

I would envision it as being similar, in effect, to that which exists at Williamsburg—similar perhaps to that which exists at the world's fair at Montreal or other places. So that these visitors, for a nominal fee, would be able to ride to the various points of particular interest, such as the Smithsonian, the Capitol, the Monument, perhaps the Elipse behind the White House, and back.

I would like it possible for those people to ask questions. I would like for someone to be on that bus to answer their questions. I would be very, very much opposed to anyone's operating the bus who would be impatient with their questions.

Now, of course you say you cannot speak for the Commission. I would like to see this done, and I would like to see it done cheaply, inexpensively for visitors.

Now, before I decide as a member of the committee whether I would desire to make this system subject to the jurisdiction of your Commission, I think I would like to know the attitude of your Commission with regard to that concept.

Mr. AVERY. Well, let me say this, Mr. Wright, first of all, what you describe sounds very much like the interpretive shuttle service the Secretary wants to start on the Mall. Practically every characteristic of it you described is practically what the Secretary had in his contract to provide the service on the Mall.

I do not think anybody listening to you could reach any conclusion other than this would be a very desirable thing to have.

The Commission, my colleagues on the Commission, and I hope myself, are very devoted to the public interest and trying to see to it that the public is adequately served.

It seems to me the kind of reasons you just stated and kind of service which you just described, which sounds very attractive and very persuasive, it seems to me that if that kind of proposal were made to the Commission, I cannot see any basis on which the Commission would say no, this is not in the public interest, or this does not suit the public convenience and necessity.

Now, that is just my own personal off-the-cuff opinion and I cannot now give you an answer as precisely what the Commission would do; but I am giving you my personal reaction to the kind of thing you are describing and I am suggesting the members of the Commission are sworn to uphold the public interest. And if this is so obviously in the public interest, it seems to me not too difficult to figure out what the Commission would do.

It would be the end result of a proceeding in which there would be adversary parties involved, and you cannot in advance of that hearing give any kind of absolute assurance as to what the Commission would finally determine.

Mr. WRIGHT. I appreciate your elucidation of that.

Mr. AVERY. We just were never given a chance on the *Mall* case, because they chose to try to go around us.

Now, in fact, one of the things we said in our brief in the court of appeals, that you might be interested in knowing, was that in determining the question of whether the public interest and necessity re-