilities—along with the willingness to use them—held the Soviets at bay for more than four decades. But there was another side to that story and to that struggle. There was the Agency for International Development overseeing development and humanitarian assistance programs that improved—if not saved—the lives of millions of people from disease, starvation, and poverty. Our diplomats forged relationships and bonds of trust, and built up reservoirs of expertise and goodwill that proved invaluable over time. Countless people in foreign countries wandered into a United States Information Agency library, or heard from a visiting speaker and had their opinions about America transformed by learning about our history and culture and values. Others behind the Iron Curtain were inspired to resist by what they heard on Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America.