

onal attractions. From Swaziland to Switzerland to Sweden, governments have long considered the attraction of outside visitors an important and legitimate function.

If the governments themselves did not so consider it, it was only because they could rely on a chamber of commerce which did. One need only stroll down Fifth Avenue, Piccadilly or the Via Veneto and observe the colorful and inviting window fronts of tourist bureaus representing countries in every corner of the world. In some capitals a nation's national travel office is often a bigger operation than the same country's local Embassy.

If a U.S. travel office is conspicuous by its absence in London, Rome, or Paris, the loss extends far beyond a question of prestige. Among other activities, these bureaus serve as points of distribution for local travel agents of pamphlets, guidebooks, and other promotional materials published by private and public tourist organizations in the home country.

Walk into any European travel agency and you will in all probability be able to find out the fee on the ski tow at Kitzbuehel, the price of a meal in some obscure Czechoslovak village, and everything you need to know for a trip to Uzbekistan. But chances are that the man behind the counter will not be able to tell you the train fare from New York to Chicago and has probably never even heard of Colorado Springs.

But this is only part of the promotional void.

A few pages away from the one you are now reading you will probably find at least one attractive advertisement beckoning you to some foreign land, inserted by the government-supported tourist office of that country. Nearly \$10 million worth of such advertising is placed in American newspapers and magazines every year. Needless to say, the foreign press has yet to see its first U.S.-sponsored full-color spread, portraying the gaiety of Mardi Gras in New Orleans, the excitement of an Iowa county fair, or the majestic beauty of Mount Rainier.

If there is any doubt travel advertising and related promotional activities produce results, all we need do is to look again at our own international travel statistics. Since 1953, the volume of foreign travel by our own citizens has exactly doubled. Our population has certainly not doubled in that period; our economy has not grown by anywhere near 100 percent, nor have the levels of disposable personal income. An increase of this order is obviously not the result of any lowering in travel costs.

There is, in short, very little that could explain such a phenomenal burgeoning of American travel abroad except the skillful and vigorous efforts of foreign governments and various international carriers, many of which are owned by these governments.

Aside from stimulating a broader long-term flow of visitors to this country, the program of oversea offices and paid advertising called for in Senate Bill 610 would be invaluable in publicizing our two upcoming World's Fairs. The Federal Government has devoted many millions of dollars toward making the New York fair and Seattle's "Century 21" exposition truly international showcases. A failure to back up this investment with suitable promotion abroad would be short-sighted, to say the very least.

The second major factor inhibiting an influx of tourists to the United States boils down to a question of geography—the thousand miles that separate us from our potential markets for new tourists, plus the fact that the United States is itself a mighty big country. New jet aircraft have fortunately overcome these disadvantages as far as travel time is concerned. But the problem of travel costs remains as big a hurdle as ever.

If we are ever to coax our foreign friends into seeing San Francisco as well as the east coast, or to lure them to Yellowstone Park as well as to Miami Beach, something will have to be done to keep transportation fares, both to and within the United States, as low as possible.

One suggestion has been made which deserves particularly careful study: the adoption of a flat-rate, limited-period pass by domestic carriers for exclusive use by bona fide foreign tourists. Travel-conscious European nations have long offered this money-saving convenience to American guests in the form of the famous "Eurail pass."

So far as international fares are concerned, significant reductions are bound to come as the volume of two-way traffic increases. Developing a larger flow of foreign visitors will thus serve to benefit the pocketbooks of American travelers as well.

Finally, we come to the much-discussed problem of our visa requirements—the third principal stumbling block in the way of launching a realistic travel program and the best example of why I have called the foreign visitor today's "forgotten man." As a matter of fact, the law presumes it does not even exist.

Section 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act states that "Every alien shall be presumed to be an immigrant unless he establishes . . . that he is entitled to non-immigrant status . . ." If the potential visitor happens to be young and single, or from a country whose U.S. immigration quota is oversubscribed, the task of convincing our officials that he (or she) is a bona fide non-immigrant may be anything but easy. But even if he succeeds, he must then go on to pass all of the tests of admissibility—legal requirements which were designed with the immigrant, not the visitor, in mind.

How does this work out in practice?

If a Danish citizen, for example, wants to visit his brother in Minnesota, he must first travel to our embassy in Copenhagen, present his passport, submit photographs, show evidence of his visitor status, fill in the necessary forms and then proceed to satisfy our consul that he is not feeble-minded, a drug addict, a polygamist, a criminal, a leper, a professional beggar, or a person liable to become a public charge or who has any immoral purpose in coming to the United States.

There are 31 separate categories of excludable aliens and the whole procedure may take anywhere from a day to a month.

Finally, with visa in hand, our Danish friend catches his plane, feeling like a Brooklyn schoolboy who has just wangled a ticket to the world series—until he arrives in New York. Then he discovers that this hard-won piece of paper is nothing more than a permit to apply for entry into the United States.

He must now take on a completely new branch of our bureaucracy, the Immigration and Nationalization Service, and satisfy them, too, of his honesty, morality, and financial resources. If he is lucky, the inspector stamps his passport "Admitted" and the ordeal is over.

But suppose instead that the brother in Minnesota decides on a trip to Denmark. The contrast is almost unbelievable. Never once does he see the inside of an embassy or consulate. The first Danish official he encounters is at the airport in Copenhagen, a pleasant fellow who stamps his passport "Welcome to Denmark" (in English, mind you), hands him an envelope with a souvenir medallion and a letter of greeting, and sends him on his way.

It is a demonstrable fact that the average Dane, Swiss, Hollivian, or Thai today finds it much easier to enter Communist Russia than to get within sight of the Statue of Liberty. For all our talk about the Iron Curtain, the unpleasant truth is that when it comes to international pleasure travel our

of . . . can be the barrier to

penetrate than the Iron. The Department of State is to be commended for its recent abolition of the so-called "long form" for visitors, thus clearing away some of this red tape. But that is only one step in the right direction. Further administrative improvements to expedite visa issuance can profitably be made, including faster staffing of our consulates abroad.

It is probably also time to take a long new look at the law itself. I am constantly struck by the brevity of our statute on passport eligibility for Americans, which is only a few lines long, compared with the page after page of legal provisions applicable to friendly tourists. Surely it is just as damaging to the national interest (if not more so) to have American indigents, prostitutes, and so forth, displaying our flag abroad as it is to allow such persons into this country temporarily from abroad.

Yet we have never felt the necessity for placing endless restrictions on American tourists, and rightly so. Why, then, should our foreign visitors present such a different problem? Legislation looking toward a simplification of the law respecting foreign visitors has recently been introduced by two of my colleagues, Senator JACOB JAVITS and Representative JOHN LINDBAY, both of New York. These measures deserve our careful consideration.

Sensible administration of revised visa laws, plus reasonably lower transport costs, plus an adequate program of travel promotion abroad should result in a significantly increased stream of foreign visitors. But will we be prepared to receive them? More important than any other aspect of our national travel program is the care and attention we give to this question.

Unless we can gear our own tourist industry—an industry which in a way includes almost all of us—to an accommodation of the special requirements of new foreign guests, it might be better not to extend the invitation.

This means more and better packaged tours, solicitation and accommodation of specialized groups of travelers, an end to the notorious rudeness of baggage handlers and other service personnel at ports of entry, sight-seeing trips built around the needs and interests of foreign guests, civic and private hospitality clubs to meet and socialize with oversea travelers, more language proficiency on the part of sight-seeing, hotel and other key industry employees, and many, many other things. Above all, it means a general recognition of the importance of assuring that each traveler from abroad returns to his home with a higher opinion of America, her ideals, her institutions and her people.

The less than \$5 million travel program which the President and we in the Senate have recommended may never completely close the travel gap. But it still adds up to a mighty inexpensive welcome mat for a Nation which prides itself on being a good neighbor.

## A CIA Briefing by the New York Times

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OR

### HON. WILLIAM FITTS RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 25, 1961

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of April 22, 1961, by the highly respected Latin American correspondent for the Times, Mr. Tad Szulc,