a clear signal of the purely political manner in which Secretary Babbitt intended to operate the NPS, and resulted in both Democratic and Republican-authored measures to require that the head of the NPS know something about parks other than having vacationed there.

Section 7 of the bill reauthorizes the National Park System advisory board. The statutory authorization for this board expired a couple years ago. While the board has been reauthorized administratively, the Federal Government recovers costs from such damage, it makes far more sense to apply those funds to restore the resources than to deposit such funds into the Treasury, as is currently the policy.

Mr. Speaker, as Members can see, this bill contains a number of very important provisions which will help our parks, its employees, and make congressional oversight more effective. I commend all Members who have provided input into the bill, Democrats and Republicans alike, and urge all Members to support this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I had hoped that we could keep this discussion of this bill bipartisan. Obviously, I have to disagree with some of the chairman's comments. This is a good bill.

Employee housing, I had a chance to go to Yellowstone over the recess and had a chance to spend some time with our Park Service employees, not just in law enforcement but also park rangers, men and women. The quality of these men and women is outstanding. They are hard workers. Of course Yellowstone is the crown jewel. They talked to me about this housing issue. Basically what you have is some of our, especially bachelor, park rangers living in what is generously called some very substandard housing. We have to do better. We have to do better for our park employees.

Let me address some of the chairman's statements. I disagree. I think Secretary Babbitt has done a good job with the Park Service. I think Director Kennedy has done a good job, too. I differ with the chairman on whether Tom Brokaw or Robert Redford would have been good directors of the Park Service. I think what Secretary Babbitt is looking for is somebody with high visibility, to give the parks the visibility that they need.

I know the chairman agrees with me. We have got to find ways to ensure that these parks are funded. We need to continue to move forward. I think that was one of the objectives viewed there.

But I am not going to get into an argument with him, except to say that this administration has done a good job with the environment and with the Park Service, particularly Director Kennedy and Secretary Babbitt.

This is an occasion where, perhaps a few times that we have come together on a bill, we should recognize that that has happened. I commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HENFORD] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] for this bill. It is a good one. They work with us. They compromise. We compromise. We have got a good product that I think will advance the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2941, the bill just passed.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3802) to amend section 552 of title 5, United States Code, popularly known as the Freedom of Information Act, to provide for public access to information in an electronic format, and for other purposes, as amended.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the words of the ranking member of the committee. Let me say that, as a Republican member, we have no desire to close any parks, contrary to what people have said, but to make them better. I think this particular piece of legislation, as we waded through all the sections, points out and expedites the things that will make the parks better and make them work better; and we are very strong on the idea of taking care of our national parks. We have no argument with the administration on most the things they do, but in some of these areas we feel that they do, but in some of these areas we feel that what they do, but in some of these areas we feel that what should be done should be done not for what is politically expedient, but done for the benefit of the parks, and that is the agreement we thought we had when we first got into the business of this committee.

I appreciate all those who have worked so diligently on this bill. I personally feel this is an excellent piece of legislation, and I urge all Members to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2941, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules suspending the rules were waived and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
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"(1) ‘agency’ as defined in section 551(1) of this title includes any executive department, military department, Government corporation, Government controlled corporation, or other entity that is maintained by an agency of the Government (including the Executive Office of the President), or any independent regulatory agency; and

(2) ‘other term used in this section in reference to information includes any information that would be an agency record subject to the requirements of this subpart when maintained by an agency in any format, including an electronic format.”

SEC. 4. INFORMATION MADE AVAILABLE IN ELECTRONIC FORMAT AND INDEXATION OF RECORDS.

Section 552a(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking “or staff manual or instruction” and inserting “staff manual, instruction, or copies of records referred to in subparagraph (D)”; (2) by inserting before the period at the end of the third sentence the following: “, and the extent of such deletion shall be indicated on the portion of the record which is made available; and unless indicating that indication would harm an interest protected by the exemption in subsection (b) under which the deletion is made”;

(b) by inserting after the third sentence the following: “If technically feasible, the extent of the deletion shall be indicated at the place in the record where the deletion was made.”;

(4) by striking subparagraph (B), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(5) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) copies of all records, regardless of form or format, which have been released to any person under subparagraph (3) and which, because of the nature of their subject matter, have become likely to become the subject of subsequent requests for substantially the same records; and

(E) a general index of the records referred to under subparagraph (D);”;

(b) by inserting after the fifth sentence the following: “Each agency shall make the index required by subparagraph (A) available by computer telecommunications by December 31, 1995; and

(7) by striking the first sentence the following: “For records created on or after November 1, 1996, within one year after such date, each agency shall make such records available, including by computer telecommunications, if computer telecommunications means have not been established by the agency, by other electronic means.”

SEC. 5. HONORING FORM OR FORMAT REQUESTS.

Section 552a(3) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(A)” after “(3)”; (2) by striking “or field facility” and inserting “or field facility or collection of records”;

(b) by striking “by the second place it appears” and inserting “(i)”;

(3) by striking “(B)” and inserting “(ii)”;

and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subparagraphs:

“(B) In making any record available to a person under this paragraph, an agency shall provide the record in any form or format. Each agency shall make reasonable efforts to maintain its records in forms or formats that are reproducible for purposes of this section.

(C) In responding under this paragraph to a request from an agency, an agency shall make reasonable efforts to search for the records in electronic form or format, except when such efforts would significantly interfere with the operation of the agency’s automated information system.

(D) For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘request’ means, but only to the extent reasonably necessary to the proper processing of the particular request—

(i) the need to search for and collect the requested records from field facilities or other establishments that are separate from the office or field facility processing the request;

(ii) the need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records which are determined to be relevant to the request;

(iii) the need for consultation, which shall be conducted with all practicable speed, with another agency having a substantial interest in the determination of the request or among two or more components of the agency having substantial subject-matter responsibilities for the record; and

(iv) each agency may promulgate regulations, pursuant to notice and receipt of public comment, for the aggregation of such requests by sector or by a group of requesters acting in concert, if the agency reasonably believes that such requests actually constitute a single request, which would otherwise satisfy the unusual circumstances specified in this subparagraph, and the requests involve clearly related matters. Multiple requests involving unrelated matters shall not be aggregated. (E) The need for consultation, which shall be determined as a factor in determining whether exceptional circumstances exist for purposes of this subparagraph.

SEC. 6. TIME PERIOD FOR AGENCY CONSIDERATION OF REQUESTS.

(a) EXPEDITED PROCESSING.—Section 552a(6) of title 5, United States Code (as amended by section 7(a) of this Act), is further amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(i) Each agency shall promulgate regulations, pursuant to notice and receipt of public comment, providing for expedited processing of requests for—

(E)(i) Each agency shall determine whether exceptional circumstances exist for purposes of this subparagraph.

(ii) Notwithstanding clause (i), regulations under this subparagraph must ensure—

(I) that a determination of whether to provide expedited processing is made, and notice of the determination shall be provided to the person making the request, within 10 days after the date of the request; and

(II) expeditious consideration of administrative appeals of such determinations of whether to provide expedited processing.

An agency shall as soon as practicable any request for records to which the agency has granted expedited processing under this subpart. Agency action to determine denial of expedited processing pursuant to this subpart, and failure by an agency to respond in a timely manner to such a request shall be subject to judicial review under paragraph (2), except that the judicial review shall be based on the record before the agency at the time of the determination.

(iv) A district court of the United States shall not have jurisdiction to review an agency denial of expedited processing of a request for records after the agency has provided a complete response to the request.

(v) For purposes of this subpart, the term ‘compelling need’ means—

(I) that a future is much to be gained by the release of the requested records on an expedited basis under this subpart could reasonably be expected to
pose an imminent threat to the life or physical safety of an individual; or

“(ii) with respect to a request made by a person primarily engaged in disseminating information to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity.

“(vi) A demonstration of a compelling need by a person requesting a request for expedited processing shall be made by a statement certifying by such person to be true and correct to the best of such person’s knowledge and belief.”

(b) Extension of General Period for Determining Whether To Comply With a Request

Section 552(a) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by striking “ten days” and inserting “20 days”.

(c) Matter Denied.

Section 552(a)(6) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (9) by inserting after the period “such reports are available by electronic means.”


Section 552 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by adding after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

“(g) The Attorney General of the United States shall notify the Chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight was A Citizen’s Guide on Using the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act of 1974 to Request Government Records. This popular publication, available from the Government Printing Office helps average citizens understand their right to obtain government records.

H.R. 3802 clarifies that records kept electronically are subject to disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. The bill also makes procedural changes in the administration of the law. It strengthens agency reporting requirements. It also requires that more information be available to the public via the Internet.

The Electronic Freedom of Information Amendments of 1996 was introduced by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], our subcommittee’s ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PETERSON], and myself. We were the original cosponsors.

I understand that Senator LEAHY intends to offer this identical bill on the floor of the other body as a substitute. Senator LEAHY. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], my colleague, the prime author of this legislation.
Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman CLINGER and Representative HORN for their hard work and leadership.

As chairman of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee—Chairman of the Committee—Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman HORN for their hard work and leadership in bringing H.R. 3802—the Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996—before us today.

And Chairman HORN of the subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology—has served on the front lines in our efforts to improve the efficiency and responsiveness of Government operations.

I have been fortunate to work alongside Representative HORN in the area of Federal information policy and the Electronic Freedom of Information Act amendments.

I would also like to acknowledge the support of Representative CAROLYN MALONEY and Representative COLLIN PETERSON. Their contributions have ensured that H.R. 3802 is a truly bipartisan effort.

Opening the work of the Federal Government to the watchful and vigilant eyes of the American taxpayers and the public is an effort that both parties and the administration can and should embrace wholeheartedly.

Thirty years ago—Congress passed the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) to advance one of the basic tenets of our Constitution—that our Federal Government is always open, accessible, and accountable to the American people.

Government works best under the watchful and vigilant eyes of its owners—the American people.

The more visible and accessible we make the work of the Federal Government to the watchful and vigilant eyes of the American taxpayers and the public is an effort that both parties and the administration can and should embrace wholeheartedly.

There is no greater example of this than the work of the Government Accountability Office (GAO).

GAO has been instrumental in holding Federal agencies accountable for their actions.

Before the enactment of the Freedom of Information Act—agencies and departments of the Federal Government regularly restricted the public’s access to information.

FOIA was enacted in order to preserve—and promote the public’s right to know—ensuring that Government information is—with few very exceptions—public information.

Unfortunately—it was intended to impose a limit on the public’s access to information.

Unfortunately—time after time—FOIA’s promise to make Government information open and accessible has been broken.

On many occasions—simple requests for information have languished—unanswered—for years.

In addition—many agencies have not responded to the needs of a public that has already moved into the information age—are using fax machines to focus on answering with volumes of paper rather than with CD-ROM’s or computer disks.

In the 30 years since the implementation of the original Freedom of Information Act—our Nation has witnessed tremendous technological advances.

My area of the country—the Puget Sound region in Washington State—is the home of Microsoft—the largest computer software company in the world.

My district has welcomed a manufacturing plant for Intel—the largest of the Pentium chip that goes into computers.

And my hometown of Puyallup has been to a manufacturing plant owned by Matsushita—one of the largest computer chip producers in the world.

These technological marvels have made the laptop computer—cell phone—fax—and internet possible—bringing the public into the information age.

It is only fitting that we now work to use modern-day technology to deliver common-sense efficiency and Government accountability to the American people.

H.R. 3802 puts FOIA online on agency websites, ensuring that citizens in every home—in every town—in every city—across the Nation will be able to access Government information from the comfort of their own homes.

My neighbors will be able to turn on their computers—click onto the Internet—and download information made accessible by the Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996.

Our Government should be user-friendly by making an effort to deliver information to Americans in the format of their choosing.

H.R. 3802 requires Federal agencies to make a concerted effort to produce records in the preferred format—such as CD-ROM or computer disk—ensuring that Government information is not only readily available but also readily usable.

The use of the latest technology by Government agencies will harness the benefits of computer technology and deliver to everyone increased Government accessibility.

This legislation also addresses the problems many citizens face when requesting Federal records—unacceptable delays in getting an answer.

This bill encourages Federal agencies to develop multitrack processing based on the complexity of requests.

For example—simple requests should be answered as if they were going through the express lane at your local supermarket—quickly and efficiently.

Those whose information which relates to life or safety or is of urgent public interest will receive the timely processing that they need.

In addition—agencies are given an incentive to actively work with the public to deliver the most useful information as fast as possible.

These changes send a clear message that the Federal Government—and its public servants—must always strive for increased Government openness—efficiency—and accountability.

Opening efficiency—and accountability are the hallmarks of the Electronic Freedom of Information Act amendments.

The American people expect their Government to deliver no less.

In a March 21 letter to Chairman HORN, I and Representatives SCARBOROUGH, DAVIS, FOX, BASS, and FLANAGAN urged House consideration of H.R. 3802 before we leave the House floor.

I thank all my colleagues on the Government Reform and Oversight Committee for their hard work and support in ensuring that the advancement of free information to the American people is pursued on a bipartisan basis.

H.R. 3802 has received endorsements from a broad array of groups—including Americans for Tax Reform—the Newspaper Association of America—the National Association of Broadcasters—and the American Library Association.

Better for the average American taxpayer; the Paperwork Reduction Act, the debt collection bill which Treasury estimates will save taxpayers $10 billion over 5 years, the Federal Acquisition Reform Act, the Single Audit Act, and the General Accounting Act, to name a few.

These achievements are a credit to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], who chairs the Subcommittee on Government Management Information and Technology which I serve as the ranking member.

They are also a credit to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TATE], for his active leadership and Senator PATRICK LEAHY who has been the driving force behind the bill in the Senate.

I appreciate the majority’s willingness to adopt my amendments, in particular one amendment that would track how agencies are responding or not responding to Freedom of Information Act requests.

As Senator LEAHY testified at our committee hearing, long delays in access can mean no access at all.
Mr. Speaker, in short, the Electronic Freedom of Information Act will bring the Freedom of Information Act from the technological stone age into the information age. It has been 30 years since President Johnson set upon signing the original Freedom of Information Act, and I quote:

"This legislation springs from one of our most essential principles, a democracy works best when people have all the information that the security of the Nation permits."

That principle still holds true today, but as written, the Freedom of Information Act is woefully outdated, drafted for a time when personnel computers were unheard of and cyberspace was no more accessible than outer space.

This bill will change all of that. It clarifies that there is no legal distinction between Government records stored on paper and Government records stored electronically. That records maintained in an electronic format can be subject to FOIA requests. Government agencies are increasingly storing their information on personal computer databases and electronic storage media such as CD-ROM's. But some Government agencies have denied freedom of information requests for information stored electronically. They are seeking the green light of Congress to provide access to that information, and this bill gives it to them by placing substance over form instead of form over substance.

The rationale for this provision is obvious. Today our information warehouses are on computer and compact disks, not in huge buildings in industrial zones. By using technology, Government bureaucrats can avoid going through endless file cabinets hunting for information, often to provide identical or overlapping information from previous FOIA requests. And ordinary American citizens can access that information without leaving their desks or driving to the post office, or in some cases having any contact with Government workers at all.

With Government downsizing, Government employees' workloads are mounting, so avoiding the need for contact with them at all can dramatically expedite fulfillment of freedom of information requests, as in the case of identical FOIA requests which have been filed before.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also forces agencies to exercise foresight when installing computer systems which must help expedite agency FOIA requests and operations, rather than impeding them. Furthermore, it would encourage agencies to offer online access to Government information, effectively transforming an individual's home computer into a Government agency's public reading room.

Most importantly, the bill would tackle the mother of all complaints lodged against the Freedom of Information Act: that is, the often ludicrous amount of time it takes some agencies to respond, if they respond at all, to freedom of information requests.

By the time freedom of information requests are fulfilled, the information is often stale, and if the requester has not died of old age. If you request a document from the FBI, you may be forced to wait for more than 4 years before you receive it, if not longer.

This bill will make several common-sense changes. It will establish that all freedom of information requests are not created equal. The bill creates a compelling need standard, warranting faster FOIA processing.

Two categories of compelling need would be created. In the first category, the failure to obtain the records within an expedited deadline poses an imminent threat to an individual's life or physical safety. The second category requires a request by someone, and "urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged government activity."

"This would apply to our good friends from the media. Mr. Speaker, I have talked about this need to constantly feed the beast, meaning the media, with information. This provision will help keep the media informed in a quicker and faster way.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would further differentiate and prioritize FOIA requests based on size, giving requesters an incentive to frame narrower requests. Agencies would no longer be able to delay responding to FOIA requests on the grounds of "exceptional circumstances" if those circumstances are nothing more than the predictable agency overload.

This clause would strengthen the requirement that agencies respond to freedom of information requests on time. However, this bill does recognize the great demands placed on agencies to fulfill FOIA requests by extending the deadline for responding to requests to 20 workdays from the current 10-day time requirement, which is simply unworkable for many agencies.

The bill also gives agencies an incentive to comply with statutory time limits by allowing them to retain half of the fees. The amendment that I introduced, which has been adopted, acknowledges that we need to make agencies more accountable to the public by requiring them to report to Congress and the public on their efforts to comply with FOIA or their failure in complying with FOIA. Information delayed is certainly information denied.

The bill requires each agency to report on its FOIA workload during the year, the number of requests received and completed, as well as the amount of backlog and the steps the agency is taking to reduce it. Each agency will be required to provide a reason it normally takes to process the request. Finally, each agency will report on the resources, dollars, and persons devoted to responding. This will allow us to make a judgment about whether adequate resources are being devoted to these requests and whether agencies are making a sufficient effort to comply with the law of the land.

One issue not addressed in this legislation is the recent D.C. Circuit Court decision in the case of Armstrong versus the Executive Office of the President. In that decision the court ruled that the National Security Council is not an agency. This is contrary to 20 years of practice and contrary to the way Congress has treated the National Security Council in other legislation. I hope the courts will correct this error; but if they do not, I am sure that we will add this provision in the 108th Congress. It helps make Government truly for the people, not just for Government insiders. In passing it unanimously, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight has proudly lived up to its name.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in closing on this that I thank the gentleman from Washington for his very constructive ideas, and the gentleman from New York for her most helpful suggestions. She has mentioned a few of the ideas. The Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology held a very thorough hearing on H.R. 3802.

This has truly been, as have most of the bills from this subcommittee, based on bipartisan cooperation. Good ideas know no bounds, and what we need to do is get the good ideas into legislation. This is one aspect of that.

We mentioned earlier the 600,000 requests a year. The gentleman from New York mentioned the 4-year lag to get a file out of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That is simply unacceptable in a free society. How are we going to solve that? As we suggested in the hearings, and this was again, both sides of the aisle suggesting it to the executive branch, we need the Cabinet officers in charge of particular departments to take this seriously, to look at how their needs and how they might better staff and organize the people in the post and the media with this information. The agencies need to put a price tag on the service. Do not necessarily come to Congress to solve...
Whereas Mother Teresa has deservedly received numerous honors, including the 1979 Nobel Peace Prize and the 1985 Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Whereas Mother Teresa has worked in areas all over the world, including the United States, to provide comfort to the world's neediest.

Whereas Mother Teresa through her Missionaries of Charity has established within the United States numerous soup kitchens, emergency shelters for women, shelters for unwed mothers, shelters for men, after-school and summer camp programs for children, homes for the dying, prison ministry, and nursing homes. She is also a founder of the Missionaries of Charity.

Mother Teresa is a living saint. Her work has affected people around the globe. She has worked tirelessly for the sick and the dying, providing them comfort and care. Mother Teresa has always, through her Missionaries of Charity, taken in those who are "unacceptable," and thus unwanted, and cared for them when no one else would. Her commitment to humanity is unwavering.

Born on August 27, 1910, Mother Teresa has worked for over 65 years for the betterment of mankind. She began her religious studies in Ireland in 1928. Later that same year, she went to Calcutta, India, where she has so nobly performed countless acts of faith and devotion.

Mother Teresa's caregiving has reached beyond creed, nationality, race, or place. She has extended her service to those who are poor and those who are unwanted around the world. Aside from her work in India, Mother Teresa has touched the lives of many in Ireland, Venezuela, Tanzania, Australia, Japan, and of course, right here in the United States, to name but just a few of the more than 90 countries where Mother Teresa and her order have been active.

Bestowing such a prestigious tribute as honorary U.S. citizenship does not come easily. There have been only three other occasions on which this privilege has been awarded. Only four individuals have received honorary citizenship. They are, first, Sir Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of Great Britain during World War II, America's greatest ally, second, Raoul Wallenberg, a Swedish diplomat who, during World War II, saved the lives of thousands of Jews, and third, William Penn, who was honored for their role in the colonial days of our great country.

Honorary U.S. citizenship does not grant any legal rights or obligations. It does not give the recipient any voting privileges. This has been a concern in the past. It is crystal clear from the legislative history of the Churchill, Wallenberg, and Penn bills that conferral of honorary citizenship is purely a symbolic gesture. It is recognition of their outstanding contribution to their fellow man and to America.

There is no question that Mother Teresa is a worthy recipient of this prestigious honor. She has established numerous soup kitchens, women's shelters, shelters for unwed mothers, religious education programs, nursing homes, orphanages, after school and summer camp programs for children, homes for the dying, prison ministry, family counseling programs, and missionary work in the United States. She also has been awarded the 1979 Nobel Peace Prize for her work as well as the 1985 U.S. Presidential Medal of Freedom and countless other honors. It would surely take up the rest of the day to list them all.

The missionaries of Charity, Mother Teresa's order, was founded in India in 1950. The order was established in the United States in 1971. There are approximately 4,500 sisters affiliated with the congregation. It is represented in the United States in the archdioceses of Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Denver, Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, New York, Newark, Philadelphia, San Francisco, St. Louis, and Washington. Also in the Dioceses of Baton Rouge, Brooklyn, Dallas, Fall River, Gallup, Lafayette, Lexington, Little Rock, Peoria, Phoenix, and Memphis. It's very possible that more have been added since the last official report. God only knows where Mother Teresa's influence and good works may turn up next.

Mother Teresa is a woman of simple, yet eloquent, faith. This is best illustrated by an observation she once made. She said:

"We do not accept any government assistance or church subsidies, salaries or fixed income. The birds of the air and the flowers of the field do not have an income, but God takes care of them. Therefore, we shall take care of our brothers and sisters, and birds and butterflies.

But, it is Mother Teresa and her Missionaries of Charity who, through their good works throughout the world have, in some way, shape, or form, taken..."