

else was derived, the other 52½ percent, ought to go to help develop that arid land out there, to put some water on it, so people could live there and develop it. The other 10 percent was for administration.

If we in Louisiana got some of it, it is just because over a period of time the Federal Government bought some land down there in depression. What happened with regard to Texas? When Texas came into the Union, one of the big arguments against its admission was that Texas had this big public debt, and those who were opposing Texas statehood did not want to assume the Texas national debt at that time, so someone said, "Well, fine, let's us put an amendment in here to say that Texas will keep her public lands, and Texas will pay off her own public debt.

At that time, it looked like a good deal for the United States for the Senator offering that amendment, but it turned out to be a great deal for Texas, public lands has greatly exceeded what the Texas public debt would have been.

So there is a history of your land. It was developed in such a way that those who were carrying the burden of developing it should get the benefit of minerals produced from it, either directly, to a State government to provide for education and roads and public services, or indirectly, by the Federal Government providing for the developments of the overall area.

Personally, I think the 37½ percent is inadequate for those interior States, and I am going to seek to support legislation, and I will offer to amend my proposal, to see that they get the 60 percent instead of the 37½ percent and if the reclamation funds needs more money I will support appropriations to see to it that it has whatever it takes, and we were very, very generous, may I say, when we brought Alaska in, to say that the minerals produced in Alaska would be devoted in large measure to help that State.

Now we have a similar problem, and may I say Louisiana has suffered very badly from poor management of this controversy between the two. It has suffered, may I say, Senator Anderson, because the people at the executive level in Louisiana government, representing the executive of Louisiana and those representing the Federal Government, at the time all this controversy arose to begin with, were not the kind of people that have a way of getting together like you and I do on the finance committee, to say what is good for the Nation, and good for New Mexico, and also good for Louisiana.

We just had some very uncompromising people there at that time, and I wish this committee would find out what the real proposals were at that particular time, even at the executive level.

I would suggest you get Oscar Chapman up here and find out from him what he thought the answer should have been when the whole thing started out. I think he will tell you that his judgment was that the States should have received 37½ percent, plus the right to tax what was produced out there, all the way out to the end of the Continental Shelf, and that a proposed compromise was made along that basis. I regret to say that we had a rather uncompromising person representing Louisiana at that time, who would hear none of it, did not want to discuss anything except the State having all of it, and the result was that the State got the worst of it very badly. I am sorry that that happened, because we would have been a lot better off with 37½ percent