

Chicken recall awakening Recently, the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food Safety and Inspection Service announced more than 2 million pounds of chicken products have been recalled by Simmons Prepared Foods Inc. over fears they "may be contaminated with extraneous materials, specifically metal," which is one of the strangest processed meat recalls we've ever had ("More than 2 million pounds of poultry products recalled, may be tainted with metal," Nov. 2).

Simmons Foods' corporate structure has recently overrun three counties in northeastern Oklahoma, constructing new megapoultry feeding operations, with basically no cost to the company. The contracted farmers bear the burdens of bank loans and a fast-track schedule for delivering live birds.

Neighbors' concerns regarding unlimited water consumption and air pollution from the "composted" carcass waste streams have largely been ignored. Now Simmons has opened up their new poultry processing plant, but did they adequately test all the new equipment prior to processing and shipping over 2 million pounds of chicken to the unsuspecting public? Institutions in Oklahoma purchased these products. How will the Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food and Forestry react to this recall? Will it stop rubber stamping those \$10 poultry feeding operation permits? Secretary Blaine Arthur has expressed no concern for public health or private property rights of the citizens of Oklahoma while defending an out-of-state corporation. Oklahomans lose on both ends of this food safety and economic issue, but our state agencies continue their lackadaisical regulating and must-approve permitting of every corporate demand. Pam Kingfisher, Moodys Contributor

As a nation, we continue to grapple with the rising cost of health care and health insurance. One of the most troubling aspects of this trend is the prevalence of hidden costs passed onto patients by insurance companies after they deny an out-of-network claim. As Congress seeks to remedy this, I urge Sens. Jim Inhofe and James Lankford to use the wisdom and foresight they have lent to other policy issues to mitigate unintended consequences that further complicate, rather than solve, the original problem. No patient should be surprised by their medical bills. Congress has the ability to solve this issue today. Johnnie Miller, Grandfield Lankford's misleading letter I received a

mass constituency letter from Sen. James Lankford on the matter of the impeachment. There is one important point that he did not address in the form letter to constituents: It is illegal for a president or any citizen to extort a foreign government by withholding congressionally approved foreign aid in order to obtain dirt on a political rival. Thank God for Speaker of the House Nancy Pelosi. She alone appears to be trying to save our system of government from this president's long record of corruption. I see by this letter that Lankford does not intend to do so himself. Additionally, there has never been any evidence to suggest that Hunter or Joe Biden were engaged in any wrongdoing. Spreading malicious lies is beneath the dignity of Lankford's office. If Lankford is so deeply concerned about nepotism, why not turn that concern toward Jared Kushner and Ivanka Trump, who work in the White House and handle foreign affairs without a shred of experience and without holding an elected office? That should concern all Americans. Julia Thomas, Broken Arrow Cult of Trump Oklahoma Reps. Kevin Hern and Markwayne Mullin have shown their only priority: Re-election. To ensure this, they have joined the Cult of Trump. This cult requires complete devotion to politics over principles. Precedent is being set. Defending and accepting President Trump's bad ethics and his usurping of power from Congress will have consequences. Consider just some of the ways Trump is weakening the constitutional separation of powers and tarnishing the office of the presidency: He refuses to divest from his business interests and makes no attempt to avoid conflicts of interest. He directs government funds to his own properties. He declared an emergency and redirected military funds appropriated by Congress to a completely different purpose than intended: the border wall. He refuses to comply with subpoenas issued by Congress for investigating his administration. He obstructs investigators at every turn. He lies without remorse. He withholds military aid to an ally until he can extract a personal political favor first. He encourages foreign powers to meddle in our elections to help him. National security concerns don't matter. He abandons the Kurds, our allies in

Syria and shrugs off possible ethnic cleansing. He praises murderous dictators and refuses to stand up to Vladimir Putin. Would this have been acceptable from President Obama? Will Mullin and Hern tolerate this from future Democratic presidents? Does hypocrisy even matter to them anymore? Lance Christiansen, Broken Arrow Minds made up Minutes after the U.S. House passed the impeachment resolution inquiry, House Republicans offered a public response to the vote. House Minority Leader Kevin McCarthy gave two reasons why the House should not have passed this resolution. First, he attacked the process, saying that the rules were designed to benefit Democrats. Second, he said there was no evidence of guilt, and that Democrats need to look at evidence before coming to conclusions. I am troubled by the representative's response because these two arguments are not compatible with each other. The first argues that Republicans are open to impeachment if the rules are fair to the minority party. The second argues that Trump is not guilty of wrongdoing, so therefore, the House does not need to investigate him. If McCarthy truly believed that his only concern was the process, why wouldn't he admit that Trump's phone call with Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskiy was suspicious and deserved inquiry, just not in the way that the Democrats presented it? If his only concern was the president was not guilty, why would he bring up the process at all? It is clear that House Republicans do not care about the process at all because they have already made their own conclusions. McCarthy is doing everything he can to stonewall this investigation. Perhaps he fears that impeachment powers would unearth irrefutable evidence of presidential misconduct requiring a Senate conviction, a worst-case scenario for House Republicans who are all up for reelection. Brian D. King, Tahlequah Ease up, calm down, be civil Sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never hurt me! I may have to rethink that. Good government starts with civility and civil discourse, which appear to be in short supply from many. But, it's got to start somewhere. Perhaps our political leaders could start by being respectful to each other and less interested in generating

drama to make, or hide, a point. Instead of talking about the other side of the aisle, perhaps our congressmen should be talking to them; something that is difficult when using words that are dismissive and denigrating to those whom you have a different view of facts and actions. I would like to believe my voice is represented by the elected representatives we send to Washington. But it's hard to know when I hear them complain about the other (my) side of the aisle, and not a word of what they are doing with the other (my) side.

Whether you believe in more government or less, what we really should believe in is good government. Good government starts with civil conversations about how to be an effective government for all. Compromise can be difficult and yet good governing is built on compromise. For government to be good for everyone, compromise is required. Everybody should feel like their government is protecting their beliefs and rights, and this means everyone should be heard, fairly. That is kind of hard to do when words are used to harm and inflame. Tom Dial, Tulsa Where's the money? Taxpayers of the state of Oklahoma need to be informed on the goals of Gov. Kevin Stitt and Attorney General Mike Hunter to increase revenues from the tribal gambling. What will be the exact use of any anticipated funds from the renewal of the tribal gaming compacts? Voters were duped by the "gambling will pay for our schools" chant that achieved the initial vote to have gambling legalized in the state, then were later informed "well, not all the proceeds will go to education." When reports surfaced on the expenditure the tribes have provided for the state of Oklahoma, they have evoked a feeling of generosity from the tribes for many needs of our state.

I am unable to claim any heritage or attachment to any tribe so the question is not linked to any membership on my part. Basically, the feelings are, "I trust the tribal expenditures more than the state." May we please call for full transparency on how and where these newly desired funds will be spent? And,

may we have it in writing in the compact that any new increases will not be relabeled or recalibrated in the future but exactly as proposed with no changes? Iris Warlick Studenny, Tulsa Editor's note: State Question 712, which set up the state's model Indian gaming compact provided that "the state's portion of the money from the gaming authorized by this act would go for treatment of compulsive gambling disorders, to the education reform revolving fund and for college scholarship." Since 2004, the state has received slightly more than \$1.5 billion from the tribal gaming compacts, most of that money has gone to education. All state lottery profits are also dedicated to education.