are too adept at finding the loopholes. In the overwhelming majority of cases, it will be levied against the American businessman and his wife; the retiree; the student; the stenographer; and the American familyman who wants to pay a nostalgic visit to the land of his ancestors and perhaps to some of his relatives abroad. Indeed, this has historically been true about the great majority of American travelers abroad. In this regard the Supreme Court stated in its 1958 opinion in *Kent* v. *Dulles* at pages 126–127:

> Freedom of movement also has large social values * * *
>
> Foreign correspondents and lecturers on public affairs need first hand information. Scientists and scholars gain greatly from consultation with colleagues in other countries. Students equip themselves for more fruitful careers in the United States by instruction in foreign universities. Then, there are reasons close to the core of personal life—marriage, re-uniting families and spending hours with old friends.
>
> Finally, travel abroad enables American citizens to understand that people like themselves live in Europe and helps them to be well-informed on public issues. An American who has crossed the ocean is not obliged to form his opinions about our foreign policy merely from what he is told by officials of our government or by a few correspondents of American newspapers * * *

It should perhaps also be reemphasized at this point that, while the United States is a "travel deficit" nation, it is simultaneously the No. 1 host Nation in the world to foreign visitors—in economic terms the major "exporter" of tourism. In 1966, for example, while 1,570,000 Americans were visiting Europe and the Mediterranean, 8,223,000 foreign tourists were visting the United States. True, about 6 million came from Canada and 400,000 from Mexico. But, the rest came from overseas, and in total, this vast number of visitors proves that the United States is fully capable of increasing its hold on the title "No. 1 Tourist Nation in the World"; and of increasing many times over the number of tourists who want to visit the United States from Europe.

This can be done if the United States will adopt and maintain a strong, positive promotional program. Conversely, it cannot be done if the United States, as the existing No. 1 host to foreign tourists, suddenly clamps down on its own tourism "imports" by taxation. This is true especially when we realize that our biggest overseas market is shown by research to be more than 13 million people financially able to "visit U.S.A.," is in Western Europe.

Short-sighted, restrictive measures can produce adverse ramifications not immediately apparent when they are first enacted into law. U.S. and foreign carriers have committed themselves to multi-billion-dollar expansion programs, with orders for American-built aircraft already on the books. Consider the situation which could develop if the American tourist, faced with a complicated tax on travel abroad, simply decides to remain at home. It is, of course, impossible to estimate at this time the full extent of the damage not only to the travel and transportation industries but also to the American aircraft manufacturing industry, to say nothing about how much this Government would lose in tax revenues previously realized from the profitable overseas transportation and tourist industries.

Another important point to consider is the effect travel restrictions might have on U.S. foreign trade in goods and services which presently accounts for a substantial surplus in our balance-of-payments accounts. Although tourism is part of the whole picture of interna-