

that was the basis for the law, S. 1901, 83d Congress, shows that this section is the substance of a provision that I had proposed at that time.

The committee report, accompanying the bill sets forth the following explanation:

The provision for the adoption of state laws as Federal Law shall never be interpreted as a basis for claiming any interest in or jurisdiction on behalf of any State for any purpose over the seabed and subsoil of the Outer Continental Shelf, or the property and natural resources thereof, or the revenues—or the revenues, I emphasize that—"therefrom."

That is from Senate Report 411 of the 83d Congress. Now during this same executive session, the following colloquy took place at the time of this discussion of the adoption of the language of paragraph 3 of section 4, and also, the language in the report:

Senator CORDON. To me it adds nothing.

Senator ANDERSON. I can answer only for myself, everywhere we have been given the statement, don't you worry, these states will back in, demanding their share of this revenue again.

Senator CORDON. I suspect they will be.

Senator ANDERSON. I suspect they will be, too, but I wanted to get something in the law that I could point to on the floor of the Senate next time, if I happen to be here, or that my grandchildren can point to if they are here.

Senator MILLIKIN. That is what is known as a butterball.

At this point is deleted material that is not pertinent.

Then the executive session transcript goes on:

Senator JACKSON. Before you go to sulphur, may I suggest that the staff be authorized to get up appropriate language to bolster our colloquy in connection with the amendment just adopted, making it clear that the state law referred to in Section 4(a) is merely for the purpose of filling these voids and to make it more applicable to Federal law.

Senator WATKINS. And that in no case can the State law be used if there is a Federal enactment.

Senator JACKSON. Just so there will not be any question on the floor, we can have it in the report.

In the floor debates on the measure, Senator Guy Cordon, floor manager of the bill, stated to the Senate:

Section 4 might be said to be the heart of the bill legislatively and administratively. I may state the committee considered several approaches to this problem. Obviously, one such approach would, of course, have been the extension of State laws, and with them, State boundaries, to the outer edge of the shelf.

I mention this, Governor, because those of us who were present at that time still have fresh memories of what we could see as a problem in the future. The Submerged Lands Act, which we had passed previously, gave to the States all of the subsoil and minerals out to the edge of State boundaries; namely, to the 3-mile limit. In the case of Texas and Florida, there are different historical facts, and, with respect to these two States, the State boundaries run out further, to the 3-league limit.

We wanted to make it very clear that these lands beyond the boundaries were Federal lands, not within the jurisdiction of any State, and it seems to me that the precedent—

Governor McKEITHEN. Mr. Chairman, it is very clear to us. We don't come here claiming such a right under existing law. We make no such claim at all.