

as part of a hazing ritual. I think I'm strong enough to handle anything that might be thrown at me as a hazing ritual."

Hazing? Been there, done that, in a non-incendiary way. On a basketball court, of all places.

"My favorite moment came freshman year," she said. "We didn't have a girls' team yet, so I had to play on the boys' team. We were playing against a team that was very, very, very chauvinist. . . . I got in with about a minute 40 left, and they were not treating me very well. At first my teammates wouldn't even pass me the ball, and finally one of 'em did. I just stood back behind the three-point line, shot and it went right in. Swish. It was perfect. We still lost the game, but I felt better."

Next scene in Erica's life: November 1996. The IRS transfers Erica's mom to Nashville. "She and her mother have been a team through the years—her mom with pretty high expectations and Erica living up to them," said Llewellyn, the St. Francis counselor.

Erica stays behind to graduate from her school. She lives with her grandma, Ellen Pitts. "She's been pretty great. I have my own loft, and it's really nice. It's not very big, but it's nice. I've got a computer and a desk and my futon up there, and that's all I really need."

For now, at least, she dreams in a loft. But soon enough, the dreams will be aloft. And Erica Pitts' life will get even more interesting.●

#### THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CITY OF HAMTRAMCK

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am honored today to pay tribute to the city of Hamtramck, MI, which is celebrating its 75th anniversary this year. The people of Hamtramck call their city a "Touch of Europe in America," and indeed it is truly a unique community. Hamtramck is a city within a city, whose boundaries on all sides are with the city of Detroit. Yet Hamtramck maintains its own identity, an identity rooted in its diversity.

The history of Hamtramck predates its incorporation as a city by more than 100 years. It is named for Col. John Francis Hamtramck, who served as the first American commander of Fort Detroit after it was surrendered by Great Britain in 1796. Originally a township larger in size than the present-day city of Detroit, Hamtramck was organized as a village in 1901.

The village of Hamtramck began with 500 people but changed dramatically with the birth of the automobile industry. A Dodge Bros. auto plant was established in 1914, attracting skilled and unskilled workers from around the Nation and the world. Between 1910 and 1920, Hamtramck boasted the greatest population growth of any community in the United States, going from 3,589 to 46,615 residents in a single decade.

While Hamtramck was originally settled by the same French colonists who had settled Detroit, and later farmed by German immigrants, the automobile industry attracted huge numbers of Polish workers. Since 1910, Hamtramck's Polish population has grown so rapidly that today, 80 percent

of its residents stem from first, second, or third generation Polish origin.

Many of the remainder of Hamtramck's residents are from Central and Eastern Europe. Having received the warm and generous hospitality of Michiganite themselves, in 1946 the Polish-American residents of Hamtramck began welcoming displaced people from Central Europe and the Balkans. More recently, Hamtramck has seen a substantial number of Ukrainians join the community. All of these groups have maintained their cultural heritage and identity, while embracing the ideals and Government of their new country.

On any street or in any restaurant in Hamtramck, one can hear any of 25 different languages being spoken, which is especially impressive in a city of slightly more than 2 square miles. Hamtramck is renowned for the best Polish food outside Poland, and the hospitality to match, as President Clinton discovered on a trip to Michigan in 1996 where he thoroughly enjoyed lunch at Polish Village Cafe.

Mr. President, Hamtramck's blend of cultures has produced a city which truly feels like a "Touch of Europe in America." Under the steady leadership of Mayor Robert Kozaren, Hamtramck is prepared to enter the 21st century with a confidence rooted in the varied traditions and fervent unifying patriotism of its citizens. I commend the residents and leaders of Hamtramck for the community they have built, and am proud to represent them in the U.S. Senate. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the people of Hamtramck on the occasion of the city's 75th anniversary. ●

#### JOHN D. MCALISTER: IN MEMORIAM

● Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, it is with sorrow that I recognize the passing of a good man and a fine citizen, Mr. John D. McAlister, who died yesterday.

John worked at Tree Top in Yakima, WA, where he served as director of government affairs. In this capacity he became a great friend of the Washington State congressional delegation and a magnificent voice for the agricultural industry. John's activities were not only confined to his work—he also served the Yakima community as a member of many agricultural industry organizations and of the Government Affairs Council of the Association of Washington Businesses, where he sat on the board of directors.

I am honored to have known John McAlister, and am grateful for his service to Washington State agriculture and to his community in Yakima.

John is survived by his wife, Patricia, to whom I extend my condolences.●

#### COMMENDING SENATOR SANTORUM'S SEARCH FOR COMMON GROUND IN THE ABORTION DEBATE

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise to commend my colleague, Senator SANTORUM, for the article he recently had published in the Washington Times concerning partial birth abortion.

All too often, Mr. President, debates over public policy issues degenerate into uncivil attacks on each side's motives. Mr. SANTORUM's article does an excellent job of showing how this bickering can be avoided even when the issue is as serious and sensitive as abortion. How can we reach common ground on partial birth abortion? By realizing that this procedure has nothing to do with the Supreme Court's decision in Roe versus Wade or the subsequent decision in Doe versus Bolton. By realizing that partial birth abortion is simply unacceptable.

Whatever one's view of abortion, one should recognize this procedure as one that is, as Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN phrased it, "just too close to infanticide."

We are a civilized society, Mr. President. I hope that our debates over this contentious issue can be made more civil. I also hope that we can reach common ground in banning partial birth abortion.

Mr. President, I ask that Senator SANTORUM's article from the Washington Times be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 22, 1997]

PARTIAL BIRTH ABORTION: THE ART OF AGREEMENT

(By Rick Santorum)

A wide spectrum of individuals has coalesced around the recent effort to ban partial birth abortions. These varied individuals and groups have raised their voices in support of a ban both because of the brutality of partial birth abortions and because they recognize that this debate is not about Roe vs. Wade, the 1973 Supreme Court decision legalizing abortion. It is not about when a fetus becomes a baby. And it is certainly not about women's health. It is about virtual infanticide, it is about killing a child as he or she is being born, an issue that neither Roe vs. Wade nor the subsequent Doe vs. Bolton addressed.

During the Senate debate last year, many traditionally pro-choice legislators voted in support of legislation to ban this particular procedure. Among them was my colleague Sen. Arlen Specter who stated on the floor of the Senate, "In my legal judgment, the issue is not over a woman's right to choose within the constitutional context of Roe versus Wade. . . . The line of the law is drawn, in my legal judgment, when the child is partially out of the womb of the mother. It is no longer abortion; it is infanticide." He was joined in these sentiments by other such consistently pro-choice members as Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Sen. Ben Nighthorse Campbell.

Such coalescence with pro-choice proponents suggests the enormous scope of the tragedy that this procedure represents. This broad coalition further confirms that extraneous considerations, such as the anticipation of a disabled child, or a mother's broadly-defined health concerns, were just that—

extraneous to the debate. And for those who may still be unclear what a partial birth abortion procedure is, it is this: a fully formed baby—in most cases a viable fetus of 23–26 weeks—is pulled from its mother until all but the head is delivered. Then, a scissors is plunged into the base of the skull, a tube is inserted and the child's brains are suctioned out so that the head of the now-dead infant collapses and is delivered.

Partial birth abortion is tragic for the infant who loses his or her life in this brutal procedure. It is also a personal tragedy for the families who choose the procedure, as it is for those who perform it—even if they aren't aware of it. But partial birth abortion is also a profound social tragedy. It rips through the moral cohesion of our public life. It cuts into our most deeply held beliefs about the importance of protecting and cherishing vulnerable human life. It fractures our sense that the laws of our country should reflect long-held, commonly accepted moral norms.

Yet this kind of tragedy—can be an unexpected catalyst for consensus, for new coalitions and configurations in our public life. The partial birth abortion debate moves us beyond the traditional pro-life/pro-choice lines of confrontation to hollow out a place in the public square where disparate individuals and groups can come together and draw a line that they know should not be crossed.

The stark tragedy of partial birth abortion can be the beginning of a significant public discussion, where we define—or redefine—our first principles. Why is such a discussion important? Precisely because it throws into relief the fundamental truths around which a moral consensus is formed in this country. And, as John Courtney Murray reminds us in *We Hold These Truths*, Catholic Reflections on the American Proposition, a public consensus which finds its expression in the law should be “an ensemble of substantive truths, a structure of basic knowledge, an order of elementary affirmations . . .”

If we do not have fundamental agreement about first principles, we simply cannot engage one another in civil debate. All we have is the confusion of different factions locked in their own moral universe. If we could agree publicly on just this one point—that partial birth abortion is not something our laws should sanction, and if we could then reveal the consensus—a consensus that I know exists—against killing an almost-born infant, we would have significantly advanced the discussion about what moral status and dignity we give to life in all its stages. Public agreement, codified by law, on this one prohibition gives us a common point of departure, a common language even, because we agree, albeit in a narrow sense, on the meaning of fundamental terms such as life and death. And it is with this common point of departure and discourse—however narrow—that we gain a degree of coherence and unity in our public life and dialogue.

I truly believe that out of the horror and tragedy of partial birth abortions, we can find points of agreement across ideological, political and religious lines which enable us to work toward a life-sustaining culture. So, as hundreds of thousands of faithful and steadfast citizens come together to participate in this year's March for Life let us remember that such a culture, the culture for which we hope and pray daily, might very well be achieved one argument at a time.●

#### PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR AVIATION

● Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deep disappointment in the President's 1998 budget re-

quest for critical aviation safety and infrastructure purposes. Most notably, the administration proposes to fund the Airport Improvement Program [AIP] at only two-thirds of its current level. This represents a drastic cut to our Nation's airport grant program, which supports airport safety, security, and capacity programs.

Mr. President, the administration has assured the American public of its commitment to a safe and secure aviation system. Without adequate resources, this assurance rings hollow.

For instance, the White House Commission on Safety and Security is due to report tomorrow on a number of steps we should take to enhance the security of the aviation system. I expect the Commission will offer valuable insight on where we should go from here to implement additional security enhancements. How we pay for these enhancements is a significant issue.

In addition, Congress approved and the President signed into law the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996. Administration officials hailed the importance of the bill's safety and security initiatives. We all joined together at the signing ceremony in praise of the legislation's security improvements. However, these improvements are meaningless without adequate financial support. For politicians to praise their own efforts in a press conference and yet fail to provide sufficient resources is cynical, at best.

Again, I want to be clear. The administration's actions and assurances are only as good as the resources allocated to implement them. Unfortunately, the administration submitted a budget request significantly short on aviation capital improvements, so that he can use these resources elsewhere in the budget to support his spending initiatives. Meanwhile, he knows he can count on Congress to step up to the plate and restore funding for vital aviation initiatives. Such budget chicanery is neither serious nor responsible.

Past experience bears out this point. When President Clinton took office, the Airport Improvement Program was a \$1.9 billion program. Every year, Congress has funded the program at a level higher than the request. For example, in fiscal year 1996, the AIP request was for \$1.3 billion, and Congress enacted a \$1.45 billion level. In fiscal year 1997, the administration requested \$1.35 billion and Congress responded with a \$1.46 billion appropriation. At the same time, the administration claimed record-level investments in transportation infrastructure improvements.

The AIP funds more than just airport construction projects, which make airports safer and enhance the system's ability to handle ever increasing levels of air traffic. Airports also use these funds to support their security programs and purchase security-related equipment.

The Administration's budget request also proposes reduced funding for the FAA facilities and equipment account.

This account is the principal resource for modernizing and improving the air traffic control system, providing enhanced baggage screening equipment, and enhanced weather detection programs.

I recognize that the Administration has made efforts to bolster its safety and security work force. Even so, a significant funding source for FAA operations depends on an unspecified user fee for which the FAA has no statutory authority to collect.

Mr. President, this is not a serious budget proposal. The Administration should back up its safety and security recommendations with enough funding to put them in place. The Nation's air travelers have paid taxes dedicated to support the aviation system. They rightfully expect the Government's commitment to spend these funds on their intended purpose.●

#### RESTORING INCOME AVERAGING FOR FARMERS

● Mr. HAGEL. Mr. President, today I am cosponsoring S. 251, a measure that will provide farmers and ranchers with a valuable tool—income averaging—to help manage their agricultural operations, improve profitability, and reduce the tax burden on a crucial Nebraska livelihood. I commend Senator SHELBY, the bill's principal sponsor, for his leadership on this matter.

Today's Federal Tax Code is hardly a friend to the family farmer.

For example, farmers and ranchers do not have access to company or government pensions and retirement plans, in which many other Americans have the ability to participate. Farmers and ranchers will receive fewer Social Security benefits than workers in most other careers since they plow much of their income back into the farm. And, as self-employed workers, farmers and ranchers are charged with payroll taxes that are nearly double that of most any other private business employee. Even retirement can be a painful proposition for agricultural producers who have spent their lives building a security nest egg only to be faced with onerous capital gains tax rates and, later, with a confiscatory estate tax when they want to pass their farm along to their children.

The American consumer still enjoys the most plentiful food supply at the lowest cost in the developed world—thanks to our Nation's agricultural might. Population growth, rising per capita incomes, expanded trade opportunities, along with new production and marketing technologies, are a few of the reasons why the future of American agriculture is so bright. However, flexibility in our U.S. Tax Code is still needed to strengthen our position as the world's leader in production agriculture.

Before 1986, agricultural producers were allowed to average their income over a 2-year period, which allowed greater flexibility in both profit potential and management decisions. This