The Washington Merry-Go-Round

Cover-Up Pervading Administration

By Jack Anderson

parently has become the style mendations or planning data" throughout the Nixon adminis- to the GAO. tration. Government auditors have been "increasing difficulties" in gaining access to records of made available to other agenraud, waste and mismanage- cies. "As a practical matter," ment.

rom inside the General Ac-not cooperate with the GAO." counting Office, which is the investigative arm of Congress. Under the law, the GAO has a right "to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any . . . department."

Yet obstacles have been raised, in apparent violation of this law, to hamstring GAO investigations. Comptroller General Elmer Staats confirmed to my associate, Joseph fore, "declined to pursue the Spear, that his auditors have noticed a "distinct tightening up" of their access to documents.

As Staats puts it, government agencies have become tary assistance and foreign aid "super cautious," thereby causing "tremendous delays" in GAO's investigations. Worst offenders: the State, Defense cover-up administration. and Treasury departments.

ample, ordered its employees ity to take uncooperative Protection Act of 1973." The Watergate cover-up ap- not to disclose any "recom- agencies to court. If an agency

> Treasury's Internal Reveencountering nue Service simply refuses to let the GAO look at its books. although IRS records are Staats told Spear, "we don't

see why they should cooper-This is the report we get ate with so many others and

Even the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, a quasigovernmental agency, has refused to open its files to the auditors. Last fall, the GAO requested some records, but CPB responded by circulating | ment of antitrust and coercion a confidential memo to its officers instructing them not to cooperate. They were told to say that the inquiries were "beyond the scope" of GAO's authority and that they, therematter."

President Nixon himself set the pattern by invoking execuive privilege to block the GAO from examing "internal working documents," for milispending.

What the President once promised would be an "open" administration has become a

State's Agency for Interna- situation is so serious that he farm bill ironically entitled

tional Development, for ex-lis asking Congress for author-}"Agricultural and Consumer should still refuse to cooperate, the GAO wants the legal right to cut off its funds.

Milk Prices

In the name of "consumer protection," the Senate Agriculture Committee has passed legislation that would raise milk prices and fatten the bank accounts of the big milk cooperatives.

Even more shocking, the language was drafted by two milk co-ops that have been accused by the Justice Departcharges.

The measure would give Associated Milk Producers, Inc. and Dairymen, Inc., together with their allies throughout America, the power to raise milk prices without serious government hindrance. It would also strike heavily at the nation's independent dairy farmers.

The two big co-ops have been charged in federal civil antitrust suits with "coercion," "threats" and attempted boycotts of other milk producers.

Yet they were able to get their friends in the Senate to slip the anti-consumer milk dairy imports that prices will Footnote: Staats feels the provision into the omnibus go up anyway.

The sheer size of the bill made it easy for the two coops to weave language, worth millions to the milk industry, into the bill. The 110 witnesses in 14 days of hearings so bewildered some senators that they left the final meeting not knowing exactly what they had voted for.

Dairy contributions of more than \$50,000 to seven committee members may also have helped mute senatorial objections.

They are Sens. Richard Clark (D-Iowa), \$7,500; Carl Curtis (R-Neb.), \$2,000; Bob Dole (R-Kan.), \$2,500; James Eastland (D-Miss.), \$15,000; Jesse Helms (R-N.C.), \$1,000; Walter Huddleston (D-Ky.), \$18,000; Hubert Humphrey (D-Minn.), \$4,100.

Consumer-minded senators, who discovered the multimillion-dollar bonanza after it. had already been approved by the committee, hope to remove it from the final bill on the Senate floor. Otherwise, they fear it not only would boost milk prices but would kill any chance that the antitrust suits can be prosecuted.

10

Footnote: Milk importers have complained that the dairy lobby has so limited

© 1973. United Feature Syndicate