really targeted elsewhere. "Actually, the Bushel for a Barrel isn't aimed directly at OPEC," the BFAB spokesman said. "They consume so little grain it wouldn't work." What we really want is to raise the prices for Japan and Eastern Europe. They can afford it.... As for the Third World, we aren't talking about food as a weapon. The Weaver bill would set aside funds for famine relief, or if Congress wanted to negotiate one-to-one deals, it could. But it's a disservice to those countries to sell them grain too cheap. Higher prices would encourage them to grow it themselves, to irrigate new land." Asked when they will get the funds to do that, he replied, "That's another question."

The bill, H.R. 4237, introduced by Rep. Weaver (D-Ore.) and 52 co-sponsors and the subject of two days of public hearings on June 5 and 6, is presently dormant, with no new action scheduled. Testimony on the legislation was, according to committee personnel, overwhelmingly negative—including, significantly, the major producer groups who were expected to be roped in on the guarantee of high prices.

—Susan Cohen

COMMODITIES

U.S. land policy fight may be oil multis boon

This year's U.S. Justice Department review of tendencies toward monopolization in the mining industry (a report Justice is obliged to put out annually since passage of the 1976 Federal Coal Leasing Act) doesn't bring a single U.S. mining corporation to task. Rather, the full venom of the report is directed against the U.S. Department of the Interior, which Justice calls the "biggest mining monopoly" in the U.S.

The grounds for the Justice Department attack are that Interior has oversight over that vast portion of U.S. land surface held by the federal government—one-third of total U.S. land surface—and that because of standing environmentalist legislation, Interior is refusing to give the land up for mining development.

Along the same lines, the General Accounting Office has just released a draft review of the results of joint work by Interior and the Department of Energy on non-fuel minerals leases. The draft was first presented during May hearings of the House Committee on Mines, where the GAO is reported to have lashed out at the paltry results of this collaboration between Interior and the DOE, leaving Interior Undersecretary Davenport speechless during her testimony.

On June 26, the House Committee on Mines will convene again, this time to review Interior's coal and coal-leasing policy. As one Committee staffer reported, "some interesting fireworks" are expected during that session.

From environmentalism to "big trusts"

The degree to which U.S. land development is presently hamstrung by environmentalist law is dramatized by the 1978 federal law suit, Hughes vs. NRDC (Natural Resources Defense Council). As a result of that suit, the NRDC, a privately-funded environmentalist organization controlled by Laurance Rockefeller, was given jurisdiction, or "final say," by the Department of Interior over allocation of leases on land bearing coal deposits.

Last month, when Interior Secretary Andrus announced that the federal government was going to issue leases for 1.5 billion tons of new coal development through 1981, Washington sources revealed that Andrus intended to hold private talks with NRDC to see if he could get an out-of-court compromise which would allow these leases to go through.

As ludicrous as present federal land policy is, however, all indications thus far are that Rep. Santini (D.-Nev.), his House Mining Committee, the GAO, and the Justice Department are launching attacks against the Carter administration to push a land policy which will have little benefit for the U.S. economy. According to Santini's staff, one of the major goals of the attacks underway is to force the Administration to repeal antitrust guidelines which currently hinder cartelization in the mining industry.

As matters now stand in the U.S. economy, however, any major push to allow greater trustification in mining can only benefit one group of corporations: the oil conglomerates, which are presently diversifying into raw materials. None of the other U.S. mining corporations—the largest included—are able to financially match the oil companies on bids for major land holdings, or on the expenditures which must be put into environmental protection equipment for new mines.

—Renée Sigerson