the Hispanic Health Initiative. President Reagan's Health and Human Services Secretary appointed her to the Task Force on Minority Health to advocate for Hispanic health needs. Henrietta also edited the first Hispanic Health Bibliography, which highlighted Hispanic health research needs and the need to prepare more Hispanic health professionals to conduct such research.

Henrietta gave so much of herself to assist others. She mentored Hispanic leaders and shared her vision with the federal government, local community health programs in Los Angeles, and organizations including the National Association of Hispanic Nurses, the National Coalition of Hispanic Health and Human Services Organization and the Mexican American National Women's Association.

Her accomplishments as a Latina, nurse and activist for others less fortunate are truly extraordinary. She will be greatly missed by those whose lives she touched.

TRIBUTE TO MARY ANN RABIN

HON. STEPHANIE TUBBS JONES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 2005

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a very special constituent, Mary Ann Rabin, on the occasion of her receipt of the Ohio Women's Bar Association's Justice Alice Robie Resnick Award of Distinction. This award is the OWBA's highest award for professional excellence and is bestowed annually on a deserving attorney who exhibits leadership in the areas of advancing the status and interests of women and in improving the legal profession in the State of Ohio. It gives me great pleasure to wish Ms. Rabin my warmest congratulations on this truly special occasion.

Mary Ann (Mickey) Rabin is a nationally recognized bankruptcy practitioner and a founding partner of Rabin & Rabin Co., L.P.A. She practices law with two of her three children. Ms. Rabin received her J.D. degree from Case Western Reserve University School of Law in 1978 and her A.B. degree in music in 1956 from Washington University in St. Louis, Missouri.

Ms. Rabin is a Fellow of the American College of Bankruptcy, a member of the Bankruptcy Trustees for the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Ohio since 1983, a life member of the Eighth Judicial Conference, and a founding member of the Ohio Women's Bar Association.

Ms. Rabin is a dedicated community activist devoting hours of pro bono work to local organizations including serving on the board of the Cleveland Legal Aid Society.

On April 29, 2005, OWBA President Halle M. Hebert will be presenting Ms. Rabin with the Ohio Women's Bar Association's Justice Alice Robie Resnick Award of Distinction at its Annual Meeting in Cleveland, Ohio.

It gives me great pleasure to rise today, Mr. Speaker, and join the OWBA in congratulating Mary Ann Rabin and wishing her continued success.

KEN-CREST CENTERS CENTENNIAL

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 2005

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 2005 marks Ken-Crest Centers' centennial celebration. For the past 100 years, this faith-based, non-profit organization, which was started by the Lutheran Church in Plymouth Meeting, PA, has been dedicated to the concept of bringing ability to life.

Throughout its history, Ken-Crest has pioneered services for the most vulnerable, including the terminally-ill, the abandoned, and the disabled. Ken-Crest began its work in 1905, leading the fight against tuberculosis in the Kensington section of Philadelphia by providing the children of infected families with a safe refuge.

As a former social worker, I am inspired by the story of Sister Maria Roeck, a Lutheran Church deaconess and German immigrant, who founded Ken-Crest, originally called the Kensington Dispensary. Sister Roeck was called to action by the loss of loved ones to tuberculosis. She passionately battled the so-called ''white plague'' that decimated her beloved Kensington; abiding by the motto ''to cure sometimes, to relieve often, to comfort always.''

In the 1950s, as tuberculosis became better contained, Ken-Crest took on a new mission—providing for the mentally retarded and those with developmental disabilities. Its success has made it the largest community-based provider of assistance to people with disabilities in the Philadelphia region, serving more than 6,400 people at 350 locations.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues join me in congratulating Ken-Crest on more than 100 years of outstanding service. I know their good work and mission will continue for many years to come.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF PREGNANCY CARE CENTERS

HON. MELISSA A. HART

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 2005

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Pregnancy Care Centers on its 20th Anniversary, and recognize the exemplary performance of service that the organization provides the 4th District of Pennsylvania.

Founded in 1985, the Pregnancy Care Centers have provided over 7,000 women with free pregnancy tests, and have counseled its clients to find alternatives to abortion. The Pregnancy Care Centers have helped to teach the message of abstinence and have provided post abortion Bible studies to dozens of women who have sought healing and forgiveness.

I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in honoring the Pregnancy Care Centers. It is an honor to represent the Fourth Congressional District of Pennsylvania and a pleasure to salute the service of organizations like the Pregnancy Care Centers which provide such valuable services.

NATIONAL CRIME VICTIMS' RIGHTS WEEK

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 2005

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, last week I stood unified with my constituents in Jamestown in observing National Crime Victims' Rights week.

Every person, male, female, children and adults alike have the right to be free from violent acts not only in the community in which they live but also in their homes. This week and every week to follow let us stand strong as one to break the cycle of violence in America.

Our wonderful Jamestown community has been blessed with Thelma Samuelson, Chairperson for the Chautauqua County Victims' Rights Week Effort and the numerous individuals and organizations that gave of their time to support the effort to ensure justice in all of our lives.

Thank you from the bottom of my heart for all that you do to make Jamestown a better place to work, play and raise a family. Your efforts do not just benefit Jamestown but they also reflect upon Chautauqua County, New York State and all over the United States.

''MODERN DAY MOSES''

HON. LAMAR S. SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 2005

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend Congressman STEVE KING for his excellent speech, included here for the RECORD, addressing courts' attacks on religion in the United States. Our Constitution never intended for religion to be eliminated from the public square, but that is what judges are forcing upon us. I appreciate Congressman KING's eloquent statement on the judicial assault on religion.

[From the desk of Congressman Steve King, Iowa, Fifth District, Mar. 6, 2005]

MODERN DAY MOSES

I turned my eyes away from ''In God We Trust,'' engraved deeply in the stone above the Speaker's chair, and walked under the direct stone gaze of Moses, as I left the chambers of the United States House of Representatives. I walked through statuary hall in the U.S. Capitol where Thomas Jefferson and James Madison were among the first presidents to attend regular church services. The House Chaplain had given the opening prayer to start the legislative day and our member's chapel in the capitol was open for morning meditation as I walked briskly across the capitol grounds to the Supreme Court. The cases of Van Orden v. Perry and McCreary County, Kentucky. v. ACLU, were to be heard this day. I went expecting to hear profound Constitutional arguments before the only court created by the Constitution, the Supreme Court.

I walked up the steps of the high courthouse. From the top of the pediment, looming, larger than life, Moses gazes down, holding the Ten Commandments. All who pause here and all who enter here are on notice, this is a nation built upon a moral foundation, a nation of laws, not of men, a nation

founded upon the belief in ''the laws of Nature and Nature's God.'' I climbed the long steps, walked past the huge columns, stepped out of the sunlight and into the presence of a security guard. I introduced myself to the guard who replied, ''I'm Moses and I'll escort you to your seat.'' ''Moses! Moses?'' I responded. The guard smiled and nodded his head. ''There couldn't be a better person to lead me to hear the Ten Commandments cases,'' I said.

Modern day Moses led me to the chambers, through the huge oak double doors, engraved with the Ten Commandments, and to my seat in the chambers. The courtroom was soon full when we all stood to the Supreme Court Marshal's announcement, ''The Honorable Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. Oyez! Oyez! Oyez! . . . God save the United States and this Honorable Court!'' The justices filed in and were seated. On the frieze above them and to their left, sculpted in stone, stands Moses with the Ten Commandments.

It is a rare privilege to be in the presence of the most powerful and unaccountable shapers of American society that our nation has ever seen. The oral arguments before the Supreme Court in the two cases before it will likely determine if there will be changes in whether and under what circumstances religious displays can be placed on public property. As I listened to the questions and remarks from the justices, I considered the implications of what had become of our Constitutional right to religious freedom and the Constitution itself. A growing uneasiness slowly turned into a sinking feeling in my stomach.

Before I get to the cases at hand, I remind you that the Constitution is written to protect the rights of the minority against the will of the majority and the rights of the majority against the whim of the court. Without the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, the will of the majority would be imposed on the minority. Put simply, a pure democracy is two coyotes and a sheep taking a vote on what's for dinner. The Founders understood this and rejected democracy in favor of their new invention, a Constitutional Republic. Our Republic is a unique design of the carefully balanced executive, legislative, and judicial branches. The three branches of government were not designed to be ''separate but equal'' branches but three carefully balanced branches, the weakest of which is the judicial branch. They were to function together so that the will of the majority could not overturn Constitutional guarantees. The Founders were concerned about the power of an unchecked court so they put limits on its power. The Supreme Court's Constitutional charge is to rule on the letter and the intent of the Constitution, ''with such Exceptions, and under such Regulations as the Congress shall make.'' (Article III, Section 2. United States Constitution)

The question before the court was, ''do the displays of the Ten Commandments violate the ''establishment clause?'' ''Do the displays violate the separation of church and state implied in the Constitution?'' Those of us who came to the Supreme Court expecting to hear profound Constitutional arguments were sadly disappointed. To my ear, no justice referenced the Constitution or quoted from it or asked a question directed to the text of our foundational document. The questions were, ''What is the context of the display?'' ''Was it a religious display, secular, or historical?'' ''What was the intent of those who displayed them? Religious? Secular? Historical?'' ''How would the display be perceived by a reasonable person? Religious? Secular? Historical?'' ''Is anyone offended by the Ten Commandments?'' All pro-religious freedom arguments were carefully and narrowly designed to preserve the two displays in question before the court. One in Texas and one in Kentucky. There was no effort made in oral argument that might have expanded religious freedom by establishing a precedent that would provide for true Constitutional religious freedom. The entirety of the oral arguments before the court and the interest of the justices were focused on issues that cannot be found in the text of the Constitution.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States states, ''Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; . . .'' There are initially only two qualifying questions to be asked of a religious display. One, did Congress. or any of the states (14th amendment), make a law that established a religion? The obvious answer is no. The Constitution has not been violated if Congress has made no law to establish a religion. There is no need to deliberate further. Case closed. For the sake of argument, the second question is, did Congress or any of the states prohibit the free exercise of religion? Again the answer is no. Again the case is closed because no Congressional or state action prohibited the free exercise of religion although the court has done so many times and may well be poised to do so again. Sadly, these two elemental and operative questions were not asked or answered, yet they are the qualifiers that must be met before any religious freedom case can be Constitutionally argued beyond these two points.

Since 1963, in the case of Murray v. Curlett when the Supreme Court ordered prayer out of the public schools, there have been a series of decisions that have diminished religious liberty, one creative, convoluted, extra-constitutional case at a time, until the basis of a ''Constitutional'' decision is distorted beyond the recognition of even those of us who have lived through and with the changes. Imagine how astonished and irate our Founding Fathers would be if they were alive to see the magnitude to which unelected judges have warped our sacred constitutional covenant with their original intent. James Madison, the father of our Constitution, attended church services in the capitol rotunda where regular Sunday church services were held for 60 years. I can hear Madison now, ''We gave you an amendment process! Why didn't you use it? Why would you honor the opinions of appointed judges who dishonor the Constitution?''

In case after case, the courts have ruled against the letter and the intent of the Constitution to the effect of diminishing religious freedom until they have now painted themselves into a legal corner. If their case precedents are to be the path, there is no way out of the room to the door marked ''Constitutional Guarantees'' because of the principle called stare decisis, Latin for: to stand by things that have been settled. Because of their activist arrogance, for the justices, the wet paint of case law precedent never dries, therefore we can't walk back across the paint through the doorway to our guaranteed Constitutional freedoms. Consequently our freedoms are reduced with each stroke of the activist's pen until they are no longer recognizable and the Constitution becomes meaningless.

Last fall, in a small and private meeting, I asked Chief Justice Rehnquist, whom I admire, this question, ''If the Constitution doesn't mean what it says, and as the courts move us further and further from original intent (of the Constitution), what protects the rights of the minority from the will of the majority and what protects the will of the people from the whim of the courts? And, considering the prevalent ''living breathing Constitution'' decisions, hasn't the Constitution just become a transitional document that has guided our nation from 1789 into this 'enlightened' era where judges direct our civilization from the bench? Is the Constitution now an artifact of history?'' The core of Chief Justice Rehnquist's answer was, ''I acknowledge your point.''

To acknowledge my point concedes that the Constitution has become meaningless, become an artifact of history, as far as the courts are concerned. Constitutional law is taught in law schools across the land without teaching the Constitution itself. Constitutional law is too often a course study about how to amend the Constitution through litigation. In fact, we had a law professor before the House Committee on the Judiciary who testified, ''You give me a favorable judge and I will write law for the entire United States of America, in a single courtroom on a single case.''

Our Nation has suffered through more than forty years of activist judges wandering in their anti-religion desert, a desert hostile to Christians and Jews and devoid of Constitutional boundaries. Let my people go! It will take another Moses to lead us out of the desert and back to the Promised Land of our Founding Fathers, a land wisely provided for and abundantly blessed by God.

IN HONOR OF EQUAL PAY DAY

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 2005

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Equal Pay Day.

Today I join the millions of women workers and local advocates across America to fight for justice and fairness in our wages. Today symbolizes the day when women have to work longer hours each week for the same amount of pay that a man would earn in just 5 working days.

It is disappointing to know that it has been 40 years since President John F. Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act in 1963, yet the wage gap between men and women persists. Forty years ago, women who worked full-time made 59 cents on average for every dollar earned by men. In 2004, women earned 77 cents to the dollar. The wage gap has barely narrowed in these past 40 years, even though women have the same education, skills and experience as men.

The disparity in wages between women of color and white men is even worse. In 2003, Asian Pacific American women earned 80 cents for every dollar that men earned. African American women earned only 66 cents and Hispanic American women earned 59 cents for every dollar that men earned.

Although working women in my home State of California are farther along the road to equal pay than women in many States, the wage gap is still there. In 2000, California's working women earned only 82.5 percent as much per hour as men.

At the current rate of change, working women in California won't have equal pay until 2044. Nationwide, women won't achieve equal pay until 2050.

It is distressing to know that it will take 87 years since the Equal Pay Act before there is pay equity.

Now is the time for our country to fix this problem and to move forward in addressing this issue.