some of us common garden variety people to lick our chops over such fancy talk.

The Treasury would have you inflict their impossible travel tax on over 200 million Americans to stop the so-called flow of gold by this corporal's guard of fictitious name droppers, the "jet set."

I don't believe you gentlemen have been taken in by this silly argument and I don't think it needs any more time to be stolen from your busy day.

The other major fallacy I find is the illusion, by many people in the Treasury Department, that people travel only to spend money.

Let me tell you from what I see of our readers and what I hear from them and from my experience in the travel business after some 23 years in it, people do not travel to spend money. They don't travel to shop and buy gifts and things they don't want.

People—I am talking about real people, not the "jet set"—people travel first and foremost to travel. Shopping and spending abroad is an accessory after the fact of travel, not before it. People spend to travel—they do not travel to spend. They leave home to travel. They don't leave home to buy perfume and other things. They buy them as an accessory after they are there and because they happen to be there.

The ultimate basic fallacy behind much of the talk about balance of payments and balance of trade is the attempt to create—by repeating it over and over again—the impression that there is actually a travel gap, a separate part of the economy.

There is no question that foreign travelers now spend less in the United States than American travelers spend abroad. It is also true that we spend more money abroad for Scotch whiskey than the British do for our American brands of liquor.

Can you translate that into a gap that means none of us should drink Scotch whiskey for the next 2 years. I rather doubt it. If you want to bring the matter up to date, what about the millions of dollars pouring out of the country right now to buy copper abroad because of the copper strike? Do you call that a copper gap?

There was an article in the Times yesterday that said the total spent in hard dollars, depleting our gold, in the last 8 months for copper that was not being mined here but had to be purchased abroad was $250 million. This is something that ought to be tossed in the pot when you are talking about travel and other gaps.

If you are really serious about wanting to plug the gold drain, I suggest you listen to the advice of General Eisenhower, whose judgment on matters military is still eagerly sought after.

I heard him in a press conference in Palm Springs last month in which he advocated bringing home the half-dozen divisions of American troops in West Germany. I did not ask him that question. Someone else did. So I am not presenting my own argument.

I have heard estimates from various sources that General Eisenhower's proposal, including the spending by military dependents abroad, would achieve a saving of about $700 million spent abroad.

These figures also I can't vouch for because I am not a statistician.

If you are serious about plugging the gold drain, if the Treasury is serious, they might well look to the Interior Department, to the American Virgin Islands. Its officials report, and they told me this