

engineering of the personal property program. The MTMC is responsible for moving service member's household goods when they receive Permanent Change of Station orders, and the current system for doing so has often been criticized for not providing the same quality service that is available in the private sector.

The current system is a \$1.1 billion a year industry that is awarded without competition and contains no provisions for the government to enforce quality standards. The status quo has produced a dismal 23% customer satisfaction rate, which is understandable when we consider that one in four military moves results in a claim for missing or broken household goods. To make the situation worse, it takes about 8 months to settle 80% of these claims with the service member, at a cost of \$100 million to the government.

For over three years, the Department of Defense has been trying to bring elements of competition and corporate practice into the military program. MTMC's plans will permit full and open competition from all types of companies which provide corporate moving services, and will hold its contractors to standards of performance. It will streamline the personal property program, and introduce accountability to the program through the use of the Federal Acquisition Regulation. The re-engineered program will also make full replacement insurance value available to service families for the first time, and will guarantee that a minimum of 41% of the total contract will be performed by small businesses. The GAO has reviewed this proposal and found it to be superior to the current program.

However, I am concerned that an alternative to the MTMC's re-engineering program, referred to as the Commercial-Like Activities of Superior Service (CLASS), has been included in the House FY99 Defense Authorization bill. This alternative, which is opposed by the Department of Defense, the Military Coalition, the Business Executives for National Security and the Military Mobility Coalition, does not improve the quality of service for our personnel, does not take advantage of current commercial practices, does not provide our military families with a streamlined claims process, and offers no protection for the interests of small business. It is estimated that the CLASS program will cost the DoD about three years and an additional \$6 million to implement. I am hopeful that my colleagues in the Senate will reject the CLASS program during the conference committee negotiations, and allow the DoD to move forward with its pilot program.

I urge my colleagues to support MTMC's re-engineering effort and to remember that this is simply a pilot program. It will take place in three states and will encompass only 18,000 shipments out of a total of 650,000 annually, or only three percent of DoD's

total annual shipments. Congress has also charged GAO to review the pilot as it is conducted and report back to Congress. If, at the end of this test, there are changes to be made, we can make them at that time.

Mr. President, our military families have waited long enough for us to improve the personal property program, and legislatively changing all of DoD's efforts for some other idea at the last minute would be extremely counter-productive. I look forward to removing this burden from our service personnel, and to working with my colleagues to ensure MTMC's re-engineering program becomes a reality.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ASHCROFT addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the vote being taken on the tabling motion for Senator HUTCHISON, I have 10 minutes to address a matter as if in morning business.

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

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, as to the earlier vote on tabling, I initiated the tabling motion in my capacity as comanager of this bill, together with our distinguished chairman. I felt it was the proper thing to do because I attribute to this particular bill, the underlying bill, the annual Authorization Act, the highest priority. It is for the benefit of those who serve in uniform all over the world. It sends a strong message to our allies and enables this country to maintain its responsibility as the sole superpower in the world today. And that is why I am going to do everything I can, together with our distinguished chairman and others, to see that this bill does move forward.

Now that the matter has been divided, then I think I am free to vote my conscience as it relates to such votes as may be taken hereafter regarding the amendments.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO TABLE DIVISION I OF AMENDMENT NO. 2737

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to the motion to table division I of the amendment No. 2737. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) is absent because of illness.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 0, nays 96, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 168 Leg.]

NAYS—96

Abraham	Feingold	Lieberman
Akaka	Feinstein	Lott
Allard	Ford	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frist	Mack
Baucus	Glenn	McCain
Biden	Gorton	McConnell
Bingaman	Graham	Mikulski
Bond	Gramm	Moseley-Braun
Boxer	Grams	Moynihan
Breaux	Grassley	Murkowski
Brownback	Gregg	Murray
Bryan	Hagel	Nickles
Bumpers	Harkin	Reed
Burns	Hatch	Reid
Byrd	Helms	Robb
Campbell	Hollings	Roberts
Chafee	Hutchinson	Roth
Cleland	Hutchison	Santorum
Coats	Inhofe	Sarbanes
Cochran	Inouye	Sessions
Collins	Jeffords	Shelby
Conrad	Johnson	Smith (NH)
Coverdell	Kempthorne	Smith (OR)
Craig	Kennedy	Snowe
D'Amato	Kerrey	Stevens
Daschle	Kerry	Thomas
DeWine	Kohl	Thompson
Dodd	Kyl	Thurmond
Dorgan	Landrieu	Torricelli
Durbin	Lautenberg	Warner
Enzi	Leahy	Wellstone
Faircloth	Levin	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Bennett	Rockefeller
Domenici	Specter

The motion to lay on the table division I of the amendment (No. 2737) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Missouri is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. LEVIN. I wonder if the Senator will yield for an inquiry.

Mr. ASHCROFT. I am happy to.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that under the order, after the 10 minutes of morning business, the Senate will then stand in recess without any intervening unanimous consent requests or motions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I have been asked to propound a unanimous consent, and I believe it has been agreed to by both sides. Prior to the Senator leaving the Chamber, I will do that.

Mr. LEVIN. Does the Senator have that to propound now?

Mr. ASHCROFT. Yes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2646

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate proceeds to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2646, the Coverdell A+ education bill, it be considered as having been read, and there be 4 hours for debate divided in the following manner:

Two hours under the control of the minority leader, or his designee, with part of their 2 hours divided as follows: Senator KENNEDY, 15 minutes; Senator

GRAHAM, 20 minutes; Senator KERRY of Massachusetts, 10 minutes; Senator TORRICELLI, 15 minutes; Senator COVERDELL, or his designee, 2 hours.

I further ask consent that following the expiration or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on adoption of the conference report, all without any intervening action or debate.

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

The Senator is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

U.S.-CHINA RELATIONS

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I want to take a few moments to address the situation regarding the policy of the United States and the way in which we relate to the nation of China. The President of the United States is making a trip to the People's Republic of China, and there has been significant debate about this trip, which provides us an opportunity to ask ourselves what kind of policy should we have toward the world's most populous nation.

There have been a number of us who have questioned whether or not the President should go to Tiananmen Square, for example, to celebrate, in some way, his arrival with those who pulled the triggers at the square to crush dissent in 1989. There are a wide variety of pluses and minuses about the Presidential trip. I want to try to put this trip and our policy toward China into a broader perspective in terms of the way foreign policy perhaps ought to be conducted.

First of all, the President has suggested that we either have to do it his way—to support the Presidential visit, welcomed by leaders at the site of a tremendous violation of human rights—or else we have no engagement with China at all. I think this is a false choice. It is not necessary, in order to have a relationship with countries, that we automatically have to have a summit. As a matter of fact, we engage in relationships with very important countries—countries far more influential in some respects than China—and we don't have summits with them on a regular basis. This is the second summit in less than a year with the nation of China.

So the first thing I would like to say is that it is not necessarily essential, in order to pursue a productive policy for a long-term constructive relationship with China, that you have a summit. As a matter of fact, it might be counterproductive. It might impair the development of the kind of healthy, long-term relationship we need if we send the President unduly, or prematurely, to negotiate with or otherwise concede to individuals whose conduct doesn't merit the President's dignifying presence—whose participation in world events is not of a quality that should be legitimized by a visit from the President of the United States.

There has been a false dichotomy presented to the American people, and

it has been the choice between either supporting the President's trip to China or being labeled isolationists. That is simply an inappropriate framework to force upon the American people. Most Americans understand that our objectives ought not to be involvement or isolation per se, but that the United States—the greatest Nation of the world—would relate constructively with the People's Republic of China on the basis of sound policy that leads to a constructive and mature relationship.

I believe that we have to have a policy toward China. While I question what the policies the President is pursuing, my reservations in no way suggest that I don't seek good relations with China. As a matter of fact, I think the road to good relations would be paved with better policy and fewer summits.

Allow me to explain. Whether we are talking about the relationships between individuals, or businesses, or institutions, or countries, there are principles that undergird and provide the foundation for good relations. Integrity is one. Relationships have to be based on integrity. People have to be able to trust one another. They have to know that when one says something, it can be trusted. Another component of a good relationship is responsibility. Individuals have to act responsibly. They can't threaten or otherwise endanger the other party if there are going to be sound relationships. Third, there has to be accountability. If we want long-term relationships, if we want a productive relationship, if we want something that can be relied upon and built upon, we have to have the foundation of integrity, responsibility, and accountability.

I suggest that our relationship with China is no different, and must include these kinds of building blocks. We have to have a relationship of integrity, responsibility, and accountability with China. If we don't have it, the future of U.S.-China relations is not bright.

I have some real problems with the way the Chinese have dealt with us. It is a way that does not reflect integrity. It does not reflect responsibility. It does not reflect accountability.

Take, for example, integrity. China last year, after almost 20 years of assuring the world that it doesn't proliferate weapons of mass destruction, was labeled by our own CIA as the world's worst proliferator of weapons of mass destruction. In spite of that, the President said, "We will invite them over for a summit." And the Chinese were invited to the United States in October. As a matter of fact, there were nonproliferation assurances at that summit similar to the assurances that have been made over the past two decades. China pledged that it did not proliferate weapons of mass destruction. We don't involve ourselves in that.

Frankly, just a few short months later, our intelligence resources inter-

cepted negotiations between China and Iran for China to provide anhydrous hydrogen fluoride, a material used to upgrade industrial-strength uranium to weapons-grade uranium. The material was destined for Isfahan, one of Iran's principal sites for manufacturing the explosive core of an atomic device.

It is pretty clear that the absence of integrity in the conduct of the Chinese is dramatic. It is an absence of integrity prior to the last summit, and it is an absence of integrity that followed on the heels of that summit. They will tell you one thing, and they do something else. That is not the basis of integrity that provides the foundation for a sound relationship.

Responsibility is the second key ingredient. I think most Americans were shocked—I was shocked; I was stunned—when it was revealed by our own intelligence sources that the nation of China had as many as 13 intercontinental ballistic missiles targeted on American cities, armed with massive nuclear warheads, termed "city busters." Every city in the United States of America north of southern Florida is within range of these missiles, and they are targeted on the United States of America.

I don't think that is the foundation for summitry. I don't think that is the foundation for a good relationship. We never appeased the Soviet Union while it was targeting nuclear warheads on American cities. Ronald Reagan had a sense of principle. He had a sense of determination that you don't stand as a target, while at the same time offering privileges to your adversary. That is not the kind of policy America has pursued in the past. A policy which sells out America's long-term security interests might facilitate a particular sale, it might obtain a particular favor, but it is not in the long-term best interests of the United States to stand as a target offering concessions to a country pointing nuclear weapons at our cities.

I think it is, of all things, terribly irresponsible of the Chinese to have 13 American cities targeted with their "city buster" nuclear weapons on intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of reaching virtually every city in the United States.

The third important element is accountability. Where do the Chinese stand on accountability? The trade barriers that China has toward the United States are incredible. In recent years, China's tariff levels have been about six times as high on our goods as our tariffs are on Chinese products. Not only that, China imposes nontariff barriers that make it impossible for our companies to penetrate the Chinese market. China treats American companies differently, so that U.S. firms don't have the protection of law in Chinese courts commensurate with the protection the United States extends to foreign investors in our market.