

aware of the social needs surrounding them. In 1968, she moved more directly into social action, working as a pastoral minister in the predominantly African-American community of Sacred Heart Parish in San Francisco. At the same time, she pursued and earned her masters of social welfare at the University of California at Berkeley.

As an educator, community organizer, and social justice leader, Sister Margaret pioneered new models of building a community within parishes. She successfully cultivated partnerships with labor, government, business, and the academic community in pursuit of justice. She fought tirelessly for civil rights in the African-American community of San Francisco, with the United Farm Workers, and with refugees from Central America. She led her order's participation in the Sanctuary Movement. She sought to know first hand the plight of the poor, visiting the migrant camps in California, the slums in our inner cities, and the poor communities on Mexico, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and El Salvador where her sisters worked. She was a bridge-builder and a peacemaker. She lived out the maxim, "If you want peace, work for justice."

On numerous occasions, she was called upon to exercise her exemplary leadership skills by working with the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, the Leadership Conference of Women Religious [LCWR], NETWORK, the Catholic organization which lobbies Congress on social justice issues, and by her own order. She exerted unparalleled leadership in building dialog within the Roman Catholic Church about the role of religious women. She never hesitated to speak the truth, to find opportunity in crisis, to identify hope within the most desperate hour.

From 1981 to 1990, the Presentation Sisters elected her to be superior general, and from 1992 until her untimely death, she served as the executive director of the LCWR.

As her sisters declared, "While Sister Margaret's contributions to the communities she served as an organizer and an advocate for the underserved were far-reaching, she will be remembered by bishops and beggars, by legislators and labor leaders, by friends and foes alike as an extremely gracious, articulate, determined and compassionate woman of faith who will be sorely missed."

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending condolences to Sister Margaret's sister, Ellen Cafferty, herself a missionary in Guatemala, and to the Union of the Sisters of the Presentation [PVBM].

TRIBUTE TO LARRY SMITH

HON. HAROLD E. FORD, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 7, 1997

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor one of my constituents, Mr. Larry Smith. On May 8, 1997, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Environmental Law Institute chose Mr. Smith as winner of the 1997 National Wetlands Award. The award honors individual citizens who have dedicated their lives to preserving wetlands through programs and projects at the regional, State, and local level.

For years, Mr. Smith has been a leader and a pioneer of the environmental movement in

Memphis. His work to protect wetlands and prevent toxic pollution has benefited every Memphian. He has made a critical difference in saving the wetlands along the Wolf River, a tributary of the Mississippi River, which snakes through southwestern Tennessee and through my congressional district. This river is important, not only for its scenic beauty, but because it's surrounding wetlands recharge the underground aquifers which have provided the pristine drinking water the citizens of Memphis and Shelby County have enjoyed for decades.

Mr. Smith has shown great skill as a grassroots organizer and educator of the public about the importance of protecting our environment. He has marshaled citizen concern about environmental issues, which has spurred our public officials to act to protect the environment.

I know how committed Mr. Smith is to the environment, because I have worked closely with him to develop and introduce legislation that will protect the public from toxic wastes. On January 27, 1997, an explosion at a hazardous waste facility in Memphis exposed the citizens of the neighborhood to a cloud of toxic chemicals and polluted a nearby creek. Thankfully, no one was injured, but at least two highly toxic chemicals, toluene and xylene were released into the environment. With the experience and expertise of Mr. Smith, I introduced H.R. 843, the Common Sense Toxics Buffer Zone Act, a bill which would require a 5,000 foot buffer zone between any residential community, school, day care, or church and the expansion or construction of a hazardous waste facility.

Mr. Smith stands as an example for all of us to follow. He is a steadfast soldier in the fight for clean water, clean air and the heritage of our national wilderness. I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Smith for receiving this prestigious award.

THE COMMUNITY RIGHT TO KNOW AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

RON KLINK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 6, 1997

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the en block amendment offered by Chairman LAZIO because it includes my simple community right to know amendment, which I offered with my good friend and neighbor, MIKE DOYLE.

As a former member of the Banking Committee I would like to thank my colleagues, Chairman LAZIO and Representative KENNEDY along with their staffs for working with us on this efforts. I realize that more work will be needed in conference and I look forward to working together to ensure that this is included in the final bill.

Our amendment attempts to avoid disastrous situations like the one that happened in our area, when HUD nearly paid \$92,000 for homes valued at less than \$50,000, almost twice the market value.

Luckily this did not take place, because Mr. DOYLE and I were able to bring it to HUD's attention in time for HUD to investigate, and stop the purchase.

No, the purchase was not stopped because of resistance from the community.

It was stopped because when HUD investigated the sale they discovered that the purchase did not even meet basic HUD criteria: the units were concentrated together; without access to public transportation, shopping, or employment opportunities; and the cost was above HUD's top purchase price.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that all of this would have been avoided if the housing authority and the locality had only worked together.

This amendment is not meant to be divisive, nor is it driven by NIMBY'ism. I am a strong supporter of public housing, and believe that every community has a responsibility to provide shelter for our poor, and less fortunate residents.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain what we are trying to do. The block grant section of the bill codifies the requirement that local housing authorities, and local governments work together. This is nothing new. Already, HUD requires housing authorities to go to the local governments in which new public housing is proposed and get them to sign local cooperation agreements as part of the application for federal dollars. Obviously, notification is implicit in that process.

We support this process, and think that local communities and the housing authorities should work together.

The problem arises when housing authorities act pursuant to a court order or a consent decree. That is what happened in our area. Pursuant to a consent decree the housing authority needed to distribute up to 23 single family homes throughout the county.

Mr. Speaker, we have no problem with public housing in our community. Nobody wants to keep people out. In fact, at both the local and the state level Democrats and Republicans alike want this to be a success and are willing to work together to ensure that it is. Our hope though, along with HUD, and in concurrence with the consent decree, is that we are able to pay a fair market value for the requisite number of homes, and have them disbursed throughout the community.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of the court that recipients of public housing, living in homes purchased pursuant to the consent decree blend into the community, and that we avoid concentrated public housing communities.

Mr. Speaker, this is our goal. Yet, Mr. Speaker, unlike every other application for federal public housing dollars the law is ambiguous as to notification requirements when it comes to consent decrees and court orders.

Mr. Speaker, I fully support the provision in the bill that would require HUD to "consult with units of local government" in the process of negotiating a settlement to housing litigation. This goes a long way toward avoiding the problems we have experienced, but it still does not adequately address consent decrees which have been entered into before this bill takes affect.

Our amendment eliminates this confusion by requiring notification. Regrettably, had the housing authority notified the borough, they could have worked together to a successful end—we would have avoided controversy, and saved the taxpayers thousands of dollars.

I urge you to support the Klink/Doyle Community Right to Know amendment.