got substantial start-up advice and assistance from the University of Georgia. More recently, it received federal venture capital to finance the expansion that helped break into the black. Most of all, it did intensive research on its own—acquiring four patents while substantially improving its product and making it more desirable and profitable.

Scientific Ag is the 2-year-old creation of a group of Georgia Tech researchers, who plan to put about as much emphasis on doing research on new industrial uses for farm materials as they do in selling the peanut hull-based activated carbon they have perfected and are producing for sale. This new firm, which has also relied on the country's whole spectrum of research programs, is just now getting to the production stage, and I believe its future is also very promising.

These companies are fairly representative of this whole movement. They are the end result of the partnership between the public and private sectors—that wide range of research programs that are collectively providing the scientific advances and the business assistance that make our farmers and manufacturers competitive in the world.

This is a partnership we must nurture and build upon. It would be catastrophic if we ever let our research infrastructure break down. Inadequate research would be a disaster for our economic future just as it would be for our national defense. If we failed to maintain a lead in military weaponry, you know what would happen—the country's influence would be weakened and our national interests would become more vulnerable throughout the world. If we failed to maintain our economic lead, our position in the world would also be weakened—as would as our standard of living.

Overall, this Ag Research Reauthorization bill strengthens the role of government in ag research—not just in terms of authorizing funds, but by ensuring that the inseparable bond between the public and private sectors involved in ag research is reinforced in the funding formulas themselves.

When we preserve this partnership, we are preserving something that is historic. Early in the nation's history, the federal government got involved in agriculture by collecting seeds from throughout much of the world and distributing them to farmers so they could experiment with new crops. This activity was managed by the Patent Office, which began to expand its farm research role in the 1840's by publishing new discoveries by our farmers for use by other farmers. In 1887, the Hatch Act greatly expanded the federal government's agricultural research activities by setting up the first experiment stations at a number of colleges in the 13 states.

Out of this beginning grew the collaboration that now exists. The private sector is the biggest part of this partnership. But the public contribution is not far behind. According to the National Research Council, private expenditures account for about 57 percent of our agricultural research and government about 43 percent. We need both.

The Georgia Research Alliance does a great job of promoting a sound, responsible, innovative, highly-diversified research infrastructure, and I commend them for what you are doing to enhance the quality of life for everyone. They are certainly doing its part to maintain this partnership, and it is up to us in Congress to make sure the federal government continues to contribute its share.

Government must stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the business and educational communities to produce the healthiest and most abundant food and fiber supply in the world; achieve our potential in agricultural exports and restore the balance of trade; reduce our dependence on oil imports; protect the environment; and keep the country economically secure for our generation and for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in sending this bill to conference.

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 365.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 365, the resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

RE-REFERRAL OF EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION 6736 TO COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from the consideration of Executive Communication 6736, an Environmental Protection Agency rule on State Implementation Plans under the Clean Air Act, and that Executive Communication 6736 be re-referred to the Committee on Commerce.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair intends to postpone appointment of conferees on S. 1150 until after 5 p.m. today in order to preserve the motion to instruct the conferees.

HOWARD C. NIELSON POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3120) to designate the United States Post Office located at 95 West 100 South Street in Provo, Utah as the ''Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building,'' as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3120

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Post Office located at 95 West #100 South in Provo, Utah, shall be known and designated as the ''Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States Post Office referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us was introduced on January 28, 1998, by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) and cosponsored by all Members of the House delegation from the State of Utah pursuant to the policy of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. This legislation was before the committee on February 12, at which time it was amended to reflect the correct address of the facility. The address of the postal facility in the original bill read 95 West 100 South Street. The committee unanimously passed the bill with an amendment correcting the address to read 95 West Number 100 South.

The amended bill designates the U.S. Post Office located at that location as the Howard C. Nielson Post Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of representatives who have cosponsored this bill. I know they will take the opportunity to expound upon Mr. Nielson's great history and his service to this country so, therefore, I would simply note that, as has happened in many occasions in the past, this recipient, I think, reflects very favorably on the kind of individual that we have historically honored with the designation of the United States Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) who has been the prime motivator and mover of this legislation for comments that he might have.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, when my office and I considered honoring one of the great Americans who has had an impact not only on my own district, but at the national level, our thoughts turned almost immediately to Howard Nielson.

I approached several of Howard's former colleagues including the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Commerce, on which Howard sat. They wholeheartedly supported this tribute and recalled fond memories.