

in my opinion that the proposed exemptions are in large part merely illusory.

III-A. INCREASED COSTS OF TRAVEL MAY REDUCE RESEARCH AND SCHOLARLY WORKS

Although much is made of the supposed ease with which members of the academic community obtain grants thereby inferring a special affluence to this group which the public may assume can bear the burdens imposed by the proposals even if members of that group cannot meet the exemption standards. This is again, in the majority of the cases, largely a myth. The greater number of funded research projects are small and barely cover transportation expenses or often exclude transportation costs and provide instead a small living stipend for the recipient at the site of his research. The proposed tax of air fares and of expenditures will quickly erode grant moneys, and also will increase the overall budget requirements of grants, which could well reduce the number of available grants. The organization which I am representing here this afternoon is one of these that feels that their research will be sizably curtailed in order to meet the proposed cost of these proposals.

III-B. PROPOSED CURBS CONSTITUTE INTERFERENCE WITH RESEARCH

Probably most important from the standpoint of members of the academic community is the interference with scholarly research that the proposals would cause. The elements of this interference are: First. The length-of-stay requirement will necessitate leaves of absence from their respective institutions, since summer vacations fall a month short of the 120 days. With a shortage of teachers, institutions of higher learning frequently will be unable to grant the requested leaves. Indirectly, then, the proposals can cut down the amount of research which can be accomplished, and this can impair an individual's effectiveness as a teacher and as a scholar. Second. Much of the foreign travel done by members of the academic community is on the level which could best be described as low or tight budget; the increased cost of transportation and the limitation on expenditures may price the trip out of the reach of the teacher of average means. This particular criticism is equally true of all low-budget travelers. Third. Although popular guidebooks tout the ease of living in "Europe on Five Dollars a Day," the average cost is usually well above that. Even where living can be accomplished at a low figure, the accommodations are well below usual American standards. There seems to be no rationale to explain why a traveler must adopt a substandard of living as a necessary sacrifice of travel. This, if done not as a matter of choice but because of the \$7-a-day ceiling, is demeaning to the individual. Particularly is this true in regard to academics traveling in Europe where academics enjoy a higher degree of prestige and status than in the United States. Subjecting the traveling scholar to this embarrassment points up another objectionable aspect of the proposals. Fourth. Interference can be found in the necessity of even more careful and additional travel records that the proposals will require. This is certainly burdensome and a hardship, albeit a minor one, but further evidence of the picayune nature of the proposals.