in effect through July 12 we can make no estimate as to how widespread this concern is. But I want to serve notice today, that I will offer this amendment year after year until this provision which allows landlords to ''take the money and run'' is fixed.

And another farmer wrote me recently,

By all accounts my farming operation is rated as one of the top five in my county. We (my father and brother) combine ourselves so we rely on no outside help . . . We specialize in production of rice, corn and soybeans. We lease 75% of ground to farm which is the cause of our problem.

The landowner can now, terminate a lease of the tenant, . . . with the sole purpose of collecting the payment and not producing any crops on that land. . . . it allows investors to buy real estate and use the payment to help pay for the land, while not allowing a producer to farm it. . . . It was not the intent of this legislation to give land owners or any one the chance to exploit this bill into another public relations nightmare.

I must however express my opposition to the cap on sugar payments that is included in this bill. While I will not offer a motion to strike this provision, its impact will be devastating to the sugar beet farmers in my District. This bill caps the U.S. raw sugar price at 117.5 percent of the loan rate, or 21.5 cents per pound. This about 1.5 cents below current prices. According to USDA, so much foreign sugar would have to be imported to reduce the raw sugar price to the capped level, that the refined sugar prices beet producers receive for their crop would plummet to about 24 cents per pound from the current 32 cents per pound. This cap will reduce the value of the sugar produced by beet growers by $650 million.

Traditional farm programs continue to receive a decreasing portion of our spending and in my view we should target our scarce agricultural dollars to small family farmers. I opposed the recent farm bill because I do not believe that it did enough to target assistance to family farmers and to provide them with a safety when times are bad. While the farm bill made progress by enacting a $40,000 payment limitation, I remain concerned that large corporate farmers can still have access to Federal payments.

In the decade of the 1980's we have slowly eroded the basis of American agriculture—the family farmer—and are moving in the direction of large corporate farms. We must address the increased concentration in agricultural markets that is squeezing family farmers out of business. We must also ensure that commodity prices are maintained at a level high enough to compensate for costs of production and to maintain standards of living in order to attract and retain individuals in farm production. And further, we must also negotiate trade agreements which encourage and enhance the ability of family farmers to compete in world markets.

In agriculture trade, we must also work to recapture lost markets and increase exports. As American agricultural exports grow, foreign agriculture exports are being shipped to the United States in greater magnitude. Since 1981, our agricultural exports have declined from $43.8 billion to a low of $26.2 billion in 1986 and are projected to be a record $60 billion next year. At the same time agricultural imports have increased from $10.8 billion to approximately $25 billion in 1995. In many cases these are products our own farmers could be selling.

In closing, I want to again commend the chairman and the ranking member for putting together a good bill. I urge the Members to support this fiscally responsible measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS) having assumed the chair, Mr. GOODLATTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, H.R. 3603, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BURR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. VOLKMER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. SMITH of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUYER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BEREUTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today after 5 p.m. and June 12.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to: