United States Attorneys

Bulletin

Published by Executive Office for United States Attorneys
Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

VOL. 16 DECEMBER 20, 1968 NO. 37

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Vol. 16 December 20, 1968 No. 37

TABLE OF CONTENTS

NEWS NOTES

SETTLEMENT REACHED IN LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS HOUSING AUTHORITY CASE

December 7, 1968: A settlement in a civil rights case has been reached requiring the Little Rock, Arkansas Housing Authority to desegregate its public housing projects. Attorney General Clark announced that a consent order signed by the Department of Justice and the Authority was filed in United States District Court in Little Rock and approved immediately by the court, to become effective in 30 days. The order concludes a suit brought November 21 charging the Authority with assigning tenants on the basis of race in violation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Under terms of the settlement, the Authority will comply with rules of the Department of Housing and Urban Development that eligible applicants be assigned to housing on a community-wide basis of first-come, first served. Also, the Authority will conduct all of its housing practices, as well as employment practices, without racial discrimination. The suit had asserted violations of both the 1964 Act and HUD regulations requiring that public housing agencies receiving federal funds assign applicants on a first-come, first-served basis. The Authority has obtained more than $6 million from the Government since 1940.

SENATOR KENNEDY AND A.G. SPEAK AT DEDICATION OF FEDERAL YOUTH CORRECTION CENTER AT MORGANTOWN

December 9, 1968: Dedication ceremonies were held at Morgantown, West Virginia for the new Federal Youth Correction Center named after former Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy. Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Senator Edward Kennedy (D. Mass.) were the featured speakers at the dedication. The Attorney General, in his dedication speech, observed that "as a people we have no greater chance to control crime than by effective corrections. No activity of a people so evidences their humanity, their character, their capacity for charity in its most generous sense, as the treatment they accord those who have offended them." Senator Kennedy, departing from his prepared speech, issued a strong defense of Attorney General Ramsey Clark and his philosophy of law enforcement. Kennedy said Clark has "resisted the awesome pressures of reaction" to display "total fidelity" to Constitutional precepts. The Nation, Kennedy told Clark, "owes a debt of gratitude to President Johnson for choosing you and for standing behind you" because "you have brought the Justice Department to new heights".

The new Youth Center was planned while Robert Kennedy was Attorney General. It is located on a 322-acre tract about a mile from Morgantown, West Virginia. The Center will house approximately 325 teenage youths in the age range from 16 to 20 who have violated federal laws, with more

than two-thirds committed for driving stolen cars across a state line. The special design of the housing units at the Center permits small living units for 12 to 16 people - thus allowing the organization of the population into groups which have similar problems or needs. The housing units are grouped informally around a "community square" which includes a dining room, school and library, auditorium, gymnasium, chapel, vocational shops and other service buildings. The emphasis of the new Center will be on rehabilitation through counseling and continuous psychological evaluation by a professional staff. There are no walls and no bars at the Center, a far cry from the obsolete National Training School for Boys in the District of Columbia. The Morgantown Center will open its doors to its first residents shortly after January 1, 1969.

FORMER OFFICIAL OF AID INDICTED FOR BRIBERY AND CONSPIRACY

December 9, 1968: A former official of the Agency for International Development (AID) and a Belgian businessman have been indicted on bribery and conspiracy charges. An indictment was returned in Washington, D.C. against Jack K. Woll, former Director of Material Resources of the Government Property Resources Division of AID, and Josef Adriaenssens, operator of two corporations in Belgium, charging the defendants with conspiring to commit bribery and to defraud the United States through payments to Woll by Adriaenssens to influence the administration of an AID contract held by Andriaenssens. Adriaenssens was charged with giving, and Woll with receiving, a payment on July 5, 1966, in Washington, D.C.

U.S. ATTORNEY MORGENTHAU AND ASSISTANT A.G. VINSON TESTIFY ON SWISS BANKS COVERUPS FOR CRIMINAL ACTIVITY BY U.S. CITIZENS

December 9, 1968: U.S. Attorney Robert S. Morgenthau of the Southern District of New York testified before the House Banking and Currency Committee, charging that Swiss banks are providing an increasing shelter for American hoodlums, gamblers, smugglers, stock market swindlers, corporate insiders reaping illegal windfalls, profit-hiding businessmen and "enormous numbers" of investors seeking to avoid U.S. taxes. He said that enforcement officials have received "virtually no cooperation" from affected banks in Switzerland and other countries that have similar bank secrecy laws. Fred M. Vinson, Assistant Attorney General for the Criminal Division, told the Committee that "we are aware that a bank in Geneva is being used on a continuing basis as a transfer point for Las Vegas 'skim' and other illegally obtained funds for the benefit of known racketeers". The skim goes tax

free and undetected since the Swiss Banking Act provides stern penalties to anyone who discloses banking secrets--even to a foreign official agency. As a result of this testimony, Chairman Wright Patman (D-Tex.) of the Committee said he will seek legislation from the new Congress making it a criminal offense for Americans to do business with foreign financial institutions who refuse to open their books to U.S. regulatory agencies.

DEPARTMENT FILES FIRST EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION CASE AGAINST A STATE EMPLOYMENT BUREAU

December 10, 1968: The Department of Justice, in the first civil rights suit of its kind, charged the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services with discrimination against Negroes in job placement in a complaint filed in U.S. District Court in Columbus against the Bureau and its administrator, Willard P. Dudley.

The civil complaint charged violations of sections of the 1964 Civil Rights Act which forbid discrimination by employment agencies and state agencies which receive federal funds. It was the first case in which the Department has charged a state employment service with racial discrimination in its placements. The matter was referred to the Department of Justice by the Department of Labor after what the complaint termed "repeated but unsuccessful" efforts to obtain voluntary compliance. In fiscal 1968, the Ohio Bureau received $35,267,670 from the Department of Labor under a program of financial support for all state employment agencies. The suit asked that discriminatory practices be forbidden and the Bureau ordered to correct the effects of past discrimination.

FORMER NARCOTICS AGENT ARRESTED FOR CONSPIRACY TO VIOLATE NARCOTICS LAW

December 11, 1968: A former federal drug and narcotic agent was arrested on charges that he conspired to violate narcotics law. Edward Russell Dower was arrested in New York City by agents of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (BNDD). Dower, 41, of West Hartford, Connecticut, was charged in a sealed indictment returned Tuesday in Baltimore, where he served from June, 1966 to January, 1968 with the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. The indictment alleged that Dower conspired with Charles McDonnell, another former official of the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, and Joseph Miles in the illegal sale of heroin by McDonnell.

Dower, who was a Bureau of Narcotics Agent from 1958 to 1966, joined the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control as a supervisory agent in Baltimore and, in January 1968, was named Agent-in-Charge of the Bureau's Hartford, Connecticut office. He retained the title when the Bureau of Drug Abuse

Control and the Bureau of Narcotics were merged April 8 to become BNDD, but he resigned on August 24.

Dower was arrested by agents of the BNDD's Inspection Service, which was established last Spring by the Attorney General to ensure integrity in the enforcement of drug and narcotic laws.

* * *

POINTS TO REMEMBER

ADVICE TO TAX DIVISION WHEN REFUND CASE CLOSED

An excessively large number of cases are pending in the Tax Division's Litigation Control Unit in which refund checks have been issued but no notification given to this office that the cases were terminated in court. It is urgently requested that you check your files, open and closed, to determine whether you have advised the Tax Division of the filing of the dismissal or satisfaction of judgment thereby permitting the closing of these cases in both the Division and the Internal Revenue Service.

Your attention is directed to United States Attorneys' Bulletin Item, Vol. 14, No. 20 (reproduced in U.S. Attorneys' Guide--Tax Division, p. 116) which in part provides:

"Pursuant to procedures set out in T.D. 6292 (published in 23 Federal Register number 78), refund checks are mailed directly to United States Attorneys for delivery to taxpayers or their attorneys of record. The checks are made to the order of taxpayers who had obtained judgments against the Government in civil tax refund cases, or who had been authorized a refund through a settlement of pending court cases."

"In accordance with this procedure, all U.S. Attorneys should be sure to (1) obtain from counsel or taxpayer the appropriate document for terminating each case (a dismissal, if the case has been settled, or a satisfaction if the case went to judgment); * * * * (3) file the document in court /where there is no dispute as to the amount of the check/, close the case on your records and advise the Tax Division immediately in order that the case may be closed on the Department's records. Until the Tax Division is so advised, the case remains open on its records and charged to your office."

RULE 11 INTERROGATION OF TAX DEFENDANTS ON NOLO PLEAS

Despite the Department's policy of opposing nolo contendere pleas in criminal tax cases (U.S. Attorneys' Manual, Title 2:17, titled 4:7; Manual for Criminal Tax Trials, p. 7), many such pleas are accepted by district courts. As a consequence, defendants convicted of attempted tax evasion on pleas of nolo are free to litigate in civil proceedings their liability for the civil fraud penalty whereas they would be collaterally estopped had their conviction rested on a plea or verdict of guilty. See Tomlinson v. Lefkowitz, 334 F.2d 262 (C.A. 5), certiorari denied, 379 U.S. 962, and Moore v. United States, 360 F.2d 353 (C.A. 4).

Considerable assistance in resolving the civil fraud issue after conviction of a tax evader on a nolo plea can be provided the Revenue Service or the Refund Sections of the Tax Division by use of the judicial admissions made by the defendant when he is interrogated by the court regarding his understanding of the nature of the charge and the consequences of his plea pursuant to Rule 11, Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, as amended in 1966. United States Attorneys should, accordingly, in every criminal tax case disposed of by a nolo contendere plea, secure a copy of the transcript of the Rule 11 interrogation proceedings and send this to the Department with the closing report.

WITNESSES

AGENTS, BUREAU OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

There has been some confusion over the payment of travel and subsistence to BNDD agents when they testify as Government witnesses. Frequently, they testify as undercover agents to violations of other laws, such as Customs laws, usually with respect to witnessing sales, observing activities of subjects, etc. Such testimony is properly classified as relating to official duties, within the provisions of 28 U.S.C. 1823, and the appropriation, "Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs", is chargeable with the expense of its agents' attendance. The Bureau furnishes its employees Government transporation requests for such travel. The United States Marshal should not become involved and, of course, should make no advances to these agents.

* * *

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE PROFILES

John R. McDonough
Associate Deputy Attorney General

John McDonough was born in St. Paul, Minnesota May 16, 1919. Upon receiving his LL.B. from Columbia University Law School in 1946, he became an Assistant Professor of Law at Stanford Law School until 1949, at which time he entered private practice with a San Francisco law firm. In 1952 he returned to Stanford as a Professor of Law. He was also Acting Dean of the Law School from 1959-60 and from 1962-1964. In September, 1967 he was appointed Associate Deputy Attorney General for Litigation, with the function of assisting the Deputy Attorney General with the internal management of the Department. He has also carried out various special assignments for the Attorney General. He served as a member of the Department of Justice team that was sent to Chicago during the April riot, and had a substantial role in the activities surrounding the "Poor Peoples Campaign" and Resurrection City. Mr. McDonough will return to Stanford Law School in January and will teach the second semester. He will then take a leave of absence from 1969-70 to serve "Of Counsel" with the Los Angeles law firm of Keatinge & Sterling.

* * *

Robert M. Morgenthau
United States Attorney
Southern District of New York

Mr. Morgenthau was born July 31, 1919 in New York City. He received his A.B. degree in 1937 from Amherst College and his LL.B. in 1948 from Yale. Mr. Morgenthau was associated with a private law firm in New York from 1948 until his appointment as U.S. Attorney in April, 1961. He resigned in August 1962 to accept the Democratic nomination for Governor of New York, and was reappointed U.S. Attorney after the election. Mr. Morgenthau's office has given strong emphasis to the prosecution of securities frauds and organized crime cases. He created a Securities Fraud Unit which has initiated major cases in the securities field and has assisted the SEC in the preparation of many cases. The Special Prosecution Unit, which handles organized crime matters, was responsible for the prosecution of Joseph Valachi as well as 52 members of the Luchese, Genovese, Gambino, Bonanno and Profaci families of La Cosa Nostra. His office also convicted James Marcus, Water Commissioner of New York City, for accepting a kickback from Mafia leader Anthony Corallo. His newly established Consumer Frauds Unit secured the first indictments ever returned against process

servers for discarding summonses instead of serving them, a practice which had become widespread in New York. He is currently conducting an investigation of the use of Swiss banks by American businessmen and mobsters to evade U.S. taxes and securities regulations. Commenting on the emphasis which Mr. Morgenthau's office has given to the prosecution of often complex and time-consuming "white-collar crimes", Attorney General Ramsey Clark has remarked: "More than anyone he has brought about an awareness of the great importance of diligent enforcement in this very complicated area. Men who seek to be measured by statistics would never take these cases on. Any one of them counts for 100 or more ordinary prosecutions in terms of the investment of investigatory and prosecutory manpower."

* * *

EXECUTIVE OFFICE FOR UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Director John K. Van de Kamp

APPOINTMENTS

ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

District of Columbia - HARVEY S. PRICE: Oberlin College, B.A.; Harvard Law School, LL.B. Former law clerk for Fulton, Walter & Duncombe.

Kansas - JOHN E. MARTIN: Kansas University, B.S.; Kansas University Law School, J.D. Former law clerk to Judge Wesley E. Brown, U.S. District Court.

Louisiana, Eastern - DANIEL J. MARKEY, JR.: Spring Hill College, B.A.; Loyola University School of Law, LL.B. Former associate lawyer.

New York, Southern - KEVIN J. McINERNEY: Fordham College, BSS; Yale Law School, LL.B. Formerly in private practice.

New York, Southern - WALTER M. PHILLIPS, JR.: Princeton University, A.B.; University of California, Hastings College of Law, LL.B. Former Assistant District Attorney, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

South Carolina - JAMES HENRY FOWLES, JR.: University of South Carolina; University of South Carolina Law School, LL.B. Former attorney, Clarkson, McCants & Fowles.

Texas, Southern - JAMES R. McKISSICK: University of the South; University of Texas Law School, LL.B. Former law clerk; also, Legislative Assistant, Texas.

* * *

ANTITRUST DIVISION

Assistant Attorney General Edwin M. Zimmerman

DISTRICT COURT

SHERMAN ACT

JAIL SENTENCE TO BE SERVED AFTER COURT ACCEPTS NOLO PLEAS.

United States v. American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp., et al. (W.D. Pa., Cr. 66-295; November 8, 1968, D.J. 60-3-154)

During September and October, over our objections, the court granted motions by the defendant Plumbing Fixture Manufacturers Association and certain of the corporate and individual defendants to change their pleas from not guilty to nolo contendere. Following the same procedure utilized in the acceptance of nolo contendere pleas in United States v. Plumbing Fixture Manufacturers Association, Criminal No. 66-296 (Western District of Pennsylvania), Judge Rosenberg asked each attorney representing a defendant corporation and each individual defendant personally certain question in order to satisfy the requirements of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure. Judge Rosenberg ascertained whether the plea was being made voluntarily with an understanding of the nature of the charge and the consequences of the plea, and more specifically, the court obtained the acknowledgement from each defendant that he understood that the plea of nolo contendere was an admission of guilt for the purposes of the case, that a judgment of conviction would be entered upon acceptance of the plea and that a maximum fine and/or imprisonment could be imposed upon acceptance of the plea. Additionally, each defendant was required to acknowledge that there was a factual basis for the charge in the indictment. At a subsequent date, after pre-sentencing investigations had been completed, the court imposed fines and prison terms as follows:

Defendant	Fines	Prison Terms
Plumbing Fixture Manufacturers Association	$ 50,000	
Crane Co.	50,000	
Wallace-Murray Corporation	50,000	
Universal-Rundle Corporation	50,000	

Defendant	Fines	Prison Terms
Rheem Manufacturing Co.	$ 50,000	
Briggs Manufacturing Co.	10,000	
John B. Balmer, President, Wallace-Murray Corp.	40,000	1 year suspended to serve 30 days in prison - 2 years probation
Robert E. Casner, Vice President and General Manager, Plumbing, Heating, Air Conditioning Group of Crane Co.	25,000	1 year suspended to serve 15 days in prison - 2 years probation
George W. Kelch, former President and General Manager of the Ingersoll-Humphryes Division of Borg-Warner Corporation	25,000	9 months suspended to serve 7 days in prison - 2 years probation
Stanley S. Backner, former Vice President, Marketing, Universal-Rundle Corporation	5,000	6 months suspended to serve 24 hours in prison - 1 year probation
Robert J. Pierson, Vice President, Marketing, Home Products Division of Rheem Manufacturing Company	15,000	3 months suspended 1 year probation
TOTAL	$370,000	

Three defendants moved under Rule 35 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to have their prison sentences reduced. Various grounds were offered in support of such motions, ranging from ill health to the discomfiture attendant upon the defendant from close association with criminals while in prison. The motions were denied.

The case remains pending against American Standard, Inc., Kohler Co. and Borg-Warner Corporation and three executives. It is scheduled for trial on January 13, 1969.

USE OF A WITNESS' GRAND JURY TRANSCRIPT TO REFRESH HIS RECOLLECTION BEFORE BEING CALLED AT TRIAL HELD PROPER

On November 5, 1968, the defendants filed a motion seeking an injunction prohibiting the Government from continuing to review with prospective trial witnesses their own grand jury testimony. While the utilization of a witness' grand jury testimony in this fashion has been the practice, there has been no ruling specifically on the point. The court denied the motion and held:

(1) Rule 6(e) expressly provides that attorneys for the United States may use grand jury material in the performance of their duties.

(2) Interviewing prospective Government witnesses and reviewing their testimony with them is an appropriate part of the duties of an attorney for the United States.

(3) Allowing a prospective Government witness to review his own testimony before the grand jury does not endanger grand jury secrecy and thus is not an improper "disclosure" within the meaning of Rule 6(e).

(4) The facts alleged do not indicate that any Government attorney has behaved improperly or breached grand jury secrecy.

DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SEVERANCE AND CONTINUANCE BASED ON ILL HEALTH DENIED

On October 30, 1968, one of the remaining individual defendants, Daniel J. Quinn, moved for severance and a continuance. He claimed that because of a serious heart condition, coupled with several other ailments, a trial at the present time would severely prejudice his health. We contended that the defendant's physical condition was not serious enough to warrant a continuance and that if severance should be granted and the defendant subsequently tried independently, the rigors of trial would be greater than if tried jointly with the other defendants. The court granted the defendant permission to present expert medical testimony concerning his condition, and on cross-examination it was brought out that the trial would not cause any greater strain on the defendant than his present level of activities. After the presentation of this testimony and oral argument, the court denied the motion.

Staff: John C. Fricano, Rodney O. Thorson, Joel Davidow, J. N. Raines and S. R. Mitchell (Antitrust Division)

* * *

CRIMINAL DIVISION

Assistant Attorney General Fred M. Vinson, Jr.

COURTS OF APPEALS

EVIDENCE

PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS TO PROVE A NEGATIVE; HEARSAY TESTIMONY.

United States v. Milton Hecht (C.A. 3, decided November 19, 1968; D.J. 29-48-1707)

The appellant was convicted for conspiring with a bank cashier, who permitted overdrafts and false credits in appellant's personal and corporate accounts. At the trial, the bank auditor, testifying for the Government, stated that he had found no record of certain relevant entries. Appellant claimed that the testimony violated the best evidence rule because the Government did not produce the documents on which the auditor's opinion was based. The Court of Appeals rejected the contention, stating that the voluminous bank records were for the most part on microfilm, the auditor had supervised the investigation of the accounts, there was no contention that the original records were unavailable to defense counsel, and the district court acted well within its discretionary limits in not requiring the production of the records to prove a negative.

The Court of Appeals also held that the auditor's testimony, which was based on what he was told by persons working under his supervision, was not inadmissible hearsay. It was noted that the records were available to the defendants, and the trial judge was justified in concluding that the testimony was reasonably reliable and its use was justified under the circumstances. The Court also held that the auditor's testimony was not inadmissible as an expression of opinion by an unqualified expert. It stated that the Government was correct in not offering the auditor as an expert, and the matters to which he testified were not opinions but conclusions based on particulars drawn from data either observed by him or those he closely supervised.

Staff: United States Attorney David M. Satz, Jr.
(D. New Jersey)

MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

LATE CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTOR CLAIMS.

United States v. Jennison, Jr. (C.A. 6, No. 18147; October 21, 1968; D.J. 25-30-270)

The Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit has refused to follow Gearey, 368 F.2d 144 (C.A. 2). In so doing, the Court stated that "a draft board is not required to consider a claim of conscientious objection first asserted after notice of induction has been received, even if a conversion to conscientious objection has allegedly matured after receipt of such notice". Previously, the Courts of Appeals for the Fifth and Fourth Circuits rejected Gearey. Davis v. United States, 374 F.2d 1 (C.A. 5); United States v. Helm, 386 F.2d 816 (C.A. 4).

Staff: United States Attorney George Cline
(E.D. Ky.)

* * *

LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION
Assistant Attorney General Clyde O. Martz

SUPREME COURT

WASHINGTON, D.C. MALL

SECY. OF INTERIOR MAY CONTRACT FOR INTERPRETIVE TRANSPORTATION SERVICE IN NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND CONCESSIONAIRE MAY OPERATE SERVICE WITHOUT OBTAINING CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FROM WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA TRANSIT COMMISSION CREATED BY CONGRESS TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION OVER MASS TRANSPORTATION IN WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA.

Universal Interpretive Shuttle Corp. v. Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Com. (S. Ct. No. 19, Oct. Term., 1968; November 25, 1968, D.J. 90-1-4-155)

The minibus designed to operate on the great central Mall in the Nation's Capital has completed a successful side excursion to the Supreme Court. The desirability of a service whereby visitors to the Mall area could be transferred from point to point and at the same time enjoy an interpretive narrative was first established in an experimental operation run by the National Park Service in 1966. The Secretary of the Interior thereafter contracted with Universal Interpretive Shuttle Corporation to provide a somewhat more expanded service. The contract provided that all details of the operation, such as the amounts to be charged, the areas to be visited, the type of equipment and the content of the narrative, would be tightly controlled by the Secretary.

Before Universal could begin operations, however, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, created by compact to assume most of the former functions of public utilities commissions in the District of Columbia and nearby Maryland and Virginia, instituted suit to enjoin operation of the service until such time as Universal obtained from the Commission a certificate of public convenience and necessity. The effect of such a requirement would have been to transfer control of the operation from the Secretary to the Commission.

The United States filed a representation of interest on behalf of Universal and thereafter took an active part in all proceedings. The district court directed dismissal of the action. Following an accelerated appeal, the Court of Appeals reversed, with one dissent and without writing an opinion. On November 25, 1968, the Supreme Court reversed.

In an opinion written by Justice White, the Court, noting that the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission's position would "result in dual regulatory jurisdiction overlapping on this most fundamental matter", held that there was no reason to conclude that Congress, in consenting to the creation of a tripartite Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, intended to repeal existing statutes granting to the Secretary of the Interior exclusive control over all park areas in the District of Columbia. It also noted that the Commission was established to regulate the mass transportation of commuters and workers--an assignment having little or nothing to do with a system of minibuses proceeding around the Mall at 10 miles per hour.

D.C. Transit, an intervenor in the case, had advanced the separate argument that the proposed service would contravene the terms of its franchise, which provides that, "No competitive street railway or bus line * * * of the character which runs over a given route on a fixed schedule, shall be established to operate in the District of Columbia without the prior issuance of a certificate" by a predecessor of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission (70 Stat. 598). The Court disposed of this argument by concluding that not only did the quoted language not encompass the proposed Mall operation but that the franchise protection was limited to commuter service and "does not include sightseeing".

Staff: Assistant Attorney General Clyde O. Martz and Thomas L. McKevitt (Land & Natural Resources Division); Louis F. Claiborne and Francis X. Beytagh, Jr. (Solicitor General's Office)

* * *