

In my state of Hawai'i, charter schools have been an exciting development in public education in decades. With more and more charter schools emerging each year, currently 27, they have managed to succeed despite institutional opposition in bringing their brand of education in the communities.

These growing pains and other obstacles make this national recognition even more deserved. But for these very reasons, charter schools also deserve their fair share of resources from federal and state governments.

A specific source of great pride within the Hawai'i charter school community is the development of Native Hawaiian charter schools. Na Lei Na'auao, the Hawaiian Charter School Alliance, serves over 1,500 Native Hawaiian public school students. The Alliance, whose focus is "Education with Aloha" seeks to enable Native Hawaiian students to achieve educational success with culturally-driven methods.

The Native Hawaiian charter schools and Hawai'i's other charter schools, both existing and future, need a federal government to be clear and unequivocal in its continued support for the concept of charter schools. They also need full parity in funding between traditional public schools and charter schools.

H. Res. 781 is welcome and needed, but these great words must now be partnered with action. I look forward to working with my colleagues and other charter schools believers toward this realization of the dream.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time and encourage support for this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 781.

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. KIND. Mr. 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 question will be postponed.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 359) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 359

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR D.C. SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN.

On June 9, 2006, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives

and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, the 2006 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (in this resolution referred to as the "event") may be run through the Capitol Grounds as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics summer games.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the event.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 359.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 359 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be held on June 9, 2006.

The Special Olympics is an international organization dedicated to enriching the lives of children and adults with disabilities through athletics. The Torch Run has historically been the largest and most successful Special Olympics fundraiser. Last year, for instance, the Torch Run raised over \$20 million globally and over \$70,000 locally. These funds make it possible for athletes with disabilities to compete in the annual Special Olympics Summer Games.

The United States Capitol Police will host opening ceremonies for the Torch Run, which will take place on the West Terrace of the Capitol. Over 2,000 law enforcement representatives are expected from more than 60 local and Federal law enforcement agencies, and they will participate in this annual event in support of the Special Olympics.

Congress has traditionally supported this worthy cause by authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds. I encourage

my colleagues to join the law enforcement community in supporting the Special Olympics and join me in supporting this resolution.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this event needs really little introduction. Eunice Kennedy Shriver started the concept of the Special Olympics in the early 1960s when she established and opened a summer day camp for people with intellectual disabilities.

2006 marks the 35th anniversary of the D.C. Special Olympics. The torch relay event is a traditional part of the opening ceremonies for the Special Olympics, which will take place at Catholic University. The torch relay event has become a highlight on Capitol Hill and is an integral part of the Special Olympics.

Each year, approximately 2,500 Special Olympians compete in over a dozen events, and more than 1 million children and adults with special needs participate in Special Olympics programs worldwide.

The event is supported by literally thousands of volunteers in the region and is attended by thousands of family and friends of the Olympians.

The goal of the games is to bring mentally challenged individuals into the larger society under conditions whereby they are accepted and respected. Confidence and self-esteem are the building blocks for these Olympic games.

So I stand in support of this resolution and urge my colleagues on my side of the aisle to support this resolution for this very worthwhile endeavor of the Special Olympics. I urge support of H. Con. Res. 359.

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

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. 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 New York (Mr. KUHLMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 359.

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. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. 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 question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL CONVEYANCE OF ANY INTEREST RETAINED IN ST. JOSEPH MEMORIAL HALL

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass

the bill (H.R. 4700) to provide for the conditional conveyance of any interest retained by the United States in St. Joseph Memorial Hall in St. Joseph, Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4700

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF RETAINED INTEREST IN ST. JOSEPH MEMORIAL HALL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the terms and conditions of subsection (c), the Administrator of General Services shall convey to the city of St. Joseph, Michigan, by quitclaim deed, any interest retained by the United States in St. Joseph Memorial Hall.

(b) ST. JOSEPH MEMORIAL HALL.—In this section, the term “St. Joseph Memorial Hall” means the property subject to a conveyance from the Secretary of Commerce to the city of St. Joseph, Michigan, by Quitclaim Deed dated May 9, 1936, recorded in Liber 310, at page 404, in the Register of Deeds for Berrien County, Michigan.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subsection (a) is subject to the following terms and conditions:

(1) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the City of St. Joseph, Michigan, shall pay \$10,000.00 to the United States.

(2) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Administrator of General Services may require such additional terms and conditions to the conveyance under subsection (a) as the Administrator considers appropriate to protect the interest of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KUHLMAN) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

□ 1115

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4700.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 4700 was introduced by Representative UPTON from Michigan on February 1, 2006. This bill conveys an interest retained by the United States of America in the St. Joseph Memorial Hall in St. Joseph, Michigan.

St. Joseph, Michigan, is in the process of redeveloping an area of the downtown to create a recreational and educational and cultural district. This development will link downtown St. Joseph with the beautiful lakefront district, creating a more inviting environment for residents, for businesses and for tourists. The project is intended to make St. Joseph a more attractive place to live and work and to play, while also improving the local economy.

H.R. 4700 is necessary to allow for the incorporation of St. Joseph Memorial Hall into those redevelopment plans. Memorial Hall's use is limited by deed restriction, placed on the property by the Federal Government more than 60 years ago. While similar deed restrictions in the city have been lifted, the restriction on Memorial Hall remains, making it impossible for the redevelopment of the neighborhood to continue.

Limitations on this tiny parcel of land located in the center of the redevelopment will significantly jeopardize the city's plans if not lifted. H.R. 4700 is a sensible, simple solution that will allow the City of St. Joseph to proceed with redevelopment. I support this measure, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4700 authorizes the conveyance of any interest retained by the United States in St. Joseph Memorial Hall in St. Joseph, Michigan, in the City of St. Joseph, Michigan.

This bill merely completes a land transfer between the Federal Government and the City of St. Joseph, Michigan, which began back in May, 1935. At that time, the city received a non-historic building and property with restricted use for a public park. In 1954, the public use restriction was lifted on the parcel just north of the building through Public Act 348.

The city officials have requested this transfer as the city is contemplating a redevelopment plan for the downtown which would utilize the parcel of land and the building. The city is prepared to pay \$10,000 to the General Services Administration for the transfer.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 4700 and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

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

Mr. KUHLMAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would say at this point that the sponsor of the bill, Mr. UPTON of Michigan, had intended to be here to speak on the bill but was at the last minute taken away to a leadership meeting that is very, very important to the long term of this country and certainly to the world. I would like to say that, as a result thereof, obviously he is not here to speak on this bill.

As we look at items like this, what we see from a general overall standpoint is that oftentimes there are deed restrictions and limitations put on communities years ago that are no longer of any real interest or any real need in this particular area. So what we see from time to time as part of the evolution of our process of managing is, in fact, that what we have to do is to modify those provisions; and this is the perfect case.

Now, there are many cities and communities, counties, villages across the

country who are trying to revitalize themselves in ways which will be beneficial for the creation of jobs for the community and the people who reside there. This is one of those components. This is one of those actions. A small little city in a small little State called Michigan, a small part of the large country and the larger part of the world is obviously trying to revitalize their activities and was prevented from doing such immediately by a restriction placed by this big, bad at times, government on them.

So we are attempting to remove that, and hopefully this bill will do that.

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 New York (Mr. KUHLMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4700.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL ENERGY PRICE PROTECTION ACT OF 2006

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5253) to prohibit price gouging in the sale of gasoline, diesel fuel, crude oil, and home heating oil, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5253

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 “Federal Energy Price Protection Act of 2006”.

SEC. 2. GASOLINE PRICE GOUGING PROHIBITED.

(a) UNLAWFUL CONDUCT.—

(1) UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE ACT OR PRACTICE.—It shall be an unfair or deceptive act or practice in violation of section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act for any person to sell crude oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, home heating oil, or any biofuel at a price that constitutes price gouging as defined by rule pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term “biofuel” means any fuel containing any organic matter that is available on a renewable or recurring basis, including agricultural crops and trees, wood and wood wastes and residues, plants (including aquatic plants), grasses, residues, fibers, and animal wastes, municipal wastes, and other waste materials.

(b) PRICE GOUGING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission shall promulgate, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, any rules necessary for the enforcement of this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—Such rules—

(A) shall define “price gouging”, “retail sale”, and “wholesale sale” for purposes of this Act; and

(B) shall be consistent with the requirements for declaring unfair acts or practices in section 5(n) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(n)).