

Not only is it highly inefficient for the Federal Government to continue funding over 100 inefficient ports, but it is also highly unfair and counter-productive to a State's plans for economic development if the Federal Government denies a port of entry designation even if the State qualifies for it.

Clearly this issue is one of fairness—fairness to the taxpayers and business men and women of South Dakota. The administration advocated the passage of GATT and NAFTA as a way to increase international trade opportunities. South Dakota, the only State in the country without a Customs presence, is precluded from capitalizing on new trade opportunities because a port designation is required before the State can become a Foreign Trade Zone [FTZ]. South Dakota businesses are moving out of the State because of a lack of an FTZ.

The refusal to grant South Dakota's port of entry application denies a major agricultural exporter and burgeoning economy the opportunity to compete on a level playing field with the rest of the Nation.

Mr. President, the State of South Dakota is right now working with me and my colleagues of the South Dakota delegation to try to convince the Customs Service and the Treasury Department to grant the status our State rightly deserves. It is my understanding a positive resolution is imminent. I certainly hope so because my patience is being put to the test. In the hope of reaching a renegotiated solution soon, I will not offer this amendment—an amendment that is more a reflection of my clear and growing frustration with this blatant unfairness being dealt to the people of South Dakota. I certainly hope I will not have to pursue this option in the near future. South Dakota deserves its rightful place on the world economic stage. South Dakota deserves a port of entry. We qualify for it. We have earned it. It is long overdue.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I know of no other amendments. Does the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KERREY. No other amendments.

Mr. President, just one final statement. Earlier, I had praised all my staff except for the staff person who wrote up my document asking me to thank the staff, and I would like to now thank Patty Lynch, chief staff person for myself and the Appropriations Committee, for her fine work on this bill.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I would also like to take this opportunity to thank Senator KERREY for working with me on this bill. We have a good relationship. We have worked hard on the bill, and I think we have accomplished much.

I also wish to thank Patty Lynch, who has worked with our staff day in, day out. I thank Chuck Parkinson who has put in hours and hours of work, and also my legislative director, Stewart Hall.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there

be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (H.R. 2020), as amended, was passed.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KERREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate insist on its amendments to H.R. 2020, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE) appointed Mr. SHELBY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. KERREY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. HATFIELD, and Mr. BYRD conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1026) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending:

Brown Amendment No. 2125, to clarify restrictions on assistance to Pakistan.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I know the managers are not right here right now, but we are back on the DOD authorization bill, which we I guess terminated last night about midnight. There are 20 some amendments that I understand have been cleared throughout the day and there will be Senators here in a few moments to start taking up those amendments. In the meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### WELFARE REFORM

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate our leader, the

chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator PACKWOOD and others, who just went above and beyond the call of duty to bring together, I believe, a consensus welfare reform package here on the Republican side.

The leader, in a few minutes, is going to lay down that package for us to begin debate next week. Second to our efforts to balance the budget, I think this is the next most important issue that we can deal with in the Senate and one that I think is at the top of the minds of not only the people of the United States who pay for the welfare system but the people in it.

I think this is a bill that addresses the concerns of both those who are in the system and those who are paying for the system. The people who are paying for the system are going to get more results, more value, for their tax dollars that they are contributing, and more people are going to be helped into productive mainstream life in America. That is a value to the people who are paying and, obviously, a tremendous value to the people who find themselves dependent on welfare.

What the leader has done, I think, is truly extraordinary. In a very difficult arena where we are trying to give authority back to the States, you run into problems such as, What is fair? How much do you give? And to what State based on what formula? We were able to, through the tremendous work of the Senator from Texas, Senator HUTCHISON, overcome that and come up with a formula that I think works for everyone. It does not disadvantage any State and provides growth opportunities for those States who are really up against it with burgeoning populations of not only the overall population but of the poor in our country.

We have been able to handle the tough problems of how we are going to get work requirements and how many requirements. How many do we turn over to the States and how much do we retain here? In that partnership we seek to establish how much do we allow the States to innovate and how much do we want to oversee and require?

And I think the leader's proposals, again, struck the proper balance of a true partnership, not one that the current administration would have you believe is a partnership where we will make all the decisions. You come to us when you want to change anything, and we will tell you if we think it is OK to do that, in everything you do. That is not a partnership, no more than a student asking the teacher for permission to go to the bathroom. If the teacher says, "No you've got to go back to your seat." It is the same thing. If the State wants to improvise, and the President says, "No, you have to go back to your seat," that is not a partnership. To call that a partnership is absurd.

What we do is truly give authority, truly give discretion and give dollars, in some cases with strings, other cases