described our dedication to these principles as follows (*Kent* v. *Dulles*, 357 U.S. 166, 125–127):

> The right to travel is part of the "liberty" of which the citizen cannot be deprived without due process of law under the Fifth Amendment * * * In Anglo-Saxon law, that right was emerging at least as early as the Magna Carta * * *
>
> Freedom of movement across frontiers in either direction, and inside frontiers as well, was a part of our heritage. Travel abroad, like travel within the country, may be necessary for a livelihood. It may be as close to the heart of the individual as the choice of what he eats, or wears, or reads. Freedom of movement is basic to our scheme of values.

And, as recently as 1961, when Congress passed the International Travel Act of 1961, the Congress stated that its basic purpose was (a) to encourage foreign residents to visit the United States, and (b) to facilitate international travel generally.

Thus, while it is clearly understandable that the United States must take reasonable steps to improve its overall balance-of-payments position, it is perplexing to our citizens and to our friends abroad to find the U.S. Government (almost immediately after the end of the U.N.'s International Tourist Year) suddenly proposing that Americans should curtail their plans for travel outside the Western Hemisphere during 1968 and 1969. In order to accomplish this end, the administration proposes taxing travel expenditures outside this hemisphere at rates of 15 percent on daily expenditures from $8 to $15; and 30 percent on daily expenditures over $15 and that such estimated tax payments should be collected from U.S. travelers even before they depart on any such trip.

This negative proposal, coupled with the President's announcement on New Year's Day, has already had a serious adverse effect on U.S. travel abroad. Bookings to Europe have dropped off sharply because U.S. travelers are presently unable to estimate how much such trips will ultimately cost, how much they will be allowed to spend, how much they will have to deposit with the Government for taxes before they can leave, and thus whether they will be able still to afford to travel at all. Our citizens are confused and this threat of a complete reversal in U.S. travel policy has already had an alarming effect on friendly nations abroad.

Many countries, like the United States, are travel-deficit nations. For example, excluding spending for international transport, Germany, Britain, Sweden, Belgium-Luxembourg, the Netherlands, France, and Turkey were all travel-deficit nations during 1965 and 1966. This means that their citizens took more out of their respective economies while traveling abroad than was realized from foreign travelers within their borders during these years. It is altogether understandable, therefore, that these friendly nations already confronted with travel deficits of their own, are highly concerned by these proposals which threaten to worsen their own situation.

Unless the administrtaion's proposed travel restrictions are promptly rejected by this committee, it seems entirely possible that new defensive economic measures might be taken by these travel-deficit nations and others as a matter of course. Figures published by the U.S. Department of Commerce show that, during 1966, citizens of just the