

we have the advisory committees on the national power survey. On the power side we have perhaps 150 people from all segments of the industry working together for the first time, providing essential information as to the plans of their companies, their load forecasts, their technological experience, their expertise in dealing with common problems in generation and fuel handling, or in transmission. And as I said, for the first time they are sitting around the same tables and working together.

I think this is very good for the country, that there should be a forum where all of them look at their problems from a single national point of view, and that the right place for them to do it is in the offices of the Federal Power Commission.

This, I think, is one of the most encouraging developments in power system history.

We have tried to balance these committees among the various segments of the industry. I don't suppose in this, any more than in anything else that you do in a badly divided industry, that we will ever win a 100-percent approval, but I think most people think we have done a fairly good and evenhanded job, and that we have competent advisers. But we have made clear that these are advisory committees, and that the power survey report will be the Commission's report and not an industry report, not a report by any segment of the industry, Mr. Chairman.

On the natural gas side, the Natural Gas Advisory Council meets infrequently. I think it has held a total of three or four meetings so far. It was established in a way that we think safeguarded the consumers interest. Representatives of the distributors, consumers, and regulatory agencies are on it. It may be that that representation could be improved, and Mr. Morgan knows that I have suggested some broadening of representation of consumer interests, and that it is still before the Commission for discussion.

But I don't think it can serve its purpose as a way of finding out what the industry is thinking, as a medium for genuine communication, if we invite all the groups that Mr. Morgan says should be invited, or as I believe he put it, "even if they have to meet in a convention hall."

That would be striking a public pose, it would not be working toward any genuine level of communication.

The next point Mr. Morgan makes is that the regulation of ex parte communications should be broadened to include staff people who advise the Commission, and there should be a public defender within the staff.

The Commission now has under consideration a broadened ex parte rule. So far as the public defender concept is concerned, our whole staff is a public defender staff. And I oppose the public defender principle, because the effect is to relieve the staff and the Commission of their responsibilities as public defenders.

Mr. Morgan's eighth suggestion is that we don't have close enough liaison with other agencies. Our relationships, he says, are touched and tinged with jurisdictional rivalry and discord. Of course, these other agencies—I presume he means departments—are headed by Cabinet officials.