REPUBLICAN CONGRESS IS MELTING

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, as we bring this 104th Congress to an end, I look at the pieces of legislation that the Republicans are so proud of, the fact that they brag about bringing the Members of Congress under all of the laws that the rest of the Nation are under. Well, that was the very first bill that I introduced back at the beginning of the 103d Congress.

And they are so proud, of course, of the fact that they passed the Kennedy-Kassebaum bill, even though Senator KENNEDY, who was one of the authors of the bill, is one of the liberals they love to hate.

They are so proud of the fact that they were able to raise the minimum wage and indeed that was something that Senator KENNEDY, the liberal that they love to hate, also put forward.

It kind of reminds me of the politician who is talking to the farmer, and he is bragging about all the things he did, and he noticed the smile on the farmer's face, and he says, ''Why are you smiling?'', and the farmer points out the fact that the politician is standing in a big, fresh cow pie and he says, ''I think you are melting.''

I think indeed as the bucket brigade from the Republican side walks around talking about how they saved us from all of the ice that was delivered to our offices, that they better look around, because I think they are melting.

TOO MANY PRODUCTS AND TOO FEW JOBS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. trade deficit once again is at a record level. Japan is in to us for more than $60 billion. China is eating our clock at about $40 billion. Mexico and Canada are now approaching $40 billion.

The result is, since 1991, we have lost 13 million jobs and 60 percent of those workers today are in jobs that pay less than half of what they previously earned. So when some spin-master coined the term ''downsizing,'' they were very conservative.

The truth is, it does not take a rocket scientist, since NAFTA, GATT, WTO, ''GNAT'' and ''PMS,'' I say to my colleagues, America is sending jobs and money overseas, and in return, we get a boatload of Suzukis and two baseball players to be named later.

Beam me up. What is next, folks? NAFTA II?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of the jobs left.

104TH CONGRESS MOST SUCCESSFUL IN A GENERATION

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the American people may wonder why over the last few weeks they have heard so much hate, venom and smear uttered on this floor. People who should know better have been on this floor, making hateful statements, venomous statements and statements of smear.

The fact is that this is their political agenda, and what they are worried about is the fact that the 104th Congress has been the most successful Congress in a generation, and the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, has been the most successful Speaker of this century. That is what they are concerned about.

MUCH ACCOMPLISHED, MUCH YET TO BE DONE

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, it is always humorous to listen to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] stand here and complain about this Congress. The gentleman said that the Accountability Act was one that he introduced in the 103d Congress. That was a Democrat Congress with a Democrat President, and he could not get it passed.

We have heard that the minimum wage was a Democratic initiative, but they had a Democrat Congress and a Democrat President in the 103d and they could not get it passed.

This Congress has also imposed congressional reforms and the line-item veto. Indeed, 7 of the 14 accomplishments listed by the President in his acceptance speech in Chicago were items in the Contract With America that he signed. Seventy percent of that contract is signed into law and the President is proudly taking credit for it.

This has been a successful Congress. We have achieved much telecommunications reform, welfare reform, the Farm Act. We have achieved much, but we have much left to do, and we intend to be back here in the majority in January, completing our work.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he 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 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later in the day.

SAVINGS IN CONSTRUCTION ACT OF 1996

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4233) to provide for appropriate implementation of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 in Federal construction projects, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4233

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 ''Savings in Construction Act of 1996''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The Metric Conversion Act of 1975 was enacted in order to set forth the policy of the United States to convert to the metric system. Section 3 of that Act requires that each Federal agency use the metric system of measurements in its procurement, grants, and other business-related activities, unless that use is likely to cause significant cost or loss of markets to United States firms, such as when foreign competitors are producing competing products in non-metric units.

(2) In accordance with that Act and Executive Order 12770, of July 25, 1991, Federal agencies increasingly construct new Federal buildings in round metric dimensions. As a result, companies that wish to bid on Federal construction projects increasingly are asked to supply materials or products in round metric dimensions.

(3) While the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 currently provides an exemption to metric usage when impractical or when such usage will cause economic inefficiencies, amendments are warranted to ensure that the use of specific metric components in metric construction projects do not increase the cost of Federal buildings to the taxpayers.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 4 of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 (15 U.S.C. 205c) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (3);

(2) by striking ''Commerce.'' in paragraph (4) and inserting ''Commerce;''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (4) the following:

''(5) 'full and open competition' has the same meaning as defined in section 403(6) of title 41, United States Code;

''(6) 'total installed price' means the price of purchasing a product or material, trimming or otherwise altering some or all of that product or material, if necessary to fit with other building components, and then installing that product or material into a Federal facility;

''(7) 'hard-metric' means measurement, design, and manufacture using the metric system of measurement, but does not include measurement, design, and manufacture using English system measurement units which are subsequently reexpressed in the metric system of measurement;

''(8) 'cost or pricing data or price analysis' has the meaning given such terms in section 304A of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 254b); and

''(9) 'Federal facility' means any public building (as defined under section 13 of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (40 U.S.C. 612) and shall include any Federal building or construction project—

''(A) on lands in the public domain;

''(B) on lands used in connection with Federal programs for agriculture research, recreation, and conservation programs;

''(C) on or used in connection with river, harbor, flood control, reclamation, or power projects;

''(D) on or used in connection with housing and residential projects;

''(E) on military installations (including any fort, camp, post, naval training station, airfield, proving ground, military supply depot, military school, or any similar facility of the Department of Defense);

''(F) on installations of the Department of Veteran Affairs used for hospital or domiciliary purposes; or

''(G) on lands used in connection with Federal prisons,

but does not include (i) any Federal Building or construction project the exclusion of which the President deems to be justified in the public interest, or (ii) any construction project or building owned or controlled by a State government, local government, Indian tribe, or any private entity.''.

SEC. 4. IMPLEMENTATION IN ACQUISITION OF FEDERAL FACILITIES.

(a) The Metric Conversion Act of 1975 (15 U.S.C. 205 et sec.) is amended by inserting after section 13 the following new section:

''SEC. 14. IMPLEMENTATION IN ACQUISITION OF CONSTRUCTION SERVICES AND MATERIALS FOR FEDERAL FACILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Construction services and materials for Federal facilities shall be procured in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth in chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, section 2377 of title 10, United States Code, title III of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 251 et seq.), and section 3(2) of this Act. Determination of a design method shall be based upon preliminary market research as required under section 2377(c) of title 10, United States Code, and section 314B(c) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 264b(c)). If the requirements of this Act conflict with the provisions of section 2377 of title 10, United States Code, or section 314B of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, then the provisions of 2377 or 314B shall take precedence.

''(b) CONCRETE MASONRY UNITS.—In carrying out the policy set forth in section 3 (with particular emphasis on the policy set forth in paragraph (2) of that section) a Federal agency may require that specifications for the acquisition of structures or systems of concrete masonry be expressed under the metric system of measurement, but may not incorporate specifications, that can only be satisfied by hard-metric versions of concrete masonry units, in a solicitation for design or construction of a Federal facility within the United States or its territories, or a portion of said Federal facility, unless the head of the agency determines in writing that—

''(1) hard-metric specifications are necessary in a contract for the repair or replacement of parts of Federal facilities in existence or under construction upon the effective date of the Savings in Construction Act of 1996; or

''(2) the following 2 criteria are met:

''(A) the application requires hard-metric concrete masonry units to coordinate dimensionally into 100 millimeter building modules; and

''(B) the total installed price of hard-metric concrete masonry units is estimated to be equal to or less than the total installed price of using non-hard-metric concrete masonry units. Total installed price estimates shall be based, to the extent available, on cost or pricing data or price analysis, using actual hard-metric and non-hard-metric offers received for comparable existing projects. The head of the agency shall include in the writing required in this subsection an explanation of the factors used to develop the price estimates.

''(c) RECESSED LIGHTING FIXTURES.—In carrying out the policy set forth in section 3 (with particular emphasis on the policy set forth in paragraph (2) of that section) a Federal agency may require that specifications for the acquisition of structures or systems of recessed lighting fixtures be expressed under the metric system of measurement, but may not incorporate specifications, that can only be satisfied by hard-metric versions of recessed lighting fixtures, in a solicitation for design or construction of a Federal facility within the United States or its territories unless the head of the agency determines in writing that—

''(1) the predominant voluntary industry consensus standards include the use of hard-metric for the items specified; or

''(2) hard-metric specifications are necessary in a contract for the repair or replacement of parts of Federal facilities in existence or under construction upon the effective date of the Savings in Construction Act of 1996; or

''(3) the following 2 criteria are met:

''(A) the application requires hard-metric recessed lighting fixtures to coordinate dimensionally into 100 millimeter building modules; and

''(B) the total installed price of hard-metric recessed lighting fixtures is estimated to be equal to or less than the total installed price of using non-hard-metric recessed lighting fixtures. Total installed price estimates shall be based, to the extent available, on cost or pricing data or price analysis, using actual hard-metric and non-hard-metric offers received for comparable existing projects. The head of the agency shall include in the writing required in this subsection an explanation of the factors used to develop the price estimates.

''(d) LIMITATION.—The provisions of subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall not apply to Federal contracts to acquire construction products for the construction of facilities outside of the United States and its territories.

''(e) EXPIRATION.—The provisions contained in subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall expire 10 years from the effective date of the Savings in Construction Act of 1996.''.

SEC. 5. OMBUDSMAN.

Section 14 of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975, as added by section 4 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(f) AGENCY OMBUDSMAN.—(1) The head of each executive agency that awards construction contracts within the United States and its territories shall designate a senior agency official to serve as a construction metrication ombudsman who shall be responsible for reviewing and responding to complaints from prospective bidders, subcontractors, suppliers, or their designated representatives related to—

''(A) guidance or regulations issued by the agency on the use of the metric system of measurement in contracts for the construction of Federal buildings; and

''(B) the use of the metric system of measurement for services and materials required for incorporation in individual projects to construct Federal buildings.

The construction metrication ombudsman shall be independent of the contracting officer for construction contracts.

''(2) The ombudsman shall be responsible for ensuring that the agency is not implementing the metric system of measurement in a manner that is impractical or is likely to cause significant inefficiencies or loss of markets to United States firms in violation of the policy stated in section 3(2), or is otherwise inconsistent with guidance issued by the Secretary of Commerce in consultation with the Interagency Council on Metric Policy while ensuring that the goals of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 are observed.

''(3) The ombudsman shall respond to each complaint in writing within 60 days and make a recommendation to the head of the executive agency for an appropriate resolution thereto. In such a recommendation, the ombudsman shall consider—

''(A) whether the agency is adequately applying the policies and procedures in this section;

''(B) whether the availability of hard-metric products and services from United States firms is sufficient to ensure full and open competition; and

''(C) the total installed price to the Federal Government.

''(4) After the head of the agency has rendered a decision regarding a recommendation of the ombudsman, the ombudsman shall be responsible for communicating the decision to all appropriate policy, design, planning, procurement, and notifying personnel in the agency. The ombudsman shall conduct appropriate monitoring as required to ensure the decision is implemented, and may submit further recommendations, as needed. The head of the agency's decision on the ombudsman's recommendations, and any supporting documentation, shall be provided to affected parties and made available to the public in a timely manner.

''(5) Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede the bid protest process established under subchapter V of chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code.''.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—This Act shall not apply to contracts awarded and solicitations issued on or before the effective date of this Act, unless the head of a Federal agency makes a written determination in his or her sole discretion that it would be in the public interest to apply one or more provisions of this Act or its amendments to these existing contracts or solicitations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring before the House of Representatives H.R. 4233, the Savings in Construction Act of 1996. H.R. 4233 was introduced yesterday by Congressman CHRIS COX and Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA, chairwoman of the Technology Subcommittee. I would like to thank both these Members for their tireless work on this important legislative measure.

H.R. 4233 is a modified version of H.R. 2779, a bill by the same name. H.R. 2779 was ordered reported by the Science Committee on June 26, 1996, and passed the House on July 23, 1996 as part of the Corrections Day Calendar.

H.R. 4233 represents a compromise worked out with the Senate which I hope the other body will send expeditiously to the President. The bill is now entirely noncontroversial, and I

hope all my colleagues will support the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BROWN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I will be brief, although in light of the schedule that I observe today, we might as well take as much time as we can.

I would like to confirm the statement that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has already made. The bill before us has been the result of bipartisan, bicameral cooperation and has produced a good piece of legislation.

There are a couple of points that I would like to make.

I rise in support of H.R. 4233, the Savings in Construction Act, which is now before us. The text of this bill has been agreed upon by the Senate and is based on the House-passed H.R. 2779.

I would like to express my appreciation of the courtesy shown to House Members on both sides of the aisle by our Senate colleagues in developing this new bill.

This bipartisan and bicameral cooperation has produced H.R. 4233 which is superior to the previously House-passed H.R. 2779 on a number of points. I would like to mention a few examples.

First, H.R. 4233 clearly demonstrates that the legislative intent of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 and the subsequent 1988 amendments remain the policy of the United States as well as the law of the land.

Nothing in this bill is contrary to our longstanding goal of catching up to the rest of the world in the use and understanding of the metric system of measurement.

As Congressman EHLERS so eloquently stated during the Science Committee debate on this measure, it is really a shame that our economy has lost billions of dollars over the years due to the inability of U.S. industry to meet the metric requirements of export markets.

The sooner the metric system becomes the standard for measurement here as it is in the rest of the world, the better off we will be.

Second, H.R. 4233 continues the House intent of easing the transition to metric by the concrete masonry industry and the recessed fluorescent lighting industry by taking into consideration their special needs.

The decision of the Senate to sunset both of these exemptions to metric conversion after 10 years is sensible. This 10-year exemption provides these industries plenty of time to convert while preserving the overall goal of U.S. metric-based construction. These two exemptions are consistent with the policy of the 1988 amendments of exempting industries from metric conversion where conversion does not make economic sense.

Third, H.R. 4233's transition rules and other qualifications on the exemptions are helpful and add certainty to the process. H.R. 4233 takes a number of positive steps to make sure delaying metric conversion does not increase Federal costs and ensures that metric projects that are now underway are not required to absorb the costs associated with reengineering to the inch-pound system.

Finally, H.R. 4233 has done a credible job of streamlining the original ombudsman provisions in H.R. 2779. These new provisions will reduce costs and better serve the need of potential Government contractors.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which gives small businesspeople a needed break while still helping us move forward to when the U.S. economy will reap the benefits of being fully metric.

□ 0915

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me time. I appreciate the remarks of the ranking member.

As the sponsor of this legislation, I am pleased we are here at the conclusion of the 104th Congress to see this measure enacted into law. There is not much question that the metric system is a superior alternative to the other random measures that have been employed throughout the ages. In particular, it is the superior system in the world today. The question before us is not whether the metric system is a good idea or whether Congress in 1975 was wise to put us on an inextricable path toward metrification, but, rather, whether we can inject some common sense into the enterprise.

We have to ask ourselves what is good about the metric system to begin with. Probably the best thing about it is that it permits the addition, multiplication, subtraction, division, with ease, of fractions. The metric system is not new. In fact, the Mohenjo-Daro civilization on the Indus River about 5,000 years ago used the decimal system. The Scotsman, John Napier, who pioneered the use of the decimal point so that we could show fractions to the right-hand side and whole numbers to the left, lived at the turn of the 16th century.

There is nothing new about this at all. What is new is that we are finding increasingly better ways to use tiny measures. It is routine now for us to measure in angstroms. We have to ask ourselves whether or not the Congress should pass a law outlawing the use of fractions, when after all, the great attraction of the decimal system is we can use with great facility fractions. That, unfortunately, is at least what the administration had been doing up until we introduced this measure.

Specifically, they said that using the metric system in America means you cannot use fractions, you have to use whole numbers, and it was an edict, a fiat, a new case, that fractions should be outlawed in American manufacturing.

Let me give you an example. In Wilmington, MA, a company named Lightolier that manufactured light fixtures, has done so for 70 years, employing about 200 people, was told they had to use round numbers if they wanted to sell light fixtures to the Federal Government for Federal buildings. This was no small thing, because they would have had to buy all new equipment. They would have had to retool in their entire factory. The general manager of the plant told the local newspaper they could not do this without spending at least $5 million. This is a company with 200 workers.

We cannot retool, he lamented, and if somebody else does, we are at a disadvantage. During the past year, Lightolier sales have fallen due to their inability to participate in Federal projects, forcing them to lay off 35 workers.

Now, the taxpayer is not any better off for this, because the cost of the projects goes up 15 to 20 percent. Many examples: Kansas City, MO, the courthouse was estimated to cost $117 million. Fortunately for the American taxpayer, the Clinton administration was forced to drop their hard metric requirement, let people use decimal fractions, and the revised cost of the project turned out to be $97 million, or a savings of about $20 million.

That is what this bill is all about. I am very, very pleased our colleagues on the Senate side, as well as our colleagues here, the minority and majority working together, have come up with a bill that is acceptable to everyone that will put us on the path of common sense.

We ought to, as we try to serve the interests of the American people, remember that there is a limit to what Government can do. When Arabic numerals were introduced into Europe, it was not because a Government passed a law saying you cannot use Roman numerals anymore, and, by the way, there are always advantages to Arabic numerals, they add up to columns and are much superior. It was because merchants of the time found it worked a lot better.

That is what is happening in commerce in America around the world right now. The Federal Government's job should be to facilitate that. What we have seen here is an example, if I may say so, of stupidity, or at least a preference for complex error to simple truth. The advantage of the metric system is its ability to work in fractions. We should not outlaw fractions, we should welcome them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for the work on this bill, particularly

the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. This is a measure that originally came up on Corrections Day for obvious reasons. I am pleased as we adjourn this Congress momentarily, that this will be part of our finished work.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering H.R. 4233, the Savings in Construction Act of 1996, introduced by Congressman COX of California.

H.R. 4233 reflects bipartisan modifications made by both the House and the Senate to H.R. 2779, the original Savings in Construction Act. H.R. 2779 passed the House on July 23 under corrections day calendar consideration and was reported out of the Science Committee and the Technology Subcommittee, which I chair.

H.R. 4233 provides for the appropriate implementation of the Metric Conversion Act of 1975 in Federal construction projects.

The Metric Conversion Act, as amended, requires all Federal agencies to use the metric system in procurements, grants, and other business-related activities, except when such use is impractical or is likely to cause significant inefficiencies or loss of markets to U.S. firms.

In the implementation of the Act, however, certain American construction industries have suffered an adverse economic impact and the government has had to incur additional costs for using metric in certain Federal construction projects.

There is a need to correct the Metric Conversion Act by providing for flexibility in its implementation.

With H.R. 42233, we can achieve the goals of the act, in Federal construction projects, without closing project bids to American companies, especially small manufacturers who do not export and who cannot afford to retool their production facilities at great cost to produce products which are identific except for a slight change in size.

In subcommittee hearings, we heard testimony from these affected companies that, under the current implementation of the act, domestic producers are at a competitive disadvantage with respect to foreign metric producers, the number of companies that compete for contracts with the Federal Government are reduced, and manufacturers are forced to maintain double inventories of similar but incompatible products.

Mr. Speaker, as the chair of the Technology Subcommittee, which has jurisdiction over our Nation's technology and competitiveness policy, I am a strong supporter of encouraging the use of the metric system in the interests of our Nation's industrial competitiveness in world markets.

Despite our current laws to promote metric, the United States still remains the only major industrialized country in the world which does not predominately use metric as a standard measurement system.

Converting to the metric system is a goal that Congress has wisely decided and should be fully supported. We must continue to promote, sensibly, and as vigorously as possible, the metric system to advance our Nation's long-term international competitiveness.

H.R. 4233 is a bill worthy of our support because it balances the need for the Federal Government to maintain our current efforts to promote metric which providing for appropriate implementation of the Metric Conversion Act in Federal construction.

I commend Congressman COX for his corrective legislation providing for this less costly and less intrusive method of meeting the goals of the Metric Conversion Act.

I also wish to recognize the chairman of the Science Committee, Congressman WALKER, the Committee's Ranking Member, Mr. BROWN, and the Ranking Member of the Technology Subcommittee, Mr. TANNER, for their bipartisan efforts in reporting this legislation to the House.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 4233.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4233.

The question was taken.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

CROWS LANDING CALIFORNIA LAND CONVEYANCE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4088) to provide for the conveyance of certain property from the United States to Stanislaus County, CA, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4088

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY

Notwithstanding any other provision of law or regulation, as soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (in this Act referred to as ''NASA'') shall convey to Stanislaus County, California, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in section 2.

SEC. 2. PROPERTY DESCRIBED.

The property to be conveyed pursuant to section 1 is—

(1) the approximately 1528 acres of land in Stanislaus County, California, known as the Crows Landing Facility of NASA Ames Research Center (formerly known as the Naval Auxiliary Landing Field, Crows Landing);

(2) all improvements on the land described in paragraph (1); and

(3) any other Federal property that is—

(A) under the jurisdiction of NASA;

(B) located on the land described in paragraph (1); and

(C) designated by NASA to be transferred to Stanislaus County, California.

SEC. 3. TERMS.

(a) CONSIDERATION.—The conveyance required by section 1 shall be without consideration other than that required by this section.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION.—(1) The conveyance required by section 1 shall not relieve any Federal agency or any responsibility under law for any environmental remediation of soil, groundwater, or surface water. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to alter the allocation of environmental responsibility contained in the Memorandum of Understanding between the Department of the Navy and NASA, dated December 22, 1992.

(2) Any remediation of contamination, other than that described in paragraph (1), within or related to structures or fixtures on the property described in section 2 shall be subject to negotiation to the extent permitted by law.

(c) RETAINED RIGHT OF USE.—NASA shall retain the right to use the property described in section 2 for aviation activities, without consideration and on other terms and conditions mutually acceptable to NASA and Stanislaus County, California.

(d) RELINQUISHMENT OF LEGISLATIVE JURISDICTION.—NASA shall relinquish, to the State of California, legislative jurisdiction over the property conveyed pursuant to section 1 by filing a notice of relinquishment with the State of California, which shall take effect upon acceptance thereof as prescribed by the laws of California.

(e) ADDITIONAL TERMS.—The Administrator of NASA may negotiate such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyance required by section 1 as are appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill would transfer the Crows Landing facility at Ames Research Center to the surrounding jurisdiction. The landing facility is no longer essential to NASA's needs. But if transferred to the county, it will provide that county with a potential economic development tool by providing needed airport capability. However, if in the future NASA needs to use the facility, it would be able to do so, and has therefore given its approval for this transfer.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BROWN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, the chairman has properly described the bill. I have nothing further to add. I ask that the House pass the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4088, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.