

additional revenue. It promoted its services at neighborhood fairs and community centers. It struck an alliance with a nearby prominent medical center that gave North General patients access to more specialty care.

Running an inner-city hospital has long been financially draining. Such hospitals lack the money and cutting-edge equipment to compete against larger hospitals. They lose top recruits to prominent teaching hospitals. Low-income communities tend to have a higher percentage of uninsured patients who can't pay their medical bills or are covered by government health plans that typically pay less for medical services than private insurers. And low-income patients frequently bolt to hospitals in affluent areas when they need specialty care.

North General faces these obstacles, yet its plan is working. From 2002 to 2005, the number of patient discharges jumped 40 percent to nearly 9,000, and is expected to climb to 9,225 this year, according to the hospital. Outpatient volume between 2002 and 2005 rose 32 percent to 95,746 visits, and 103,520 visits are expected this year.

During the 3-year period to 2005, North General's revenue rose 45 percent, boosted by higher patient visits, including surgical procedure volumes that jumped nearly 20 percent. This year, North General estimates revenue will rise 2.7 percent to \$152 million from \$148 million last year. North General is paid in large part by government health plans, such as Medicare and Medicaid, and to a lesser extent by private insurers.

But before offering any new services, North General had to confront a major problem: attracting higher-skilled surgeons. "We needed the technical know-how," Dr. Daniel says.

The hospital couldn't afford to hire these surgeons, so Dr. Daniel tried another route: He forged an alliance with the Mount Sinai Medical Center, one of New York's most prominent teaching hospitals located just a mile away from North General. (In addition to his North General duties, Dr. Daniel is an associate clinical professor of medicine at Mount Sinai's medical school.)

He approached Mount Sinai's president and CEO, Kenneth L. Davis, and the two men agreed that both hospitals could benefit from a collaboration. Within 90 days, the hospitals reached an agreement that took effect in January of 2004.

North General pays Mount Sinai an annual \$2.7 million and in return gains access to 16 Mount Sinai doctors who perform vascular surgery, lung biopsies, and other highly specialized services on North General's campus. Mount Sinai also provides specialists in urology, rheumatology, radiology, and pediatric psychiatry. North General receives the revenue from these services. In a separate agreement, North General and Mount Sinai have teamed up to provide free preventive care to Harlem residents with chronic illnesses in exchange for higher Medicaid reimbursement rates at its outpatient clinic. (The arrangement has benefited both Mount Sinai and New York state.)

Contracting these specialists costs less than if the hospital hired the doctors on its own, says Michael Greene, North General's chief operating officer. The contract also gives North General staffing flexibility because it can ask Mount Sinai to send specialists for extra hours as more patients come in for these specialty services. This helps North General control labor costs by linking a doctor's work hours to patient volumes.

For Mount Sinai, the deal boosts the hospital's revenue and brings in patients. Last year, North General transferred roughly 375 patients to Mount Sinai for cardiology, neurosurgery and obstetrics services. As a teaching hospital handling complex cases,

Mount Sinai "needs community hospitals as referral sources," Dr. Davis says.

In 2004, North General began offering bariatric, or weight-loss, surgery, in which a surgeon staples off a section of a patient's stomach, leaving a tiny pouch that absorbs less food. Last year, North General performed 109 such surgeries and it expects to perform 125 this year. Medicare and Medicaid typically pay North General \$10,000 to \$12,000 per bariatric surgery, though a complicated procedure can bring in as much as \$20,000. Last year, the bariatric surgery program generated \$725,000 in revenue and a \$25,000 profit, according to Frank Hagan, North General's chief financial officer.

Since many emergency-room patients were being sent to hospitals in other neighborhoods, North General added ambulances in 2002 and 2004 that brought more Harlem residents through its emergency room—thus boosting revenue. Emergency-room visits jumped 16% to nearly 34,450 in 2005 compared with 2002. North General estimates that roughly eight out of 10 patients who are admitted to the hospital stem from emergency-room visits.

North General recognized that infant mortality is a health problem that looms large in the Harlem community. In August 2004, the hospital opened the Women's Health Center in a separate building that handled nearly 4,000 visits last year. The center offers a prenatal program with services that include ultrasound, nutritional counseling and social work. While the center isn't yet profitable, North General says female patients who are treated at the center are more likely to bring family members to North General for other medical care.

Last year, the hospital expanded its AIDS center and opened a new cardiac-catheterization laboratory that checks patients for clogged arteries, a precursor to heart trouble. The profitable AIDS center, which is promoted in Harlem through brochures, open-house events and free HIV testing at local health fairs, handled more than 6,400 visits in 2005 and projects roughly 7,250 visits this year.

Since opening in December, the catheterization laboratory has handled 152 visits, and projects 300 cases for 2006. North General markets the lab's services to primary-care physicians and cardiologists.

Henock Saint-Jacques, a North General cardiologist, says he used to refer patients to other hospitals for exams, but he estimates as many as 30 percent of patients wouldn't make the trip. "Those problems started to fade away" once North General opened its cardiac lab, he says. "This has improved the quality of care."

IN SUPPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Mr. Mark Malloch Brown, the Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations. In a recent speech on "Power and Super-Power: Global Leadership in the Twenty-First Century" at the Century Foundation and Center for American Progress in New York, on the 6th of June, Mr. Brown criticized the U.S. government for its lack of support given to the United Nations. In his speech he claims that the U.S. in the eyes of the rest of the world has ignored our commitment to the U.N., al-

lowing divisive issues such as the Iraq War to break up a partnership which since the founding of the U.N. has mutually benefited the U.S. and the U.N.

Historically, the U.N. was designed through U.S. leadership and other nations who emerged from World War II with the realization that there must be a vehicle to encourage the promotion of peace and provide collective security to all nations with the goal of promoting global values such as human rights and democracy. Today, the U.N. fields 18 peace-keeping operations around the world, from the Congo to Haiti, Sudan to Sierra Leone, Southern Lebanon to Liberia. Unfortunately, the U.N.'s ability to respond to the world's challenges is being weakened without U.S. leadership.

The speech identifies several key issues that have exacerbated the tension between the U.S. and the U.N. First, The U.N. is currently renovating the dilapidated U.N. Headquarters in New York. Ironically, the government not fully supporting this project is the U.S. Also, the U.N. is undergoing specific reform. This reform comes in many forms from the creation of a new Ethics Office and a whistle-blower policy, to the establishment of a new Peacebuilding Commission and Human Rights Council. Although the U.S. championed such reform, our endorsement has provoked more suspicion than support.

The U.N. will play a larger role in maintaining security around the world. No country can afford to neglect the global institutions needed to manage it. As such, the U.S. needs to be more supportive of the U.N. as a vehicle around which an international consensus can be formed to promote peace, social and economic development. America's leaders must again recognize that the U.N. matters. Ultimately, as America continues to address concerns in countries like Sudan, Iraq and Afghanistan, it should recognize that it needs the U.N. to provide an effective multilateral response that will have international legitimacy and support.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues in the House to encourage more open collaboration and engagement between the U.S. and the U.N.

SPEECH BY U.N. DEPUTY SECRETARY-GENERAL
MARK MALLOCH BROWN

Thank you for allowing me to speak to you today on Power and Global Leadership. I often get asked to talk about leadership, but rarely about power. I wonder why.

With that thought as my starting point, I am going to give what might be regarded as a rather un-U.N. speech. Some of the themes—that the United Nations is misunderstood and does much more than its critics allow—are probably not surprising. But my underlying message, which is a warning about the serious consequences of a decades-long tendency by U.S. Administrations of both parties to engage only fitfully with the U.N., is not one a sitting United Nations official would normally make to an audience like this.

But I feel it is a message that urgently needs to be aired. And as someone who has spent most of his adult life in this country, only a part of it at the U.N., I hope you will take it in the spirit in which it is meant: as a sincere and constructive critique of U.S. policy towards the U.N. by a friend and admirer. Because the fact is that the prevailing practice of seeking to use the U.N. almost by stealth as a diplomatic tool while failing to stand up for it against its domestic critics is

simply not sustainable. You will lose the U.N. one way or another.

FOUNDERS' VISION

Multilateral compromise has always been difficult to justify in the American political debate: too many speeches, too many constraints, too few results. Yet it was not meant to be so. The all-moral-idealism-no-power institution was the League of Nations. The U.N. was explicitly designed through U.S. leadership and the ultimate coalition of the willing, its World War II allies, as a very different creature, an antidote to the League's failure. At the U.N.'s core was to be an enforceable concept of collective security protected by the victors of that war, combined with much more practical efforts to promote global values such as human rights and democracy. Underpinning this new approach was a judgement that no President since Truman has felt able to repeat: that for the world's one super-Power—arguably more super in 1946 than 2006—managing global security and development issues through the network of a United Nations was worth the effort. Yes it meant the give and take of multilateral bargaining, but any dilution of American positions was more than made up for by the added clout of action that enjoyed global support.

Today, we are coming to the end of the 10-year term of arguably the U.N.'s best-ever Secretary-General, Kofi Annan. But some of his very successes—promoting human rights and a responsibility to protect people from abuse by their own Governments; creating a new status for civil society and business at the U.N.—are either not recognized or have come under steady attacks from anti-U.N. groups. To take just one example, 10 years ago U.N. peacekeeping seemed almost moribund in the aftermath of tragic mistakes in Rwanda, Somalia and Yugoslavia. Today, the U.N. fields 18 peacekeeping operations around the world, from the Congo to Haiti, Sudan to Sierra Leone, Southern Lebanon to Liberia, with an annual cost that is at a bargain bin price compared to other U.S.-led operations. And the U.S. pays roughly one quarter of those U.N. peacekeeping costs—just over \$1 billion this year. That figure should be seen in the context of estimates by both the GAO and RAND Corporation that U.N. peacekeeping, while lacking heavy armament enforcement capacity, helps to maintain peace—when there is a peace to keep—more effectively for a lot less than comparable U.S. operations. Multilateral peacekeeping is effective cost-sharing on a much lower cost business model and it works. That is as it should be and is true for many other areas the U.N. system works in, too, from humanitarian relief to health to education. Yet for many policymakers and opinion leaders in Washington, let alone the general public, the roles I have described are hardly believed or, where they are, remain discreetly underplayed. To acknowledge an America reliant on international institutions is not perceived to be good politics at home.

However, inevitably a moment of truth is coming. Because even as the world's challenges are growing, the U.N.'s ability to respond is being weakened without U.S. leadership. Take the issue of human rights. When Eleanor Roosevelt took the podium at the U.N. to argue passionately for the elaboration of a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the world responded. Today, when the human rights machinery was renewed with the formation of a Human Rights Council to replace the discredited Commission on Human Rights, and the U.S. chose to stay on the sidelines, the loss was everybody's. I hope and believe the new Council will prove itself to be a stronger and more effective

body than its predecessor. But there is no question that the U.S. decision to call for a vote in order to oppose it in the General Assembly, and then to not run for a seat after it was approved by 170 votes to 4, makes the challenge more difficult.

More broadly, Americans complain about the U.N.'s bureaucracy, weak decision-making, the lack of accountable modern management structures and the political divisions of the General Assembly here in New York. And my response is, "guilty on all counts". But why? In significant part because the U.S. has not stuck with its project—its professed wish to have a strong, effective United Nations—in a systematic way. Secretary Albright and others here today have played extraordinary leadership roles in U.S.-U.N. relations, for which I salute them. But in the eyes of the rest of the world, U.S. commitment tends to ebb much more than it flows. And in recent years, the enormously divisive issue of Iraq and the big stick of financial withholding have come to define an unhappy marriage.

As someone who deals with Washington almost daily, I know this is unfair to the very real effort all three Secretaries of State I have worked with—Secretary Albright, Secretary Powell and Secretary Rice—put into U.N. issues. And today, on a very wide number of areas, from Lebanon and Afghanistan to Syria, Iran and the Palestinian issue, the U.S. is constructively engaged with the U.N. But that is not well known or understood, in part because much of the public discourse that reaches the U.S. heartland has been largely abandoned to its loudest detractors such as Rush Limbaugh and Fox News. That is what I mean by "stealth" diplomacy: the U.N.'s role is in effect a secret in Middle America even as it is highlighted in the Middle East and other parts of the world. Exacerbating matters is the widely held perception, even among many U.S. allies, that the U.S. tends to hold on to maximalist positions when it could be finding middle ground.

We can see this even on apparently non-controversial issues such as renovating the dilapidated U.N. Headquarters in New York. While an architectural landmark, the building falls dangerously short of city codes, lacks sprinklers, is filled with asbestos and is in most respects the most hazardous workplace in town. But the only Government not fully supporting the project is the U.S. Too much unchecked U.N.-bashing and stereotyping over too many years—manifest in a fear by politicians to be seen to be supporting better premises for overpaid, corrupt U.N. bureaucrats—makes even refurbishing a building a political hot potato.

MAKING REFORM WORK

One consequence is that, like the building itself, the vital renewal of the Organization, the updating of its mission, its governance and its management tools, is addressed only intermittently. And when the U.S. does champion the right issues like management reform, as it is currently doing, it provokes more suspicion than support. Last December, for example, largely at U.S. insistence, instead of a normal two-year budget, Member States approved only six months' worth of expenditure—a period which ends on June 30. Developing and developed countries, the latter with the U.S. at the fore, are now at loggerheads over whether sufficient reform has taken place to lift that cap, or indeed whether there should be any links between reform and the budget. Without agreement, we could face a fiscal crisis very soon.

There has been a significant amount of reform over the last 18 months, from the creation of a new Ethics Office and whistleblower policy, to the establishment of a new Peacebuilding Commission and Human Rights Council. But not enough. The unfin-

ished management reform agenda, which the U.S. sensibly supports, is in many ways a statement of the obvious. It argues that systems and processes designed 60 years ago for an organization largely devoted to running conferences and writing reports simply don't work for today's operational U.N., which conducts multibillion-dollar peacekeeping missions, humanitarian relief operations and other complex operations all over the world. The report sets out concrete proposals for how this can be fixed while also seeking to address the broader management, oversight and accountability weaknesses highlighted by the "oil-for-food" programme.

One day soon we must address the massive gap between the scale of world issues and the limits of the institutions we have built to address them. However, today even relatively modest proposals that in any other organization would be seen as uncontroversial, such as providing more authority and flexibility for the Secretary-General to shift posts and resources to organizational priorities without having to get direct approval from Member States, have been fiercely resisted by the G-77, the main group of developing countries, on the grounds that this weakens accountability. Hence the current deadlock.

What lies behind this? It is not because most developing countries don't want reform. To be sure, a few spoilers do seem to be opposed to reform for its own sake, and there is no question that some countries are seeking to manipulate the process for their own ends with very damaging consequences. But in practice, the vast majority is fully supportive of the principle of a better run, more effective U.N.; indeed they know they would be the primary beneficiaries, through more peace, and more development. So why has it not so far been possible to isolate the radicals and build a strong alliance of reform-minded nations to push through this agenda? I would argue that the answer lies in questions about motives and power. Motives, in that, very unfortunately, there is currently a perception among many otherwise quite moderate countries that anything the U.S. supports must have a secret agenda aimed at either subordinating multilateral processes to Washington's ends or weakening the institutions, and therefore, put crudely, should be opposed without any real discussion of whether they make sense or not.

And power, that in two different ways revolves around perceptions of the role and representativeness of the Security Council. First, in that there has been a real, understandable hostility by the wider membership to the perception that the Security Council, in particular the five permanent members, is seeking a role in areas not formally within its remit, such as management issues or human rights. Second, an equally understandable conviction that those five, veto-wielding permanent members who happen to be the victors in a war fought 60 years ago, cannot be seen as representative of today's world—even when looking through the lens of financial contributions. Indeed, the so-called G-4 of Security Council aspirants—Japan, India, Brazil and Germany—contribute twice as much as the P-4, the four permanent members excluding the U.S.

Prime Minister Tony Blair acknowledged exactly this point on his trip to Washington last month, and it is something which does need to be addressed. More broadly, the very reasonable concerns of the full U.N. membership that the fundamental multilateral principle that each Member State's vote counts equally in the wider work of the U.N. needs to be acknowledged and accommodated within a broader framework of reform. If the multilateral system is to work effectively, all States need to feel they have a real stake.

NEW GLOBAL CHALLENGES

But a stake in what system? The U.S.—like every nation, strong and weak alike—is today beset by problems that defy national, inside-the-border solutions: climate change, terrorism, nuclear proliferation, migration, the management of the global economy, the internationalization of drugs and crime, the spread of diseases such as HIV and avian flu. Today's new national security challenges basically thumb their noses at old notions of national sovereignty. Security has gone global, and no country can afford to neglect the global institutions needed to manage it. Kofi Annan has proposed a restructuring of the U.N. to respond to these new challenges with three legs: development, security and human rights supported, like any good chair, by a fourth leg, reformed management. That is the U.N. we want to place our bet on. But for it to work, we need the U.S. to support this agenda—and support it not just in a whisper but in a coast to coast shout that pushes back the critics domestically and wins over the sceptics internationally. America's leaders must again say the U.N. matters.

When you talk better national education scores, you don't start with "I support the Department of Education". Similarly for the U.N. it starts with politicians who will assert the U.S. is going to engage with the world to tackle climate change, poverty, immigration and terrorism. Stand up for that agenda consistently and allow the U.N. to ride on its coat-tails as a vital means of getting it done. It also means a sustained inside-the-tent diplomacy at the U.N. No more "take it or leave it", red-line demands thrown in without debate and engagement.

Let me close with a few words on Darfur to make my point. A few weeks ago, my kids were on the Mall in Washington, demanding President Bush do more to end the genocide in Darfur and President Bush wants to do more. I'd bet some of your kids were there as well. Perhaps you were, too. And yet what can the U.S. do alone in the heart of Africa, in a region the size of France? A place where the Government in Khartoum is convinced the U.S. wants to extend the hegemony it is thought to have asserted in Iraq and Afghanistan. In essence, the U.S. is stymied before it even passes "Go". It needs the U.N. as a multilateral means to address Sudan's concerns. It needs the U.N. to secure a wide multicultural array of troop and humanitarian partners. It needs the U.N. to provide the international legitimacy that Iraq has again proved is an indispensable component to success on the ground. Yet, the U.N. needs its first parent, the U.S., every bit as much if it is to deploy credibly in one of the world's nastiest neighbourhoods.

Back in Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt's day, building a strong, effective U.N. that could play this kind of role was a bipartisan enterprise, with the likes of Arthur Vandenberg and John Foster Dulles joining Democrats to support the new body. Who are their successors in American politics? Who will campaign in 2008 for a new multilateral national security?

A REVIVAL OF HARLEM'S ELEGANCE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the RECORD, an article by Ruth La Ferla, titled *Downtown Comes to Harlem*. The

article published on June 22, 2006, in the Thursday Styles section of the New York Times, talks about the retail potential of Harlem. Most inner city communities, such as Harlem, possess tremendous undiscovered potential, and provide manifold opportunities for success by large scale business. It is a region of the city that has a greater competitive advantage, according to Michael E. Porter, a professor of Harvard Business School and a leading authority on business strategy. Compared to the suburbs and areas in the other boroughs of the city, the Harlem community is under-served and under-retailed. Although the average household income is low, the dense population of the Harlem community represents a buying power that is comparable to that of other parts of the city. Because of its historical and cultural heritage, entrepreneurs in Harlem have an added marketing advantage. As Ms. La Ferla remarks, N, the new fashion emporium in Harlem, "is the latest in a growing number of retailers to invoke Harlem's multilayered heritage to put their wares on the fashion map."

Offering a mix of local labels and African American designers like Byron Lars and Tracy Reese with more established, upscale brands, these rarified stores are visible symbols of the rapid gentrification of Harlem. Springing up along and just off Seventh and Lenox Avenues, from about 114th St. to 135th St. stores like Pieces of Harlem, Montgomery, Denim Library, B. Oyama, Harlemae are realizing urban sociologists' prediction of the "branding" of Harlem using niche marketing. Meanwhile some longtime residents are fretting that the goods might not be relevant to the local population. The store owners are countering that their inventories were specifically conceived to cater to the locals, simultaneously drawing attention of the tourists.

I want to commend these business owners who are finally utilizing the competitive advantage of Harlem to revive the community. By infusing the legacy of Harlem's glory days with Cab Calloway, Dorothy Dandridge, and Nat King Cole with the modern street-inflected sensibility, these entrepreneurs are marketing Harlem's diversity and culture to revive the elegance of Harlem.

[From the New York Times, June 22, 2006]

DOWNTOWN COMES TO HARLEM

(By Ruth La Ferla)

Talking up N, his new fashion emporium in Harlem, Larry Ortiz posed a question: "If we had to put Harlem in a bottle, what would the scent be?" He then answered with no prompting. "It would obviously be a little retro, a little 1930's." An infusion, in short, evocative of Harlem's glory years, an era of artistic ferment that spawned Cab Calloway, Dorothy Dandridge and Nat King Cole, fused with a modern street-inflected sensibility.

For Mr. Ortiz, one of N's three partners, capturing the essence of the neighborhood is not just rhetoric. To succeed as a merchant, he maintained, he will need to distill Harlem, not just in a fragrance but in all of the upscale fashions, home accessories and cosmetic lines sold at his gracious two-level store in a town house on 116th Street between Seventh and Lenox Avenues.

His objective in showcasing brands like Nicole Miller, Hugo Boss, Marimekko and Jonathan Adler to the increasingly affluent enclave north of Central Park is partly to cater to a fashionably hip local population that has until now traveled downtown in search of popular fashion labels. He is also the lat-

est in a growing number of retailers to invoke Harlem's multilayered heritage to put their wares on the fashion map.

"One of the things that is compelling to us is the idea of branding Harlem," Mr. Ortiz said. It is an idea he hopes to render concrete by offering a mix of local labels and African-American designers like Byron Lars and Tracy Reese with more established, upscale brands. "It's very important to push a lot of black designers who wouldn't get the same attention elsewhere," he said.

"This store is not about hip-hop," he added emphatically.

At 4,000 square feet, N, which opened in April in Mount Morris Park, is the largest upscale retailer to descend on the area. Like N, other newcomers are pointedly distancing themselves from the brash hip-hop aesthetic and offering fashion that deliberately summons Harlem's fabled past, along with current fashion trends being interpreted by downtown outposts like Scoop, Intermix and Big Drop and also by a clutch of stylish men's stores.

As well they might. They have arrived in a rapidly gentrifying neighborhood. Mount Morris Park, a 16-block area from 118th Street to 124th Street between Fifth and Seventh Avenues, has the highest concentration of Harlem households with incomes exceeding \$100,000, said Nikoa Evans, a partner in the store and a former vice president for finance for the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone, a federal economic development initiative. Affluent residents pay about \$750,000 for a one-bedroom condominium and \$2 million for the traditional brownstones that are in high demand.

But Mount Morris Park, and much of Harlem, remains a relative bargain for boutique owners, who pay rents varying from \$75 a square foot to as much as \$150 on 125th Street, compared with \$700 on prime blocks along Madison Avenue.

Flaunting an aura of exclusivity, the new shops offer a high-style—and pricey—alternative to the wares on 125th Street. That crowded, populist thoroughfare is now home to, among others, a MAC cosmetics store; Atmos, a Japanese-owned store specializing in hard-to-find sneakers, with a flagship in the Harajuku district of Tokyo; Old Navy and H & M.

"Harlem is so much more than just 125th Street," said Faith Hope Consolo, the chairwoman of the retail leasing and sales division at Prudential Douglas Elliman. "There is so much retail potential there," said Ms. Consolo, who is scouting sites for several clients. "The challenge is to choose the right location."

Springing up along and just off Seventh and Lenox Avenues, from about 114th Street to 135th Street, are stores like Pieces of Harlem, on West 135th Street, a boutique that sells denim skirts and jackets with Victorian-inspired ruffles and pearl buttons designed by the owners, Latisha and Colin Darling. It also carries draped jersey dresses (\$354) by Rachel Roy, who is married to the rap entrepreneur Damon Dash, and ribbon-trimmed T-shirts (\$185) by Gwen Stefani.

Montgomery, on Seventh Avenue, sells handbags, T-shirts and lingerie emblazoned with the image of Jolinda, a head-wrapped rag doll that recalls the Southern roots of its designer, Montgomery Harris, who moved her store from SoHo to Harlem about three years ago. Ms. Harris is also known for her whimsically hand-embroidered, one-of-a-kind skirts and dresses, many in a vintage mood (\$400 to \$500).

Another new store is Denim Library, on Seventh Avenue, a repository for premium jeans like People's Liberation, Citizens for Humanity and Ciano Farmer, all of which are displayed folded with rear pockets on