

AGRICULTURAL REFORM

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, the Senate recently passed their farm bill. In that farm bill, they had payment limitations that I think is the kind of farm policy we should have in this country.

I ask all my colleagues in this Chamber to support the idea of some kind of payment limitations, whether it be \$200,000 or \$300,000 or a half a million dollars, but something so that the megafarms and the megacorporations that own 50,000, 60,000, 80,000 acres are not capturing so much of the proceeds of our farm program payments.

Madam Speaker, there are some people who say that there are payment limits for price supports. There are no payment limits for price supports. They can do an end-run.

Let me just demonstrate the top five recipients of farm program payments for 1996 through 2000, according to the Environmental Working Group's Web site: Riceland Foods, \$49 million; Farmers Rice Co-op, \$38 million; Harvest States Co-op, \$28 million; Tyler Farms, \$23 million; and Producers Rice Mill, \$19 million.

It is reasonable to have farm policy that helps most of the farmers in this country. We can argue about what a family farm is, but what we cannot argue about is farm policy that gives most of the money to the megafarms.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6:30 p.m. today.

FAMILY SPONSOR IMMIGRATION
ACT OF 2001

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1892) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the acceptance of an affidavit of support from another eligible sponsor if the original sponsor has died and the Attorney General has determined for humanitarian reasons that the original sponsor's classification petition should not be revoked.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 3, line 4, after "law," insert "sister-in-law, brother-in-law,".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1892, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1892, the Family Sponsor Immigration Act of 2001, was introduced by the two gentlemen from California (Mr. CALVERT) and (Mr. ISSA).

I want to thank them for bringing to our attention an unintended quirk in the Immigration and Nationality Act that needlessly keeps families separated. I also want to thank them as well for developing this bill, which corrects the problem.

Each year, the United States provides hundreds of thousands of immigrant visas for spouses and other family members of U.S. citizens and permanent residents. Tragically, each year a number of these U.S. citizens and permanent residents petitioning for their family members will die before the immigration process is complete.

Generally, INS regulations provide for automatic revocation of a petition when the petitioner dies. The consequences are severe for a beneficiary when his or her petitioner dies before the beneficiary has adjusted status or received an immigrant visa. If no other relative can qualify as a petitioner, then the beneficiary would lose the opportunity to become a permanent resident.

For instance, if a petition is revoked because a widowed citizen-father dies after petitioning for an adult unmarried daughter, the daughter would have no living mother to file a new petition. If another relative can file an immigrant visa petition for the beneficiary, that beneficiary would still go to the end of the line if the visa category was numerically limited.

For instance, if the daughter's mother was alive, she could file a new first family-preference petition. However, the daughter would lose her priority date based on the time her father's petition had been filed with the INS and would receive a later priority date based upon the filing date of her mother's petition.

Because of the severe consequences of the revocation of a visa petition, INS regulations do allow the Attorney Gen-

eral, in his or her discretion, to determine that, for humanitarian reasons, revocation would be inappropriate, and thus complete the unification of a family.

However, there is a complication. The Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 requires that when a family member petitions for a relative to receive an immigrant visa, the visa can only be granted if the petitioner signs a legally-binding affidavit of support promising to provide support of the immigrant.

If the petitioner has died, obviously he or she cannot sign the affidavit. Thus even in cases where the Attorney General feels a humanitarian waiver of the revocation of the visa petition is warranted, under current law a permanent resident visa cannot be granted because the affidavit requirement is unfulfilled.

H.R. 1892 solves this dilemma. It simply provides that in cases where the petitioner has died and the Attorney General has determined for humanitarian reasons that revocation of the petition would be inappropriate, a close family other than the petitioner would be allowed to sign the necessary affidavit of support.

Eligible family members in H.R. 1892, as it passed the House last July, would include spouses, parents, grandparents, mothers- and fathers-in-law, siblings, adult sons and daughters, adult sons and daughters-in-law, and grandchildren. Legal guardians would also be eligible.

The Senate passed a minor amendment to the bill to add brothers- and sisters-in-law, and this is the motion to concur in the amendment that is before the House today.

□ 1415

H.R. 1892 is humanitarian and pro-family. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1892 and thank the co-sponsors of this legislation, the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT); and as well I thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary for his astuteness and commitment to this legislation, having spearheaded its movement through the House the last time we were able to vote on it. I as well thank the ranking member for his commitment to these issues.

I believe that this is a legislative initiative that is extremely important because it speaks to the cornerstone of immigration policy in this Nation, and that is family reunification. In spite of all the tragedies that we have faced in the last year and reminding ourselves of the tragedy of September 11, I believe this Nation should never stray

away from the honest need to reunite families who legally want to access the opportunities of citizenship in this country.

Last July I supported this measure as it passed the House and the Senate. The Family Sponsor Immigration Act of 2001 is a very important immigration bill with a bipartisan support. We are correcting a glitch in the immigration law. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I was pleased to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), the chairman of that subcommittee, on that legislation along with the original sponsor of this legislation as well. Again, I thank them for their service and their leadership.

Currently, the Immigration and Nationality Act requires that the same person that petitions for the admission of an immigrant must be the same person who signs the affidavit of support. That person is called a sponsor. So if the sponsor dies, current law does not allow someone else to sign the affidavit of support, although they are a legitimate person, although there is no attempt to commit fraud; and that person is unable to adjust his or her status to receive an immigrant visa even though they have been waiting in a line, have a very procedurally correct manner, and adhering to laws of our Nation. There lies the problem. There lies the complete loss of your opportunity to seek citizenship in a legal manner.

Such consequence of the law toward a beneficiary when his or her petitioner dies before the beneficiary has a chance to adjust status or receive an immigrant visa has been and continues to be harsh and only creates a pool of individuals that remain illegally in this country.

H.R. 1892 will amend the Immigration Nationality Act to allow an alternative sponsor, a close family member; and with the Senate amendment, a close family member can be a sister now or a brother-in-law.

Additionally, I am pleased that we were able to work out an agreement last July that further allows alternative sponsors to be a spouse, a parent, mother-in-law, father-in-law, sibling, child if at least 18 years of age, son, daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, grandparent or grandchildren and now a brother-in-law or sister-in-law of a sponsored alien or legal guardian of a sponsored alien all with the idea of reunifying a family.

I am grateful to all of the members of the subcommittee, Democrats and Republicans, who saw fit to ensure that families can stay together. This bill, H.R. 1892, which has bipartisan support, is important because in the event of death of a sponsor, the beneficiary's application will now be able to have someone else sign the affidavit of support and the beneficiary's application for permanent residency can move forward without losing the beneficiary's

priority date, in essence, not having them go to the back of the line and, therefore, delaying them being reunited with their family.

Just think of moms and dads whose children are here, young children are here or the father and children are here and they want to reunite with that mother or father.

Madam Speaker, I believe this is an important initiative that we have done in a bipartisan way, and it speaks loudly to the fact that the United States will craft a very legitimate immigration policy that addresses the question that we are a country of laws, but we are also a country of immigrants.

Madam Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 1892, and I believe that it is a legislative initiative that speaks to the cornerstone of immigration policy in this Nation: family reunification. Last July I supported this measure as it passed the House and the Senate. The Family Sponsor Immigration Act of 2001 is a very important immigration bill. With bipartisan support, we are correcting a glitch in the immigration law. As the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I was pleased to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), the chairman of the subcommittee, on this legislation, along with the original sponsors of this legislation as well, and I thank them for their service and leadership.

Currently, the Immigration and Nationality Act requires that the same person that petitions for the admission of an immigrant must be the same person who signs the affidavit of support: the sponsor, that person is called. So, if the sponsor dies, current law does not allow someone else to sign the affidavit of support, although they are a legitimate person, although there is no attempt to commit fraud, and that person is unable to adjust his or her status to receive an immigrant visa, even though they have been waiting in a line in a very procedurally correct manner and adhering to the laws of our Nation. Such consequences of the law toward a beneficiary when his or her petitioner dies before the beneficiary has a chance to adjust status or receive an immigrant visa, has been and continues to be too harsh.

H.R. 1892 will amend the Immigration Nationality Act to allow an alternative sponsor, a close family member, and with the Senate amendment a close family member can be a sister or brother-in-law.

Additionally, I am very pleased that we were able to work out an agreement last July that further allows alternative sponsors to be a spouse, parent, mother-in-law, father-in-law, sibling, child, if at least 18 years of age, son, daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, grandparent or grandchild, and now a brother or sister-in-law of a sponsored alien or legal guardians of a sponsored alien, all with the idea of reunifying a family.

This bill, H.R. 1892, which has bipartisan support, is important because in the event of the death of the sponsor the beneficiary's application will now be able to have someone else sign the affidavit of support and the beneficiary's application for permanent residency can move forward without losing the beneficiary's priority date, in essence, not having

them go to the back of the line and, therefore, delaying them being reunited with their family.

Madam Speaker, I believe this is an important initiative that we have done in a bipartisan way, and I ask my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1892, Family Sponsor Immigration Act of 2001, as amended in the Senate. I want to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER); our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS); the leadership on both sides of the aisle that worked diligently to bring a fuller and more complete reform to the floor here today.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), who is not on the committee but who has constituents that were faced with exactly this problem and brought it to our attention, only to find that I had constituents with this exact same problem, thus creating the need for the bill.

Last I would like to thank Senator FEINSTEIN who has taken time out of her busy schedule on the Senate side to research this and to make those amendments which, in fact, make this a more thorough bill and less likely to need to be revisited.

Lastly, rather than speaking of the merits of this bill, I would like to go down on record as saying that the Family Sponsor Immigration Reform Act is just another example of how we work together on a bipartisan basis to find the legal alternatives to immigration, and to encourage those who play by the rules, those who go through the hoops, sometimes a decade, to get their legal status should be rewarded.

At a time when we are saying to those who come here illegally that we will not tolerate it any more, I hope this is the first of many reforms that allows us to say we have an open door if you want to come through the front door, and we are closing and locking the back door.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude by again acknowledging my support, but also raising two important points that I would like to acknowledge. I might say that the chairman of the full committee has expressed a great interest in this, and I want to thank him for his support on these issues.

I hope that we can finally bring some rest to the passage of 245-i which is another legislative initiative that deals with the reuniting of families. I know that our committee worked very hard on that legislation.

Then I think, again, in the shadow of the tragedies that we faced this past September, it is important that we

move consistently with a purpose to re-order our immigration policies by means of restructuring the INS with an assistant attorney general for immigration affairs so that we can share data and information. Intelligence is clearly a key element of what we need to reform our immigration policies and to fight terrorism, two dual issues which I think we can do.

Immigration does not equate to terrorism. I hope we have an opportunity to debate those legislative initiatives, get them passed, and begin on a pathway of formulating a very comprehensive immigration policy for the United States of America. I offer my support for this legislation.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, today I support and applaud the House's final passage of the "Family Immigration Sponsor Act." And, I thank my colleague, Mr. CALVERT, for his work on this issue.

A family in my district, with a tragic story, has become a well-known example of why this bill's passage is necessary. Mrs. Zhenfu Ge, a 73-year-old Chinese national, came to the United States in 1998 to help care for her dying daughter and her daughter's children. Her daughter—my constituent Yanyu Wong—requested that her mother be allowed to stay in America to take care of her grandchildren. Following the rules of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), my constituent immediately submitted the appropriate paperwork to sponsor her mother's petition for a green card so she could stay in the United States.

Sadly, on April 15, 2001, Yanyu Wong lost her fight against cancer. This was only 11 days before the INS was scheduled to grant Mrs. Ge's permanent resident status. In a desperate attempt to keep his mother-in-law in the country, my constituent's husband petitioned to be Mrs. Ge's new sponsor. However, INS law mandates the sponsor be another adult blood relative. Without an adult blood relative left alive to sponsor her, Mrs. Ge was told that she must go back to China and restart the visa process.

Realizing the devastating results of these circumstances, I introduced H.R. 2011, a private bill to allow Mrs. Ge to remain legally in the United States while she completed the process to attain legal status. Forcing Mrs. Ge to abandon her family during this time would only add to the family tragedy. Enabling Mrs. Ge to stay in the country could give the children a living link to their mother, and her culture, something they would be denied forever if Mrs. Ge is deported.

With the passage of Representative CALVERT's Family Immigration Sponsor Act, Mrs. Ge will be able to stay in America and take care of her grandchildren, while she completes the immigration process. With the passage of this bill, Mrs. Ge can keep her promise to her daughter.

There's no doubt that the Family Immigration Sponsor Act will be able to assist other families in situations similar to Mrs. Ge's. Passing H.R. 1892 is the smart way for this country to help encourage families to stay intact.

Mr. WU. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1892, the Family Sponsor Immigration Act, introduced by my colleague Representative KEN CALVERT.

Our government plays a key role in shaping the lives of thousands of immigrants. It is our duty to ensure that our system is fair to aspiring residents.

Under our current law, someone applying to become a permanent U.S. resident must be sponsored by a family member who assumes financial responsibility for that person. However, if the sponsor dies before U.S. permanent residency is granted, the applicant must find another sponsor and start the process all over again. This process can take as long as 7 years.

This must change.

As an immigrant, I understand the difficulties of the immigration process. One should not have to wait another 7 years if the sponsor dies. H.R. 1892 addresses this issue. It would allow for substitute sponsors. More importantly, it will help unite families that have been separated.

I applaud Representative CALVERT for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my fellow colleagues to join in support of this bill which will ensure a fair process for those seeking U.S. residency.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1892.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 2002

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1206) to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1206

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Appalachian Regional Development Act Amendments of 2002".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

(a) THIS ACT.—The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.); and

(2) to ensure that the people and businesses of the Appalachian region have the knowledge, skills, and access to telecommunication and technology services necessary to compete in the knowledge-based economy of the United States.

(b) APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965.—Section 2 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting after the third sentence the following: "Consistent with the goal described in the preceding sentence, the Appalachian region should be able to take advantage of eco-industrial development, which promotes both employment and economic growth and the preservation of natural resources."; and

(2) in subsection (c)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting "including eco-industrial development technologies" before the semicolon.

SEC. 3. FUNCTIONS OF THE COMMISSION.

Section 102(a) of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by inserting "and support," after "formation of";

(2) in paragraph (7), by striking "and" at the end;

(3) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(9) encourage the use of eco-industrial development technologies and approaches; and
"(10) seek to coordinate the economic development activities of, and the use of economic development resources by, Federal agencies in the region."

SEC. 4. INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL ON APPALACHIA.

Section 104 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended—

(1) by striking "The President" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—The President"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL ON APPALACHIA.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—In carrying out subsection (a), the President shall establish an interagency council to be known as the 'Interagency Coordinating Council on Appalachia'.

"(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The Council shall be composed of—

"(A) the Federal Cochairman, who shall serve as Chairperson of the Council; and

"(B) representatives of Federal agencies that carry out economic development programs in the region."

SEC. 5. TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE.

Title II of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App.) is amended by inserting after section 202 the following:

"SEC. 203. TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may provide technical assistance, make grants, enter into contracts, or otherwise provide funds to persons or entities in the region for projects—

"(1) to increase affordable access to advanced telecommunications, entrepreneurship, and management technologies or applications in the region;

"(2) to provide education and training in the use of telecommunications and technology;

"(3) to develop programs to increase the readiness of industry groups and businesses in the region to engage in electronic commerce; or