matters and thus missed rollcall votes Nos. 370, 371, 372, 373 and 374. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on all votes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 2006

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to record my rollcall votes 436 and 437. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on votes: roll No. 436 and roll No. 437.

IN HONOR OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY DOMINICAN HOSPITAL

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 2006

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dominican Hospital on 65 years of high quality, passionate, and kindhearted healthcare in Santa Cruz County. Created by six Dominican Sisters from Adrian, Michigan, the Catholic hospital was duly named "Sisters Hospital." Today, the hospital continues to approach the healthcare needs of the region by partnering faith with scientific innovations.

Since its inception in 1941, "Dominican Santa Cruz Hospital" has consistently delivered comprehensive and modern medical care for the county. Part of the compassionate mission of Dominican Hospital is to "improve the health of the people of the greater Santa Cruz area, without distinguishing by race, creed, or source of payment . . ." The hospital is known for partnering with other healthcare providers in order to improve the quality of life for those who are less fortunate.

In 1951, "Sisters Hospital" became aware of the ever growing needs within the community for a comprehensive healthcare institution. Due to this realization, the hospital decided to expand its services and obtain a new location. The hospital acquired its Soquel Avenue location and renamed itself, Dominican Santa Cruz Hospital.

In 1984, Dominican Santa Cruz Hospital, in a partnership with the County of Santa Cruz, agreed to provide the first inpatient mental health services program in the county. This was in response to the ever growing needs the hospital saw emerging within the community. Dominican Hospital, time and time again, proves its love for the community by constantly evaluating and reacting to the needs of the people, and I am very grateful to them.

The hospital again expanded its services in 1988. It introduced the county to its first cardiac program. It also created Dominican Oaks, an assisted and independent living community, providing 206 residents with comprehensive medical support. Dominican also joined forces with Catholic Healthcare West, a hospital system of similar values and visions with locations throughout California, Arizona, and Nevada.

Dominican Hospital now serves about 150,000 patients annually, has birthed over 75,000 children, and currently counts 379 beds on two campuses. The medical specialties available at the hospital are numerous. They include, but are not limited to, complete Emergency Services, a renowned Intensive Care Service, the only Level 2 and Level 3 Neonatal Intensive Care Nursery in the county, Behavioral Health Services, and an array of outreach services, and educational options focusing on community needs and healtb prevention.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLYSON Y. SCHWARTZ

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 13, 2006

Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during an absence yesterday, I regrettably missed rollcall votes 436–437. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following manner: rollcall No. 436: "yea" and rollcall No. 437: "yea."

AMERICAN HORSE SLAUGHTER PREVENTION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JEB HENSARLING

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 7, 2006

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 503) to amend the Horse Protection Act to prohibit the shipping, transporting, moving, delivering, receiving, possessing, purchasing, selling, or donation of horses and other equines to be slaughtered for human consumption, and for other purposes:

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Chairman, sometimes in the House of Representatives, we debate and vote on emotional issues. H.R. 503 is certainly one of those issues, and I understand that those who support it hold strong opinions. Having grown up working on a farm and both owning and riding a horse, I do not relish the idea of them being processed for meat. It is something I personally do not care to do.

But this bill is not about whether we are a Nation of horse lovers. It is a bill about whether we are a Nation of freedom lovers. We are presented with a simple question of freedom, namely: will we grant the Federal Government the power to tell livestock owners and family farmers what they can do with their livestock?

Freedom in America often means having to tolerate actions to which we are personally opposed. To protect our freedoms we must first respect our neighbor's freedoms. For instance, I personally abhor smoking and wish every tobacco company in the country would find something else to do or cease to exist. But I will not support legislation outlawing the production and marketing of tobacco products, and I will not support legislation outlawing the use of tobacco products as long as such use does not infringe on my rights or those of my fellow citizens. I would vigorously fight efforts on this floor to regulate them out of business or prohibit them from operating in the United States. I believe there is an extremely high standard that must be met before we restrict the historic freedoms of our fellow citizens. This bill does not even come close to meeting that test.

Those in favor of this bill make a number of arguments as to why we must ban the processing of horses. Though on the surface some of these arguments may be compelling, noticeably absent from any of them is a scientific, health, or safety argument. In fact, the primary reason that proponents of H.R. 503 offer is that we should not process horses simply because, well, they are horses. Clearly, this argument is anything but scientific, and I suspect the cattle in America may be upset with the prejudice.

Some supporters of this bill argue that we must give special protection to the horse because of its prominent place in the heritage of the American West. Well, do not cattle have an even greater place in the heritage of the American West? Yet we use that animal to protect our feet with shoes and nourish us with beef. How is the horse different? Also, I note that those who we celebrate in the history of the West were known as cowboys, not horseboys. Again, how is the horse different? I further note the lobster has a prominent place in the heritage and history of Maine, but I doubt that people of that state would argue that we should stop harvesting it commercially because of its legacy.

Proponents of H.R. 503 will try to convince us that owners who sell their horses in auctions unknowingly sell them to representatives of the processing facilities, with no knowledge that the horse would be processed. Common sense tells me that if these sellers don't want their horses sold for processing, they would not sell them at high bidder auctions. But, if this is indeed a serious problem, Congress could simply pass legislation requiring that horse auctions make all sellers aware that their animals could potentially be bought for processing. Simple disclosure laws will render that argument moot.

Some will claim that horse processing needs to be banned because the horses suffer during transport and the slaughter process and others will claim that horse processing encourages horse thievery. The former is not based in fact. With respect to the latter, just because cattle rustling has been around since the birth of the Republic does not mean we should outlaw the processing of cattle. The same is true of horses. Current federal laws require that horses must be transported and processed humanely, just like cattle. Both of these arguments raise the issue of enforcement. Thus, the solution is to enforce current federal law, not pass a new, draconian one.

While proponents of H.R. 503 have many arguments about why this process needs to be banned, they remain silent about the unintended consequences of this bill. I believe chief among those unintended consequences is that horse owners will not have a humane option to dispose of a horse that is either unwanted or unable to be cared for. In 2005, around 90,000 horses were processed in the U.S. If there was another viable option for these horses, clearly they would not have been sent to the processing facility. This is particularly true for a number of struggling family farmers. If this bill were to become law, it would mean that when a working horse is at the end of its useful life, it will turn into a liability instead of an asset for the family farmer. No one should come to this floor bemoaning