

(d) CONSTRUCTION—The compact shall not in any manner alter—(1) any present or future rights and interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in-interest; (2) any tribal trust lands; (3) allotted lands that may be held in trust or lands subject to a Federal restriction against alienation; (4) any boundaries of lands owned by the tribes and nations referred to in paragraph (1), including lands referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3), that exist now or that may be established in the future under Federal law; and (5) the sovereign rights, jurisdiction, or other governmental interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in-interest presently existing or which may be acknowledged by Federal and tribal law.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee (KCAILUC) hereby approve and support the Amendment to H.J. Res. 72 Offered by Mr. Gekas.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing KCAILUC Resolution No. 00-10 was duly adopted at a Regular Monthly Meeting of the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee held at the KCA Administration Office on July 12, 2000, by a vote of 6 For 1 Against 0 Abstain. A quorum being present and at least two representatives from each tribe concurring in the vote.

BILLY EVANS HORSE,

Chairman.

MELVIN KERCHEE, JR.,

Secretary.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.J. Res. 72, a Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Red River Boundary compact. This bipartisan legislation will re-enforce the eroding Red River south bank and establish a new boundary between the states of Texas and Oklahoma. The new boundary is a vegetation line that is not as susceptible to the forces of nature and is substantially the same as the gradient line used to originally determine the states' boundaries.

Initially, three tribal nations, the Kiowa, the Comanche, and the Apaches expressed concerns regarding this legislation's effect on the status of land from which the tribes derive oil and gas royalties. To remedy that issue, language, approved by officials from Texas, Oklahoma, the Indian Tribes, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, was put into the legislation confirming that neither the rights of the Indian nations nor the boundaries of the Indians lands will be altered by the compact.

I commend my colleagues for working together in a bipartisan manner to resolve this important issue and I strongly support the effort.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 72, the Red River Boundary Compact, and urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. Today, with Congressional consent the border dispute between Oklahoma and Texas that has existed for more than 100 years will come to an end.

The official boundary is currently the south bank of the Red River. However, the Red River constantly runs dry, which makes deter-

mining the south bank difficult. There was an obvious need for a new, more definitive way to determine the border.

In 1996, Oklahoma and Texas agreed upon creating a Red River Boundary Commission to solve this border dispute. In the last year, this commission released their findings and both Oklahoma and Texas state governments have agreed on this compromise. This agreement would clarify and affix the boundary between Oklahoma and Texas as the vegetation line on the south bank of the Red River. This agreement would mean that the Red River would be part of the State of Oklahoma, where it belongs.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We need to put a stamp on this agreement which will end the Red River War, and I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 72.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam 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. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 72, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Thursday, July 20, 2000:

H.R. 1791, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for harming animals used in Federal law enforcement;

H.R. 4249, to foster cross-border cooperation and environmental cleanup in northern Europe.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING
NATIONAL MOTTO FOR GOVERNMENT OF A RELIGIOUS PEOPLE

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to

the resolution (H.Res. 548) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the national motto for the government of a religious people, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the national motto of the United States is "In God we trust";

Whereas the national motto was adopted in 1956 and is codified in the laws of the United States at section 302 of title 36, United States Code;

Whereas the national motto is a reference to the Nation's "religious heritage" (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. 668, 676 (1984));

Whereas the national motto recognizes the religious beliefs and practices of the American people as an aspect of our national history and culture;

Whereas nearly every criminal law on the books can be traced to some religious principle or inspiration;

Whereas the national motto is deeply interwoven into the fabric of our civil polity;

Whereas the national motto recognizes the historical fact that our Nation was believed to have been founded "under God";

Whereas the content of the national motto is as old as the Republic itself and has always been as integral a part of the first amendment as the very words of that charter of religious liberty;

Whereas the display and teaching of the national motto to public school children has a valid secular purpose, such secular purpose being to foster patriotism, symbolize the historical role of religion in our society, express confidence in the future, inculcate hope, and instruct in humility;

Whereas there is a long tradition of government acknowledgment of religion in mottoes, oaths, and anthems;

Whereas the national motto serves "the legitimate secular purposes of solemnizing public occasions, expressing confidence in the future, and encouraging the recognition of what is worthy of appreciation in society" (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. at 693 (O'Connor, J., concurring));

Whereas the national motto reflects the sentiment that "[w]e are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being" (*Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 313 (1952));

Whereas President George Washington, in his Farewell Address, stated, "[o]f all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports," and "[w]hatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle," and "let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle";

Whereas President John Adams wrote that "it is religion and morality alone which can establish the principles upon which freedom can securely stand";

Whereas the role of religion in public life is an important one which deserves the public's attention;

Whereas the signers of the Declaration of Independence appealed to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of their intentions, and avowed a firm reliance of the protection of Divine Providence;

Whereas President George Washington, in his First Inaugural Address, said that "it would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply