

2. Kennedy Round—favorable or unfavorable to U.S. exports?: As stated in one of the ads I showed, "the impetus to international trade should be enormous, judging from the experience of the European Economic Community. Over a five-year period, they reduced tariffs between member nations by 50%. In the same period, world trade rose about 42%. But trade between members of the EEC during that time increased about 100%."

As for how well the U.S. fared from the negotiations, I respectfully refer Committee members to the "Report on United States Negotiations," General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, 1964-67 Trade Conference, Geneva (U.S. Government Printing Office: 1968 O-305-215 (106)).

Volume I (General Summary), Parts 3 and 4, analyses concessions granted on principal products by other countries and by the United States. With few exceptions, the U.S. got more than it gave, as anyone who takes the time to read it will discover. (This is, incidentally, a beautifully organized document.)

Along other lines not relating to my testimony so much as the hearings in general, I noted that there were frequent references to the overall Balance of Payments problem in general, and I noted, too, that there seemed to be agreement that the Travel Tax Program was but a small contribution, if any, to its solution. In this regard, I support fully the broader recommendations outlined in "The Balance of Payments in 1968" (Salant and Associates), a study commissioned by the Brookings Institute at the behest of the Council of Economic Advisors at the request of President Kennedy in 1962 and completed in January 1963.

Sincerely,

COLLINGWOOD J. HARRIS,
Chairman.

P.S.—I would appreciate very much your extending the above remarks into the record.

C. J. H.

Mr. ULLMAN. Our next witness is Prof. James Weeks.

Please identify yourself, Professor Weeks, and state whom you represent and proceed as you see fit.

**STATEMENT OF JAMES K. WEEKS, SECRETARY, ADVISORY COUNCIL,
PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF INTERNATIONAL LAW INSTITUTE OF
NEW YORK CITY**

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, my name is James K. Weeks. I am associate professor of law, College of Law, Syracuse University. I am appearing on behalf of the Procedural Aspects of International Law Institute of New York City, for the advisory council of which I am secretary.

Mr. ULLMAN. You may proceed.

Mr. WEEKS. During the past weeks since the administration's proposals regarding travel curbs were announced the critical responses have been fairly narrow in scope. The majority of these have raised the fear of retaliatory measures by foreign governments, whose economies are dependent in large measure upon tourism; or the specter of authoritarianism which restrictions upon travel imply. Therefore, I should like to direct this committee's attention to some of the particulars of the regulations which I think demand more careful consideration than has been given to date.

**I. AREAS OF CONCERN CURRENTLY NEGLECTED BY PUBLICITY RE PROPOSED
TRAVEL CURBS**

Insufficient attention has been paid to other equally important aspects of the problem. Although the proposals contain exemptions for the less affluent traveler, they are unrealistic in both the extent of the exemption and the qualifying standards. The very concept of exemp-