

RESTRICTED — Not to be released outside the General Accessiting Office except on the basis of specific pproval UNITED STATES GENERAL: ACCOUNTING: OFFICE And of Cool is kept by the Distribution Section, Publications Branch, CAS

GENERAL GOVERNMENT DIVISION

B-178205

RELEASED

JUN 21 1974 74-0012

The Honorable William H. Hudnut, III House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Hudnut:

On March 11, 1974, you transmitted to us a letter from Mr. Trueman T. Rembusch, Chairman, Trade Practice Committee, Theatre Owners of Indiana. Mr. Rembusch's letter referred to our February 14, 1974, report to you. You requested comments or information we may have on Mr. Rembusch's letter.

On March 28, 1974, we met with Mr. Rembusch and discussed complaints filed with the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) concerning alleged violations of the June 13, through August 12, 1973, Special Price Freeze. One complaint concerned Warner Brothers Distributing Corporation, and the other concerned Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation. We also discussed a complaint possibly filed concerning Paramount Pictures and its pricing of the movie, "The Godfather."

The complaint against Warner Brothers as filed with the Indianapolis, IRS distric office and transferred to the Cincinnati IRS district office. The complaint against Twentleth Century-Fox was filed with the Des Moines IRS district office. The possible complaint against Paramount Pictures was reportedly filed with the Los Angeles IRS district office.

On February 15, 1974, IRS forwarded to the Cost of Living Council (CLC) information on its investigation of the alleged violation by Warner Frothers. IRS asked CLC to determine whether motion picture distributors were subject to the Special Price Freeze and whether each motion picture theater was considered a separate class of purchaser. On April 5, 1974, CLC ruled affirmatively on both questions and subscquently transmitted this ruling to IRS.

On April 18, 1974, IRS issued a remedial order to Warner Brothers for an alleged violation of the Special Price Freeze regulations. An IRS official said that on April 29, 1974, Warner Brothers had requested a conference for rebutting the remedial order.

904720 089675

After contact between Warner Brothers' attorneys and an IRS conferce, the conferce concluded that the Government would be in an untenable position to sustain the violation. He based his decision on an August 11, 1972, CLC determination that the application and enforcement of price controls on motion picture rentals is not feasible, due to the highly complex industry pricing practices. Although the conferce recommended revocation of the remedial order without prejudice, the IRS national office asked that the decision be delayed until the case was heard by a case resolution panel. The panel's purpose was to resolve cases not easily resolved by district conferces. This panel was composed of a representative from the CLC General Counsel, the CLC Office of Operations, the Department of Justice, and an IRS analyst. After the conferce presented the case before the panel, the panel ruled on May 22, 1974, that the conferce's recommended IRS disposition be upheld due to "insufficient documentation." Accordingly, the remedial order has been revoked.

With respect to the complaint against Twentieth Century-Fox, IKS told us that its Des Moines district office had not developed sufficient information when the Warner Brothers case was being pursued to show whether there was a violation of the Special Price Freeze. Originally, IRS said that the Dec Moines district office would be directed to quickly pursue the Twenti th Contury-Fox case if Warner Brothers won its case. IRS told us that it had chosen to pursue only one of these to complaints in an effort to quickly reduce its coupliance case inventory because the Economic Stabl by tion Program authority had lapsed on April 30, 1974. and wind-down activities would cease on June 30, 1974. However, on May 31, 1974, an IRS official informed us that the Dos Moines IRS district office would be instructed to discontinue work on the complaint again. Toostieth C atury-Yoz. In a Jone 4, 1974, reportadua to us, IRS states that the complaint does not marit further investigation. Also, IRS believes it cannot justify pursuing the case in view of the resolution reached on other motion picture industry cases.

IRS also said that the exhibitors who feel they may have incurred unjustified price increases have exhausted their administrative remedies. However, the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970 provides that any person suffering legal wrong because of any act or practice arising out of the Economic Stabilization Act of 1970, or any order or regulation issued under the act, may bring an action in a district court of the United States for apprepriate relief, including an action for declaratory judgment, writ of injunction, and/or damages.

In Mr. Rembusch's letter to you and in our discussions with Mr. Rembusch, he referred to complaints which may have been filed with IRS alleging a violation in pricing the movie, "The Godfather." An IRS national office official contacted the Los Angeles IRS district office on May 8, 1974, to inquire about these complaints. The official said there had been numerous complaints from consumers, not theater owners,

- 2 -

concerning ticket prices charged by theater chains exhibiting "The Godfather." He also told us that as a result of an IRS investigation and an IRS Chief Councel ruling, the higher ticket prices for that movie did not violate the price control regulations.

On April 1, 1974, you requested that we furnish you a copy of the March 7, 1972, letter from the Motion Picture Association of America to CLC regarding a CLC interpretation of price controls on motion pictures. We have provided Mr. Rembusch with a copy of this letter and are also enclosing a copy for your records.

Sincerely yours,

uter L'Ac, cue

Victor L. Love D:rector

Enclosure

KALOBACH, DEMARCO, NMAPLE CAD LINGWORTH

 $\begin{array}{l} \left\{ \left\{ P_{1}^{(1)}(P_{1}^{(1)}(q_{1$

,

4000 BEC 2435 (2013) ALMA 2014 (2013) ALMA 2012 AL 500 69 BEC 120 ALMA 2013 (2014) 10 2017 (2013) CONFOLOCION 10 Feb 26 60 (2013) (2013)

March 7, 1972

MCC CONTRACTORS SCHTCAL CONTRACTORS SCHTCAL CONTRACTORS SCHTCAL CONTRACTORS MEDICAL CONTRACTORS TELECONTRACTORS

> OF COMMUNE LE JUNE 19 JUNE 19 JUNE

BEST DOCUMENT AND LODLE

Mr. Joseph E. Mullaney General Councel Cost of Living Council New Encoutive Office Building Washington, D.C. 20507

Re: Application of Motion Picture Association of America, Inc.

Dear Mr. Mullaney:

Thank you for your letter of March 3, 1972 in response to the request on behalf of the Motion Picture Association of America, The. for an interpretation of the copyright exemption set forth in the Cost of Living Council's regulations.

It is obvious from the detailed discussion set forth in your letter that the Connoll Les recognized the complexity of this nucle and has indeed given it entensive condition, for which we thenk you.

No respectfully request that, contrary to the action proposed by the next to the last perceraph of your lateer, you do not call the Calof Councel's office of the LRS to implement the Council action concerning the interpretation questions discussed in your letter. In view or the fact that the ChC contemplates looking at the action problem, we feel that to cal implement whe phicing problem, we feel that to cal implement when by the TRS will serve no useful perpose, but will create the impression in the industry that, by indirection, all notion picture licensing action act are in fact within the freeze before the Cect of Little Council has in fact cousidered our request for exception of the fees charged for each licensing agreements. 10. Joseph D. Mullaney March 7, 1972 Pega Cao

FRIMEN & LOWIS DELAND & CHELINGWOODE

BEST DODITIONT ANNUADLE

•

We shall look forword to hearing from the brie Consission staff with the view toward arriving at a chercy and equitable determination of this rather complex and important question.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Earl le Mares fr. FRANK DE MANCO, JR.

For the Firm

FDM:gem

.

.

el 1926 - en alter d'al de la contra de la con La contra de la contr

, ,