White House Unit On Antitrust Policy Seems a Mystery

By Morton Mintz Washington Post Staff Writer

Federal officials expressed what, precisely, is "govern-irprise yesterday over a ment antitrust policy."

One of the close advisers, Nixon administration statement that the President had once "approved a proposal for N. Mitchell, dealt with the iscreating a central clearing house for information about clearing within the White House,"

"Ive just never heard of it," said a high official of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division. "I was astonished," he said.

Another high division official said, "I never heard about it, either."

Both officials were in the Antitrust Division in April 1971—when, according to Tuesday's presidential "White Paper" on the International Telephone and Telegraph anti-trust decision, the "clearing trust decision, the house" was approved.

The purpose of the proposal was "to ensure that the President's views on the subject could be made known to all the operating agencies," the "White Paper" said.

It did not say whether the proposal was ever implemented, who was in charge of the "clearing house," if anyone was, or whether the "operating agencies" included the independent ones with antitrust responsibilities, especially the Federal Trade Commission.

"We never hear of it," the

sworn denials by close advisers that he personally had intervened in the ITT case, and

sue of presidential intervention when he testified in March, 1972, at Senate Judiciary Committee hearings on the armination of his successions. the nomination of his succes-

"But specifically, with respect to ITT or any other litigation, no, I have never talked to the President about it."

In flat contradiction of this, the "White Paper" says that on April 21, 1971, Mitchell "advised the President that in his judgment it was inadvisable for the President to order no appeal to the Supreme Court" of a lower court ruling approving ITT's acquisition of Grinnell Corp.

ity of conglomerate mergers, in which one firm acquiring another in a different line of business may substantially told the lessen competition or develop Committee.

"We never hear of it," the FTC's information director, Arthur L Amolsch, told a report L Amolsch, told a substantial potential for report L Amo



ERWIN N. GRISWOLD . . . threatened to quit

sor, Richard G. Kleindienst.
"Did the Prseident ever call you and say, 'Lay off ITT'?" asked Sen. Roman L. Hruska (R-Neb.).

(R-Neb.). The April 19 decision was to order Kleindienst not to appeal, on the ground that the department," Mitchell said. "But specifically with respect would now it and the case." would permit antitrust suits to be brought against large American companies simply on the basis of their size," the White Paper said.

Kleindienst said on Nov. that the President ordered him to drop the appeal him to "without "without any discussion." Kleindienst said he then sent word to Mr. Nixon that he would resign if the President "persisted."

Kleindienst, as Deputy At-The purpose of an appeal, torney General, was in charge sought by then antitrust chief of the ITT case because Mitch-Richard W. McLaren, was to ell had disqualified himself. get a final ruling on the legal-ity of conglomerate mergers, was "that my former law firm "that my rormer in...
done work for one of
"subsidiaries," Mitchell had ITT's subsidiaries," Mitchell told the Senate Judiciary

for Mr. Nixon.

In San Clemente, Deputy White House press secretary Gerald L. Warren told newsmen that Mr. Nixon has no further plans to explain to the public his role in the Watergate and related scandals. Warren declined to say why Kleindienst's threat to why Kleindienst's threat to quit was omitted from the White Paper, which he termed "complete and detailed from the perspective of the President."