# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## SENATE IMMIGRATION BILL (S. 1639)

### HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 28, 2007*

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my concerns over the Senate's Immigration bill.

I am disappointed that the Senate continues to maintain a "Z" visa program within the text that would reward illegal behavior. Not withstanding how its proponents choose to characterize this plan, it represents de facto amnesty and is unfair to those who have patiently pursued the citizenship process legally.

We have some 12 million illegal aliens in this country. Granting amnesty will only push those numbers up, not down, as we saw after the implementation of Simpson-Mazzoli.

The White House and the Senate just do not seem to recognize the fatal flaw in their so-called immigration "compromise": If we cannot control our borders now, then how can we reasonably expect to manage future immigration programs that will inevitably increase the numbers of individuals seeking to enter this country illegally? The end results of this bargain, I fear, will be compromises to the rule of law and to the security of the homeland. And those we most certainly do not need.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LAND GRANT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2007

### HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 28, 2007*

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce legislation that would put the University of the District of Columbia (UDC) on par with all of the other land grant universities around the country.

Land grant institutions play a significant role in ensuring that our nation remains the world leader in the production of food, fuel and fiber. Through a wide range of research and extension activities, U.S. citizens gain useful knowledge on the latest changes in agriculture-based technology that keeps our food supply safe while providing for critical health information on food and nutrition.

Congress authorized land grant status to the University of the District of Columbia in 1974, and since that time the University of the District of Columbia has played a major role in these efforts from an urban point of view as the only all urban land grant institution in the country.

Many are not aware that the University of the District of Columbia is an 1862 Land Grant Institution with specific legislative authority to participate in various United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) research and extension programs. More particularly, the University has specific statutory authority to participate in research funding programs under the Hatch Act, similar to the authority given to other 1862 Land Grant Institutions. This is not the case, however, for the University's extension service activities.

Extension services at the University are awkwardly authorized under Section 208(c) of the District of Columbia Higher Education and Post Secondary Act of 1974, rather than Section 3 of the Smith-Lever Act. While Section 208(c) of the District of Columbia Higher Education and Post Secondary Act of 1974 incorporates by reference the specific extension activities under Section 3 of the Smith-Lever Act, this outdated statutory scheme presents significant barriers to the University's ability to effectively carry out extension activities. The barriers resulting from this statutory scheme present themselves in form and substance while raising issues of equity and fairness. USDA's implementation ofthe Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) best highlights this inequity.

EFNEP is a formula-based nutrition education program authorized under Section 3(d) of the Smith-Lever Act. In Fiscal Year 2006, the Congress appropriated $62 million for the EFNEP program and USDA disseminated these funds, without any nonfederal matching requirement, to the various land grant institutions in the states and territories, except for the University of the District of Columbia. Under current law, Smith-Lever EFNEP funding is made only conditionally available to the University of the District of Columbia through Section 208(c) of the D.C. Postsecondary Education Act, which requires UDC to provide 100% matching funds for its EFNEP funding. UDC is the only 1862 Land Grant Institution required to do so. The language requiring the 100% match for District of Columbia EFNEP programs is clearly a relic of the budget and political climate that existed at the time the EFNEP provision was enacted for the District of Columbia in 1974.

Moreover, as a critical threshold issue, the University does not currently have access to any EFNEP funding because UDC is not in the Smith-Lever Act that guides the appropriations process; no one looks to the D.C. Postsecondary Education Act, so UDC is overlooked in the EFNEP funding allocation.

There is no reason why the District of Columbia's children should have less access to nutrition education programs than children in the states and U.S. territories. It is long overdue to remove this inequitable financial barrier. Neither the continued exclusion of the University from the EFNEP program nor the mandatory matching requirement is supported by USDA's policy goal of ensuring that the EFNEP program reaches all predominantly minority low-income youth and families with nutrition education that leads to sustainable behavior changes.

The legislation that I introduce today corrects this problem along with other barriers to the University's participation in the agricultural research and extension programs, and provides the authority needed for the University to participate in capacity building and facilities programs now being administered at the United States Department of Agriculture. The University of the District of Columbia functions with very limited resources in comparison to the large endowments of most other land grant institutions. Accordingly, a reduction in the current matching requirements for the Hatch Act state agricultural experiment station programs and the other Smith-Lever extension programs, similar to the reduction and waiver provisions authorized in the 2002 Farm Bill for some of the smaller 1862 Land Grant Institutions would be equitable and fair. For this reason, this legislation would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce and waive the nonfederal matching requirement if the Secretary finds that the University will not be in a position to secure nonfederal funds.

Finally, this legislation would allow the University to participate in USDA's competitive capacity and facilities grant programs. Participation in these grant programs would significantly enhance the University's teaching and agricultural research capacity building resources, and its ability to upgrade its research, teaching and extension facilities, thereby recognizing the importance of the University as the only all urban land grant institution performing valuable urban agricultural research and extension services to the District of Columbia community and a predominately African American student population. It is only fair that the University of the District of Columbia is afforded the same opportunity to compete for capacity building and facilities opportunities that the other small, minority-serving institutions are eligible to pursue.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. AL GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, June 28, 2007*

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I inadvertently voted "no" on Rollcall No. 573, the Inslee amendment to H.R. 2643. I intended to vote "aye" on this amendment, which would have prohibited the use of any funds in the bill to issue permits for importation of any polar bear or polar bear part. Protection of our threatened species is a critical objective and I believe that this amendment, had it passed, would have greatly assisted our efforts to protect the polar bear.