

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE	1
A. The Massachusetts Municipals' Antitrust Contention	2
B. The Staff Position before the Examiner	3
C. The Examiner's Conclusions on the Section 10 (h) Issue	4
II. ARGUMENT	5
A. Facts Relating to the Section 10 (h) Issue	5
1. The Massachusetts Municipals' Efforts to Get a Bulk Power Source	5
2. The Value of Regional Planning to a Utility	7
3. The Council and Its Planning Committee	9
4. The Exclusion of the Massachusetts Municipals from the Council's Planning Activities	11
5. The Lack of a Comparable Alternative Planning Group	13
B. The Law of Exclusionary Arrangements	14
1. Section 10 (h)	14
2. The "Bottleneck" Boycott	15
3. The Silver, Associated Press, and Terminal Railroad Cases	16
4. The Vermont Yankee Case	23
C. Errors in the Examiner's Analysis	25
1. Examiner's Assumption that Anticompetitive Purpose is a Necessary Element of a Bottleneck Boycott	25
2. Examiner's Conclusion that Differences on Policy Justify Exclusion from Cooperative Planning Activities	27