

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN MEMORY OF EVELYN
CHRISTINE HALL

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Evelyn Christine Hall who passed from this life on April 16, 1995, at the age of 60.

Evelyn Hall was born on November 8, 1934, in Covington, TN. Fondly referred to as "Mickey," Evelyn was a loving wife, mother, and friend who touched the hearts of many.

After completing high school in 1952, Evelyn moved to Chicago where she met her husband, Johnnie Marshall Hall. To this union were born five loving children, two sons and three daughters. She was employed by the U.S. post office in 1964, and retired from service in 1976. However that did not slow her down. In 1985 she received her salespersons license in real estate and eventually her brokers license. She even added another feather to her cap in 1994 when she received her associate of arts degree from South Suburban College in Illinois.

Evelyn leaves to cherish her memory, a loving husband, Johnnie M. Hall, Sr.; 2 sons: Rev. Gregory R. Hall and Johnnie M. Hall, Jr.; 3 daughters: Natalie D. Hall, Cora J. Layrock, and Shiela A. Hall-Frazier; a stepdaughter, Margaret A. Hall; 2 brothers: Eddie and Lloyd Coward; 16 grandchildren; 2 great-grandchildren; 1 special aunt, Evelyn Bates; and a host of cousins and friends. As you can well see, she will be greatly missed by many.

I am honored to enter these words of tribute to Ms. Evelyn Christine Hall into the RECORD.

AMERICA'S CITIES

HON. BILL RICHARDSON

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues a wonderful article written by the Honorable Raymond L. Flynn, United States Ambassador to the Vatican. Ambassador Flynn had a distinguished career as mayor of Boston before his current service as Ambassador, and is very well informed of the problems and crises facing American cities. As an acknowledged expert in Urban Affairs, Ambassador Flynn has a keen interest and useful insight into solving the pressing problems of our cities. I would like to share a copy of Ambassador Flynn's article as published recently by Urban Affairs Review and commend it to my colleagues.

AMERICA'S CITIES—CENTERS OF CULTURE, COMMERCE, AND COMMUNITY—OR COLLAPSING HOPE?

(Raymond L. Flynn)

Perhaps the greatest obstacle facing cities today is the changing nature of the definition of city. The term city formerly signified a social center wherein large populations gathered to live, to exchange goods and ideas, and to develop and sustain a system that provided for the needs of its inhabitants. The very word had connotations of hopelessness, a place where "they" live. People demand greater measures against crime, welfare fraud, and illegal immigration. Underlying these demands, however, is the sentiment held by many Washington officials that few resources should be dedicated to urban areas—and to those who dwell within them.

In 1968, the Kerner Commission (U.S. National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders) issued a warning that America was in danger of being divided into two nations: one white, one black. Presently, the United States faces the prospect of becoming a gated community—confining the poor within the city limits, separating them from those better off in the suburbs. Instead of seeking solutions to the problems of the cities, the cities themselves, along with the people living in them, have been incorrectly identified as the problem. If this misperception continues, more will be at stake than our cities. Indeed, the very values on which our nation was founded—equality, and life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—will be placed in jeopardy.

The question has been asked, Why should we concern ourselves with cities? It has been suggested by some high-ranking officials and sociologists that cities have outlived their usefulness. It is argued that new technology and the world economy have made cities obsolete and that we should discard them like unproductive units in a company that needs downsizing.

This utilitarian approach to the modern city ignores the reality that cities are made up of much more than material and human resources. The people are the heart of the city and cannot be reduced to a pool of disposable "goods" in an economic system. Cities are much more than economic entities; therefore, the human side of urban life cannot be ignored.

There are many compelling motives for turning our attention to the problems of the modern city. Among them are the following:

1. Cities have always been, and will always be, places of refuge, where those in need seek the support and comfort of others. They are centers for opportunities and hopes, where ideas, talents, and native intelligence are translated into a mutually energizing and life-giving environment conducive to the development of both culture and commerce. The historic roots of our nation remind us that nearly all of our families entered the American mainstream through cities. Most of these families arrived by ship, crossing one border or another, legally or illegally (and, many times, in the "gray area" in between). Cities in the United States kept the promise inscribed at the base of the Statue of Liberty—to receive "Your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." No matter how far we may have come since then, we cannot forget the

values of the cities that were home to them. To do so would be hypocritical, denying to new immigrants the promise offered to our ancestors by American cities.

2. From a purely economic perspective, it would actually be less expensive to spend more rather than less on cities and the people living within them. The cost of urban misery is astronomical. From furnishing prison beds to caring for low-birth-weight babies, from providing for health care for AIDS victims and the elderly to feeding the urban poor, the cost of the barely living index is exorbitant. This growing moral deficit pulls not only on our consciences but also on our economy. The expense of preventive programs can reduce the cost of urban neglect.

3. From a socioeconomic perspective, saving urban America might be in everyone's self-interest. It seems that the rumors of the death—and decrease in importance—of cities are greatly exaggerated. Cities are again seen for what they have always been—economic engines that create and distribute wealth. In an upcoming book, Neil Pierce argues that city-states are replacing nations as the key units of production in the modern global economy (Spence 1994, 11). Michael Porter, author of *The Competitive Advantage of Nations* (1990), talks about the "untapped economic potential" of cities, especially as hosts for the "clusters" of industry he sees as the driving force in the new economy (Porter 1994, 11). Yes, capital is mobile, but it has to land somewhere. Invariably, it is in cities. But which ones? A new school of thought, with proponents such as Paul Romer, an economist at the University of California at Berkeley, Lester Thurow of M.I.T., and Michael Porter of Harvard, holds that cities attract investment to the degree that they can bridge the income gap with their surrounding suburbs. Romer states that "maybe even the rich can be worse off from inequality" (Bernstein 1994, 79).

These sentiments are being echoed on the political front by Democrats and Republicans alike. Labor Secretary Robert B. Reich recently warned that "A society divided between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' or between the well educated and the poorly educated . . . cannot be prosperous or stable" (Bernstein 1994, 79). Republican theorist Kevin Phillips, who traces the growing inequality to a transfer of wealth from the middle class not down to the poor but up to the rich (Bernstein 1994, 79) agrees with this assessment. He remarks that economic stratification is contrary to the American sense of fairness and equality.

Where did we go wrong? How did we lose the idea of equal opportunity that has been part and parcel of city life? At the moment, it is fashionable to ascribe the plight of our cities to the failure of the urban policies of the 1960s and 1970s. Fashionable, but false. There are at least four factors that have contributed to the present situation.

1. Even as the urban policies of the 1960s and 1970s were being initiated, the "suburbanization" policies that began in the 1950s were continuing. Superhighway subsidies and low-interest mortgages accelerated the process of urban disinvestment. Cities began to spruce up their front yards and put out the welcome mats while the moving trucks were pulling up to the back door, carrying away not only the furniture but, more important, the families that form

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the fabric of a strong and vibrant community.

2. Those who did stay to "fight the good (urban) fight" found themselves embroiled in an unproductive and unnecessary civil war (well documented by urban expert Nicholas Lemann, 1991) over whether these new policies should be administered from the bottom up (by community-based organizations) or from the top down (by local government). It is not clear who won that war, but it is clear who lost—the cities and the people in them. It is also clear that with few exceptions, mayors began to see themselves more as CEOs than as community champions, while people in the neighborhoods increasingly found themselves having to fight City Hall.

3. The urban policies of the 1960s and 1970s were preempted by the "What's in it for me?" policies of the 1980s. Tax and investment policies were enacted by an antiurban administration in Washington that favored the wealthy corporations at the expense of the community. This political about-face prevented any progress that had begun in urban areas from taking root.

4. Finally, America still has not dealt with the issue of race. Federal government mandates, quota systems, and reckless policies have divided poor whites and blacks, pitting one against the other. Until we deal with this problem, our urban areas will remain fragmented.

So what are we going to do about it? Ironically, the 1994 election gives us a new opportunity to finally "get it right." Let's begin by not repeating the mistakes of the past. Let's recognize the importance of U.S. cities and support them, just as we support any valuable institution in American society, such as home ownership and business investment. It is imperative to encourage ownership and investment in our cities—by individuals and corporations—at least as much as we do in the suburbs. We need to promote policies that will halt the flight of the working middle class, the backbone of our society, from our cities.

Too costly? Many say so. However, those who call for cuts in support to the cities might eventually have to consider equal cuts in the suburbs. No enterprise zones downtown? Fine, but let's stop building express roads to the suburban shopping malls, roads that carry away both shoppers and jobs.

Further, let's not force a false choice between community and local government. During my 10 years as mayor, the city of Boston was able to enjoy unprecedented success in building affordable housing by collaborating with community development corporations, in promoting jobs for Boston residents by working together with employers and unions, in caring for the hungry and the homeless by uniting our efforts with a network of charitable organizations, in providing quality community health care by working with neighborhood-based health centers, and in fighting crime by facilitating cooperation between police and residents to form "crime-watch" groups. Citizens and governments have enough to fight against without fighting each other.

Moreover, mayors should be the leaders in working for economic and social justice. They should be out in the communities, fighting for the rights of their people in the neighborhoods and not just in boardrooms, up at the state House (where much of the political power has shifted), and down in Washington. The present generation of "button-down" mayors needs to return to a more grassroots approach if they want their constituents to recognize that they are working for their benefit and to avoid the divisiveness of a citizen-versus-City-Hall mentality. Urban America needs players, not spec-

tators; fighters, not promoters; activists not actors.

I believe that city mayors have some powerful and active allies in their effort to serve the well-being of their citizens. One such ally is the religious community. I have some experience in this area and can personally testify that the Catholic Church, for example, is not motivated by what is considered liberal or conservative or by labels such as Democrat or Republican but, rather, by the quest for Truth and Justice. The Catholic Church may be perceived as conservative on moral issues, but is liberal and progressive regarding economic and social issues such as strong concern for working families and the needy (once traditional Democratic voters). This, of course, is true for other religious organizations as well.

You have only to read the documents from Annual U.S. Bishop's Conference to be convinced that on many social and economic issues, the positions of the Catholic Church are very much like those of the Clinton administration, whose agenda support working families, the needy, and the American cities. Furthermore, their stated positions are in strict opposition to those set forth in the "Contract with America." Although the Catholic Church does not support the Democratic party platform on abortion, it is they make this country work. We must bring cities back if we're going to remember who we are, where we came from, and what we hope to be. We must bring cities back if we're going to continue to care.

IN HONOR OF "UNCLE DAN"
BEARD

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today commemorate the life of a great American, Daniel Carter Beard.

Daniel, or "Uncle Dan" as he was known to the thousands of young men whose lives he affected, was the cofounder of the Boy Scouts of America. Born in 1850, Daniel Beard was vigorous enough to be active in the Boy Scouts until his passing in 1941, just months shy of his 91st birthday. While his presence lives on in the design of the original Scout uniform, far more important are the effects that he had on the teaching, thoughts, and philosophies of the Boy Scout movement which is with us to this day.

Daniel Beard cofounded the Boy Scouts in 1910 when he was 60 years young. At an age when most people would think of slowing down and retiring, Daniel Beard began to speed up. By profession he was an illustrator, editor and author of books for boys. His abilities complemented his love of nature, and so he organized groups of young men and taught them the skills of America's pioneers. He would later merge these groups into the Boy Scouts. He became the first National Scout Commissioner of the Boy Scouts and added the title of Chairman of the National Court of Honor in 1913. During this time he was editing and writing articles for Boys' Life magazine as well as continuing his fight as an early proponent of conservation. He was thus one of America's first environmentalists. Daniel Beard carried on his tradition of helping and teaching the young men of this country until his death.

Daniel Beard spent the final years of his life at his home, Brooklands, in Rockland County,

NY, in my 20th Congressional District of New York State. One might think that he no longer continued in his practice of working with young men but this is not the case. On moving to Brooklands in 1928, Dan Beard hosted a national Scout rally at his home. At the age of 78, he appeared in his famous buckskin outfit and spoke at length to the boys in attendance. Subsequently he joined an honor guard of Rockland Eagle Scouts when they attended the National Scout Jamboree in Washington, DC, at which he was the guest of honor. He attended all of the major Scout gatherings during those years and his popularity with the young men involved was amply proved. At the 1939 World's Fair, his introduction received louder applause than most of the other guests of honor, including President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

In the last years of his life, Dan Beard continued to be active in the Scout community of Rockland County. In 1940, at the age of 90, he led 100 Scouts from the county in the dedication of a community site. In the same year he presided over a meeting of the Campfire Girls of Arden, NY, in Orange County, NY, showing his support and love for all young people. Thus, he was one of the first Americans to express support for gender equality in our society.

Daniel Beard's life of service cannot be lauded enough. His effect upon so many of the young men whose values were shaped by their time in the Scouts is immeasurable. He summed up the course of his life when he said: "Once a Scout, always a Scout." He proved this sentiment with his unending dedication to the organization that he cofounded. Many of the young men and women of this Nation, and of Rockland and Orange Counties in particular, owe this man a debt of gratitude for his influence and service.

On June 3, 1995, Daniel Beard will be honored in Rockland County by the Dan Beard Committee and the Rockland County Council of the Boy Scouts of America. The council and the committee will host a day of dedication for Daniel Beard in the Village of Suffern, Rockland County, NY.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite our colleagues to join us in honoring Daniel Beard. Fifty years after his death Daniel Beard is still considered a great American and an outstanding example of how many lives one dedicated person can affect.

IN OBSERVANCE OF MEMORIAL
DAY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1995

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in advance of Memorial Day, to remember the men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice in defense of this great Nation and the ideals for which it stands. It is fitting that before we Americans celebrate the arrival of summer, we set aside a special day in honor of all those brave and selfless individuals who have died to defend our freedom and security. Each of the patriots whom we remember on Memorial Day was first a beloved son or daughter, sibling, spouse and friend. Each had hopes and dreams not unlike our own.