

(10) Charles M. Schulz gave the Nation a unique sense of optimism, purpose, and pride. Whether through the Great Pumpkin Patch, the Kite Eating Tree, Lucy's Psychiatric Help Stand, or Snoopy's adventures with the Red Baron, "Peanuts" embodied human vulnerabilities, emotions, and potential.

(11) Charles M. Schulz's lifetime of work linked generations of Americans and became a part of the fabric of our national culture.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to award posthumously, on behalf of the Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 2 at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. FUNDING AND PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund an amount not to exceed \$30,000 to pay for the cost of the medals authorized by this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to authorize the President to award posthumously a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world, and for other purposes."

Mr. LEACH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3642.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF ASSISTANT OF HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Michelle Giannetta, Staff Assistant of the Honorable GEORGE RADANOVICH, Member of Congress:

May 26, 2000.

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony and documents issued by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California.

Afer consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

MICHELLE GIANNETTA,
Staff Assistant.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

DISTURBING TRENDS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about some disturbing trends in the Middle East. I admire enormously the commitment of Prime Minister Barak of Israel to try to find a peaceful solution to many of the disputes that have troubled the region. I believe historically the record is very clear that Israel sought it first to live in peace with its neighbors. It was forced to resort to armed conflict to defend itself.

Prime Minister Barak to his credit has been willing now after 50 years and more of conflict to take some risks for peace. That is not always unanimously agreed upon within Israel. Israel is, as we know, the only genuine democracy in this part of the world. The people of Israel are contentious in some ways as befits people in a democracy when important issues are at stake. And Prime Minister Barak to me is an admirable example of an elected official who is trying to lead in the direction that he thinks is important.

And in so doing, he has espoused some positions that he believes and I believe will lead to a lasting peace if they meet with an appropriate response from those with whom he seeks to negotiate. What is especially troubling to me has been the negative responses his initiatives have drawn.

His offer to withdraw from the Golan Heights is really by historical standards an extraordinarily generous one. Very few nations which have won this sort of strategic territory and battle have voluntarily given it up, even in the face of the kind of hostility that Syria has evinced towards Israel. But Prime Minister Barak, taking a request politically based on his military judgment, which obviously everyone who knows him respects, was willing to make a deal with the Syrians in which Israel would have given up that very large strategic amount of territory with some safeguards, and essentially, President Assad of Syria refused any kind of reasonable deal.

Interestingly, had Assad agreed to the deal, it would have been controversial within, as real as having given too much to Syria, but Syria would not accept that. For years, people have been urging Israel to withdraw from Lebanon. There is a U.N. resolution that says Israel should withdraw from Lebanon. When the negotiations with Assad ended, because I believe of Assad's unreasonable hostility, Prime Minister Barak again courageously said, I will withdraw unilaterally from Israel; and one of the most extraordinarily depressing reactions I have seen people who had for years had been pressing Israel to withdraw then began to attack Israel for withdrawing unilaterally, as if they needed permission to do what people had been berating them for not doing.

And what happened when Israel withdrew was an outburst of hostility and of inappropriate behavior in much of Lebanon which can only strengthen the hands of those who believe within Israel that Prime Minister Barak has been making a mistake. So in these two important areas with regard to Syria and to Lebanon, you have an elected official, a democratic leader of his country, taking some risks for peace and being met with an extraordinarily hostile reaction; and then, finally, we had a few weeks ago violence on the part of many in the Palestinian areas, including gunfire between the Palestinian authority in Israel.

Again, I want to stress Israel has in the past couple of decades beginning with Prime Minister Begin in the Sinai, engaged in more withdrawal from territory it had been forced to fight to conquer than almost any nation I can think of. And I am talking now about turning it over to the enemies, not with a period of demilitarization. It is not like America, the allies keeping Germany in a very subordinate position for a long time that was not being occupied. It was simply turned over in many cases, and to see the negative reactions from Syria, from people in the south of Lebanon, the more extremists there and within the Palestinian community, is very troubling to me.