

QUINCY, ILL., *February 24, 1968.*

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MILLS: In regards to the travel tax proposal I would like to submit this statement of protest for the records of the Ways and Means Committee hearing.

I am a travel counselor in a rather large agency and as such I have a double interest in this matter. I am strongly opposed to Mr. Fowler's thoughtless proposal. Aside from the fact that it is discriminatory, unjust, unenforceable, short-sighted, and I am sure unconstitutional in its restrictiveness, it is absolutely stupid in that it will create a destructive retaliation.

American tourism is one of the principal businesses all over the world, providing an income which permits foreign countries to purchase our goods. If travel is curtailed we can look forward to more taxation in order to increase our foreign aid to these countries as they will no longer be able to support themselves.

We in the travel business have been supplied with official statements from every foreign carrier and government and without exception they prove with facts and figures that they are pouring millions of dollars more into our country, in wages, advertising, American built aircraft, etc., than they are taking out. At this very moment Boeing and McDonnell-Douglas have nearly two and a half billion dollars in aircraft orders from foreign airlines, and this is just one, very small, example.

Why not put our energy into a more forward and constructive solution such as the United States Travel Service. Let us make the United States a desirable place to visit. Let us continue to travel to far off places so that the world may know that we still believe in our constitution; only then can other countries believe in us.

Respectfully yours,

DEANNA HUTMACHER.

AUSTIN, TEX., *February 12, 1968.*

GENTLEMEN: I wish to go on record as expressing my objection to the proposed travel tax. The very concept of a tax on world travel is repugnant, and it is painfully ironic that it is proposed by an administration which castigates as "isolationists" those who oppose our involvement in the Vietnamese war. What could be more isolationistic than so blatant a disregard for international trade relations, and ultimately world economy, as this tax represents?

On a more basic level is the question of whom such a tax would affect most heavily. Contrary to Congressman Pickle's statement to his constituents who oppose the tax, it is not "those who travel for pleasure and spend large amounts of money abroad," but the middle class people who have saved for years for their trip who are going to be most seriously affected. My husband is a secondary school teacher, and among our friends are *stx* couples who planned on European trips this summer. They are all teachers or professors and all have come within reach of these trips by money put aside from obviously limited salaries. That money is a set quantity. There simply is no more. The person with less limited financial resources may be annoyed at the extra outlay brought on by the tax; if they are terribly annoyed, they can always decide to go another year, or make this year's trip within this hemisphere. But there is a vast difference between being annoyed and being prevented. This tax can either prevent the trips of persons like my husband and myself, or decrease their length—the length of perhaps a once in a lifetime trip, not a "this year's trip." Three of the six couples mentioned are young and without children; to try and postpone their trips until another year would almost certainly mean that the next attempt to take the trip would be when they have children, which would either be prohibitive or limiting. Even if the trip were possible after the arrival of a child or children, it would understandably *not* be the same trip; it could never be the same trip.

The proposed tax affects those who travel because they consider it important, not because they're looking for diversion and have seen all the current movies (if that is what Congressman Pickle means by travelling "for pleasure.") But regardless of whom it affects, in principle the tax represents a restriction on the freedom of international exchange in all forms. It is a move worthy of the current Greek military regime. Surely a noisy lobby is not required in order to see this proposal rejected.

Sincerely,

LESLIE L. FENTON
 Mrs. Alan H. Fenton, Jr.