KAYE, SCHOLER, FIERMAN, HAYS & HANDLER

(212) PLAZA 9-8400

MAROLD L. FIERMAN
MILTON MANDLER
FORDERICK R LIVING BTON
STANLEY O MARBERG
MILTON MOMEN
NATHANIEL M JACKSON
NICHARD C FLESCH
JOSEPH G COMMOLLY
FALCEFICA GLUSERG
JAT O. RAMER
STANLEY D. ROBINSON
SICHEY D. ROBINSON
STONEY A DIAMONO
FRED A. FREUND
TURBER MARS
SAUL GOVER ARCHOVET
SAUL TOMEN
MILTON R. MESSEL
M. MILTON R. MILTON R

ARNOLD I. GOLDSERG
HORMAN SINRICH
DONEN G. ZICK
105 HUAF TO RETHBERG
LAVID KLINCETTSOS
MILTON J.SCHUON
PETER M. FISHBEIN
LAMBENCE NEWMAN
PETER M. WELL
SEMOUN GOLDSTEIN
PAUL J. CURMAN
OAND GOLDSTEIN
FAUL J. CURMAN
OLIVE F. SEMOUN GOLDSTEIN
FAUL J. CURMAN
AND GOLDSERG
RELVIM MICHAFLSON
CONALD J.CH F. F.
BESTRAM A J. STAMS
JULIUS BESTMAN
MICHAEL MALINA
JOEN T. DUNNE
JOHN T. DUNNE
SINNER RWEDTEL
JOHN T. DUNNE
SINNER RWEDTEL
JOHN T. DUNNE
SINNER ROCKHBERG
ROSERT M. SCHAMZER
JAY G. STRUM

May 13, 1971

BY HAND

MAY 1 7 1971

Office of the Secretary

Public Proceedings

Branch

OTTO

JACOB SCHOLER
JAMES S. HAYS
COUNSEL
EUROPEAN OFFICE
44. CHAMPS-ELYSEES
PARIS VIIII, FRANCE
TEL: 223-8810

CABLE ADDRESSES RAYEMACLER NEW YORK KAYEMACLER PARIS

TELEX NUMBERS NEW YORK 234660 PARIS 65061

Arthur W. Murphy, Esq., Chairman Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Columbia University School of Law 435 West 116th Street New York, N.Y. 10027

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS
POOR QUALITY PAGES

In the Matter of Consumers Power Company Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2 Docket Nos. 50-329 and 50-330

Dear Chairman Murphy:

This is in opposition to the <u>Saginaw</u> May 11, 1971 letter requesting a further and indefinite postponement of the Hearing.

The <u>Power Reactor</u> case makes very clear that continued development is a touchstone of present nuclear power production technology. If inquiry is to be postponed every time there is a possibility of something new or better, inquiry may never start.

Moreover, it is clear that <u>Saginaw</u> will seize on any new fact to demand delay, just as they recently did when they were furnished the Applicant-Dow contract and other Applicant documents available beginning December 1, 1970.

Indeed, one of the reasons Dow has opposed improper Saginaw discovery demands rather than simply furnish the information to get on, is our belief that production of one irrelevant piece of paper will serve only to stimulate demand for production of a second irrelevant document referred to in it, and on and on ad infinitum, accompanied by charges that disclosure of the first constitutes admission of significance and precludes later objection.

8007160920

G

hearing

Arthur W. Murphy, Esq.

May 13, 1971

In view of the <u>Saginaw</u> use of procedural discretion for tactical advantage, we believe thi Hearing can proceed to a fair final determination only if procedural regularity is adhered to with strict rigor, and the proceedings are confined tightly to the issues and related discovery and evidence as defined by the AEC Regulations and the law. Informality and good faith negotiations will not work.

We believe the Hearing should commence on June 1, 1971, and proceed from day to day thereafte. Areas in which new information is needed can be postponed while other matters are heard. A requirement that all be done before we start, effectively means no beginning.

Respectfully,

Milton R. Wessel

MRW:skl

cc: Dr. Clark Goodman
Dr. David B. Hall
Myron M. Cherry, Esq.
Thomas F. Engelhardt, Esq.
William J. Ginster, Esq.
James A. Kendall, Esq.
Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.
Richard G. Smith, Esq.
Secretary, Atomic Energy Commission