

Prior to working on Capitol Hill, Rotterman had a distinguished career in journalism with the Dayton Daily News. During that time, he interviewed both Richard Nixon and John Kennedy during the 1960 Presidential campaign.

Rotterman never ducked a challenge. In the beginning of his career as a beat reporter, he once posed as a minister and walked out on a rain-soaked edge of an office building with a policeman to lure a suicidal man back to safety.

Lou Rotterman was the product of an earlier generation. He went to war, served his country, and raised a family.

Lou Rotterman is gone, but his successors are out there today working just as hard as he did. We do not read their names in the paper, because they are not in it for the glory. But they do their part to make the world a better place for all of us.

Simply put, Lou Rotterman was part of the Greatest Generation that understood sacrifice, duty, honor, and country. He will be missed by all that knew him.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking God to please bless America, and bless our men and women in uniform.

DOWNED ANIMALS POSE THREAT TO FOOD SUPPLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, to make our communities livable, to make our families safe, healthy and economically secure, we must deal with the issues of food safety. 76 million Americans are ill every year from unsafe food, 325,000 are hospitalized, 5,000 die.

A century ago, Upton Sinclair's epic novel "The Jungle" exposed the scandal in America's meatpacking industry; and yet a century later, we still do not have it right.

Despite telling journalism and concerns from experts in food safety and animal welfare, the cattle industry and some of their key Congressional allies fight to continue allowing almost 200,000 unhealthy animals a year into our food supply. These animals are called "downers" because they are so sick they are unable to stand or walk. They are dragged to slaughter facilities around the country, and most of these sick animals end up in our food supply.

What difference does it make? Downed animals are often afflicted with many, sometimes fatal, illnesses. Sending these sick animals to slaughter facilities where they will mix with healthy animals is exceedingly dangerous.

Many afflicted animals that should have been euthanized at the farm were sent to auction markets and slaughter facilities where they could contaminate healthy animals.

A study of USDA slaughterhouse facilities in almost 1,000 packing plants

in the northeast United States found that 73 percent of downed animals ended up passing inspection and entering the food chain. These animals had afflictions such as gangrene, lymphoma, hepatitis, and pneumonia.

A study by the Livestock Conservation Institute revealed that 14 percent of the downed cows were salmonella positive. One cow even tested positive for a variant of salmonella that kills almost 1,000 Americans each year. This animal passed inspection and entered the food supply.

Another area of concern is mad cow disease, not just because of the dangers to humans, but because of the devastating effect that it can have on the cattle industry itself. Recently, a single infected animal in Canada shut down their entire industry. Perhaps the reason we have not found mad cow disease in the United States is because the American consumer is eating the evidence.

The Federal Government has started to react. The USDA recently added regulations, which Congress would not, to protect the ground beef that goes into school lunches from containing meat from downed animals.

Earlier this year, the USDA began circulating a proposed rule that specifically notes the health hazard for downed animals for consumers. Some fast-food leaders like Jack in the Box, and Burger King and Wendy's have responded to past tragic incidents by raising their standards.

But Congress has not just been "missing in action" to protect the American consumer from tainted beef; some have actually been leading the charge to keep those animals on your table. Some people put the convenience and profit of the cattle industry ahead of public safety.

Last year's agricultural bill passed both bodies of Congress with language to keep the downed animals out, yet in conference the conferees stripped away the language. They led a battle in this year's agriculture appropriations bill against an amendment that would have kept downed animals out of the food supply.

This is serious business. All independent experts know that downed animals are dangerous. Responsible producers understand the problem. Some State regulators have stepped up to deal with protecting their facilities. They are sending the right message, but they only deal with a small part of the overall food chain.

Congress and the Federal Government must act. The downed animals end up as hamburger in America's grocery stores because they are processed in just a few huge centers where the animals are ground up, they disappear into the food chain. The same child that is now safer in school goes home to the family dinner table, where the entire family is at risk.

It is time for Congress to withstand the pressures of the huge packers and their apologists and allies in Congress.

Until the agriculture appropriations bill has finally passed both Chambers, it is possible for the conferees to include provisions protecting the food supply, provisions, as I said, that have passed both Chambers last Congress.

Every single Member of Congress should sign on the critical bipartisan legislation led by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) that would prohibit downed animals from entering the food supply. This legislation already has the support of 119 Democrats and Republicans in Congress.

It is supported by people who care about animal welfare, food safety, to join with the State health officials and responsible members of the cattle industry. All these people know that our Nation needs to produce meat in a humane and safe manner. Continuing to process downed animals for human consumption is not part of the recipe.

COMPREHENSIVE SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is recognized.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, it is another week of major activity in the war on terror. The President will sign the first annual Department of Homeland Security spending bill in American history. The House will continue our consideration of the President's spending request for military and democracy-building operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. American and Coalition Forces will continue their work around the globe to ensure the security of our people and the success of our cause.

None of these actions would be relevant or even possible without the others, because without bolstering our civil defense here at home, our anti-terror activities around the world would be useless; without our aggressive actions to root out and destroy terrorist cells where they live and plan, all of the Homeland Security spending in the world would be useless; and, finally, without an intense commitment to build viable and tolerant democracies in former terrorist states, neither our national nor domestic security goals could be met.

The results speak for themselves. Since 9/11, no terrorist attack has scarred our soil. Two tyrannical regimes have been replaced by fledgling democracies. And threats, be they terrorist states, networks or individuals, have been captured or destroyed, no longer to threaten innocent Americans.

The comprehensive security strategy of the Bush Doctrine that folds in homeland, national and international security priorities is working. Because of that comprehensive strategy, the United States has successfully combatted terrorism abroad and repelled it at home for more than 2 years.

The lesson of the Bush Doctrine is very clear: You cannot separate homeland and national defense. They are one and the same comprehensive and indivisible security policy.

Critics can complain about one application of this policy or another, but given its overwhelming success and the absence of an alternative, these critics do so to the detriment of their own credibility. Without an alternative policy, these critics must be supporting the weak and indecisive foreign policy of the past.

This week, America's war on terror will move forward with strength and confidence, as always, with one objective in mind, and that is victory.

I commend the President for his leadership and urge him to stay bold in his defense of American lives and human freedom.

COMMENTS FROM THE HOME FRONT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, in 1838 a former President, John Quincy Adams, was a Member of this House of Representatives. Congress in those days, conservatives in Congress, had passed a House rule saying that slavery, believe it or not, could not be debated or discussed on the floor of the House of Representatives.

John Quincy Adams decided that he wanted the people of his district and other districts in Massachusetts to be heard, so he brought to the floor, every day or a couple of times a week, letters from his constituents protesting that slavery could not be discussed on the floor and supporting the ending of slavery in the United States.

Today, we are faced with a serious issue, perhaps not the seriousness quite of slavery in our country, the biggest blot in our history, but we are faced with the issues of what we do in Iraq and what we do with Iraq.

Debate in this House has not been particularly open or forthcoming, so I have chosen today, as John Quincy Adams did, to bring letters from constituents about Iraq to the House floor. I have received literally hundreds of them, as have my colleagues, questioning our intentions and the President's intentions, questioning the veracity of the administration, whether the administration has been straightforward with the American people. I would like to share some of those letters with you.

Patty from North Royalton, Ohio, said, "All of the worst case possibilities with Iraq, with the exception of the weapons of mass destruction, of course, and the truth of the administration, have proven true, and the American public is being asked to foot the bill.

"I suggest a proposal to break apart the military spending from the rebuild-

ing. Focus this administration on the bare necessities for now. We are trying to do way too much at one time."

Mary Lu wrote, "U.S. out, UN in. We should pull our soldiers out and turn the rebuilding process over the United Nations. Congress should vote no on the \$87 billion until the President works it out with the United Nations. Roll back the tax cuts to pay for the war. The only way we could responsibly pay for Iraq's reconstruction is by rolling back President Bush's tax cuts for the wealthy. If we roll back the tax cuts on the top 1 percent, we could pay for the \$87 billion and have money left over for other programs, like prescription drugs for the elderly."

Jay of Richfield, Ohio, writes, "If we assume there are 290 million men, women and children in the U.S., that means that every man, woman and child in America will be contributing \$300 to the reconstruction of a country we will never visit, and whose welfare would have never affected us but for the lies of the Bush administration."

Janet from Norton, Ohio, writes, "Please do not vote for one more cent to be spent on this losing proposition in Iraq. Enough is enough."

Judith writes, "Our President has arrogantly put us into a position where we stand, in many ways, alone, and we are making a huge mess of things. We do have an obligation to the Iraqis, but they aren't happy with our presence there and are crippling our ability to help them. The most effective thing we can do is turn over control of the operation to the United Nations."

Helen writes, "Wealthy Republicans who voted for Bush do not send their kids to die in Iraq, and wealthy Republicans made sure their tax money was given to them before presenting the bill in Iraq. The rest of the tax money isn't theirs to spend on defense contracts. It is ours.

"The U.S. kleptocrats want to profit from Iraq," talking about Halliburton and many of the President's friends who are getting the unbid contracts. "They can only do it by keeping the UN out."

I found in these letters, Mr. Speaker, literally dozens of them questioning the fact we are spending \$1 billion a week right now, before the President asked for \$87 billion more. A third of that money is going to private contractors, many of them contributors to the President, most of those contracts unbid, and many of them going to a company called Halliburton, from which Vice President CHENEY is still drawing a \$13,000 a month benefit check.

Andrew writes, "I believe the Bush administration should be required by law to submit to the following conditions before his request for \$87 billion is approved. The \$87 billion should be funded by the immediate cancellation of the recently-passed tax cut for the wealthy, where 43 percent of the tax benefit goes to the richest 1 percent of Americans."

It is clear there is a theme here. The American people in this mail, and in the mail that literally every Member of this Congress is getting, the people of this country are concerned that this \$87 billion is only a start, that it is going to be a lot more in the future. There is no plan. The American people need to continue to speak out.

IRAQI SUPPLEMENTAL SHOULD INCLUDE LOANS, NOT JUST GRANTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, we will soon be asked to provide an additional \$87 billion in order to continue our efforts abroad in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Now, many, as you just heard, are complaining about the costs in Iraq and the billions that will be needed to maintain a stable Iraq into the future. One question I ask for my colleagues and the American people to consider is, what is the cost if we do not act? In reality, very few Members of Congress will vote against the President's supplemental request, but we do not need to blindly cast our vote without providing options on how to at least partially offset the cost for this reconstruction.

I recently had town meetings in my Congressional District. Some of the questions that some of the constituents asked centered on why the American taxpayer has to foot the entire bill for Iraq reconstruction? Why can Iraq not provide funding for reconstruction and security themselves? I think all of my colleagues would agree this is a valid question.

However, with the decrepit state of Iraq's infrastructure and economy, such a contribution from a people just emerging from decades of oppression and neglect, it is impossible to expect Iraq to provide much in the way of reconstruction funding in the near future.

The American people are generous people. They understand that it is for the greater good to help someone help themselves. But they also recognize we cannot continue to provide open-ended monetary assistance if we do not receive something in return. It is a meet-us-halfway approach, if you will.

Why not provide loans for reconstruction, or at least for rebuilding some of the infrastructure, to include electric and water, et cetera? I think that we should consider this as an alternative to the grantmaking that the administration is requesting.

Specifically, these loans should be linked to potential future Iraqi oil revenues. As we know, Iraq has the world's second largest oil reserve, 11 percent of the world's total. However, only 17 of 80 oil fields have been developed. In addition, Iraq has a sizable amount of natural gas reserves that have yet to be