

Hall Denies Any Vested Interest Deals As Supervisor

By EMORY DANIELS
Farmington Township Supervisor Curtis H. Hall read a prepared statement Monday night denying ever having any vested business interests in the township while holding public office.

While denying conflict-of-interest charges, Hall called Democrat Burton Levy "a liar."

Supervisor Hall read the prepared statement after Monday night board meetings had adjourned. After doing so, he denied Levy an opportunity to respond.

Hall was specifically referring to allegations by Levy that there was a conflict of interest in Hall's private business transactions.

did not discover they were being circulated until after the August primary election," Hall said.

"Since Aug. 4, I have not been a candidate for public office and have sought nothing for myself but an honorable retirement."

"Yet, despite the fact I am not a candidate, the mudslinging is still being thrown by the chief muckraker of them all -- Democrat Burton Levy who has no regard at all for fair play."

Hall said Levy has accused him of conflict of interest by using his position as supervisor to line his pockets financially.

AT A RECENT debate between trustees, Hall continued, Levy accused Clerk Floyd Cairns and himself of trying to influence a zoning decision for Topps department store and of being a part of the corporation which owned the land upon which Topps was built.

"The time has come that Levy be exposed for the liar that he is," Hall said, "I don't know an answer having any interest in the land now occupied by Topps or with the corporation which owned that land."

With the exception of his residence in Quakertown, which he recently sold, Hall explained, "I have never had a financial interest in the township before or after I became supervisor. I have invested in other areas, but never in the township."

Hall also said he has never taken advantage of any special information he knew by being supervisor and has never passed on any confidential information to any other person.

"Having already decided

once that I must be like Caesar's wife, above reproach, these charges are doubly galling to me."

Hall claimed the Farmington Enterprise & Observer printed a news story noting his involvement with the South Lyon trailer park and "reached the completely unwarranted conclusion that I had an interest in the Topps property and somehow used my influence on that rezoning."

The news story referred to simply reported Hall was a partner in the firm owning the South Lyon trailer park and the NOT draw the conclusion Hall owned the Topps property. A later personal column

by the editor specifically stated Hall was not involved in the sale of land to Topps.

HALL SAID the property now owned by Topps on Orchard Lake, north of 12 Mile, was owned by Northwest Trailer Park, Inc., with Doug Schenck and his mother as partners.

Because some of the land on Orchard Lake was non-conforming for trailer park use, Schenck asked for a B-3 rezoning to expand the park.

In May 1967, Hall contended, the township board voted to approve the B-3 rezoning. Hall said he believed Schenck, at this time, actually planned to expand the trailer park.

In June 1967, Douglas Schenck and his brother purchased an option for property in Lyon Township to be developed into a trailer park.

In September 1967, the Schencks reported their partners didn't want to continue with that deal and asked Cairns, Hall and Bill Taylor, township building inspector, to participate in the investment. Hall explained.

On Oct. 10, 1967, Hall said, Kensington Place was incorporated for purposes of developing and operating a trailer park in South Lyon.

SINCE THAT time, Hall continued, the Schencks, Continued on Page 4A

today's
hot line
Vol. 83, No. 8 50 pages, 5 sections
what's inside

6 Days Left
Only six days remain before Farmington voters will decide the fate of the annexation proposal on Nov. 3. A number of pros and cons appear inside plus letters from our readers on annexation. Arguments given inside include those from the City of Farmington, Future Farmington Association and a Chamber debate.

Pages 9-10A

All Sides Given
That six day countdown also faces Farmington Township residents, who'll be electing officers to represent them for the next two years. News stories inside reporting on debates gives the views of: Louis Rebeck and Earl Teeplees, supervisor candidates; Thomas Nolan and Harris Berger, treasurer candidates; and trustee candidates, Burton Levy, Earl Opperthaus, Dave Stader and Bill Hatton.

Pages 4, 5 and 7A

McDonald Or Harris?
The candidates for Congress in the 19th District were on the same platform last week. Republican incumbent Jack McDonald and Democratic challenger Fred Harris disagreed sharply on the economy and other issues. We covered it in detail.

Page 10C

Pursell Vs. Kadish
The two candidates for the State Senate in the 14th District squared off on parochialism and aid to education in general -- not once but twice. Who's your choice -- Republican Carl Pursell or Democrat Paul Kadish?

Pages 12-13A


Amusements	6-7C
Classified Want Ads	Sec. D
Cooking, by Elly	9C
Deaths and Funerals	14A
Editorial Viewpoints	8B
Home and Garden	6-7B
Readers' Forum	9B
Regional Affairs	9C
Ski Hill	3B
Sports-Prep and Pro	1-5B
Spotlight on Women	1-5C

upcoming

THE WEEKEND edition of the Farmington Enterprise & Observer will feature our endorsements of Farmington Township candidates we believe best qualified to serve township residents for the next two years. The weekend paper will also include concluding arguments on the annexation question. You won't want to miss this last edition before the Nov. 3 general election.

He's In Business On Your Street

The 50c you pay your Farmington Enterprise and Observer carrier each month encourages him to give good service, insuring success in his first business venture. Be sure to ask for a receipt, which will guarantee delivery of the Observer.



HALL BEGAN by stating that prior to the August primary, his opponent, Earl Teeplees, had staged a whispering campaign that Hall was using his position as supervisor for personal gain.

"There is absolutely no truth in these accusations but I



CARVING CHALLENGE — Mario Serra, seven-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. Angelo Serra of Farmington, has a mansize job facing him. He wants to carve a jack-o'-lantern from this big Mac pumpkin. Mac pumpkins are milk fed and grow to over 100 pounds. Mario painted a face on his pumpkin and still debating whether or not to carve. (Fran Evert photo)

Is Write-In Hall Puppet?

"A write-in vote is a vote for a discredited machine of Curt Hall. A vote for Earl Teeplees is a vote for responsible, solid government," says Teeplees, Farmington Township supervisor-elect.

He spoke to a group of Farmington citizens at a TV-radio station, blasting the "Curt Hall machine now governing the Township."

TEEPLEES TENTATIVELY unseated Hall in the August primary for the office of township supervisor.

"A write-in vote is a vote for Curt Hall," he told the crowd. "Look out for the Trojan horse. Isn't Curt Hall really the write-in candidate? And isn't he using a puppet to serve his machine?"

TEEPLEES ACCUSED Hall of using his "machine" to defeat any opposition by labelling them as Democrats.

"Before we go any further, let me set the record straight," he went on. "Before this so-called write-in candidate was in kindergarten, I was a card-carrying Republican. I have

voted Republican in every election, and when I could afford it, I contributed to the Republican campaign funds. I have canceled checks to prove it."

"Of course the Democratic candidates say they will support me. Everyone likes a winner, and they would like to be in office with Teeplees, too. Besides, it gives me a warm feeling to know that all of our citizens are behind me."

"I don't mind saying that I intend to serve all of the people of the township -- north, south, and all of it, be they Republican or Democrat."

TEEPLEES SAID he contributed to Gov. William Milliken's campaign "four weeks before this write-in business began."

"Where was the write-in candidate when the community really needed him? Where was he when the land developers had the administration in the pockets and the citizens were crying for representation?"

Area Best Served By Defeat Of Annexation

On Nov. 3, Farmington residents will again vote on a proposition to alter the boundaries of the Farmington Area.

The proposition is whether the southern portion of Farmington Township should be annexed to the City of Farmington.

If it's approved, the township would be left with half its territory from which another city could be formed. If it's defeated, the city would likely remain landlocked with its tax base deteriorating in future years.

The Farmington Enterprise & Observer believes city and affected township residents would be wise to vote "No" on annexation next Tuesday and we urge defeat of the question.

THE TWO ISSUES at stake are the city's ability to grow and the township's desire to incorporate into a 33-square mile home-rule city.

This newspaper does not believe the 33-square miles is untouchable and that each square mile must become a part of the proposed Farmington Hills. But we have supported and continue to support the right of Farmington Township to incorporate.

The future of both municipalities, in varying degrees, is on the line Tuesday when voters decide the annexation question. The thrust of arguments depends upon which municipality the voter resides in, but the voter should recognize there are two sides to the issue.

REASONS WHY a "YES" vote on annexation would be desirable include:

- Two equal-sized cities which would make more sense than one 33-square-mile city and a 2.5 square mile city.
- It would bring closer together the rich industrial tax base with the problem residential areas.
- The northern portion of Farmington Township has shown little concern for south end residents (describing them as "those people") and likes to forget there are low income folks in their community.
- The city has a progressive administration in existence, including an established DPW, and is able to extend its sound administration to the portion proposed to be annexed.
- The township lacks a city administration and an established DPW, but would have to build from scratch: the type of efficient government needed to provide city services.
- The city would have room to grow and would have control over the entire stretch of Grand River which needs much beautification work.

REASONS FOR a "No" vote on annexation include these:

- The City of Farmington, on Nov. 4, 1969, voted to take John Allen's "Little Birmingham" dream and preserve the quaintness of a small city by rejecting consolidation with the township.
- The City might not necessarily pump the industrial tax revenues into the poorer south end area but, instead, might rake it off for other projects such as revamping the downtown business district or building a civic arena.
- A personal property settlement made to the city could almost bankrupt the township administration.
- The city council has shown little imagination toward improving living and housing conditions in the south end but seems content only to provide water, sewer, drains, sidewalks and roads.
- The council's fright of modular housing prevents the city from doing much at all to improve substandard housing conditions.

IT IS TRUE the election of Earl Teeplees as township supervisor does not provide any ironclad

guarantees to south end residents that they will receive a fair shake from the township.

There is hope, yes, but even that has been diminished by the attempt by the power group in the northern half to regain control with their write-in candidate.

The city has pulled the reigns on its missionary zeal and promises little more than its existing city services and its greater ability to float bonds for capital improvements.

The Farmington Enterprise and Observer has consistently maintained that the township and its two villages have the right and ought to become a home-rule city. We continue that stance because the need is still pressing.

This newspaper is sympathetic to the plight of the city and believes that defeat of annexation will not necessarily trap the city into its present 2.5 square mile boundary.

With new powers granted the State Boundary Commission, that agency is now equipped to make an equitable settlement of the Farmington Area boundaries which would give the city its growing room and not rob the township.

FOR INSTANCE, there is now on file with the state a petition to incorporate the township and the Village of Quakertown. That petition will come before the Boundary Commission if annexation is defeated.



The Commission, under new legislation, has the power to square off the city's boundaries by deleting territory from the area proposed by the township for incorporation.

In other words, the commission could, by its own action, annex a couple of square miles to the city and establish an election to incorporate Farmington Hills as a 31-square mile city.

With due consideration to the residents of Wood Creek Farms, the commission could annex Wood Creek to the township immediately AFTER the township incorporates.

This could be done by a resolution passed by the commission. If villagers did not want to join Farmington Hills, they could easily petition for an election and vote to "go it alone."

A "NO" VOTE will maintain the township's right to incorporate but will not necessarily freeze the city's boundaries as now constituted.

A "NO" vote would give the Boundary Commission, with its new powers, the chance to settle the Farmington Area once and for all in a sensible, logical, equitable manner.

On the other hand, a "YES" vote would permanently divide the community into two halves and effectively prevent any future chance to consolidate the Farmington Area into a single community.

A "YES" vote would take the pressure off both the city (vacant land for taxes) and the township (city status to obtain more revenue) to get together in the long run.

The proposed annexation is not equitable and should be defeated for that reason.

But MOST IMPORTANT, the annexation proposal fails to pass the ultimate test which is: "What boundary alternative will best serve the interests of all residents of the Farmington Area community?"

Farmington Enterprise & Observer