

Insular Affairs. However, in view of the vote of yesterday, it now appears that we have the substance of S. 50 before us, as a part of the unfinished business. I have not had time to prepare a lengthy address giving a full discussion of every aspect of the Alaska statehood bill. Since I am leaving town this afternoon and will be necessarily absent for a few days, I desire to make a brief statement covering some of the high points of the Alaska statehood bill, which is now before us as title II of S. 49. For details on the bill, I refer Members of the Senate to Senate Report No. 1028 on S. 50, which is, I believe, reasonably complete.

I believe that the pending measure is by far the best Alaskan statehood bill that has ever been considered by either House of Congress or reported by either committee. In fact, the changes from previous statehood proposals made by the Senate committee are so far-reaching and fundamental that this bill must be considered a totally new approach to the problems involved in granting statehood to Alaska.

In the past, I have been opposed to every previous version of an Alaskan statehood bill, because I felt that none of them provided Alaskans with a basis for making a success of their new State. All previous Alaskan statehood bills proposed to make Alaska a State in theory, but in practice to withhold control and ownership of the resources and of the Territory from the jurisdiction of the proposed State.

There is in Alaska a great urge to get rid of the excessive Federal restrictions and limitations on the development and use of the resources of the Territory—restrictions which appear to follow unavoidably from the fact of Federal ownership of almost all those resources. Senators should realize that today, 37 years after our acquisition of Alaska, the Federal Government still owns ninety-nine and nine-tenths of the land area of Alaska, including all the oil and coal, substantially all the better timber, all the prospective hydroelectric power sites, and almost all the other valuable resources generally.

The sense of frustration of Alaskans against this overwhelming dominance of the Federal Government in the affairs of their Territory is an impressive thing to learn of. During recent years, this frustration has expressed itself in a repeated demand for statehood, as a means of escaping from control by a distant bureaucracy in Washington.

Unfortunately, there has been in the past, the States and in Alaska also, some confusion and misunderstanding as to the true significance of statehood. Statehood by itself is nothing. Statehood by itself is hardly more than the right to elect Senators and Congressmen and to vote for President.

The important question has always been, Under statehood, who would control the land and resources of the new State? Under statehood, would the Federal Government continue to own most of the land surface and retain all the mineral rights? Or would the State be given control of at least a share of its own resources?

To my mind, that has always been the fundamental issue involved in Alaskan statehood.

I have felt compelled to oppose each of the previous statehood bills because they failed to give any substantial land or resources to the proposed State. Those bills would have given Alaska the political status of a State, but would have denied the substance of statehood—the opportunity to grow and develop, which can come only with State or private control of economic resources.

Thus, for example, the first Alaskan statehood bill to come seriously before our committee, in 1948, would have given Alaska only two sections out of each surveyed township of land in Alaska. This proposal appeared to

be fair on its face, but the joker lay in the fact that only a tiny portion of the land area of Alaska had been surveyed by the Federal Government, or is likely to be in the near future. At the rate at which surveys are proceeding at present, this proposal would have given the State barely 1,000 acres per year. That bill provided certain other grants of land, but even so, at such a rate of progress a full century could pass before the State would obtain title to 1 percent of its vast land area.

That is the reason for much of the opposition, within Alaska, to these previous statehood proposals, because many Alaskans understood, better than the average stateside resident, that statehood would be almost meaningless unless it gave them freedom from restrictive Federal controls over their resources. That is why I have always opposed statehood unless it could be done under an equitable enabling act. That language, an equitable enabling act, is in the Republican platform for 1952. I subscribe to it fully.

I am proud to say that our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has attacked this problem boldly and has, in this bill, gone a long way toward solving it. This bill, in my judgment, would give Alaska statehood in fact, as well as statehood in theory. It is, in my opinion, an equitable enabling act.

At this time, I shall not attempt to analyze the various provisions of the bill in detail. The major changes made by our committee, however, fall into three major categories.

First, we have attempted to unlock the coal, oil, and certain other resources of the Territory for State ownership or private development for the benefit of the Nation and of the people of Alaska. Previous statehood bills did nothing whatever about this problem. In fact, previous statehood bills probably had the effect of largely denying the State any chance of securing any mineralized lands of any kind, on the basis of established judicial interpretation of the language used in those previous bills. We have corrected that language in our bill, so that mineral rights, as well as land surface, may pass to the State. This point is of extreme importance to Alaska, since Alaska's future probably lies largely in the mineral field, rather than in agricultural development.

This bill, I might add, does not go quite as far in that direction as I personally would like to see it go. For example, it does nothing about the vast naval oil reserve in the far North, where the Navy and Interior Departments between them hold, locked away from use, a tremendous area, greater in size than each of 33 of the present 48 States. However, I am still hopeful that some means may be found to permit the resources of that vast acreage to be put to the use of mankind.

The second major improvement of this bill is the large acreage of land granted to the State for its development—100 million acres. This grant is by far the largest land grant ever proposed for any one State. Some Members of the Senate may feel it is too large. Yet, even after these lands are vested in the new State, the Federal Government will still hold title to over 70 percent of Alaska's land area. Surely a Federal predominance, expressed in Federal ownership of 70 percent of the land area of the State, should satisfy the most ardent advocates of Federal centralization.

Again let me say that I personally would have liked to see us go much farther. I would have liked to give the new State control over all its land area, as we used to do with all the older States of our Nation. Thus, in all the present States, with the exception of the 11 Western States, the percentage of land owned by the Federal Government is usually nominal and hardly ever rises above 10 percent. However, I feel that the proposed grant to Alaska in this bill

should be sufficient to enable the State to survive and grow.

In connection with these land grants, the committee has also inserted appropriate provisions to make sure that the new State is not hamstrung by a cloud on titles to the grants, arising from vague and unsubstantial Indian claims to vast areas. At the same time, we have done full justice to the native population of the Territory by providing a new means through which patents can be granted to them for the lands actually possessed and used or occupied by them for a certain period.

The third major group of changes in this bill provides certain types of temporary Federal financial assistance to the new State, to help it bridge a difficult transition period. Without such provisions, the new State might have faced extreme financial problems immediately upon attaining statehood. These provisions will be particularly helpful in connection with road construction, which is a pressing need in Alaska.

While these financial amendments will be helpful, I feel I should warn Alaskans that they will not last long. The new State should not come to rely on this type of special assistance too heavily. The Federal grants for road construction in particular decline sharply after the first year.

No doubt the detailed provisions of this bill will be fully analyzed during the course of this debate. The various changes from previous statehood bills deserve the close scrutiny of the Senate. We of the committee are proud of this bill. In my report from the committee I have referred to this bill as a "new approach" to the problem of statehood for Alaska. I think that is what it is. We feel we have offered a solution, not only to the statehood question as such but also to the problem of developing Alaska.

We believe that Alaska has the potentialities of becoming one of the richest States of the Union. We feel that this bill offers the vehicle to achieve that goal. If it should happen that the State of Alaska will in the future outstrip many of the older States in wealth and population, those of us who represent the present States will not look on that growth with envy and bitterness. On the contrary, what strengthens one part of our Nation strengthens all of it. In the event this bill is enacted, those of us who have had a part in giving birth to the new State will watch with the friendly approval of the traditional family doctor to see our creation justify the hopes and aspirations that we have for it.

#### PERMITS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF RADIO STATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4557) to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to permits for construction of radio stations.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the purpose of this proposed legislation is to simplify the procedure for securing certain licenses to operate certain types of radio facilities.

Section 319 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934 provides that no license shall be issued for the operation of any radio station unless the permit for its construction has been first granted by the Commission. However, section 319 (b) exempts from this requirement Government stations, amateur stations, and stations upon mobile vessels, railroads, rolling stock, or aircraft.

This bill would exempt from such requirements in addition to the types of stations referred to above, all other mo-

mobile stations, which have come into existence since the passage of the Communications Act of 1934. It would also give the FCC discretionary authority to waive the requirements of a construction permit in the case of radio stations which are operated in the common carrier, safety or special radio services. However, construction permits could not be waived by the FCC in cases of radio and TV stations which are engaged in broadcasting.

The statutory requirement that a construction permit must be first secured for any radio station for whose operation a license is applied for is based upon the congressional intent of keeping the FCC free from pressure which might be exercised by an applicant for a radio-station license who has made considerable expenditures toward construction of a station without having previously obtained an authorization for its construction. Normally the site and installation of transmitting equipment for broadcasting are costly. These buildings and equipment cannot be used for anything else. Once these investments have been made they are difficult to liquidate. Mobile stations, on the other hand, generally utilize standardized and relatively inexpensive transmitting equipment. Therefore, as to them, the same problem does not exist. This bill merely exempts all mobile radio stations from the requirement of construction permits and gives the Commission discretionary authority to waive the requirement in cases of common carrier, safety, and special radio services whenever such a waiver is in the public interest.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. POTTER. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. The bill has the full support of the Federal Communications Commission. In fact, it is a Commission bill.

Mr. POTTER. That is true. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which the distinguished Senator from Ohio is chairman.

Mr. BRICKER. It involves only a technical amendment, which the Commission itself is desirous of having made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UFTON in the chair). The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. POTTER. I have just completed an explanation. If the Senator cares for a further explanation, I shall be glad to offer it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I was not in the Chamber. I should like to have the Senator summarize his statement.

Mr. POTTER. The purpose of the bill, which is recommended by the Federal Communications Commission, is to permit the Commission to waive the requirement of a construction permit for

mobile units, that is, units in connection with which construction cost is not an important item. At the present time an applicant must obtain a construction permit from the Commission. The construction costs in connection with such units are not the same as construction costs in connection with a radio or television station which does broadcasting. The bill is a technical amendment, which would permit the Commission to waive the construction permit requirement in certain cases.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Under existing law such requirement cannot be waived?

Mr. POTTER. That is correct. An applicant must go through the formality of asking for a construction permit, even in cases in which construction is not a large item.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 4557) was passed.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME LIMIT FOR ACTION ON PROTESTS BY FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 505, H. R. 4558.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4558) to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, this is also a minor bill, which seeks to correct a technicality which now exists in the law. The purpose of this legislation is to extend the time in which the FCC must act on a protest filed in accordance with the provisions of section 309 (c) of the Communications Act from a period of 15 days as now provided in the Communications Act to a period of 30 days. Section 309 of the Communications Act was amended by Public Law 554 in the 82d Congress to provide a new procedure whereby parties in interest may file with the FCC a protest against a grant of any radio authorization which was made by the Commission without a hearing. Within 30 days after such a grant is made by the Commission the protestant may request a hearing on whether such a grant is in the public interest. The Commission is required to enter findings within 15 days from the date of the filing of a protest as to whether or not the protest contains sufficient allegations of fact so as to give the protestant standing as a party in interest.

This bill merely extends that 15-day period to 30 days, because practice has

shown that the Commission needs this additional time to hold a preliminary hearing and make a proper determination without delaying the Commission's other work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### OFFENSES PUNISHABLE UNDER COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 4559.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4559) to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor, rather than a felony.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the purpose of this proposed legislation is to reduce the criminal penalties contained in section 501 of the Communications Act so that a first offense punishable under that section will constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony. A violation committed by a person who had already been convicted of an offense under section 501 would remain a felony.

Among the violations to which section 509 applies are violations of section 301, which prohibits the operation of a radio transmitter without a license, and section 318, which requires any person who is actually engaged in the operation of any transmitter apparatus to secure operator's license. Violations of the provisions by persons interested in the art of radio transmissions are not uncommon.

The amendment merely limits the first offense to imprisonment for a term not exceeding 1 year or a fine of not more than \$10,000 or both. In the case of persons who have once been convicted and are subsequently convicted, they shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$10,000, or imprisonment for a term of not more than 2 years or both.

In other words, it changes a first offense from a felony to a misdemeanor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside