I have talked in the past, and in the recent past, with the able director of the U.S. Travel Service and he has consistently indicated to me his confidence in the ability to the Travel Service to do a real job on travel promotion if we give the Service an adequate budget upon which he could do it.

I am sure he still believes, as he has told me previously, that a $10 million appropriation would enable his agency to have a significant impact on our travel deficit.

Even with its present and very inadequate appropriation, the U.S. Travel Service has done a gratifying job of bringing the wonders of the United States and the advantages of visiting our country to the attention of tourist agencies and would-be travelers in many, many foreign countries.

This is reflected in the fact that, for the first 10 months of 1967, the number of business and pleasure visits to the United States was up over 30 percent above the first 10 months of 1966.

Since the Travel Service was created in 1961, the flow of visitors from overseas—where we need to have our greatest impact—has tripled from a half million in 1961 to one and a half million in 1967.

This has been accomplished despite the fact that the direct-promotion aspects of the Travel Service budget are those that have to be cut back most deeply when we fail to provide the full amount authorized. The administrative costs take up a larger share of the money available and we have less, even proportionately, to spend on travel advertising, special promotions, and other essential ingredients of a good travel-promotion program.

I would like to point out that the money we give the U.S. Travel Service is far less than the amount allotted by most foreign countries for their respective official travel promotion agencies.

For example, last year Greece spent $11 million, and we spent $2,975,000; the United Kingdom, $9 million; Ireland over $13.5 million; Canada over $8 million and again I repeat the U.S. Travel Service authorization is $4,700,000 and we appropriated less than $3 million.

I feel strongly, therefore, that until the Travel Service has had a fair chance to demonstrate what it can accomplish with additional funds, we should refrain from taking any action which would not only be a blow to the freedom of Americans to travel but might well have the most unfortunate repercussions and bring retaliation abroad.

I know you have heard many statements of well-founded and cogent opposition to these travel tax proposals and I do not want to add unduly to this record. I do not need to stress the administrative complexity and ease of evasion of the expenditures tax, nor the discriminatory burdens it places on certain classes of Americans who would like to travel abroad.

But I do want to indicate why on principle I think this tax is an appallingly regressive step. Last year, after long drawn out negotiations, we finally completed the Kennedy round of trade negotiations.

As the President said in his Economic Report on February 1 of this year, this was "the most successful multilaterial agreement on tariff reduction ever negotiated."

With this tax, we are going directly counter to the spirit of the Kennedy round. Not only will it put a brake on American travel