

addressed to Governors and Utility Commissions in the affected States, seemed -- but only seemed -- to notify them of an "opportunity for hearing" on an important issue. That notice states:

"Any person desiring to be heard or to make any protests with reference to said application should on or before the 21st day of March 1962, file with the Federal Power Commission, Washington 25, D. C., petitions or protests in accordance with the requirements of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure (18 CFR 1.8 or 1.10). The application is on file and available for public inspection."

The difference (and the importance of the difference) between the Commission's Notice of Application and a genuine public notice is amply illustrated by the following telegram, dispatched and received while the order was still under consideration as the direct result of my telephone call on March 26, 1962, informing the Chairman of the State of Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission exactly what was contained in the pending application. The telegram, addressed to all Commissioners, was received at 8:40 a.m., March 27, 1962.

"Re your Dockets E-7024 and E-7025 it is requested that FPC give full consideration to position of Pacific Northwest area that no means be provided for the transmission of Federally generated electricity outside present service area Bonneville Power Administration unless and until proper Congressional safeguards be first provided this area. As early as April 1959 in hearings before the Senate Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee stated opposition to any California tie-line until such adequate safeguards existed. We therefore respectfully request that in acting on foregoing dockets FPC qualify any approval granted so as to limit any expenditures for interconnection to capacity not in excess of power resources of applicant exclusive of Federally generated power until Congress can fully consider required safeguards."

Does all this throw a new light on the majority's recital, contained in the order, that, on various dates immediately following distribution of the Notice of Application to the Utility Commissions of the States in which PP&L operates, each of those States approved the security issue with no reservations as to the use of the funds raised? It clearly seems so to me -- particularly in the case of those States, Oregon and Washington, whose Commissioners testified before the Senate against any intertie proposal such as is now before us.

This seemingly routine financial matter, decided without a hearing and upon the basis of applicant's representations and assertions alone, actually is deeply involved in a controversy which has been raging with