

DeFazio amendment would have severely hindered this partnership would have delayed attention to this agricultural crisis in my state. For this reason, I could not support the Bass-DeFazio amendment.

I know that many of my colleagues have similar concerns. They object to the inhumane use of Wildlife Services in the western states, but rely on the useful Wildlife Services funds in their districts. I urge the conferees for the Agricultural Appropriations bill to seek a solution to this conundrum that will eliminate inhumane Wildlife Services practices without hindering such important programs as Bovine TB control.

Hon. JOE SKEEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR JOE: This is to express the Department of Agriculture's concerns about a proposed amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill that would cut \$7 million from the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for its Wildlife Services (WS) program. The Department urges that this amendment not be passed.

While the amendment's supporters contend that the proposed funding reduction would only affect predator control programs for private ranches, in reality significant budget reductions in this program would affect other WS program activities as well. The same wildlife biologists who handle agricultural protection work provide protection against threats to public health and safety, damage to property, and protection of natural resources such as threatened or endangered species. A cut of \$7 million in such a personnel-intensive activity would result in a serious weakening of the WS infrastructure through large-scale reductions-in-force. This will result in the elimination of work to protect endangered and threatened species, prevent bird strikes at airports, and control animals that can transmit diseases to humans such as rabies, plague, histoplasmosis, and Lyme disease.

Most State and local governments are not in a position to deal with these problems alone. This is why the WS program is largely a cooperative program. In fact, cooperators provide more than \$30 million in funding for WS activities. Many cooperators have indicated that they could not fund wildlife management activities alone. Thus, a loss of Federal support for this program could ultimately lead to the loss of State and local funding as well. As you know, the President's budget reduced WS by \$1.8 million from the FY 1999 level by assuming that cooperators could be encouraged to cover a larger share of the program. Larger cuts would be extremely difficult for Federal and State officials to manage.

The Department also wishes to reiterate its continuing support for predator control work. Protecting agricultural resources is an investment we make on behalf of producers and consumers. The total value of agricultural production in the United States is estimated at about \$200 billion annually based on cash receipts at the farm gate. Agricultural losses to wildlife in this country are estimated to range from \$600 million to \$1.6 billion annually. A disproportionate share of this burden falls on small farmers. The National Commission on Small Farms defines small farms as those with less than \$250,000 in gross receipts annually or farms with an

average size of less than 1,129 acres. WS estimates that more than 80 percent of its cooperative agreements in the United States are with small farms and ranches.

The range and extent of wildlife problems continues to grow each year in response to expanding wildlife populations such as predators, geese, deer, beavers, cormorants, and other animals. There is an increasing need to look at these problems from a national perspective to avoid simply moving the problem from one location to another. WS provides the responsible leadership necessary to bring balance to the equation. The Department urges Congress to reject the proposed amendment.

Sincerely,

DAN GLICKMAN,
Secretary.

A TRIBUTE TO THE MEMBERS OF
THE YOUNG ISRAEL OF AVENUE
K ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 74TH
ANNUAL JOURNAL LUNCHEON

HON. ANTHONY D. WEINER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1999

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues to pay tribute to the members of Young Israel of Avenue K on the occasion of its 74th Annual Journal Luncheon.

The members of Young Israel of Avenue K have long been known for their commitment to community service and to enhancing the quality of life for all New York City residents.

This year's luncheon is not only a festive happening, it is a chance for all of us to celebrate and pay tribute to a group of individuals who have dedicated their lives to helping others. This year's honorees truly represent the best of what our community has to offer.

Each of today's honorees, Drs. Fred and Sheri Grunseid and Shelly and Roberta Lang, have continuously surrounded themselves and their families in the warmth of Judaism through their involvement with Young Israel of Avenue K.

Drs. Fred and Sheri Grunseid and Shelly and Roberta Lang have each accumulated many years of devoted service to Young Israel of Avenue K and the entire community. Through their repeated acts of generosity toward and on behalf of Young Israel, they have consistently proven themselves to be pillars of strength and support for my constituents.

Each of today's honorees has long been known as innovators and beacons of good will to all those with whom they come into contact. Through their dedicated efforts, they have each helped to improve my constituents' quality of life. In recognition of their many accomplishments on behalf of my constituents, I offer my congratulations on their being honored by Young Israel of Avenue K on the occasion of its 74th Annual Journal Luncheon.

CALLING FOR STRONGER UNITED
STATES ACTION TO END THE
WORLD'S LONGEST RUNNING
WAR IN SUDAN

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 9, 1999

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call my colleagues' attention to a recent editorial appealing for higher-level United States diplomatic attention to pressing for an end to the war in Sudan (Christian Science Monitor, "Sudan: to End a War," June 2, 1999).

I ask that the text of this editorial be entered into the RECORD. It echoes the appeal twenty colleagues and I sent to Secretary of State Madeline Albright in a June 1, 1999 letter (renewing a similar appeal made one year ago) to appoint a special envoy of stature to focus diplomatic attention on the resolution of the political issues and civil war that are the root cause of Sudan's crisis. Two Washington Post editorials on Sudan in the past year have also supported our approach.

Mr. Speaker, war is hell, but Sudan's war is like no other in the suffering it has inflicted. Sudan's brutal conflict is the longest running civil war in the world, and has killed nearly 2 million people, far surpassing the death toll in Kosovo and many humanitarian disasters combined. Since 1983, Sudan's civil war has killed 180 people per day, on average, most of them Christian or non-Muslim Southerners.

More than 2.5 million Sudanese were at risk of starvation when I last visited Sudan in May, 1998 during the last major famine in which an estimated 100,000 people died. The potential for serious food shortages and large-scale malnutrition continues. As long as it drags on, Sudan's war will continue to perpetuate the cycle of misery that has already claimed nearly two million lives over the past 15 years.

Throughout the war, the rebels and the Government of Sudan each have made repeated predictions of decisive military victories over the other side that have never materialized, and no significant shift in the current stalemate or in the military balance of power is foreseen in the near future. Despite limited progress, peace talks continue to founder, and that pattern is sure to continue without sustained high-level diplomatic attention from the United States and the international community. By all indications, without concerted international diplomatic attention and intervention, Sudan's war can and will continue to drag on as it has almost without interruption for the past four decades.

Humanitarian aid aimed at saving lives and easing human suffering must continue. Nonetheless, the United Nations, relief agencies and others have questioned whether aid has enabled the endless pursuit of war and terrorism. In late 1998, the State Department declared Sudan an emergency—for the 10th consecutive year—so that another \$70 million to \$100 million in U.S. disaster aid could be sent to those in need. The total U.S. contribution during the last decade has been more than \$700 million. We all must ask ourselves how long this can continue, and what could be