

benefit" authorized is only \$60 per month of detention (or hiding to escape internment) for persons over eighteen years of age and \$25 for persons under that age. However, also authorized are "injury, disability, or death benefits," the latter payable to certain heirs, which are to be based on the assumption that earnings would have been \$37.50 a week, with a total maximum payment of \$7,500.

Under the Act, prisoners of war and employees of contractors with the United States Government are entitled to certain benefits, and religious organizations may also be reimbursed for expenditures incurred in assisting members of the armed forces of the United States and civilian American citizens.

The benefits, especially for the civilian internees, might well have been larger, all the more so as the payments are to be made from a fund to come from liquidated enemy assets in possession of the Office of Alien Property. However, any assistance at all will be a godsend to many of the people affected, especially to those who for reasons of advanced age or broken health have not been as successful as some of the others in rehabilitating themselves.

The unfortunate thing is that there may still be further delay. At this writing, the Senate has not even as yet confirmed the President's appointments.

But there is a limit to delay. According to Section 2(c) of the War Claims Act of 1948—

"...The time limit within which claims may be filed with the Commission shall in no event be later than two years after the date of enactment of this Act."

And according to paragraph (d) of the same Section,—

"The Commission shall wind up its affairs at the earliest practicable time after the expiration of the time for filing claims, but in no event later than three years after the expiration of such time."

Two years after July 3, 1948, will be July 3, 1950, and three years after that is July 3, 1953, a total of eight years from the time of liberation.

Though many died in the Camp and many more have died since liberation, let us hope that most of the rest of the ex-internees will live that long at least. Let us hope also that the President's appointments will soon be confirmed and that the Commission will then take hold and act promptly to make up for the already too, too long deferment.

The delay would have been even greater if it had not been for the American Internees Committee in the United States which has done all it could to bring the plight of the former internees as a group to the attention of the American Government. Thanks are due especially to Mr. Frank Wilson, the Chairman of the Committee.

The Board of Directors of the American Internees Committee in Manila is at present composed of Alva J. Hill, President, Mrs. Louise M. Smith, Secretary, and Fay Bailey, Treasurer, with John Canson, Mrs. Ward B. Gregg, Donald Gunn, Stanley Lehman, and Julian A. Wolfson as the other members. Mrs. Germain Newman is the Executive Secretary. The Committee has asked all American civilian ex-internees to send their names and addresses to Mrs. Newman, P.O. Box 2418, Manila.

A prominent American businessman in Manila has asked how the Philippine Government can square the Krivenko Case decision of the Supreme Court and such legislation as the Tañada Bill, with its acceptance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights passed and proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 10, 1948.

The Supreme Court in the decision referred to in effect interpreted certain parts of the Philippine Constitution to mean that foreigners may not acquire ownership of any land here, even a residential lot. The correctness of this decision has been questioned and it is believed in some legal quarters that it did not definitely settle the constitutional question because it was not concurred in by a sufficient number of the members of the Court. The Tañada Bill, — not passed, or not as yet, would provide for the forced sale of lands "illegally" held by foreigners.

Article 17 of the Declaration of Human Rights runs:

"(1) Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

"(2) No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property."

Article 12 runs in part:

"No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home, or correspondence..."

Article 13 states in part:

"(1) Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state..."

Article 22 states:

"Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international co-operation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social, and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality."

Article 7 states:

"All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination."

Article 2 declares:

"(1) Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or status.

"(2) Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional, or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether this territory be an independent, Trust, Non-self-governing territory, or under any other limitation of sovereignty."

It is to be noted that the rights proclaimed are for "all," for "everyone." They are not limited to citizens as distinguished from other inhabitants of a country.

Those who wish to follow discriminatory nationalistic policies may point out that the Declaration is not binding law, that the Preamble says that Member States are only pledged to "achieve, in co-operation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect for and observation of human rights

and fundamental freedoms." They may point out that the Declaration itself says that the various rights are proclaimed as a "common standard of achievement," which they shall "strive" to reach, "keeping this Declaration constantly in mind."

But those who hold a decent respect for the Member Governments of the United Nations as well as for mankind, must believe that a Government which joins in the proclamation of any international declaration, does so in all sincerity, in this case especially a Government like that of the Philippines which itself played a notable part in the framing of the Declaration.

Those who so believe in the good faith of all these Member States of the United Nations can not conceive of any of them searching the text of what they have solemnly signed for loopholes of escape and evasion.

And if there are individuals in the Government here who would do such injury to the international

good name and the dignity of the Philippine Republic, then let them scan the text of the Declaration more carefully and consider the meaning of Article 30 which runs:

"Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group, or person, any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein."

This final article in the Declaration appears to be intended especially for those States, groups, or persons who might seek to misinterpret and evade the commitments made by signing the Declaration.

Of course, this article is no more binding than any part or the whole of the Declaration or, it would seem, any international declaration so long as there is no true world government or any real enforcing authority.

But the conclusion stands: There is no "squatting" possible. And the question remains: Is the Philippine Government's signature good or not.

Recommendations re American Investment

Memorandum To President Quirino

By a Committee of the American Chamber of Commerce

UPON President Quirino's invitation, a group of members of the American Chamber of Commerce of the Philippines called upon him on the afternoon before he left Manila for his visit to the United States and had an hour's conference with him regarding the local business situation and Philippine-American business relations generally.

For the President's convenience, a memorandum was left with him which, previously prepared, had formed the basis of the discussion. Because this is of general interest as the considered statement of an able business group, the memorandum is reproduced here in substance, as follows:

IN appreciation of the opportunity given us to confer with His Excellency, the President, at his invitation, shortly before his departure for the United States on an official mission, and in confirmation of statements we made orally to him on this occasion, we have the honor to submit the present memorandum.

We expressed our support of the program of cooperation between the Philippine and American Governments and their respective business groups recently put forward by the National Foreign Trade Council (New York) which is briefly summarized as follows:

1. Elimination of double taxation through the restoration of the tax incentives to American business in the Philippines before independence by extending the effectivity of Section 251 of the U.S. Internal Revenue Code.

We stated that this would be one of the most practical steps the American Government could take toward encouraging further American investment here. We expressed the opinion that private capital would not be attracted to the Philippines so long as its Philippine income is taxed not only here but in the United States as well, which results in American corporations paying a 26% tax-premium over that paid by the

nationals of other countries with whom they are in competition and who also are extensive importers of American products.

2. Increased appropriations under the Philippine Rehabilitation Act for war damages to private and public property, and the extension of the 1950 expiry date of this Act to permit of further reconstruction under its terms.

3. Assistance to the Philippines in line with Point IV of President Truman's Inaugural Address.

4. Early conclusion of the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Navigation now under negotiation between the two countries to establish *basic reciprocal rights*.

We stated that the conclusion of this Treaty would probably be the most effective, positive action which could immediately be taken.

5. Removal of the present obstacles within the Philippines to further private investment in industry and trade. These obstacles we particularized as follows:

A. — *Import Control*. Under this head we stated that we could not disapprove of Import Control as a means of balancing foreign exchange, but we pointed out that the rapid enlargement of the scope of the Control and the use being made of it for extraneous purposes is creating alarm among American businessmen and potential investors. The whole course of the Control appears to threaten more controls to come.

We stated that we feel very definitely that Import Control should be strictly limited to conserving the exchange position and that it should not be used as a means of discrimination against foreign businessmen nor as a means of forcing them to make such commitments as may be desired by the Government. In this connection we referred to the 20% quotas assigned to "new importers" and to the recent insistence of the Government that importers commit themselves to purchases of flour up to four years in advance. We pointed