vacation to travel for self-improvement or study. Conversely, a tourist who can afford to spend the summer at the French Riviera or on a round-the-world cruise could easily vacation for 120 or more days and do so entirely tax-free.

This discrimination between the haves and have-nots is further aggravated by the proposed travel restrictions since they violate the ideal that citizens in a democratic society have the inherent right to travel without restrictions.

Our second contention is that the travel restriction proposals are self-defeating. Treasury figures show that in 1967, American tourists spent $3.9 billion in contrast to the $1.8 billion spent by foreign tourists in the United States. This accounted for a $2.1-billion deficit in our balance of payments. The Treasury proposal hopes to reduce this deficit by $500 million. We contend that this figure is highly speculative, but even were it to materialize it would be obtained at a tremendous cost.

More than 2 million Americans have been and are planning to travel to foreign countries during this summer. Most of these prospective travelers will consider the proposals as an unnecessary aggravation imposed upon middle-income tourists. Many who saved nickels and dimes for years in order to take that one long-awaited trip to Europe may decide to go anyway and pay the tax or try to find methods of evasion. Our memory of the chaos created by attempts to enforce the Volstead Act is too vivid to lead us to believe that these travel restrictions would not be accorded the same disdain.

Since the close of World War II, the United States has provided more than $100 billion to rehabilitate the nations of the world. As a result, the economies of many nations have improved to an extent that far exceeds our wildest expectations. Certainly, any decrease in the dollars which Americans spent abroad in 1967 will seriously affect the economies of these nations, thereby defeating the very purpose of our foreign aid program, deflating the economies which we built up, and projecting the possibility of further and more extended devaluations of currencies.

Certainly, if the restrictions are effective, in their own self-interest other nations would be compelled to retaliate, thereby nullifying any advantages we may have gained. We need only to recall that it was the United States that first imposed a tax on visas. Subsequently, practically all the nations of Europe imposed visa taxes so that in the end the United States was a loser. Fortunately, when the Marshall plan was instituted these taxes were removed from visas.

While it is doubtful that the new restrictions would produce the desired results so far as balance of payments are concerned, there is no doubt that the increased cost of collection will be substantial. Such monies could be utilized to better advantage in promoting foreign tourist travel in the United States.

As a Nation we have spent very little compared to the expenditures of many smaller nations in promoting their natural beauty and points-of-interest. With little effort on our part we could very easily increase foreign travel to this Nation, not only to equalize but, perhaps, even to exceed American tourist expenditures overseas.

The recent action to reduce air and rail travel costs in the United States of America for foreign visitors is a step in the right direction. Far more can be done, including an easing of the visa restrictions for