A complete list is enclosed herewith. (See p. 493.)

I have gone into some detail to show that ATA is not a travel agency or part of the travel industry as such. It works closely with all branches of the travel industry but is really an organization of consumers of travel.

We are sorry to have to oppose the President on this matter. But we believe the decision was made without adequate information and consultation. For it is economically unsound and a backward step in national policy as it moves away from international cooperation and development toward greater isolation.

ATA was established in 1952 as an organization devoted to purposeful travel. It was our belief that every effort should be made to encourage average citizens to travel abroad and to meet with fellow members of cooperatives, trade unions, teachers organizations, and similar groups, that in addition to seeing the Tower of London, the Eiffel Tower and the Leaning Tower of Pisa, the average American should see the headquarters of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization in Rome, the U.N. Center in Geneva, UNESCO in Paris, the cooperatives in Scandinavia. That they should have an opportunity to break bread with trade union members and with Members of Parliament in England and to see NATO factories and methods of agriculture as well as the Riviera in Southern France.

The program has been successful. Group travel is a good way to visit a foreign country—at least for the first time. And there are substantial educational opportunities as well as economies in such travel.

Now to the problem at hand. The board of directors of ATA at their meeting in January voted to ask the appropriate committees of the House and Senate for an opportunity to present the organization's position in opposition to the administration proposals.

Here, briefly, are our fundamental points:

First. The proposals will hit hardest the little people—the U.S. traveler who has saved for his "once-in-a-lifetime" trip, and the service people in the countries visited by U.S. tourists.

Second. The cutting of U.S. travel abroad will hurt the nations we want to help and bring a cutback of foreign spending in the United States that may leave us worse off in balance of payments than before we started.

Third. Restriction of travel is a move backward in foreign policy which, tied with restrictions in trade, can put us on the track back to scarcity and isolationism.

Fourth. The answer to the balance-of-payments problem lies in greater stimulation of travel to and in the United States accompanied with growing international travel, plus continued and expanded sale of U.S. goods abroad, including continuing large-scale sales of planes and equipment to foreign carriers.

It is possible to solve the balance-of-payments problem if we are willing to balance the payments at zero. But none of us would advocate that answer.

A FEW BASIC QUESTIONS

Here, Mr. Chairman, are a few basic questions. We understand that the two largest U.S. airplane manufacturers, Boeing and Douglas, have orders on their books for $2.13 billion worth of equipment for