

Advisory Board of the United

States on March 5, It 'points out that though the average level of US tariffs has been brought down from 45 per cent in 1934 to 12½ per cent, on some individual commodities the duty is still fantastically high. There are plenty of goods which are subjected to duties ranging from 30 to 50 per cent.

An instance in point is the duty on cheap briar pipes which come from France, and Italy and have to pay a duty as high as 75 per cent *ad valorem* in some cases. Manufacture of these pipes was begun in US during the war and after the resumption of imports from the continent, makers of briar pipes approached the US Tariff Commission for relief and the latter in turn recommended a further rise in import duties on them, to which President Eisenhower has withheld his assent. It will be recalled that American watchmakers had made a similar request for and the Tariff Commission recommended an increase in the duty on imported parts, which President Truman rejected last year,

If Europe is to rely on trade and not aid, this is an important finding, because it has often been suggested that there was little scope for narrowing the dollar gap through reduction in US tariffs. In view of the heavy duty on particular groups of imports, the Public Advisory Board suggests that the upper limit should be fixed at 40 per cent except where there is a clear need for protection in the interests of national security. A measure of this kind will provide the much needed assurance to exporters that the substantial investments that are necessary for entering the American market would be worthwhile.

Equally important, if not more so, is a revision of the US Customs Administration. The Public Advisory Board also suggests that it is even more important than the tariff reduction. A reform long overdue is a reduction in the variety of tariff categories numbering over 8,000 which makes the position of new products extremely insecure. Another is adoption of a simple standard of valuation for assessment of duty. A revision of customs procedure was approved by the House, though not by the Senate, in 1951- The President has asked the Congress for such revision and legislation is expected to be passed during the present session of the Congress.

Letters to the Editor

Indian Employees in Foreign Firms

In your otherwise excellent review of the Government Survey of the Employment of Indians in predominantly foreign commercial concerns, there are two serious omissions which should not go unnoticed. One is your failure to see that what matters more is not the grouping by salary but the distinction made, particularly in British firms, between covenanted hands who are mainly non-Indian and others, whatever their salary. The Head *Sarkar* or *Munim* in a big shipping firm may draw a salary of Rs 1,000 or more, but is his position comparable in any way to that of the junior-most European assistant, who may have a starting salary of Rs 100 only? True enough, if instead of basic salary, information had been asked for full emoluments drawn by each class of employees, some part of the discrepancy would have been brought, out but not the whole of it. What makes things galling for Indian employees even for those in the highest salary group is this distinction between the "heaven-born" and the 'Lain admis'.

The second omission is the table of nationalities of non-Indians in foreign (inns which runs as follows:

Nationality	1947	1952
British	6,495	6,820
Other European	403	535
American	183	202
Canadian	28	22
Australian	14	14
New Zealander	5	6
Israeli	1	—
Pakistani	—	6
Others	33	48

Total 7,162 7,653

The small number of American employees invites close scrutiny. On the face of it, the figure appears to be an under estimate.

May be highly paid Americans working here are classed as factory representatives or in some other category, and their salaries are debited to the head office account. Hence they do not figure among the employees of the foreign concerns doing business in India. On any other assumption the smallness of the number is difficult to explain.

The entry under Israeli as also that under Pakistani merits attention for a similar reason, viz, the suspicion it raises about the reliability of the figures. Who could be an Israeli in 1947? And yet, one is shown under this head for that year while none are registered for 1952 Again, could there be only 6 Pakistanis working in commercial concerns all over India in

Indian Employee

Andhra's Claim on Madras Historic

I have read Shri R Srinivasan's eloquent rejoinder to my letter with an open mind. How I wish he had read my contentions more carefully before rushing to print. his verbose rejoinder! Briefly, tile two points raised by me boiled down to this that Andhra's claim on Madras was historic and that instead of imposing" arbitrary decisions, a boundary Commission should have been set up to decide the future of Madras from an objective view-point (of course, after giving" due hearing to all the claimants).

I am sorry Shri Srinivasan neither brought forward any evidence to refute my first point, nor did he try to touch the second one. Is it then the weakness of his own case that has led him to wander into irrelevancies instead of sticking to the path of plain historical facts and fair judgment?

Hartirath Singh

New Delhi-5, February 17, 1953.

A LIFE or a PROPERTY
... IT'S WORTH INSURING!
CALCUTTA INSURANCE LTD.
 Haroon House, Bazargate St., Fort, Bombay.
 LIFE * FIRE * MARINE * MOTOR * ACCIDENT * MISCELLANEOUS