

Mr. YOUNGER. No; I think that you can summarize it in just a few words. Maybe I can shorten it.

Mr. MORGAN. Do you have a place in mind, sir?

Mr. YOUNGER. No; except that what you said yesterday was that the committee failed, or the Commission failed to write the proper opinion in your mind because they were fearful of the disturbance of the industry.

Mr. MORGAN. I haven't found that.

Mr. YOUNGER. Well, look it up.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you have a reference, Mr. Younger?

Mr. YOUNGER. No, I do not. I have not seen the transcript. All I have is my memory.

Mr. MORGAN. At the summing up point where I ceased talking about that case, Mr. Younger, I find this—I pointed out that I had raised a number of serious policy questions that should be investigated, and then I said, "There is not one word of response from my colleagues, not one word of explanation as to why this Commission is not willing to do what the previous members of the Commission said could be done, should be done, and would be done."

Now, the strange thing about the Idaho Power decision is simply that. There is a three page—

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Beasley, bring us a copy of this transcript.

Mr. MORGAN. There is a three-page order followed by a seven-page dissent raising issues which I think should have been investigated to determine whether they were serious or presented obstacles to proper financing, and no word of explanation of the Commission—or no word of answer, at any rate, by the Commission, to the points raised by the dissent.

Mr. YOUNGER. Where you are referring, Mr. Morgan, is to the opinion given in private which was not made public—

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, on page 26.

Mr. YOUNGER. Yes. What was said in private by the Commission as to why they made their decision? Will you read your testimony, on the middle of page 26.

Mr. MORGAN (reading):

I don't want to be specific as to the case involved, but let me say this. When in open Commission meetings—

And I don't mean that it is open to the public, but with the full Commission present and the staff department heads, the lawyers, the secretary, the executive director—

the statement is made that we mustn't investigate the situation because it would disturb the industry—

And then going on in a later paragraph—

by a Commissioner, and sometimes by the staff, and that statement is accepted and acted on in the absence of any other reason for such an action, or usually inaction, then I would say this is an example of what I was talking about.

Mr. YOUNGER. That, I believe, applies to the *Idaho* case, because that was what Mr. Bennett was interrogating you on.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. YOUNGER. I have read your dissent in the *Idaho* case, and you make no mention of that. If that was a violation, or was the reason why the Commission reached their decision, do you consider that in