

from his participation in the military, to his work on behalf of veterans, to his contributions in the community. The Air Force has a very special tradition in Idaho, and Mel has long been part of that tradition. Enlisting in the U.S. Air Force during the Korean conflict, Mel served 4 years on active duty and 8 years in the Air Force Reserves as a meteorologist. He has also been a stalwart veteran advocate. His active membership and leadership in the American Legion led him to be selected to be National Vice Commander in 1982-83. In 1983, Mel began his service as State Adjutant for the Legion, and he has served in that capacity until this September.

Mel's service to our country makes it clear that he has never been afraid of challenges, hardships or hard work. Idaho is privileged to have Mel and his family as residents. I am honored to stand before the Senate today and tell my colleagues about Mel; however, I do this with mixed emotions. Mel Napier recently stepped down as State Adjutant for the American Legion, a position he held for 16 years. It is a special individual indeed who commits to that kind of service on behalf of all the men and women in uniform who have proudly served our great nation.

In sum, I would like to thank Mel for his tremendous contribution to our country, and most of all, to America's veterans. I know that Mel will not be leaving the American Legion, or ending his service to veterans because he will no longer serve as State Adjutant, but I do think that this is a very appropriate time to give Mel our thanks and show our gratitude for his service.

Mr. Napier, thank you, congratulations, and Godspeed.●

#### TRIBUTE TO KATHRYN "KAYCI" COOK

● Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant and steward of our National Park System, Kathryn "Kayci" Cook, Superintendent of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine and Hampton National Historic Site. Kayci has recently been selected as Assistant Superintendent of Glen Canyon National Park in Utah and I, and many others in the State of Maryland, are sorry to see her go.

Throughout her 18-year career with the National Park Service, Kayci Cook has distinguished herself for her leadership, commitment and dedication to managing and protecting our Nation's most precious natural and cultural resources. Beginning as a seasonal park ranger at Wupatki and Canyon de Chelly National Monuments in northern Arizona, she quickly advanced through the ranks to positions as park ranger at San Antonio Missions National Historical Park in Texas, supervisory ranger at California's Death Valley National Monument, and Chief of Resource Education for Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in Wisconsin.

In 1994, her contributions and accomplishments in these positions earned Kayci the prestigious Benvenuto Congressional Fellowship.

I came to know Kayci three years ago, soon after she was appointed to lead Fort McHenry and Hampton and have had the privilege of working closely with her on a number of matters of mutual concern affecting these units of the National Park System. I can personally attest to the exceptional talent, ingenuity, and energy which she brought to this position. Under her leadership the fort walls and many historic structures at Fort McHenry have been restored, plans have been advanced to develop a new visitors center to accommodate the increasing number of visitors to the Fort, many preservation projects have been completed at Hampton and a new General Management Plan for this historic site is being completed.

Kayci Cook's hard work and dedication to the stewardship Fort McHenry and Hampton have earned her the respect and admiration of everyone with whom she has worked. She leaves behind two units of the National Park System that have been protected and improved through her efforts and the visitors to these sites will benefit from her labors for years to come. In my judgement, her extraordinary commitment and leadership should serve as a standard for those who will follow her. I greatly value the assistance Kayci provided to me and my staff and wish her the best of luck in the years ahead.●

#### TRIBUTE TO YOUNG MEN OF IDAHO

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to two groups of exceptional young men from my State of Idaho.

In August, the South Central Boise Little League team from Boise, ID, became the first little league team from Idaho ever to compete in the Little League World Series. Under the leadership of Stan McGrady, this team of 11- and 12-year-olds completed an underdog run to win the Western Regional Pennant and advance to the Little League World Series in Williamsport, PA. They won one game and lost two in the World Series, but, more importantly, showed an impressive amount of maturity and sportsmanship and represented our state in an exemplary manner.

Furthermore, the Madison Cats of Rexburg, ID, ended a successful season by competing in the Babe Ruth League World Series in Clifton Park, NY. This team of 14-year-olds, coached by Randy Sutton, went undefeated in both the state and regional tournaments to earn the right to represent the Pacific Northwest in the Babe Ruth World Series.

Along with the entire State of Idaho, I am very proud of these young men. Their accomplishments show a level of

dedication and teamwork that will benefit them for many years to come. They were exceptional ambassadors for Idaho. I congratulate them, their parents, and their communities on these unprecedented accomplishments.●

#### WELFARE REFORM AND THE COLLEGE OPTION: A NATIONAL CONFERENCE

● Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, this weekend, the McAuley Institute, Wider Opportunities for Women, the Center for Women Policy Studies, and the Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center of CUNY hosted a national conference on the important relationship between welfare reform and higher education. On Friday night, they held an opening night reception and awards ceremony. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend, but I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter that was read on my behalf as part of the ceremony.

The letter follows.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1999.

TO ALL IN ATTENDANCE: First, I would like to begin by apologizing for the fact that I can't be here in person to accept this award. Certainly, I always like to attend any dinner that someone has gone to the trouble of holding in my honor, but even more so I would love to attend your conference focusing on the important relationship between education and economic self-sufficiency.

Second, I would like to thank all of the sponsors of this conference—the McAuley Institute, Wider Opportunities for Women, the Center for Women's Policy Studies, and the Howard Samuels State Management and Policy Center of CUNY—for presenting me with this award. I have worked with these groups in the past on important legislative efforts, and deeply respect the work that each of these organizations has done to protect and advance the well-being of the most needy among us.

Having done that, though, I would also like to take this time to talk a little bit about poverty and need.

We live in a nation of riches. Since 1969, the era when we launched our War on Poverty, we have seen the nation's total wealth per person grow by 62 percent, and as a nation, we consumed 73 percent more material goods and services per person in 1997 than we did 1969. Yet during that same time, the number of poor children in America grew by 46 percent, or more than 4 million children. About one-half of this growth represented the growing number of poor children in families headed by someone who worked.

1998 was a year of economic prosperity for many Americans. Many of us have benefitted greatly from a strong economy: unemployment is at its lowest level since 1969, and for the second year in a row wages have gone up, cutting across the traditional barriers of race, ethnicity and education.

Unfortunately, though, these gains have barely been felt by those left behind by the growing economic inequality we see in this country. New figures on family income show that the gap between low- and moderate-income families and rich families is at an all-time high. During the 1990s, we have seen a disturbing trend in income gains—the rich in America are benefitting in ways that the poor are not: While the richest 20 percent of households gained about \$15,000 dollars in annual income between 1990 and 1997, the poorest 20 percent of families gained only about

\$35 in annual income. That's a gain of 15 percent versus a gain of less than 1 percent.

A recent study by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities offers further evidence of the widening income gap between the rich and the poor in this country. Using Congressional Budget Office data, they found that the after-tax income of the richest one percent of the population will more than double between 1977 and 1999, rising 115 percent after adjusting for inflation. At the same time, the average after-tax income for middle-income households, which accounts for 60 percent of all households, will increase by only 8 percent—less than one-half a percent per year—and the average income of the poorest twenty percent of households will actually decrease. As a result of these large increases in income among the rich and the loss of income among the poor, CBPP estimates that in 1999, the richest twenty percent of households in the U.S. will have slightly more income than the other 80 percent of households combined, and the 2.7 million Americans with the highest incomes will have as much after-tax income as the 100 million Americans with the lowest incomes.

My own state of Minnesota provides a telling example of how some of our families are being left behind: Minnesota leads the country in low unemployment—less than 3 percent statewide, less than 2 percent in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. But even with such impressive figures, we still see a situation where unemployment in our poorest central-city neighborhoods hovers around 15 percent, and a horrifying 60 percent of the children who live in these neighborhoods are growing up in poverty. And it isn't just in our cities, but also among our rural communities, particularly our farm communities, where we see similar levels of poverty and need.

And when we talk about people being poor, we are talking about people in desperate need. It never fails to amaze me what the Federal government defines as poor—in 1997, a three-person family was "officially" poor if it made less than \$12,802 a year. Even more upsetting, though, is that most poor families in the U.S. don't even meet this minimum. The average poor family with children received in 1997 only \$8,688 a year in total income from all sources—the equivalent of \$724 a month, \$167 a week, less than \$24 a day.

Of course, those who suffer the most from poverty in this country are our children. It makes me sick just thinking about it. America's youngest children, those under the age of 6, are more likely to live in poverty than any other age group. During the past two decades there has been a substantial increase in the number and percentage of poor young people in the United States. The young child poverty rate has grown among all racial and ethnic groups, and in urban, suburban, and rural areas. The number of American young children living in poverty increased from 3.5 million in 1979 to 5.2 million in 1997. The young child poverty rate grew by 20 percent during those two decades, and currently one-in-five young children in the U.S. live in poverty. Nearly one-in-two young African American children live in poverty, and about one in three young Latino children live in poverty in the U.S.

Still more horrifying, one in ten young children in the U.S. live in extreme poverty, in families with incomes less than half the poverty level, an amount of only \$6,401 for a family of three in 1997. Nearly half of the children living in poverty in the U.S. live in extreme poverty. Currently, the extreme poverty rate among young children is growing faster than the young child poverty rate.

I think what I find most upsetting is not the fact that so many among us still live in poverty, but that so many of those who live

in poverty are hard-working parents who are doing everything—everything—that they can. But they still aren't making it. Sixty-one percent of the average poor family's income comes from work—\$5,295 a year, \$441 a month, \$102 a week, or less than \$15 a day. For an 8 hour workday, that means someone was earning just under \$2 an hour. Only twenty-one percent of our average poor family's income came from welfare—just \$1,824 a year, \$152 a month, \$35 a week, or less than \$5 a day. And a majority of all poor children under age 6, 65 percent, live with at least one employed parent. Only one-sixth of poor young children live in families who rely solely on public assistance for income.

How is this possible? How can we live in a time when there are people who literally can't support themselves and their families despite the fact that they work, often nearly 52 weeks a year, 40 hours a week, sometimes more than one job. In a time of unprecedented economic well-being, of budget surpluses, and an 8.6 trillion dollar economy, it is criminal that there are those living among us, who are doing everything within their powers to make ends meet, who cannot provide the basic needs of day-to-day survival for themselves and their families.

We need to ask ourselves, we must ask ourselves, what is happening when we see this happening. We should be desperately concerned when we see that the average income of American families living in poverty actually declined between 1996 and 1997. Simply put, this is both inexcusable and utterly unacceptable. Even in the hardest of times, no family, no child, in this country should be forced to go without the basic necessities of food, shelter, and medical care. But even more so, in a time of unparalleled economic prosperity, how can any one not react with both despair and outrage when confronted by such a scenario?

There is much to be done, much that should be done, much that must be done. I am deeply committed to doing my part: I will continue to offer legislation that protects the rights of the poorest among us, and to fight to help them provide for their needs. I have sponsored or co-sponsored legislation to raise the minimum wage; to find out what's happening to people when they lose their welfare benefits; to allow welfare recipients to count two years of education or vocational training toward their TANF work requirements; to ensure that everyone in America has access to quality, affordable healthcare and child care; and to guarantee that women and children who are victims and survivors of domestic violence have the economic resources and security they need to leave abusive situations. We in Congress must recognize that it isn't enough to tell people they must work, but we also need to provide them with a wide range of supports while they try to make the difficult transition from poverty to economic self-sufficiency. All of it goes together—we must address each if we intend to solve any.

There is so much that you can do with me as well. I urge you to follow what happens in Congress and with the Administration and make your opinion known to your Representatives, to your Senators, and to the President—write, e-mail, fax, and phone. Participate in every way you can, not only for yourselves but also for those who might not feel able to. We must all give a voice to those who are most likely to go unheard, and we must teach them to speak loudly for themselves. We must also make sure that people don't forget the less fortunate among us. Sometimes in our own prosperity, it is easier to simply turn away from that which is difficult or painful to witness. We must not relax our efforts, and we must never allow anyone to declare the war against pov-

erty won until there is no one, no mother, no child, who lies down at night hungry or homeless. No one should have to worry about whether or not they can provide medical care for a sick loved one, or whether or not their child is safe in daycare while they are at work.

I know that I am preaching to the choir at this point, so I will close by simply praising you for all of your efforts—each and every one of you is fighting this fight right on the front lines—and by urging you not to bend and not to give up. In the face of spending cuts, changing priorities, and a simple lack of concern, you are the real "poverty warriors."

And finally, I thank you again for honoring me this evening.

Sincerely,

PAUL D. WELLSTONE,  
U.S. Senator. ●

#### TRIBUTE TO JUDGE RICH

● Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, on June 9, 1999, Judge Giles S. Rich passed away at age 95, still serving on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit after nearly 43 years as a Federal judge and as the oldest active Federal judge in U.S. history. Today, the Federal court will hold a memorial service in his honor. I rise today to add my voice to those of the participants in that memorial service in paying tribute to this man who contributed as much, if not more, than anyone else in this century to the development of U.S. patent policy and the promotion of American innovation.

Judge Rich was heard to say, "You see, as I go along, practically everything I did was what I didn't intend to do." I believe that statement to be true in large part because Judge Rich was a man who didn't follow success, but was instead followed by success. Bright people and prestigious positions were drawn to him because of who he was.

Judge Rich was educated at Harvard College, from which he graduated in 1926. He went on to receive his law degree from Columbia Law School in 1929. Since Columbia University didn't have any patent law classes, Judge Rich decided to teach himself patent law, through an arrangement with a professor that allowed him to receive credit for a thorough and lengthy paper on patents. He in turn shared his knowledge and intellect with students as a lecturer on patent law at Columbia University from 1942 until 1956, as an adjunct professor at Georgetown University Law Center from 1963 to 1969, and as a lecturer on patent and copyright law as part of the Federal Judicial Center's training program for newly appointed judges from the program's inception in 1965 until 1971.

As a dedicated lawyer, professor, and judge, Judge Rich played a significant role in the development and evolution of intellectual property law in the United States. He practiced law in a private practice from 1929 to 1956, specializing in patent and trademark law. He became a member of the New York Bar in 1929 and was certified by the U.S. Patent Office in 1934. As a member