the Berlin wall and liberate Eastern Europe and free more people than any victory in any war in the history of mankind, now all of a sudden, because a few Members who because of their numbers have dominated this process, say, ''Don't let people compete for my jobs,'' will not be able to compete to keep some of their work. I cannot step aside and let that happen willingly. I may not be able to prevent it, as we will find out as this process goes along, but I have an obligation to fight it because it is fundamentally wrong for America to be preventing competition.

Almost as if on cue, our distinguished majority leader is here. I yield the floor.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, let me say that it seems customary on this floor to say how much you appreciate and love somebody and respect them. Of course, there is no better evidence of my affection for the senior Senator from Texas than the fact that back when—some may have forgotten that he ran for President. In the primary, he ran against the then majority leader Bob Dole. I openly supported the senior Senator from Texas over Senator Bob Dole, which was politically pretty dumb for me to do. But I did it because I felt he is a very capable individual.

Having said that, I would like to respond to the items that he has stated in his statement. Let me cover a couple of things that the distinguished Senator from Texas talked about.

For openers, the Senator from Texas stated that the BRAC Commission, during their process in 1995, offered as an alternative to privatize in place. Let me suggest to you, Mr. President, that is not the case. It was the case in Newark, it was the case in Louisville, it was the case in the Naval Air Warfare Center in Indianapolis; but it was not the case in either McClellan Air Force Base or Kelly Air Force Base. The reason I say that is that, specifically in those first three instances where they did privatize in place, the BRAC report said specifically ''privatize in place.'' Contrary to that, in the 1995 round, it specifically said that whatever happens, whether it is privatization or anything else, you have to move the required equipment and any required personnel to the receiving locations.

I think we all know why that is the case. If you have five air logistic centers, each one operating at 50 percent capacity and you close the two least efficient ones, according to the BRAC Commission, you then would transfer that workload, and if you didn't transfer that workload, you would have to somehow account for paying for 50 percent of overhead that isn't being used.

Now, when we talk about what this bill does, it is true that we are including in any competition a value for the vacancy that occurs, or the 50 percent capacity that is not being used in the remaining ALC's. There would be three remaining. That is only reasonable because there is a tremendous value to that.

Second, we are also providing a value of the actual real estate value of the facilities that would be used. For example, if the Senator from Texas wanted competition to come in and use Kelly Air Force Base, it would not be fair competition to say, fine, you could have it for $1 a year. Instead, the bill provides that it would have to be for the value of that institution. Those are dollars that otherwise would be spent on our defense system.

Third, I mention the question as to whether or not President Clinton made a political statement when he suggested out in Sacramento, CA, that they were going to leave that alone, I would like to read his statement to you. It says:

> On July 1, you were dealt a serious blow when the independent Base Closing Commission said that we ought to shut Kelly down. At my insistence and my refusal to go along with that specific recommendation, the Air Force developed the privatization in place plan that will keep thousands of jobs here at this depot.

That is right before the Presidential election. If you look at this one sentence which says, ''At my insistence and my refusal to go along with that specific recommendation * * *'' that in and of itself is a very clear violation of both the intent and the letter of the BRAC process.

I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I know there is a lot more debate that we will hear on this subject. We would like to start a process that would get us on the DOD authorization conference report.

EDUCATION SAVINGS ACT FOR PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, regarding the Coverdell A-plus education bill, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to H.R. 2646, the Coverdell education bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. We have no opposition to moving to the bill, but, obviously, how the bill is considered will be of some interest to us. I know that the leader has indicated he would like to go to the bill and, as I understand it, there may be a cloture vote as early as Friday on the bill itself.

Obviously, we still have not been able to resolve our problems relating to campaign finance reform and, in part because of that and also because this is a tax bill and not subject to reconciliation constraints under which we have worked with other tax bills, Democratic Senators, I know, and perhaps some Republicans would appreciate the opportunity to offer amendments. We have an array of amendments on this particular bill that we would like to offer and, of course, perhaps most prominently of all, the non-tax-related matters for which there would be an interest in having a good debate is the campaign finance reform bill.

Hopefully, by Friday, we can resolve that matter. But even if we do, the issue would still stand that we would need to be able to offer some amendments. So I am hopeful that we can arrange a way in which that can be accommodated. Subject to how the bill is pending on Friday, we would be subject to another cloture vote for which there would be a significant degree of opposition—hopefully unanimous on our side—so long as the campaign finance reform issue and this tax matter has not been resolved. But we certainly will work with the leader to work through these matters, and we have no objection to bringing the bill up today.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I have a unanimous-consent request pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

> A bill (H.R. 2646) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

> CLOTURE MOTION
>
> We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.R. 2646, the Education Savings Act for Public and Private Schools.
>
> Trent Lott, Paul Coverdell, Robert F. Bennett, Pat Roberts, Strom Thurmond, Gordon H. Smith, Bill Frist, Mike DeWine, Larry E. Craig, Don Nickles, Connie Mack, Jeff Sessions, Conrad Burns, Lauch Faircloth, Thad Cochran, and Wayne Allard.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the cloture vote on the Coverdell education bill will occur on Friday of this week. We will have consultation with the Democratic leader and will notify Senators as to exactly what time that would occur. We will give them that information on Thursday so Members can make plans for what time we would have that vote and, hopefully, what time they could then leave on Friday.

In response to the Democratic leader's comments, first of all, this is a very, very important issue. I have found that any time that I explain what the Coverdell A-plus provision will do, people of all backgrounds and races and situations in education are very much attracted to it. We would allow people, whether it is parents or grandparents or even other groups, to be able to have savings accounts similar to individual retirement accounts.