

The coal-miners have gone back to work for a fortnight, without a contract. (Mr. Lewis, who has a Hitlerish love of legal form, likes to claim that to stay away from work in the absence of a contract is not the same as a strike.) What will happen when the fortnight is up is anybody's guess. On the surface, the deadlock is still complete: the President insists that only the War Labour Board must deal with it, while Mr. Lewis refuses to discuss it with the Board. This is much more than a mere conflict of jurisdiction; the Board, which includes representatives of the A.F.L. and C.I.O., is an important part of the war-time structure of the Administration. Meanwhile flanking operations are in progress in two directions. Mr. Ickes, who now controls the mines in the name of the United States Government, has ordered them to work a 6-day week; this will raise the miners' weekly wage to at least what they have been asking, but it, of course, involves other complications—the extra cost to the owners, the problem of selling the extra coal—which Mr. Ickes has not attempted to deal with. At the same time the Office of Price Administration is making plans to reduce the cost of living and thus to meet, at least in part, the grievance that wages have been stabilised at a level which has been rendered inequitable by later rises in food and other prices. This grievance is felt by the A.F.L. and C.I.O. Unions, as well as by the miners, and public opinion admits that it is well founded. It appears that O.P.A. intends to follow British precedents, which have been widely commended in press comment, and to reduce or keep down prices by the use of subsidies. This process was already hinted at in the President's "hold the line order" of April, but it cannot be carried far without asking Congress for fresh appropriations; and the Farm *Bloc* has been against subsidies in the past, since it prefers less selective methods of remunerating the farmer.

Mr. Lewis continues cheerfully to describe the United States Government as "the new employer." The President appears to accept the term, and shows confidence that the miners will not strike against the Government. Meanwhile, the fear is expressed in some quarters that the seizure of the mines is just what Mr. Lewis wants. This throws a somewhat disconcerting light on the anti-strike Bill proposed by Senator Connally, passed by the Senate on the 5th May by a vote of 63 to 16, and now before the House. This Bill (amongst other provisions) empowers the Government to seize any plant essential to the war effort which is closed owing to a labour dispute, and lays down penalties for interference with Government operation after such seizure has taken place. It is generally thought of as hostile to labour; the union leaders object to it now, as they did a year ago, when it was first put forward. Some of its supporters, e.g., the *New York Times* (which, like all the greatest papers in the United States, is a resolute champion of private enterprise), are now suggesting that the penalty should be applicable after a decision by the War Labour Board, without its being necessary "to penalise the innocent party" by Government seizure of private property. For this and other reasons there is some demand that the provisions of the Bill should be stiffened in the House. On the other hand, Organised Labour can probably put up more of a fight there than in the Senate.

On his return from his recent tour of Southern training camps the President made an interesting reference to one of the plans he is making for the country's future. He suggested that after the war there should be some sort of compulsory national service of a civilian character, under which all young men should have a year of training and work on leaving school or college. Thus the camps on which vast sums have been and are being spent would serve a permanent purpose, and future age-groups would get the physical and educational benefits which military service was giving those now in training. Though this proposal has not yet received much attention, it is not unlikely that it represents a well-defined purpose in Mr. Roosevelt's mind and that more will be heard of it. Perhaps the only New Deal institution which won general approval was the "Civilian Conservation Corps," in which scores of thousands of unemployed young men were given a period of forestry and similar work with immense benefit to themselves and the country. The C.C.C. (which is no longer needed under war conditions) was planned on a very big scale, but compulsory national service on similar lines would, of course, be much bigger still.

LATIN AMERICA.

Of the speeches delivered on Labour Day, the 1st May, three call for notice. President Ríos of Chile and President López of Colombia both envisaged national policies increasingly conscious of the claims of Labour. The Labour movement

in Latin America is strongest in Mexico, Cuba, Chile, Argentina and Colombia and most radical in the first three of these countries. It was stimulated, especially in the Andean republics, by a tour which Sr. Lombardo Toledano, President of the Confederation of Latin American Workers (C.T.A.L.), made last autumn. Since then, however, relations between Labour and the Governments of Bolivia and Ecuador have degenerated. In the Bolivian tin-miners' strike in December, which was firmly repressed by the Government, Sr. Lombardo Toledano unsuccessfully intervened in favour of the miners by means of messages to President Roosevelt and Vice-President Wallace. In Ecuador, as a follow-up to Sr. Lombardo Toledano's visit, a Labour Congress was arranged for March and the Government, however reluctantly, promised it a measure of official support. But when the Archbishop of Quito and the Confederation of Catholic Workers announced their intention of boycotting it the Government withdrew its promised support; and when the Congress did meet, obstacles were put in its way, some Ecuadorean Socialists were arrested and a visiting Labour leader from Colombia was deported.

The third of the May Day speeches was that delivered by the Argentine Foreign Minister, Dr. Ruiz Guinazú. It was one of his few utterances which did not gratify pro-Axis elements in Argentina. His remarks on the totalitarian State, which he said was "essentially pagan" and could not prosper "in our climate," drew from the violently pro-Axis paper, *El Pampero*, the rebuke that he had forgotten Moscow and Wall Street. Dr. Ruiz Guinazú's speech, however, was no more than an expression of orthodox, conservative Catholicism and is not to be taken as implying any change in Argentine foreign policy.

In the absence of a quorum in the Bolivian Chamber in the last week of April action on the "state of war" was postponed until the return of President Peñaranda from Washington. He arrived there on the 5th May, accompanied by his Foreign Minister, Dr. Tomás Elio, and by the somewhat enigmatic Colonel David Toro, who was President of Bolivia in 1936-37 as an exponent of the Germán Busch brand of totalitarian socialism, was thereafter in exile and has at least until recently been regarded as sympathetic to the Axis and a potential threat to the Bolivian Government. Just before his departure to Washington Dr. Elio, in an interview, said that Bolivia would not renounce its legitimate territorial and maritime claims. He referred, of course, to the Pacific littoral lost to Chile in the War of the Pacific, and his remarks confirm the view (see *Summary* No. 184) that the hope of recovering some of the lost territory was one of the factors that led to the declaration of a "state of war" on the 7th April. The Chilean Government, though not inclined to take Dr. Elio's remarks too seriously, issued on the 6th May a statement to the effect that it considered all territorial issues between Bolivia and Chile as settled by the Treaty of 1904 and would oppose any attempt to reopen them.

On the 26th April the joint resolution of the United States Senate and House approving the executive agreement concluded on the 18th May, 1942, between the Governments of the United States and Panamá was forwarded to President Roosevelt. The agreement ceded to Panamá the water, sewage and sanitation installations in Panamá City and Colon as well as the real estate, not used for transport purposes, owned by the Panamá Railroad Company in those cities. It also cancelled the Export-Import Bank loan of \$2,500,000 of 1940 which was appropriated to the new road between the Canal Zone and the Río Hato base. The executive agreement, as well as the military agreement concluded at the same time, was an acknowledgment of the many facilities (including sites for 80 bases in Panamanian territory) granted by the Panamanian Government to the United States. Its ratification had been opposed in the United States Senate, not on the ground of its contents but because critics of President Roosevelt consider the device of the executive agreement as an attempt to by-pass the Senate in the conduct of foreign policy.

On the 4th May, as a result of personal attacks on two Ministers in relation to imports from the United States, the Venezuelan Cabinet resigned. It was reconstituted with four changes (one favourable to survivors of the former Gómez régime) on the 7th. The next Latin American President to visit Washington is likely to be President Morinigo of Paraguay, who, having necessarily achieved re-election in March (when he was the only candidate), is to make his journey north early in June. In Peru the acute shortage of foodstuffs in urban areas is being made full use of by Axis agents who are trying, with some success, to foster the belief that it is due to exports of food supplies to the United States.