

Y 4
. J 89/1
90/14

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

1020

4/1/06
1/16/85
4/1/06

WAIVER OF TOURIST VISAS

GOVERNMENT

Storage

HEARING

BEFORE

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETYETH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

H.R. 15651

A BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT
TO FACILITATE THE ENTRY OF FOREIGN TOURISTS INTO
THE UNITED STATES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Serial No. 14

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1963

92-368



AY
1/28/11
20/11

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

EMANUEL CELLER, New York, *Chairman*

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Ohio | WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, Ohio |
| EDWIN E. WILLIS, Louisiana | RICHARD H. POFF, Virginia |
| PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey | ARCH A. MOORE, Jr., West Virginia |
| BYRON G. ROGERS, Colorado | WILLIAM T. CAHILL, New Jersey |
| HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts | CLARK MacGREGOR, Minnesota |
| JACK B. BROOKS, Texas | CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, Jr., Maryland |
| WILLIAM M. TUCK, Virginia | EDWARD HUTCHINSON, Michigan |
| ROBERT T. ASHMORE, South Carolina | ROBERT McCLORY, Illinois |
| JOHN DOWDY, Texas | HENRY P. SMITH III, New York |
| BASIL L. WHITENER, North Carolina | WILLIAM V. ROTH, Jr., Delaware |
| ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin | THOMAS J. MESKILL, Connecticut |
| JAMES C. CORMAN, California | CHARLES W. SANDMAN, Jr., New Jersey |
| WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE, Connecticut | TOM RAILSBACK, Illinois |
| DON EDWARDS, California | EDWARD G. BIESTER, Jr., Pennsylvania |
| WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, Missouri | CHARLES E. WIGGINS, California |
| HERBERT TENZER, New York | |
| JOHN CONYERS, Jr., Michigan | |
| ANDREW JACOBS, Jr., Indiana | |
| JOSHUA EILBERG, Pennsylvania | |

- BESS E. DICK, *Staff Director*
 WILLIAM R. FOLEY, *General Counsel*
 GARNER J. CLINE, *Counsel*
 HERBERT FUCHS, *Counsel*
 WILLIAM P. SHATTUCK, *Counsel*
 JEROME M. ZEIFMAN, *Counsel*
 BENJAMIN L. ZELENKO, *Counsel*
 CHARLES J. ZINN, *Law Revision Counsel*
 DONALD G. BENN, *Associate Counsel*
 DONALD E. SANTARELLI, *Associate Counsel*
 FRANKLIN G. POLK, *Associate Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 1

GENERAL JURISDICTION OVER JUDICIARY BILLS AS ASSIGNED.
SPECIAL JURISDICTION OVER IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY

MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Ohio, *Chairman*

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| PETER W. RODINO, Jr., New Jersey | ARCH A. MOORE, Jr., West Virginia |
| HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts | WILLIAM T. CAHILL, New Jersey |
| JOHN DOWDY, Texas | CLARK MacGREGOR, Minnesota |
| GARDNER J. CLINE, <i>Counsel</i> | |
| DONALD G. BENN, <i>Associate Counsel</i> | |

CONTENTS

Testimony of—	
Hon. Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Under Secretary of State, accompanied by Nathan Lewin, Deputy Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.....	Page 4
Hon. Raymond F. Farrell, Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, accompanied by James L. Hennessy, Executive Assistant.....	22
Hon. John Black, Director, U.S. Travel Service, Department of Commerce.....	26
Hon. Donald G. Agger, Assistant Secretary of Transportation for International Affairs and Special Programs.....	31
Statements received from—	
Air Transport Association of America.....	33
American Automobile Association.....	34
American Society of Travel Agents, Inc.....	35
Transportation Association of America.....	36
Telegram received from National Association of Travel Organizations.....	38

CONTENTS

122	1	Hon. Nicholas J. B. Karamba, Under Secretary of State, Room 5600, State Department, Washington, D. C.	
123	2	Hon. Raymond E. Carroll, Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, accompanied by James A. Hanney, Executive Assistant	
124	3	Hon. John B. Black, Director, U. S. Travel Service, Department of Commerce	
125	4	Hon. Donald W. Agert, Assistant Secretary of Transportation for International Affairs and Special Programs	
126	5	Hon. Raymond E. Carroll, Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service	
127	6	American Automobile Association	
128	7	American Society of Travel Agents, Inc.	
129	8	Transportation Association of America	
130	9	Program received from National Association of Travel Organizations	

H.R. 15651, TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT TO FACILITATE THE ENTRY OF FOREIGN TOURISTS INTO THE UNITED STATES

THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 1968

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 1 OF THE
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met at 10 a.m., pursuant to call, in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Michael A. Feighan (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Feighan and Rodino.

Staff members present: Garner J. Cline, counsel; Donald G. Benn, associate counsel.

(The executive communication and the bill, H.R. 15651, follow:)

[House of Representatives, 90th Cong., second sess., Doc. No. 263]

COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING A PROPOSAL TO ELIMINATE UNNECESSARY AND CUMBERSOME BARRIERS WHICH INHIBIT FOREIGN VISITORS AND BUSINESSMEN FROM TRAVELING TO THE UNITED STATES

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 23, 1968.

HON. JOHN McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. SPEAKER: I ask the Congress to eliminate unnecessary and cumbersome barriers which inhibit foreign visitors and businessmen from traveling to the United States.

Over a half century ago we began to require each foreign visitor to obtain a visa from an American consul abroad.

This process of pre-screening obliges every visitor—other than a national of Canada or Mexico—to establish to the satisfaction of the consul:

- that he is not ineligible for a visa under some 25 specified grounds of eligibility.
- that he has a residence abroad to which he intends to return;
- that he will not accept employment while in the United States.

Those requirements have been rendered obsolete by a major increase in tourism from abroad, by a revolutionary reduction in travel time, and by the fact that 35 other nations require no visas from American tourists.

This system clearly must be reformed.

Last Monday, I received a report from my special Industry-Government Commission on Travel. The report outlined a broad program to increase tourism to the United States, improving our balance of payments and promoting international understanding.

With regard to these entry requirements, the Commission stated: "Present entry procedures for vacation and business visitors to the United States are outmoded. They serve only to project an adverse image of this nation's willingness to receive foreign guests."

By imposing time-consuming entry requirements, we discourage tourism to the United States at a time when we are acutely concerned with our balance of payments.

By imposing stringent requirements, we appear to a foreign visitor to be greeting him grudgingly rather than graciously.

By imposing complicated requirements, we add an unnecessary and increasingly expensive workload to our consulate staffs abroad.

I believe the time has come to stop imposing these unnecessary requirements on our visitors. To accomplish this, I propose the Non-immigrant Visa Act of 1968.

This Act would authorize the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to issue regulations exempting visitors to the United States for 90 days or less from the visa requirement and from all but the most serious grounds of ineligibility.

Under the Act:

—The Secretary of State would designate the countries whose citizens would be entitled to this privilege. Initially, this would be done on the basis of reciprocity.

—Foreign nationals who have been convicted of serious crimes, or narcotics traffickers, will still be barred.

—Entering aliens will continue to be examined by immigration and naturalization service officers at points of entry.

This will afford full protection to our internal security.

—Persons entering under these conditions will be required to have a valid passport, and a nonrefundable round-trip ticket. They will not be allowed to alter their status as a visitor while they are in this country.

This new Act will improve our foreign relations and promote a better understanding of America throughout the world.

It will improve our balance of payments and strengthen the dollar.

It will allow us to treat travelers from abroad more efficiently and more hospitably.

With the cooperation of private industry, the government is seeking new ways to attract more visitors to our shores in 1968. This new Act can be a vital part of that effort.

The Secretary of State will shortly send to the Congress further recommendations to improve our non-immigrant visa laws.

I consider the proposals in this letter to be of urgent concern. I ask the Congress to give them prompt and favorable consideration.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

[H.R. 15651, 90th Cong., second sess.]

A BILL To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the entry of foreign tourists into the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 212(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

“(9) The provisions of subsection (a) (other than paragraphs (2), (6), (15), (17), (26)(A), (27), and (29)) may, pursuant to regulations prescribed jointly by the Attorney General and the Secretary of State, be made inapplicable to aliens who are seeking to enter the United States as temporary visitors for business or pleasure for a period of not more than ninety days and are nationals of foreign countries designated, in his discretion, by the Secretary of State on the basis of reciprocity or on the basis of a determination that such designation would promote the foreign policy of the United States. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, such aliens may not have their status adjusted under section 245 or 248.”

(b) Section 238(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1228(d)) is amended to read as follows:

“(d) The Attorney General shall have power to enter into contracts, including bonding agreements with transportation lines, (1) to guarantee the passage through the United States in transit of aliens destined to foreign countries, or (2) to prescribe procedures designed to accomplish the departure from the United States of aliens who, under section 212(d)(9), have entered the United States as temporary visitors for business or pleasure without possessing a valid non-immigrant visa. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, such aliens may not have their classification changed under section 248.”

Sec. 2. Section 221(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each alien who applies for a visa shall be registered and fingerprinted in connection with his application and shall furnish copies of his photograph signed by him for such use as may be by regulations required. The Secretary of State and the Attorney General are hereby authorized, in their discretion and on the basis of reciprocity, pursuant to such regulations as they may severally prescribe, to waive the requirements of this subsection and the requirement of fingerprinting specified in section 262 in the case of any nonimmigrant alien."

SEC. 3. This Act may be cited as "The Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968".

Mr. FEIGHAN. The subcommittee will come to order.

The purpose of the hearing today is to receive testimony on H.R. 15651, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the entry of foreign tourists into the United States. The provisions of this bill are a direct result of the recommendations of the President's Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel, and were embodied in an executive communication to the Congress.

In essence, H.R. 15651 would authorize the Secretary of State and the Attorney General to issue regulations exempting aliens coming to visit the United States for 90 days or less from the visa requirement and from all but the most serious of the present grounds of ineligibility.

These grounds of ineligibility which would not be waived by this bill pertain to aliens who are insane, afflicted with any dangerous contagious disease, liable to become a public charge, prior deportees, or who are without a valid passport, or entering to engage in activities prejudicial to the public interest, or entering to engage in espionage activities.

In return for the privileges extended, this bill would also impose certain restrictions to reduce the possibilities that mala fide visitors, such as intending immigrants, would attempt to gain entry with no intention of leaving. Accordingly, any alien entering the United States under the provisions of this bill would be ineligible to have his status adjusted while in the United States to any other nonimmigrant or immigrant status. Further authority would be given the Attorney General to enter into contracts with transportation lines designed to accomplish the departure from the United States of these nonvisa visitors by the end of the maximum allowable visit of 90 days.

Additional safeguards would be incorporated into the applicable regulations, including the requirement of a nonrefundable round trip ticket, and would be in addition to those already existent in the inspection procedures by Immigration and Naturalization Service officers at points of entry.

The major purpose of this legislation is an integral part of the President's overall program to increase foreign travel to this country, and thereby help to improve our foreign relations through promoting a better understanding of America throughout the world.

In addition, such tourism to the United States will have a salutary effect upon our balance of payments. Such objectives are certainly commendable, and we are privileged to have expert witnesses from the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce to present the expected benefits and proposed regulations required to attain them.

Our first witness will be our old friend the Honorable Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Under Secretary of State.

On behalf of the subcommittee, we want to extend to you a very warm welcome. It has been a little while since you have been here. So we are very happy to have you.

STATEMENT OF HON. NICHOLAS deB. KATZENBACH, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, ACCOMPANIED BY NATHAN LEWIN, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, BUREAU OF SECURITY AND CONSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. KATZENBACH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is a pleasure to be back before this committee.

I have a prepared statement which, with your permission, I would like to proceed with.

Mr. FEIGHAN. That will be fine.

Mr. KATZENBACH. I am pleased to testify today in support of H.R. 15651, the Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968. In transmitting this proposed legislation to Congress almost a month ago, the President urged its prompt enactment for the following three reasons:

First, it "will improve our foreign relations and promote a better understanding of America throughout the world."

Second, "it will improve our balance of payments and strengthen the dollar."

Third, "it will allow us to treat travelers from abroad more efficiently and more hospitably."

Let me begin by describing the situation to which this legislation is addressed, because I think it will then become apparent how its enactment can contribute substantially to each of these three important objectives.

Magnificent technological developments have taken place over the past few decades in the field of international transportation. One consequence of these rapid advances has been the growing volume of international travel.

Friendly citizens of foreign countries who today wish to visit the United States for brief periods find it within their means and ability to do so. And they have come in ever-increasing numbers.

In 1937, we admitted approximately 65,000 tourists to the United States. In 1947, that number rose to approximately 155,000. In 1957, it was almost 350,000. And last year—in 1967—almost 1½ million visitors arrived here from countries other than Canada and Mexico on trips for business or pleasure.

Technology is not standing still. And with mammoth aircraft and faster-than-sound flight, we may expect the annual number of tourists to the United States to increase by geometric progression.

Private studies have estimated that a decade from now the number of tourists visiting the United States will run between 7½ to 10 million annually.

Our procedures for the admission of visitors have not kept pace with this growth. For we are still making foreign tourists go through essentially the same process to obtain permission to come to this country as we required 50 years ago. In 1917, as a World War I security measure, an Executive order was issued requiring each foreign visitor to the United States to obtain a nonimmigrant visa from an American consul abroad. This procedure has survived over the past half century, and it is now part of our immigration law.

What it means is that any national of a foreign country other than Canada or Mexico cannot visit the United States unless he first applies for and obtains a visa at a U.S. embassy or consulate abroad.

The applicant must establish to the satisfaction of the consular officer that he is not ineligible under some 25 grounds of ineligibility specified in the Immigration and Nationality Act, that he has a residence abroad to which he intends to return, and that he will not accept employment while in the United States.

Let me discuss briefly the grounds of ineligibility. Section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act specifies certain classes of aliens who are declared "ineligible to receive visas" and who are to "be excluded from admission into the United States."

There are good and sufficient reasons to keep out of the United States as permanent residents or as long-term visitors nearly all of the classes enumerated in section 212(a). But many of these ineligibilities are inappropriate in the case of short-term tourists or business visitors.

Congress recognized as much when, in section 212(d)(3)(A), it authorized the Attorney General and the Secretary of State acting jointly to waive, for the purpose of a nonimmigrant visa, any of the enumerated ineligibilities other than those directly relating to national security.

Under this authority, the overwhelming number of nonimmigrant cases involving ineligibilities under section 212(a) now result in the eventual admission of the applying alien—but only after he has been told that he is ineligible and after time and effort have been consumed in obtaining an individual statutory waiver in each case.

The Departments of State and Justice have taken certain administrative measures over the past few years in an attempt to grapple with the mounting problem caused by the cumbersome process of obtaining a visa.

Several years ago we authorized consulates to accept nonimmigrant visa applications by mail. In some posts, such as London, over three-quarters of the applications processed are handled by mail. In other posts, however, much nonimmigrant visa work is still done in person by the burdensome work of personal interview.

Just last year another innovation was instituted when consulates were authorized to issue visitor visas of indefinite validity to nationals of certain designated countries who had reason to make repeated short-term visits to the United States.

In addition, to expedite the process of obtaining waivers of ineligibility, consular officers and Immigration and Naturalization Service officials have, for some time, been delegated joint authority to issue waivers in certain kinds of cases in the field.

Desirable as these administrative steps are, they do not reach to the heart of the problem. So long as a potential foreign visitor is obliged to obtain a visa from a U.S. embassy or consulate abroad, he is compelled to spend his time and energy and ours so that we may determine in advance of his arrival whether he is eligible to enter the United States.

And so long as an intending visitor is initially declared ineligible under section 212(a)—even if that ineligibility is subsequently waived—good will has been wasted and unnecessary effort expended.

The proposed Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968 would modernize the visa procedure and obviate these administrative difficulties by permitting a qualified foreign tourist to bypass the U.S. consulate altogether. It would also empower the Secretary of State and the

Attorney General to declare many of the ineligibilities of section 212(a) inapplicable to a select group of nonimmigrants.

Let me emphasize, at the outset, the limited scope of this proposed legislation:

First, it applies only to a certain kind of nonimmigrant: the temporary visitor who wishes to come here for business or pleasure for a period of not more than 90 days. It does not apply to students, long-term visitors, temporary employees, or any of the other non-immigrant classifications.

Second, it applies only to nationals of countries designated by the Secretary of State either on the basis of reciprocity or on some other foreign policy consideration. We do not anticipate invoking it initially with respect to nationals of Eastern European countries—except for those who are coming to designated international conferences.

Third, only certain of the ineligibilities in section 212(a) are subject to waiver. The bill itself specifies six ineligibilities—in addition to the requirement that the alien possess a valid passport—which must be retained.

Fourth, any alien entering without a visa under this proposal would be ineligible for adjustment or change of status. He cannot, in other words change to the status of an immigrant, student, or temporary employee during his stay here. This provision is designed to prevent this means of entering the country from being used as a way of evading the normal immigration process.

Finally, nothing in the bill prevents any prospective tourist from applying for a standard nonimmigrant visa if he wishes to do so. All that is proposed is that an alternative route be made available for the very large number of bona fide short-term tourists and business visitors who now must obtain nonimmigrant visas.

We have given substantial thought to how this proposal would be implemented. We contemplate that the Secretary of State will designate, by public notice, the countries whose nationals may be admitted as 90-day visitors under section 212(d)(9).

Nationals of those countries will be able to come here without visas and with an automatic waiver of certain specified paragraphs of section 212(a) if they possess nonrefundable roundtrip tickets and if they submit, prior to embarkation for the United States, a completed and signed form in which they certify that they are not ineligible for admission under the retained provisions of section 212(a) or other applicable provisions of the law.

On their arrival here, such visitors will be screened by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which will determine whether they are, in fact, eligible to enter the United States. If they are turned back by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the transportation line will have the responsibility of carrying them home.

Let me say just a word about the Immigration Service's inspection here. Although many visitors are processed in a short period of time, the Immigration Service is capable of checking them all against its lookout book—as it does now.

To make this port-of-entry inspection as complete as possible, the Department of State would supplement the material in the Immigration and Naturalization Service lookout book with whatever information we have. This would make the check as effective for purposes of national security as the separate checks are now.

The problem of internal security is, I know, a worrisome one. But I am convinced it is in no way enlarged by this legislation. All information in the hands of the Department of State which would affect the alien's eligibility under the provisions of law designed to protect national security would be made fully available to the Immigration Service for use in compiling its lookout book.

Let me now return to the three goals specified in the President's message. I think it is clear that the Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968 would be an important step in their achievement.

Enactment of this legislation will "improve our foreign relations and promote a better understanding of America throughout the world" because it will put the United States into the mainstream of the international trend to eliminate unnecessary barriers to international travel.

Most countries in Western Europe—as well as some in Eastern Europe, Asia, Africa, and South America—have modernized travel procedures by eliminating the requirement that a visa be obtained abroad.

An American citizen today is free to travel throughout Western Europe with only his passport as a travel document. This legislation would permit the United States to give to the citizens of these nations the same treatment that those countries now provide Americans.

The President noted in his message that under our present procedures "we appear to a foreign visitor to be greeting him grudgingly rather than graciously." Certainly, the leading nation of the free world cannot afford to perpetuate such an image.

We are no longer suspicious of the stranger on our shores; today we welcome him for the good will he brings and takes with him as well as for the benefits our economy derives from his visit. We do ourselves and our cause no good if we appear reluctant to allow free entry to the United States.

In fact, we look forward to the day when private citizens will be free to travel around the world with an absolute minimum of documentation. The time has come for the United States to demonstrate its support of this trend by the elimination of our own unnecessary procedures.

The President noted that this legislation "will improve our balance of payments and strengthen the dollar." It does so in two ways:

First, the recent report of the Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel recommended the enactment of this very legislation as a means of encouraging tourism to the United States. The director of the United States Travel Service, who is also scheduled to testify today, will discuss in detail the effects this bill will have on tourist travel to the United States.

But it is obvious that whatever is done to make travel to this country simpler and easier is likely to increase the volume of such travel. And increased tourism to the United States means a narrowing of the tourism deficit which has contributed so substantially to the present balance-of-payments crisis.

A second and less obvious—though equally compelling—balance-of-payments benefit is the effect that such legislation will have on our manpower abroad.

In the 35 countries which permit American citizens to visit without visas, our consular personnel spent about 300,000 man-hours (the equivalent of 160 man-years) in fiscal year 1967 processing tourist visas.

A substantial reduction in the number of consular positions abroad can thus be effected if this proposal is enacted. Even if some increase in the staff of the Immigration Service is necessary, the total reduction of government expenditures should be significant. And, what is even more important, the greatest saving in terms of our expenses abroad is preventive.

For if no action along the lines proposed in this bill is taken, the size of our consular staffs will have to increase several fold as the volume of visitors to the United States grows. If 10 million tourists travel here several years from now, as is projected, we will have to provide six or seven times as many visa officers at consulates abroad to process the applications.

Finally, the President observed that this bill "will allow us to treat travelers from abroad more efficiently and more hospitably." The Travel Task Force commented in its report that the procedures we now follow "bespeak an unfriendly attitude based upon feelings of suspicion" and that they "almost appear designed to discourage the potential traveler."

I need not, of course, tell this committee that such a result is not the purpose of our law, and that we attempt, in our administration of it, to facilitate the admission of those who are entitled to enter the United States in either immigrant or nonimmigrant status.

The impression we give to each individual tourist who comes to the United States is an important part of our long-range foreign policy. We have always encouraged tourism from abroad not merely for balance-of-payments purposes but because we are confident that exposure to our country and our way of life will win us friends.

In dealing with individuals, even more than in dealing with governments, it is important that we be open and hospitable. And it is in just this respect that the "unnecessary and cumbersome barriers" which this legislation would eliminate are most harmful.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons I repeat to this committee the request in the President's message that the Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968 be given prompt and favorable consideration.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary, for your very excellent presentation on the issues contained in this bill.

I would like to ask you: How has the present nonimmigrant visa procedure restricted or hindered travel to this country?

Mr. KATZENBACH. I think it has restricted it in several ways, Mr. Chairman. It is mainly the cumbersomeness of the procedures, despite our efforts to streamline them. These procedures require a foreign visitor to this country to go to the nearest consulate or Embassy and to answer several questions and provide documentation as to his answers before he can be issued a visa.

What seems to me important, if we are really going to try to increase tourism to the United States—for the balance-of-payments reasons and for other reasons—is that we make it as easy as possible for the airlines, the shipping lines, the travel agencies, to promote travel to the United States.

It is a great deal easier for them if they are in a position of saying, "Do you have a valid passport?" And almost everybody who is a tourist or a businessman in Europe for example does have a valid passport.

They say, "That is all that is required. Here is the paper you are going to have to sign on grounds of ineligibility but that is all that is required. All you have to do is certify this, have a round trip ticket with the second return ticket nonrefundable, and that is all that is required."

It is a very simple procedure. You can sign the brief piece of paper and be done with it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Secretary, since nonimmigrant visa issuances have been steadily increasing, why is this legislation necessary?

Mr. KATZENBACH. I would expect nonimmigrant visa applications to steadily increase. The point I think, Mr. Chairman, is that foreign tourism is not increasing at the rate that it would increase if we remove various blocks to it and if we were more active in promoting travel to the United States and made it as easy as possible.

One would expect tourism here to increase just purely on the basis that we live in a pretty affluent society. Europe is pretty wealthy; People do want to visit the United States. There is a bigger population which increases the number of visitors. But the important thing is to get as much of that as we can.

After all, as much as it has increased here, it has increased more in other countries. When I was recently in Europe on balance-of-payments discussions with various government officials of seven European countries, almost without fail they said, "You can do much more to improve your balance-of-payments position on the tourism part. You are not doing it."

People like the Swiss who have been in the tourist industry—it is a very important part of the Swiss economy—were critical of what we hadn't done. They mentioned in particular our cumbersome requirements for visas and the fact that there just simply wasn't enough promotion and we didn't make it attractive enough. We created the impression that we really didn't welcome visitors to the United States.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Secretary, how would this procedure work as a mechanical matter in the foreign country?

Mr. KATZENBACH. In the foreign country, as a mechanical matter, it would never require the foreign visitor to visit any U.S. official. If he had a valid passport, the airlines or the travel agencies or whoever was acting for him in selling him his ticket would provide him with a piece of paper which would tell him the grounds of ineligibility for admission to the United States which would remain.

And he would certify at the end of that that none of these grounds applied to him. He would have this nonrefundable round trip ticket. If he then arrived in the United States and his name was in this look-out book as someone who was not eligible, he would be on the plane going back the other way.

If he was not on the list, then he would be in this country and be a visitor for 90 days. But there would be a minimum of fuss and bother.

Of course, the overwhelming percentage of the people who come as tourists to the United States are not ineligible under any of the grounds which apply.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Rodino?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, thank you for yielding.

Mr. Secretary, in line with the statement you made a while ago that this new policy is in accord with the recommendations submitted by the Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel, I ask this question and assume that this is what would come about—a new climate.

However, doesn't it appear to you that this new policy is a little bit inconsistent with the proposal that is now being considered by committees of the Congress whether we are going to impose taxes on those people who would travel to other countries? In one way we restrict travel to other countries on people who are more prone to travel, the students and those who want to visit their relatives in other countries, and yet at the same time we say, "We want to encourage travel coming here."

Doesn't this strike you as being somewhat inconsistent?

Mr. KATZENBACH. No, Mr. Congressman, I don't think that is inconsistent. Nobody likes to restrict or deter travel by Americans in any way. Therefore, it is much better over the long run if we can do something to balance the tourism account by attracting more tourists into the United States and continue to have Americans go abroad.

The fact is, however, that at this moment we run a deficit on the tourism account of over \$2 billion, as a difference between what foreigners are spending to come here and what Americans are spending abroad. On our current account that wipes out all of our trade surplus. So we come out with a slight net loss on the current account if you put in tourism with trade.

It is surely better to balance it by attracting more people here. But you have the two sides of the ledger. What the tax proposals are trying to do is to encourage Americans over the short range to postpone some of their travel abroad or to at least not stay as long or spend as much for balance-of-payments reasons. At the same time we are trying to increase foreign tourism here with the thought that any tax which discouraged Americans from going abroad would be temporary. Nobody likes it in the sense that nobody wants to discourage travel.

Mr. RODINO. I agree with you, Mr. Secretary, that we should encourage travel. I very frankly find it difficult to accept the type of proposal which is presently before the Congress which definitely, in my opinion, serves to restrict travel abroad on the part of the American who wants to tour other countries. It does, in my judgment and in the judgment of many people whom I have talked with, seem to impose a kind of barrier.

Mr. KATZENBACH. I certainly don't think there is any inconsistency in the sense that however one feels about tax on American tourists going abroad, it shouldn't affect one's judgment about this bill, which would encourage foreigners to come here.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Secretary, does the present indefinite validity visa adequately serve the purposes of this bill?

Mr. KATZENBACH. I think it does for the businessman who is the frequent visitor. But it doesn't for the tourist who is coming over, who is a once-a-year or once-every-5-years or once-a-lifetime visitor to the United States, or even for the businessman who wants to make an occasional trip and is not a frequent visitor.

I would expect that even with the passage of this bill, the businessman who makes frequent visits to the United States would continue

to get a visa which gives him a right to make an indefinite number of trips because we would in our regulations have to take measures to insure that the 90-day provision was not constantly and consistently used in such a way that a person could extend it and spend 180 and 360 days. We would have to deal with that problem. We would want to keep the visitor who visited 10 times a year, outside of this special provision. So I think he would go get a visa.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Secretary, for the purposes of the record, would you state what provisions of section 212(a) would continue to apply?

Mr. KATZENBACH. Yes. The effect of the regulations would be to continue the inadmissibility of the following: (1) the insane (2) aliens who are mentally retarded, who have had one or more attacks of insanity, are afflicted with psychopathic personality or a mental defect, unless accompanied by a responsible person who would care for the alien during his entire visit; (3) sexual deviates; (4) aliens afflicted with a dangerous contagious disease; (5) aliens sentenced to imprisonment for 18 months or more upon conviction of a crime within the past 5 years and aliens sentenced to imprisonment for more than 5 years, at any time; (6) aliens coming to engage in prostitution and allied activities; (7) aliens who are likely to become a public charge; (8) previous deportees; (9) stowaways, (10) aliens who have been convicted of any offense involving traffic in narcotic drugs or marihuana or who are engaged in such traffic; (11) aliens who are not in possession of a passport; and (12) aliens who would be dangerous to the security of the United States.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Secretary, how would the alien know whether he came within an excludable category?

Mr. KATZENBACH. He would sign a piece of paper that would sum it up in the way that I have in simple language. It would say, "You are ineligible for admission and may be denied admission to the United States upon arrival if" and would then list all of these things. At the bottom he would say, "I certify that none of these apply to me."

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Secretary, doesn't this merely shift the determination of eligibility from the consular office to the aliens themselves?

Mr. KATZENBACH. Yes, to some extent that is true, but it is true now to a considerable extent. The consular officer goes through an interview or sees an application submitted by mail which asks these questions. The alien answers them. If the consular officer has no information to the contrary, he issues the visa. So it is not perfection in any event.

With respect to the cases that are serious, the most serious ones are the security ones. All the information that is in the hands of the U.S. Government with respect to persons of this kind would be the basis of the Immigration Service lookout book. So that would be a very simple matter. It is not particularly burdensome simply to check the name upon arrival.

Of course there is the Public Health inspection when the traveler arrives here. He has that in any event, as far as contagious diseases are concerned.

With respect to the others, if we have any information conflicting with the certification, we may send them back notwithstanding his own certification.

In many of these instances, frankly, Mr. Chairman, if we don't have any information to the contrary, as I say we now take the person's word for it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Secretary, would this proposed procedure apply to countries behind the Iron Curtain?

Mr. KATZENBACH. It could, because it gives the Secretary of State that kind of discretion. It is not our intention to do so, at least at the outset, although two Iron Curtain countries have abolished any visa requirements temporarily so far as American visitors are concerned.

Mr. FEIGHAN. You primarily would enact this procedure on the basis of reciprocity?

Mr. KATZENBACH. Primarily, yes. Although there are two Iron Curtain countries that have temporarily abolished visa requirements, we would not intend, at least initially, to apply it there. I think we would want some experience, for one thing, as to how it operated. We would take it a little slowly in extending the privilege beyond Western European countries and some others which, from the point of view of the purpose of it, are where we find the people who are most likely to be traveling. They are the people who most likely would be in a financial position to come to this country. That is the major purpose of the bill.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Secretary, what penalties would you propose for the alien entering the United States under the provisions of this proposed bill and who then violates his status by overstaying the 90-day period or by accepting an appointment?

Mr. KATZENBACH. I think primarily the sanction would be simply to return him. There could be other sanctions.

The thing that I think would perhaps be an effective sanction in most of these instances would be to make sure that if that person who came and overstayed and took employment, and so forth, were on a priority list or had a labor certificate and was going to seek immigrant status, that he go to the bottom of the list. It could be used as a sanction against his future admission to the United States in another status.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I was going to ask you what about the registered immigrant who enters for 90 days but then decides to wait here using judicial or administrative delays until his visa number comes up. Could you deprive him of his priority number by regulations or would it be necessary to include it in this legislation?

Mr. KATZENBACH. I think it would be desirable to include it in the legislation. The bill does provide for no change of status here. I think it is also extremely important that we don't let people use this provision to get an advantage over somebody who doesn't use it. I would think that so far as the loss of priority is concerned, it would be good to provide that by law. If you wish I would be happy to suggest some language on that score.

I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that if the committee reports this bill, it would make a strong statement about this point so it might deter any exceptions in the future by special legislation on that subject. I think it is important to recognize that people should not take advantage of a 90-day provision to get a preferred status in this country.

(The information to be furnished follows:)

On page 2, line 8, H.R. 15651, add the following after the period:

"Notwithstanding any provision of law or regulation governing the chronological order in which immigrant visa applications are to be considered, an ap-

PLICANT for an immigrant visa, who has at any time been admitted as a nonimmigrant under this subsection and who has willfully remained beyond the period of authorized stay or who has failed to maintain the status in which he was admitted by engaging in employment or otherwise, shall forfeit any priority for consideration for an immigrant visa if the date on which that priority is based precedes the date of his departure from the United States. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 205 the approval of an immigrant visa petition is revoked automatically as of the date of approval if the beneficiary forfeits his priority date as provided in this section."

PROPOSED REGULATIONS OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE TO IMPLEMENT ADDITIONAL PROVISION IN H.R. 15651

Amend 8 CFR 205.1(a) by adding the following paragraph at the end:

"Upon a determination by a consular officer with respect to an applicant for an immigrant visa, or by an immigration officer with respect to an applicant for adjustment of status, that such applicant after admission as a temporary visitor pursuant to section 212(d)(9) of the Act had during that visit willfully failed to maintain the status in which he was admitted or had willfully remained in the United States beyond the period of his authorized stay, the approval of any petition filed on his behalf at any time prior to the date on which he departed from the United States following such admission shall be automatically revoked, and such petition may not be revalidated."

Amend 8 CFR 205.1 by adding the following as paragraph (e):

"(e) *Aliens who are in the United States as temporary visitors pursuant to section 212(d)(9)*. Any petition filed on behalf of an alien while he is within the United States pursuant to an admission under section 212(d)(9) of the Act shall be denied upon the District Director's determination that such alien, during his stay following such admission, willfully failed to maintain the status in which he was admitted or willfully remained in the United States beyond the period of this authorized stay. Notwithstanding any other provision of his part, no appeal shall lie from the denial of a petition under this paragraph."

41.8 *Nonimmigrants to whom certain provisions of section 212(a) shall not be applicable*

(a) *Inapplicability of visa requirement of section 212(a)(26)(B)*. A visa shall not be required of an alien seeking admission to the United States as a temporary visitor for business or pleasure for not more than 90 days who (1) is a national of a country designated by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 212(d)(9) of the Act and paragraph (c) of this section or is the accompanying spouse or child of such national; (2) is transported to the United States on a vessel or aircraft of a transportation line that has entered into an agreement with the immigration and Naturalization Service on Form I-427 pursuant to section 238(d)(2) of the Act, or travels to the United States from contiguous territory other than by vessel or aircraft; (3) presents a valid passport and a properly executed Form I-7; (4) is not ineligible under any provision of section 212(a) of the Act or, if he is within such provision, it is inapplicable to him in accordance with the terms of paragraph (b) of this section; and, (5) was never refused a nonimmigrant visa by a United States consular officer.

However, if all aliens who have at some time been denied a visa were to be referred to the consular office for either a visa or a letter stating they are eligible for the visa waiver, we believe that one of the most important objectives of the bill would be negated.]

(b) *Inapplicability of certain other provisions of section 212(a)*. The provisions of the following paragraphs of section 212(a) of the Act shall be inapplicable to an alien within the purview of paragraph (a) of this section: Paragraphs (1), (3), and (4) with respect to the provisions of those paragraphs relating to aliens who are mentally retarded, have had one or more attacks of insanity, are afflicted with psychopathic personality or a mental defect, if the alien is accompanied by a responsible person in whose care the alien will remain during the entire visit; paragraphs (5) and (7) if the alien is not likely to become a public charge; paragraph (9) if the alien was not convicted within the past five years and sentenced to imprisonment for eighteen months or more and if he was not sentenced at any time to imprisonment for more than five years; paragraph (11); paragraph (12) unless the alien is coming to the United States to engage in any conduct described

in that paragraph; paragraphs (13), (14), (16), (19), (21), (22), (24), (25), (28) and (31).

(c) *Designation of countries whose nationals may be admitted under this section.* Paragraphs (a) and (b) of this section shall be applicable to:

(1) nationals of countries designated by the Secretary of State by Public Notice published in the Federal Register pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(9) of the Act; and,

(2) a national of any country except Albania, Communist-controlled China ("Chinese Peoples' Republic"), Cuba, North Korea ("Democratic Republic of North Korea"), North Vietnam ("Democratic Republic of Vietnam"), Outer Mongolia ("Mongolian Peoples' Republic"), or the Soviet Zone of Germany ("German Democratic Republic"), who presents evidence issued by the United States sponsor of such conference that he is a delegate to or participant in an international conference designated by the Secretary of State as being of significant interest to the United States, and the accompanying spouse or child of such delegate or participant.

(d) *Classification and restrictions.* An alien admitted pursuant to section 212(d)(9) of the Act shall be accorded classification symbol B-3 and shall be ineligible to apply for change of status under section 245 or 248 of the Act, or for extension of stay. A B-3 alien who becomes deportable may be granted the privilege of voluntary departure without the institution of deportation proceedings as provided in section 241(b) only if he establishes that he is ready, willing and able to depart promptly from the United States or he establishes that his inability to depart promptly is due entirely to circumstances beyond his control.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Don't you think this legislation would result in a sharp increase in the number of private bills introduced?

Mr. KATZENBACH. I think it would if there was an effort to use it for that purpose and if the Congress did not make a clear-cut recognition that it was not going to allow adjustment of status for people who came in on this kind of a basis and then pleaded the hardship of going home.

There is no particular hardship in their going home because they already have a nonrefundable ticket.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Rodino.

Mr. RODINO. On that question of a nonrefundable ticket, how do you propose to determine whether the ticket, which you may construe to be nonrefundable, is really nonrefundable?

Isn't this going to be a contract between a foreign national and a tourist agency? And wouldn't you be violating some basic private right of individuals to contract between themselves?

Mr. KATZENBACH. I don't think so, Mr. Congressman, because in our contract with the transportation companies we would make them responsible for the transportation back home and require that they sell unrefundable tickets to such visitors.

Mr. RODINO. I hope it works.

Mr. KATZENBACH. I think it will.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Secretary, you advanced the projection of the number of tourists who might be visiting the United States within the decade, between 7½ to 10 million annually.

Is that projection based on the present procedure or the procedure which we would adopt in this bill?

Mr. KATZENBACH. It is a projection that is based on this bill plus other steps in a policy of increasing tourism.

As you get, for example, your large jet carriers, they must travel with a load both ways on your Atlantic travel or your Pacific travel to make a profit out of this. So if you look at this huge advance in terms of spaces available, it can accommodate this many people.

There will be a tremendous incentive to do so. The comparable figures for Americans going abroad, we would anticipate, would go up, too.

Mr. RODINO. I don't know whether I make myself clear, Mr. Secretary.

If we do not enact this bill and still require the intending tourists to have immigrant visas, would you still stick with the 7½ to 10 million figure you gave?

Mr. KATZENBACH. No, I think the figure would be lower if we didn't do that. But it is almost impossible to make any projection as to the effect of this particular bill that you can stand on and prove to anyone. I do know that the experts in this, the tourism people, the airlines, the shipping companies, feel that this kind of procedure would make a substantial difference in their promotion of tourism to the United States. But how to measure it on a projection is too speculative for me to know.

Mr. RODINO. In other words, it would be difficult to ascertain what the increase of nonimmigrant visitors would be under this bill?

Mr. KATZENBACH. Yes, because you are really dealing with a psychological question to a large extent, and it ties in with other things—how many package tours, how much promotion, all of this.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Secretary, it would appear to me that preinspection abroad would facilitate admission of tourists upon arrival at the U.S. ports of entry.

I am wondering if there has been any thought given to such a proposal? If so, what conclusions have been reached?

Mr. KATZENBACH. There has been some thinking on that. Mr. Farrell would be more of an expert than I. But they do have this kind of a system in various places. I think we do it in Puerto Rico, we do it in Montreal, if I recollect correctly, and I could certainly envision the possibilities of principal airports doing a preinspection so as to facilitate this in the United States.

In addition to that, I think it is possible to speed up that process as you get into modern technology. I think you can get passenger manifests well in advance of the arrival of a plane. These can be gone over, checked against the lookout book, and you can get rid of some of the work in that way and speed up the process.

But I would think that a preinspection in some places where there is a large amount of tourism would be a possibility.

Mr. RODINO. Wouldn't you say that under this bill, Mr. Secretary, we are merely shifting the burden of responsibility in determining admissibility of the alien or the intending tourist from the consular officer to the immigration inspector? Isn't this what is actually going to take place?

Mr. KATZENBACH. The immigration inspector does that anyhow. So we are not significantly increasing his job. There is really a double check system now. What would happen is that the information that is now separately kept in a consular office or in the Embassy and the information that the Immigration Service has would be consolidated into your one book on ineligibles. All that information would be provided and the names would be there. So that everything we knew that we could now be applying against this could be applied by the immigration inspector.

I think really about the only result to him is that he has got a somewhat bigger book to go through. He still speaks to every foreign visitor coming into the country, checks his name against that lookout book now, and I don't really think it would significantly increase that burden.

Mr. RODINO. It may not increase that burden, but at the same time the consular officer who was taking an adverse action certainly would have stopped right then and there.

Mr. KATZENBACH. Yes, on the adverse actions, the thing would have stopped right then and there. Really, the great bulk of the adverse actions have been adverse actions that have been taken by the consular officer for fear that the person was not genuinely a nonimmigrant and that what he wanted to do was to get to the United States and then apply for adjustment to immigrant status.

So that in a sense, Congressman, it really discriminated against some poor people who had relatives in the United States and wanted to come to visit them.

Mr. RODINO. I agree with you, Mr. Secretary. I have experienced many cases like that.

Mr. KATZENBACH. They were denied that kind of a visa for fear that they would stay permanently. This bill would eliminate that, but then you have got to be tough at the other end and say, "We are going to be tough about your status. You can come to visit your relatives but you are not going to get any advantage out of doing it."

Mr. RODINO. I agree with you. At least in my experience in the Congress in the past 20 years, I know there were many people who wanted to visit their relatives here. I know of many obstacles and difficulties they encountered when going before a well-intentioned consular officer who took upon himself the authority to probe the mind of the individual and say, "Well, I know that this is a case where you are not coming back" and stop then and there.

Mr. KATZENBACH. I think the round trip ticket coupled with tough adjustment of status provisions would mean that we would no longer have to worry, really, about that. That has been the big worry of the consular officers.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Secretary, I would disagree on that score because I know of cases where there have been round trip, nonrefundable tickets which in my judgment showed a clear intention on the part of these people to return aboard and who didn't have the kind of money to spend, or to throw away. Yet, with all of this it was determined in the mind of a consular officer that the intention was not bona fide. They were just going to the United States to stay and just bought this ticket only to misrepresent the case.

Mr. KATZENBACH. We would get rid of that problem.

Mr. RODINO. Yes, Mr. Secretary, I have one last question.

What advantage would this kind of a procedure have in terms of time over the present procedures including visas by mail? Can you tell us something on that score?

Mr. KATZENBACH. It is hard to estimate those times. Let me just sort of give you the range of them.

If you apply for a visa by mail, not including the time necessary for the person to collect the necessary documentation that has to accompany it and assuming that he has all of that documentation, then he would probably get his visa in about 7 or 8 days from the time he applied for it by mail.

If he went around to the Embassy or the consular office, it would depend on the length of the line, which might in turn depend on the season of the year. But from the time he actually saw the consular officer, assuming he had all the documentation and not counting the time in line, it would take him about 15 minutes.

If there was then a problem about it, and he was potentially ineligible and it was a situation where you had to seek a waiver, then that time element goes up 30, 60, 90, and 100 days in that very small percentage of the cases.

Our interest, of course, is to make it as simple as possible.

Mr. RODINO. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

You have been extremely helpful as usual.

I do also want to state for the record that you have been accompanied by Mr. Nathan Lewin, Deputy Administrator of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

We are very happy to have had you with us, also, Mr. Lewin.

Mr. LEWIN. Thank you.

(The State Department submitted the following statistics to further answer the inquiry concerning time saved if visas were issued by mail:)

NONIMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED TO NATIONALS OF COUNTRIES WHICH GENERALLY DO NOT REQUIRE
VISAS OF U.S. CITIZEN VISITORS

Nationality	Fiscal year 1967			1st half fiscal year 1968		
	Visas issued		Revalidations, temporary visitors ¹	Visas issued		Revalidations, temporary visitors ¹
	Nonimmigrant total	Temporary visitors		Nonimmigrant total	Temporary visitors	
Austria.....	9,797	8,281	678	4,665	3,901	351
Barbados.....	1,675	1,520	4	1,461	1,260	15
Belgium.....	11,235	9,980	497	6,376	5,759	260
Botswana.....	12	1	-----	19	1	-----
Cyprus.....	301	172	2	215	119	3
Denmark.....	13,358	11,192	957	6,473	5,167	381
Finland.....	7,252	6,238	371	2,904	2,199	107
France.....	80,751	71,811	5,244	46,038	41,346	2,442
Germany.....	101,609	91,303	5,356	48,497	42,824	1,686
Great Britain.....	197,615	174,889	11,685	81,500	69,915	5,002
Greece.....	15,114	9,727	663	10,234	6,250	370
Guyana.....	3,124	2,415	152	2,184	1,541	55
Iceland.....	1,782	1,382	44	1,111	862	304
Ireland.....	11,624	10,147	417	6,442	5,816	38
Israel.....	18,173	14,156	1,124	10,758	7,978	600
Italy.....	53,273	47,432	5,357	31,156	27,939	2,794
Jamaica.....	16,324	13,974	2,257	8,626	7,436	1,150
Liechtenstein.....	25	24	2	32	31	1
Luxembourg.....	429	382	9	339	317	1
Malawi.....	50	5	-----	92	14	-----
Malta.....	631	581	1	160	138	1
Monaco.....	33	32	1	33	31	2
Morocco.....	1,607	1,106	82	869	696	72
Netherlands.....	34,038	30,226	3,767	14,020	12,218	1,378
Norway.....	16,551	7,683	293	7,997	3,881	158
Paraguay.....	798	462	2	447	246	2
Portugal.....	6,436	5,306	407	4,127	3,547	240
San Marino.....	23	22	1	14	13	2
Spain.....	17,364	11,803	790	9,056	6,458	516
Sweden.....	21,528	18,742	860	10,305	8,582	499
Switzerland.....	24,275	22,275	726	12,834	11,860	428
Thailand.....	4,421	1,139	8	2,864	603	3
Trinidad and Tobago.....	8,219	6,917	303	6,774	5,774	147
Tunisia.....	527	281	9	314	223	8
Turkey.....	3,749	2,478	136	2,064	1,303	89
Uruguay.....	3,448	2,696	24	1,653	1,249	14
Subtotal.....	687,171	586,780	42,229	342,653	287,497	19,089
Grand total.....	1,152,103	931,057	84,268	604,807	479,947	43,632

¹ Estimated.

NONIMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED AT POSTS IN COUNTRIES WHICH GENERALLY DO NOT REQUIRE VISAS OF U.S. CITIZEN VISITORS

Area total	Fiscal year 1967			1st half fiscal year 1968		
	Visas issued		Revalidations, temporary visitors ¹	Visas issued		Revalidations, temporary visitors ¹
	Nonimmigrant total	Temporary visitors		Nonimmigrant total	Temporary visitors	
American Republics Area.....	39,759	33,342	3,226	22,831	19,061	1,316
Europe.....	534,673	460,352	24,944	252,860	213,917	9,536
East Asia.....	12,182	6,944	944	7,944	3,933	449
Near East and Asia.....	29,464	19,847	804	17,915	10,921	235
Africa.....	2,645	1,685	6	1,356	1,005	1
Subtotal.....	618,723	522,170	29,924	302,906	248,837	11,537
Grand total.....	1,152,103	931,057	104,274	604,807	479,947	54,983

NONIMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED AT POSTS IN COUNTRIES WHICH GENERALLY DO NOT REQUIRE VISAS OF U.S. CITIZEN VISITORS

Post	Fiscal year 1967			1st half fiscal year 1968		
	Visas issued		Revalidations, ¹ temporary visitors	Visas issued		Revalidations, ¹ temporary visitors
	Nonimmigrant	Temporary visitors		Nonimmigrant	Temporary visitors	
AMERICAN REPUBLIC'S AREA						
Barbados: Bridgetown.....	5,079	4,451	61	2,700	2,383	-----
British Honduras: Belize.....	1,638	1,122	16	1,155	830	3
Guyana: Georgetown.....	3,187	2,495	174	2,144	1,519	41
Jamaica: Kingston.....	16,867	14,592	2,794	8,302	7,231	1,230
Paraguay: Asuncion.....	796	471	6	419	221	8
Trinidad: Port of Spain.....	8,585	7,276	175	6,573	5,681	34
Uruguay: Montevideo.....	3,607	2,935	-----	1,538	1,196	-----
EUROPE						
Austria: Vienna.....	7,431	6,310	365	3,449	2,777	135
Bahamas: Nassau.....	8,683	7,568	2,735	5,805	5,254	1,534
Belgium:						
Brussels.....	7,315	6,205	200	4,052	3,555	-----
Antwerp.....	3,551	3,265	77	2,263	2,041	62
Bermuda: Hamilton.....	721	624	155	452	382	121
Denmark: Copenhagen.....	11,950	9,857	643	5,899	4,531	212
Finland: Helsinki.....	6,124	5,318	191	2,369	1,732	55
France:						
Paris.....	56,031	47,960	3,463	31,000	26,969	1,213
Bordeaux.....	3,198	3,077	29	1,610	1,518	-----
Lyon.....	4,603	4,357	84	2,905	2,730	24
Marseille.....	3,825	3,617	27	1,774	1,603	-----
Nice.....	2,757	2,633	153	1,753	1,695	39
Strasbourg.....	2,769	2,613	4	1,254	1,184	-----
French West Indies: Martinique.....	2,028	1,865	-----	1,545	1,508	-----
Germany:						
Bonn.....	5,339	4,178	20	3,622	2,969	-----
Berlin.....	6,533	6,154	255	3,049	2,807	1
Bremen.....	7,379	6,164	179	1,768	1,499	-----
Duesseldorf.....	13,500	12,439	89	5,440	4,952	-----
Frankfurt.....	18,011	16,693	713	8,244	7,408	131
Hamburg.....	16,572	13,065	510	7,844	5,948	144
Munich.....	11,878	10,930	576	6,290	5,728	4
Stuttgart.....	14,111	13,225	409	6,210	5,737	30
Great Britain and Northern Ireland:						
London.....	119,254	103,515	5,064	51,591	42,920	2,213
Belfast.....	6,142	5,862	3	1,571	1,454	-----
Edinburgh.....	24,908	23,749	120	6,564	6,204	-----
Liverpool.....	21,227	19,436	1,594	7,295	6,559	547
Iceland: Reykjavik.....	1,804	1,422	34	1,135	888	3
Ireland: Dublin.....	9,911	8,447	438	5,502	4,956	297
Italy:						
Rome.....	9,362	7,517	866	5,672	4,708	231
Florence.....	2,424	2,255	254	1,305	1,188	126
Genoa.....	2,047	1,022	141	881	556	118
Milan.....	6,862	6,228	586	4,221	3,597	284
Naples.....	4,726	4,128	186	2,359	2,005	88
Palermo.....	4,907	4,748	161	2,857	2,793	-----
Trieste.....	1,454	1,141	82	860	758	46
Turin.....	1,846	1,708	162	1,246	1,152	62
Luxembourg: Luxembourg.....	510	448	-----	433	370	-----
Malta: Valetta.....	574	533	-----	140	126	-----

¹ Estimated.

NONIMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED AT POSTS IN COUNTRIES WHICH GENERALLY DO NOT REQUIRE VISAS OF U.S. CITIZEN VISITORS—Continued

Post	Fiscal year 1967			1st half fiscal year 1968		
	Visas issued		Revalidations, ¹ temporary visitors	Visas issued		Revalidations, ¹ temporary visitors
	Non-immigrant	Temporary visitors		Non-immigrant	Temporary visitors	
EUROPE—Continued						
Netherlands:						
The Hague.....	150	46		77	32	
Amsterdam.....	14,234	12,338	1,454	5,770	4,832	508
Rotterdam.....	11,336	9,981	649	3,873	3,272	204
Netherlands Antilles: Curacao.....	2,816	2,472	689	1,592	1,435	264
Norway: Oslo.....	15,355	6,510	168	7,486	3,371	85
Portugal:						
Lisbon.....	2,526	1,742	120	1,282	963	54
Oporto.....	429	370		277	230	
Ponta Delgada.....	433	399		263	249	
Spain:						
Madrid.....	7,266	5,259	366	4,117	2,876	103
Barcelona.....	2,044	1,892	146	1,155	1,071	73
Bilbao.....	3,078	751		1,318	389	58
Seville.....	463	932		274	240	2
Valencia.....	490	396		283	240	
Surinam: Paramaribo.....	655	580	69	332	270	28
Sweden:						
Stockholm.....	14,430	12,821	521	6,958	6,046	390
Goteborg.....	6,130	5,241	193	2,906	2,211	47
Switzerland:						
Bern.....	8,127	7,491		6,076	5,369	
Zurich.....	12,444	11,395	1	6,589	6,060	
EAST ASIA						
Fiji Islands: Suva.....	1,899	1,660	153	1,011	907	73
Hong Kong: Hong Kong.....	5,769	4,053	791	4,026	2,387	376
Thailand: Bangkok.....	4,514	1,231		2,907	639	
NEAR EAST AND ASIA						
Aden: Aden.....	48	40			Closed	
Cyprus: Nicosia.....	310	195		204	117	
Greece:						
Athens.....	9,515	4,929		6,744	3,227	
Thessaloniki.....	544	414	14	301	220	4
Israel: Tel Aviv.....	16,077	12,440	783	9,087	6,500	228
Turkey:						
Ankara.....	1,242	450	2	641	204	
Adana.....	54	36		34	16	
Istanbul.....	1,528	1,258	3	818	600	2
Izmir.....	146	85	2	86	37	1
AFRICA						
Angola: Luanda.....	73	67		12	11	
Malawi: Blantyre.....	168	43		84	25	
Morocco:						
Rabat.....	721	264		371	231	
Casablanca.....	674	631	6	382	371	1
Tangier.....	104	91		72	54	
Mozambique: Lourenco Marques.....	47	43		28	24	
Southern Rhodesia: Salisbury.....	358	292		163	127	
Tunisia: Tunis.....	500	254		244	162	

¹ Estimated.

POSSIBLE MANPOWER SAVINGS RESULTING FROM THE WAIVING OF TEMPORARY VISITOR VISA REQUIREMENTS
AT POSTS IN COUNTRIES WHICH GENERALLY DO NOT REQUIRE VISAS OF U.S. CITIZEN VISITORS

Post	Visas issued		Percentage of total NIV's	Temporary visitor	
	Nonimmigrant total	Temporary visitors		Man-hours ¹	Man-year savings
American Republics Area:					
Barbados: Bridgetown.....	5,079	4,451	87.6	3,810	1
British Honduras: Belize.....	1,638	1,122	68.5	1,910	-----
Guyana: Georgetown.....	3,187	2,495	78.3	1,991	-----
Jamaica: Kingston.....	16,867	14,592	86.5	9,972	4
Paraguay: Asuncion.....	796	471	59.2	648	-----
Trinidad: Port of Spain.....	8,585	7,276	84.8	5,783	2
Uruguay: Montevideo.....	3,607	2,935	81.4	1,861	-----
Total.....	39,759	33,342	83.9	25,975	7
Europe:					
Austria: Vienna.....	7,431	6,310	84.9	5,383	2
Bahamas: Nassau.....	8,683	7,568	87.2	5,826	2
Belgium:					
Brussels.....	7,315	6,205	84.8	3,549	1
Antwerp.....	3,551	3,265	91.9	3,806	1
Bermuda: Hamilton.....	721	624	86.5	286	-----
Denmark: Copenhagen.....	11,950	9,857	82.5	5,023	2
Finland: Helsinki.....	6,124	5,318	86.8	2,518	1
France:					
Paris.....	56,031	47,960	85.6	26,703	12
Bordeaux.....	3,198	3,077	96.2	3,047	1
Lyon.....	4,603	4,357	94.6	3,661	1
Marseille.....	3,825	3,617	94.6	933	-----
Nice.....	2,757	2,633	95.5	1,324	-----
Strasbourg.....	2,769	2,613	94.4	1,766	-----
French West Indies: Martinique.....	2,028	1,865	92.0	1,401	-----
Germany:					
Bonn.....	5,339	4,178	78.2	2,080	1
Berlin.....	6,533	6,154	94.2	10,352	4
Bremen.....	7,379	6,164	83.5	2,694	1
Dusseldorf.....	13,500	12,439	92.1	6,703	3
Frankfurt.....	18,011	16,693	92.7	7,712	3
Hamburg.....	16,572	13,065	78.8	14,323	6
Munich.....	11,878	10,930	92.0	6,992	3
Stuttgart.....	14,111	13,225	93.7	6,899	3
Great Britain and North Ireland:					
London.....	119,254	103,515	86.8	29,024	13
Belfast.....	6,142	5,862	95.4	3,374	1
Edinburgh.....	24,908	23,749	95.3	6,727	3
Liverpool.....	21,227	19,436	91.6	5,265	2
Iceland: Reykjavik.....	1,804	1,422	78.8	1,237	-----
Ireland: Dublin.....	9,911	8,447	85.2	4,136	1
Italy:					
Rome.....	9,362	7,517	80.3	10,192	4
Florence.....	2,424	2,255	93.0	4,633	2
Genoa.....	2,047	1,022	49.9	2,545	1
Milan.....	6,862	6,228	90.8	5,237	2
Naples.....	4,726	4,128	87.3	5,296	2
Palermo.....	4,907	4,748	96.8	9,289	4
Trieste.....	1,454	1,141	78.5	1,366	-----
Turin.....	1,846	1,708	92.5	2,172	1
Luxembourg: Luxembourg.....	510	448	87.8	155	-----
Malta: Valletta.....	574	533	92.8	474	-----
Netherlands:					
The Hague.....	150	46	30.7	8	-----
Amsterdam.....	14,234	12,338	86.7	4,456	2
Rotterdam.....	11,336	9,981	88.0	7,588	3
Netherlands Antilles: Curacao.....	2,816	2,472	87.8	2,349	1
Norway: Oslo.....	15,355	6,510	42.4	3,530	1
Portugal:					
Lisbon.....	2,526	1,742	69.0	2,516	1
Oporto.....	429	370	86.2	502	-----
Ponta Delgada.....	433	399	92.1	1,358	-----
Spain:					
Madrid.....	7,266	5,259	72.4	3,351	1
Barcelona.....	2,044	1,892	92.6	1,593	-----
Bilbao.....	3,078	751	24.4	689	-----
Seville.....	463	392	84.7	481	-----
Valencia.....	490	396	80.8	453	-----
Surinam: Paramaribo.....	655	580	88.5	522	-----
Sweden:					
Stockholm.....	14,430	12,821	88.8	7,273	3
Goteborg.....	6,130	5,241	85.5	2,284	1

See footnotes at end of table, p. 21.

POSSIBLE MANPOWER SAVINGS RESULTING FROM THE WAIVING OF TEMPORARY VISITOR/VISA REQUIREMENTS AT POSTS IN COUNTRIES WHICH GENERALLY DO NOT REQUIRE VISAS OF U.S. CITIZEN VISITORS—Con.

Post	Visas issued		Percentage of total NIV's	Temporary visitor	
	Nonimmigrant total	Temporary visitors		Man-hours ¹	Man-year savings
Switzerland:					
Bern.....	8,127	7,491	92.2	5,488	2
Zurich.....	12,444	11,395	91.6	4,873	2
Total.....	534,673	460,352	86.1	263,417	100
East Asia:					
Fiji Islands: Suva.....	1,899	1,660	87.4	2,245	-----
Hong Kong: Hong Kong.....	5,769	4,053	70.2	7,952	3
Thailand: Bangkok.....	4,514	1,231	27.3	2,267	1
Total.....	12,812	6,944	57.0	12,464	4
Near East and Asia:					
Aden: Aden.....	48	40	83.3	-----	-----
Cyprus: Nicosia.....	310	195	62.9	491	-----
Greece:					
Athens.....	9,515	4,929	51.8	8,376	4
Thessaloniki.....	544	414	76.1	2,415	1
Israel: Tel Aviv.....	16,077	12,440	77.4	7,354	3
Turkey:					
Ankara.....	1,242	450	36.2	560	-----
Adana.....	54	36	66.7	233	-----
Istanbul.....	1,528	1,258	82.3	3,067	1
Izmir.....	146	85	58.2	73	-----
Total.....	29,464	19,847	67.4	22,569	9
Africa:					
Angola: Luanda.....	73	67	91.8	129	-----
Malawi: Blantyre.....	168	43	25.6	25	-----
Morocco:					
Rabat.....	721	264	36.6	90	-----
Casablanca.....	674	631	93.6	831	-----
Tangier.....	104	91	87.5	245	-----
Mozambique: Lourenço Marques.....	47	43	91.5	270	-----
Southern Rhodesia: Salisbury.....	358	292	81.6	1,281	-----
Tunisia: Tunis.....	500	254	50.8	183	-----
Total.....	2,645	1,685	63.7	3,054	-----
Totals:					
American Republics Area.....	39,759	33,342	83.9	25,975	7
Europe.....	534,673	460,352	86.1	263,417	100
East Asia.....	12,812	6,944	57.0	12,464	4
Near East and Asia.....	29,464	19,847	67.4	22,569	9
Africa.....	2,645	1,685	63.7	3,054	-----
Grand total.....	618,723	522,170	84.4	327,479	120

¹ Estimated: Man-year savings estimated on the basis of 2,080 man-hours per man-year, rounded downward to the next full man-year to allow for growth in other visa activities, and to provide for necessary leave and holidays.

NONIMMIGRANT VISAS ISSUED AND REVALIDATED AT FOREIGN SERVICE POSTS

Area	Fiscal year 1965			Fiscal year 1966			Fiscal year 1967		
	Issued and revalidated	Total by mail	Percentage by mail	Issued and revalidated	Total by mail	Percentage by mail	Issued and revalidated	Total by mail	Percentage by mail
AF.....	16,738	5,525	33	18,376	5,588	30	20,122	6,200	31
ARA.....	451,317	65,630	15	1,384,252	82,399	21	2,339,405	81,496	24
EA.....	114,793	38,245	33	125,146	43,124	34	150,259	55,019	37
EUR.....	510,362	231,298	45	566,697	254,946	45	680,481	338,672	50
NEA.....	48,754	13,476	28	51,756	15,990	31	55,112	16,905	30
Total.....	^a 1,141,964	354,174	31	^a 1,146,227	402,047	35	^a 1,246,379	498,292	40

¹ In addition 74,259 border crossing cards were issued at interior Foreign Service posts in Mexico.

² In addition 163,485 border crossing cards were issued at interior Foreign Service posts in Mexico.

³ In addition 7,117 issued in the Department.

⁴ In addition 8,148 issued in the Department.

⁵ In addition 9,998 issued in the Department.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Our next witness will be another old friend, the Honorable Raymond F. Farrell, Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization in the Department of Justice, accompanied by Mr. James L. Hennessy, executive assistant. It is always a pleasure to have either one or both of you with us.

Mr. FARRELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Would you care to make any statement or shall we just ask you questions for the record?

Mr. FARRELL. Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Katzenbach has stated it all so clearly that I think I can best serve the interest of this committee by making myself available for questions.

**STATEMENT OF HON. RAYMOND F. FARRELL, COMMISSIONER,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION, DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE, ACCOMPANIED BY JAMES L. HENNESSY, EXECUTIVE
ASSISTANT**

Mr. FEIGHAN. If an alien arrives in the United States under this proposed legislation and is found to be excludable, what steps would be taken to effectuate his removal from the United States?

Mr. FARRELL. We would have to go through the same procedures we go through today with the visaed applicant for admission. If the examining immigrant inspector did not believe the alien was clearly and beyond a doubt entitled to admission, he would inform the alien that he was being held for a further hearing before a special inquiry officer of the Service under section 235. From an order of excludability and deportation entered by a special inquiry officer, there would be an appeal to the Board of Immigration Appeals here in Washington, which would conclude the administrative procedures in the case. Pending the final administrative review, the alien would be held in detention; would be permitted to return; or would be paroled into the United States on a deferred inspection basis under section 212(d)(5). Our current procedure is to detain relatively few applicants for admission.

If the final decision is to exclude and deport the alien, under the terms of the contract between participating carriers and the Service, the steamship line or airline which brought the alien to the United States would be obligated to honor the return trip portion of the ticket and to remove him from the United States.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Could the alien who was found to be excludable contest his excludability through judicial review?

Mr. FARRELL. I think the only way would be through a writ of habeas corpus which is I think what you had in mind.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Would it not be feasible for immigration officers stationed abroad to preinspect aliens destined for the United States as tourists?

Mr. FARRELL. In connection with some of our thinking in connection with the new jumbo jets, we have thought that we might have to come to this. We might have to have people stationed in at least four countries abroad, London, Frankfurt, Rome, and places like that. But we haven't quite crossed that bridge. It may be that if we had a little experience with the 90-day tourists, we might have to come to that.

Mr. FEIGHAN. At present, Mr. Commissioner, approximately how many names are listed in the lookout book used by the immigration inspectors in screening aliens at the port of entry?

Mr. FARRELL. There are approximately 47,000 names.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Are you in a position to advise the committee how many aliens are excluded at the port of entry because their name is listed in the lookout book?

Mr. FARRELL. I don't have the exact figure, Mr. Chairman. But it is approximately 1,000. There are some others, of course, which are excluded without hearings also at the ports.

Mr. FEIGHAN. In your opinion, Mr. Commissioner, would the combining of the State Department lookout book with the Immigration Service lookout book make the screening process too burdensome and too unwieldy at the port of entry?

Mr. FARRELL. No, sir. I think that we will have to devise some method of obtaining the name of passengers coming in in advance. It also may be that some of these people will be coming from specific countries such as Italy and we might be able to break it down by nationalities. There are some other things that we probably could do in this connection. Our present book is cumbersome in a way. We have been trying to find ways of working with it a little better. I think we are going to be able to handle that.

I think also this provision in the regulation that Mr. Katzenbach referred to will help us. That would be one where if a person knows, he is on a waiting list to come here for permanent residence and he knows if he violates this 90-day rule that he would go to the bottom of the list. I think this will be a great deterrent. I also think that some of the things we are trying to work out now with the Social Security Administration would be very helpful.

We plan to transmit to Social Security under section 290 of the immigration law the names of these people who may have appeared to have violated the rules. They would run them against their list to see whether any of these people are working to enable us to find them more readily and expel them.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Rodino.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Commissioner, would you suggest then that we write into the legislation a provision which would dictate that the name of that individual who was here for 90 days as a nonimmigrant go down to the bottom of the list?

Mr. FARRELL. Congressman, that would require legislation. Yes, I think it would be desirable.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Do you think it should be included in this?

Mr. FARRELL. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RODINO. Commissioner, you heard the Under Secretary testify a while ago in answer to one of my questions.

The question was whether or not, in his judgment, he did not believe that the action that would be contemplated here would not be merely a shifting of the burden of responsibility in determining admissibility from the consular officer to the immigration officer. What would you reply to this?

Mr. FARRELL. Mr. Congressman, it certainly would. But I do feel we can handle this. It may be that we will handle it as we have been doing in the past. We may have to eventually, as I say, have some people abroad in several countries.

Mr. RODINO. In view of the fact that the Secretary also projected quite a radical increase in the number of tourists who would come to the United States, and considering the proposed increase that might come under this new policy, wouldn't this mean adding to the staff of immigration inspectors considerably?

Mr. FARRELL. I am not really prepared to say that it would. I think we would have to augment it. We might have to have some people abroad as you have indicated. I think, however, that if we can keep these people from taking employment in the United States, that this would go a long way toward solving the problem.

People actually won't stay in a country unless they can work there. With these provisions which would put them down at the bottom of a waiting list which they might be on, I think with that plus the fact that their names would be submitted to the Social Security agency so that they couldn't obtain employment—as the only people who are allowed to work in the United States, as you know, are U.S. citizens and resident-alien and other people with permission—I think there won't be any incentive for these people to remain in the United States beyond the 90-day period.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Commissioner, returning to the question I addressed to the Secretary concerning nonrefundable, round trip tickets, in your experience as the Commissioner, you have dealt with those who have come here, who have overstayed their time and sought to stay indefinitely.

Could you tell us whether in the course of your investigations you have found that some of these aliens had purchased nonrefundable tickets and still showed an intention to stay here through this apparatus of nonrefundable ticket?

Mr. FARRELL. Yes, Mr. Congressman. Some of them did have round trip tickets. But here, of course, it is going to be stamped right on it that it is a nonrefundable ticket. The carriers are going to impress this upon them, that we do have this added factor, and that there are certain penalties that will be provided in the event they do stay beyond the 90-day period.

Mr. RODINO. In other words, the nonrefundable ticket which is supposed to act as a protective measure really doesn't always work. An individual can have a round trip, nonrefundable ticket and still stay here.

Do you think it is going to alter that person's intentions if that is what he decides to do?

Mr. FARRELL. Mr. Congressman, I think they had the round trip ticket but I don't think it has stamped right on there that it is nonrefundable. I don't think it has been impressed on them by the carriers to the extent we are going to enforce this law.

Mr. RODINO. So then you would conclude in this case, especially where many people are in very moderate circumstances, the sum of money involved here would be sufficiently prohibitive to keep them from staying here on a permanent basis?

Mr. FARRELL. I think so, Congressman, in the majority of cases. It is a psychological factor involved. Then, as I say, we do have this addition of the penalties and the fact they go down to the bottom of the list and the fact they could be also perhaps subject to other penalties if they didn't tell the truth about things.

Then, also, there is the fact that they wouldn't be able to work and therefore there wouldn't be much inducement for them to try to stay.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Commissioner, would this proposed legislation in any way minimize our security screening procedures and if so, to any substantial extent prejudice us?

Mr. FARRELL. I don't think so, Mr. Congressman. We go into these things rather thoroughly. Our experience with people who have come here over the years as visitors has been that most of them actually leave. It is perhaps only 1 percent that we have to be concerned with from an enforcement standpoint.

Mr. RODINO. Would false or fraudulent statements in the form which would be filled out at the airline terminal be subject to prosecution in the United States?

Mr. FARRELL. Sir, it was our thought that we would treat that as though it had been a false statement made before a U.S. consul. It would put them in the position of having obtained a visa by fraud and therefore they would be ineligible to return to the United States at any time as a permanent resident under the existing law.

I suppose they could also be prosecuted for a false statement to a Federal official in the same manner that they can now be prosecuted for a false statement to the U.S. Consul abroad.

Mr. RODINO. You don't contemplate any huge number in this area?

Mr. FARRELL. No, sir.

Mr. RODINO. I have one last question, Mr. Commissioner.

Would you describe the method for granting a waiver under the provisions of section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the waiver of grounds of excludability for security reasons?

Mr. FARRELL. First, it is first referred to as the law is now, it comes to us from the State Department after they have looked into it, and have made a definite recommendation to the Immigration and Naturalization Service. It is really up to the Attorney General to delegate it.

Then if we concur in that, the waiver is granted.

Mr. Hennessy has reminded me that in efforts sometimes to expedite these, we have been able to accomplish them in as short a period as 3 weeks.

Mr. RODINO. In your judgment, Mr. Commissioner, the bill presently before us with the suggestions you have made, is the kind of bill that you feel would do the job that has been indicated by the Secretary in promoting more tourism to the United States, and at the same time would safeguard under the proper restrictions and proper guidelines the national security interest?

Mr. FARRELL. Yes, I do, Mr. Congressman, because I feel that perhaps some of these provisions could even be extended to other than the 90-day tourist and would give us a lot more effective enforcement than we have now.

Mr. RODINO. Thank you, very much.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Thank you, Mr. Commissioner, and Mr. Hennessy for your usual very comprehensive and illuminating testimony.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Our next witness will be Mr. John W. Black, Director of the Travel Service of the Department of Commerce.

We extend to you a very warm welcome, Mr. Black.

You may proceed.

**STATEMENT OF JOHN W. BLACK, DIRECTOR, U.S. TRAVEL
SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

Mr. BLACK. I have a very brief statement.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to appear in support of H.R. 15651, a bill to eliminate the mandatory visa requirement for certain overseas visitors and businessmen.

The essential arguments for this legislation have already been presented to you in the President's communication of February 23, and in the testimony of previous Government witnesses. I would only add to these remarks by stressing the importance of this measure in our efforts to promote a greater flow of foreign travelers to the United States in alleviation of our critical balance-of-payments problem.

The legislation before you applies only to overseas travelers. Last year our deficit with overseas countries was \$898 million, or about 43 percent of the total imbalance in our travel account. During the 7 years our government-industry "Visit U.S.A." program has been in operation, we have made considerable progress in building up overseas traffic.

Last year approximately three times as many business and pleasure visitors entered the United States as in 1960, and our receipts from these visitors rose by 170 percent, from \$224 to \$604 million.

Even so, our overseas deficit increased by \$135 million because of the greater number of American tourists going abroad.

I believe the relative success of our Government's travel program has been greatly aided by the progress made during this period in liberalizing visa procedures—particularly through the mail order visa, instituted in 1963, and the indefinite visa and transit-without-visa regulations adopted last year. But more needs to be done.

The Travel Advisory Committee to the Secretary of Commerce has consistently recommended to the executive branch that action be taken on the matter of visa waiver. Typical of the committee's attitude on eliminating the visa requirement is the following resolution which it adopted in 1966:

The Travel Advisory Committee, noting that 1967 has been designated International Travel Year and noting further the overall objective to bring into equilibrium our payments balance, urges introduction of visa waiver legislation on a reciprocal basis with friendly countries at the earliest opportunity during the next Congress.

One of the primary themes we have tried to exploit in our promotional program is the friendliness and hospitality of the American people. Adoption of the proposed legislation would give further thrust to this message by making our Government's greeting of visitors appear gracious rather than grudging.

Thank you.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Black.

What is the type of visitor you are trying to reach through the provisions of this bill?

Mr. BLACK. This would apply primarily to tourists and businessmen, at least those who don't have the indefinite visa or the long-term visa. But I think the primary objective here is the tourist who comes to the United States usually in many cases for the first time or on a very infrequent basis. We, from the research we have done, see that

a greater and greater percentage of our tourists are first-time visitors. Almost a third of them from Europe now are first-time visitors.

It is these people we can attract with somewhat more ease if we make the visa requirement less onerous or abolish it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. You are quite confident that the provisions of this bill would result in the increase of such travel?

Mr. BLACK. I would agree completely with Secretary Katzenbach and his remarks on that. But the effect will be to increase travel. I think my greatest reason for believing that, sir, is that the people who are making money out of promoting travel are airlines, travel agents, and tour operators who have been consistently urging this as a way of building up business. It is going to help them and help us.

I don't think they would urge that if in their own good business judgment they didn't think it would be valuable.

Mr. FEIGHAN. What kind of programs would you undertake to publicize this new type of visitor status?

Mr. BLACK. We would, depending upon the availability of funds, certainly make great mention of this in the trade press. We have a trade advertising campaign. We would do the same kind of thing in promoting this as we did in promoting the mail-order visa.

We ran several ads proclaiming the fact, "Now you can get a visa by post," and so forth. We would do the same thing here. We would make this an essential element of any consumer advertising we have.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I suppose the foreign or U.S. transportation companies and travel agents would participate and cooperate in every way?

Mr. BLACK. Yes: I think foreign travel agents who are selling "Visit U.S.A." would. It would be of great sales value. I am sure they would join in that.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Rodino?

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Black, let me ask you, in the event the suggestions of the Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel are carried out, such as reduction of rates and fares and exemptions from certain taxes, would you think that we would experience any domestic criticism [from the Americans who travel throughout the United States and wouldn't enjoy the same kind of privileges as a foreign tourist would?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Rodino, I think we might get some of that. In fact, we already have gotten a little bit of it. Whether it is justified or not—I don't think it is—the reactions still come. I don't think it is going to be terribly important. But we have had it.

Mr. RODINO. How would you justify that kind of discrimination, so to speak?

Mr. BLACK. We have to justify it, I suppose, in the same way we justify the proposal for a travel tax on Americans going overseas. We have a very critical balance-of-payments program. We are having to take some extreme measures to increase the flow of travel to this country and cut down our so-called travel deficit.

I don't think, personally, over the long run this is the way to promote travel to this country. I don't think we should increase travel by putting our tourism in the bargain basement, over the long run. I think we have got a lot to sell in this country. I don't think it is overpriced.

We have a critical situation with us today, and this may be one way of hypoing the flow of visitors to this country, to get us over this emergency period.

Mr. RODINO. You heard my question directed to the Secretary whether or not he didn't consider it inconsistent that we are asked to impose a travel tax on certain tourists who travel overseas.

It seems to me it places a restriction on travel of the American tourist who wants to visit relatives abroad, or who, as a student, wants to acquire more knowledge, more information. In doing this, he, too, promotes better relations between our country and other countries. It is in keeping with the objectives and the goals that were set out in the President's message when this task force was set up.

It seems to me to be a little inconsistent with what we are asked to do here. We are saying, "We want to encourage visitors to come into our country," and yet we want to place restrictions on those who go out of the country by imposing travel taxes on them.

Mr. BLACK. I would have to answer that in very much the same way the Secretary did. I think it is regrettable that it has to be done. We all recognize that. I am not sure it is inconsistent. I would cite this example: Foreign countries have been doing the same thing for years and years.

The British, for example, have placed very strict currency regulations on their citizens more recently. They had more liberal regulations before, but they were still measures designed to keep more Britons at home or spend less pounds sterling abroad. They have been doing that at the same time they have been encouraging, in a very marvelous way, travel from the United States.

They don't require visas of American citizens, et cetera. This could be said of many other countries. No one has accused them of being inconsistent.

As I say, I am sorry that we have to do this in this emergency situation. I don't think it could be described as creating an inconsistent situation.

Mr. FEIGHAN. You mentioned the restrictions by Great Britain on the amount of money that their citizens can take abroad with them. Have you made a study of the amounts of money that other countries permit or restrict their citizens?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; we provided detailed information on that. Most countries—I would say about half of our major foreign markets—do have some kind of travel currency limitation. But, with the exception of the British, none of them are really significant in deterring our efforts there. They are quite liberal.

Mr. FEIGHAN. We would like to have that for the record.

Mr. BLACK. I would be happy to provide it.

(The information to be furnished follows:)

Restrictions on the sale of dollar exchange for tourist travel

CARIBBEAN

<i>Country</i>	<i>Allowance</i>
Barbados.....	\$700 per person per year.
Bermuda.....	\$1,405 per person with no limit as to per year or per trip. No limit on domestic currency.
British Leeward Islands and British Windward Islands.	\$700 per person per year.
Dominican Republic.....	\$100 per person each 6 months.
Jamaica.....	\$700 per person per trip.
Trinidad and Tobago.....	\$700 per person per year with additional amounts granted.

CENTRAL AMERICA

El Salvador.....	\$500 per person per trip, with an amount up to \$2,000 allowed on request to the central bank.
Guatemala.....	\$2,500 per person per year.

SOUTH AMERICA

Argentina.....	\$1,000 per person per trip, with \$500 allowed for minors.
British Guiana.....	\$393 per person per year.
Brazil.....	Unrestricted if the currency is exchanged at the Brazil exchange market.
Chile.....	\$500 per person per trip for travel outside Latin America.
Colombia.....	\$30 per person per day with a maximum of \$1,800 per year.
Surinam.....	\$1,050 per person per trip with additional amounts granted.

EUROPE

Austria.....	\$1,000 per person per trip, plus \$577 in domestic currency.
Cyprus.....	\$700 per person per year with additional amounts authorized.
Finland.....	\$238 per person per trip for travel. The \$125 allowance for shorter trips has been discontinued.
Greece.....	\$266 per journey (2 journeys per year) which amount includes \$66 in Greek currency.
Iceland.....	\$240 per year, plus cost of international transportation.
Ireland.....	\$700 per adult per trip.
Italy.....	\$1,600 per person per trip. This raised from \$880 per trip per year.
Malta.....	\$700 per person per year with additional amounts granted.
Monaco.....	\$1,200 per person per trip, which includes \$200 in francs.
Netherlands.....	\$830 per trip of up to 14 days plus \$42 per day up to 75 additional days, with additional amounts granted.
Norway.....	\$700 per adult per year and \$250 per year for children under 12.
Portugal.....	Unlimited.
France.....	Do.
Spain.....	\$750 per person per trip, including \$50 in domestic currency, and transportation can be paid for in advance.

Restrictions on the sale of dollar exchange for tourist travel—Continued

EUROPE—continued

Country	Allowance
Sweden.....	\$1,170 per person per trip with additional amounts granted.
Turkey.....	\$222 per person per year.
United Kingdom.....	\$120 per person per trip, plus \$36 in domestic currency.
Yugoslavia.....	\$35 per person per year for travel to North America.

AFRICA

Cameroon, Republic of.....	All payments for travel subject to approval by the Exchange Office.
Ethiopia.....	\$420 per person per year.
Ghana.....	\$140 per adult per year and \$98 per minor per year.
Guinea.....	Allowance subject to individual license.
Libya.....	Increased to \$1,400 per year.
Malagasy Republic.....	\$507 per person per year.
Morocco.....	\$5 per person each 6 months.
Nigeria, Federation of.....	\$270 per person per year.
Sierra Leone.....	\$700 per person per year with additional amounts granted.
Sudan.....	\$288 per person per year; \$72 per child under 16 per year.
Tunisia.....	\$96 per person per year.
Republic of South Africa.....	\$2,800 per adult per year, and \$1,120 per year for children under 12.
Uganda.....	\$700 per person per year with additional amounts granted.
Zanzibar.....	Do.

MIDDLE EAST

Aden.....	\$840 per person per year with additional sums granted.
United Arab Republic (Egypt).....	\$46 per person per trip.
Iran.....	\$500 per adult per year; \$250 per child under 10 years of age.
Iraq.....	Adult residents of Iraq are allowed \$840 per year without prior approval of the Central Bank of Iraq. For adults, the 1st \$420 is duty free, and amounts over this and up to \$1,400 are subject to a duty of 5 percent, and amounts over \$1,400 at 12 percent. For Iraqis under 18 years, the 1st \$210 is duty free.
Israel.....	\$350 per person per trip.
Jordan.....	\$33.60 per day for 1 month, with additional amounts possible.
Syria.....	\$375 per person per trip.

FAR EAST AND PACIFIC

Australia.....	Unlimited.
Burma.....	\$10 plus any amount sanctioned by the Foreign Exchange Controller for travel.
Cambodia.....	No allowance for pleasure travel.
Ceylon.....	Do.
India.....	Do.
Indonesia.....	\$100 per person per trip.
Japan.....	\$500 per person per trip for pleasure travel.
Korea.....	Allowance subject to approval by the Bank of Korea.

Restrictions on the sale of dollar exchange for tourist travel—Continued

FAR EAST AND PACIFIC—continued

<i>Country</i>	<i>Allowance</i>
Laos-----	Allowance subject to approval by the exchange control authorities.
Malaysia-----	\$1,400 per person per year.
Nepal-----	No allowance for pleasure travel.
New Zealand-----	\$1,680 per person per year, except if an allowance has been granted for travel in the previous 3 years, this amount is reduced to \$560.
Pakistan-----	\$420 per person once every 3 years for a limited number of tourists per month.
Philippines-----	October 1967 unofficial guidelines on banks to limit sales of dollars for pleasure travel to \$30 per person per day.
Singapore-----	\$1,400 for each person with additional amounts granted.
Taiwan-----	\$300 in foreign currency and \$200 in cash per person per trip.
Thailand-----	\$630 per person per trip for pleasure travel or \$40 a day for not more than 90 days, whichever is greater.
Vietnam-----	Authorization required from the National Exchange Office.

Source: Department of State and International Monetary Fund.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Rodino?

Mr. RODINO. I have one last question, Mr. Black.

In reading the report of the President's Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel, I note that there were a number of recommendations that were made by this task force. I would like to know what steps have been taken in private industry to implement or carry out the recommendations of the task force?

Mr. BLACK. I can't give you a really detailed answer on that. The steps that were promised or undertaken to be made by private industry are mainly in the area of increased promotion of travel to the United States and in the offering of the special discounts.

At the moment we have pledges that this will be done, pledges from hotel companies, rent-a-car companies, and so forth that the discount will be offered. We are now trying to devise a system whereby these will be implemented.

Finally, I think industry has responded well to the recommendations of the task force. But they are still only about 6 weeks old now. It is too soon to know exactly what the outcome will be.

Mr. RODINO. Thank you very much, Mr. Black.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Thank you very much Mr. Black. We are very happy to have had the benefit of your testimony.

At this time we will have the statement by the Honorable Donald G. Agger, Assistant Secretary of Transportation for International Affairs and Special Programs.

(The statement follows:)

STATEMENT BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS, DONALD G. AGGER

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to respond to your request for the views of the Department of Transportation on H.R. 15651, the Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968.

The Department supports the provisions of this bill and urges its enactment at the earliest date. Such action by the Congress will provide a major breakthrough in the restrictive and cumbersome processes that are imposed on visitors to the United States. In addition, it will contribute greatly to improving the image of this country and enhance our efforts to attract visitors, thereby strengthening our balance-of-payments position.

The Department of Transportation bases its support of this legislation also on a realization that the time is upon us when we must create a totally new environment in international border crossing and terminal area processes if we are to reap the benefits of modern transportation technology and accommodate the large number of travelers that are forecast for the 1970's. It is incumbent upon government, industry and the public to pursue improvements in national and international regulations, procedures and documents which apply to the movement of people and goods by all modes of transportation.

It is to meet this challenge of changing technology that the Department of Transportation has developed a broad facilitation program designed to identify and to alleviate those impediments in the transportation system that limit the full attainment of safe, convenient, and economical transportation.

Government and industry leaders have been appointed to the Transportation Facilitation Committee and its task forces and work groups for the purpose of studying and recommending changes which will contribute to an improved and modern transportation environment.

Fundamental to improving the procedures for passenger handling at international terminals is the need to eliminate every process or document that is not absolutely essential in the identification or clearance process. In the case of this legislation, the visa for nonimmigrant visitors has been identified as a document which is not required.

The Transportation Facilitation Committee will seek to engage industry and government in an evaluation of all such documentation. The Committee's efforts will be directed toward the elimination and simplification of documents. When appropriate, the Committee will encourage automation of those processes and documents that must be retained.

The recommendations of the President's Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel and the Aviation Committee of the International Cooperation Year Program are consistent in urging that entry procedures for visitors to the United States reflect a friendly and welcoming image and still protect the security and health of the nation.

The Department of Transportation not only supports the waiver of the non-immigrant visa but also would encourage the automation of the "look-up" procedures. Today every visitor to the United States is confronted upon his arrival with an objectionable manual search of his name in a mysterious black book. Many countries are considering the possibility of introducing a card-type passport that can be read by optic or magnetic scanners. With such a system, an invalid document or an undesirable visitor would be identified swiftly and automatically.

As a progressive step toward the modern, efficient and hospitable transportation environment which the United States must achieve, I commend to you the Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968 and urge its enactment.

Mr. FEIGHAN. The committee will adjourn, subject to the call of the Chair.

(Whereupon, at 11:32 a.m., the subcommittee recessed, subject to the call of the Chair.)

(In answer to a question raised during the hearing, the State Department replied by the following letter:)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1968.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: At the Hearing on March 21 on H.R. 15651, the Non-immigrant Visa Act, the question was raised whether an alien coming to the United States under the provisions of the bill would be subject to a criminal penalty if he made a false statement in the card he would fill out in the foreign country prior to his boarding the carrier.

It is contemplated that the prospective alien visitor would be required to fill out, prior to boarding the carrier, a card that would identify him and would list the grounds of ineligibility for admission which would continue to apply under the proposed law and the regulations. Among other things, he would be required to certify on the card that he was not ineligible under any of those provisions. He would display this card to the airline and, on arrival in the United States, would present it to an Immigration Inspector as part of the process of applying for admission.

Under this procedure, we would think that any false statement or entry by an alien on this card would make him liable to prosecution under Section 1001, Title 18 U.S.C. This section, in summary, makes it a crime to falsify or conceal a material fact or make any false, fictitious or fraudulent misrepresentations or use any document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry "in any matter within the jurisdiction of any Department or Agency of the United States."

A false statement on the card might also constitute a violation of Section 1546 of Title 18 relating to fraud and misuse of visas, permits, and other entry documents.

Sincerely yours,

BARBARA M. WATSON,
Acting Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs.

(The following statements were received for insertion in the record at this point:)

AIR TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1968.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Air Transport Association of America, on behalf of its member carriers which include virtually all of the scheduled airlines of the United States, urges that prompt and favorable consideration be given to H.R. 15651, a bill to facilitate the entry of foreign tourists into the United States.

In transmitting this proposed Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968 to Congress on February 23, the President stressed that he considered this matter to be of urgent concern. We wholeheartedly concur with that evaluation. As we all know, the United States is confronted with a serious and persistent balance of payments deficit. It is incumbent upon every sector of our economy to make positive contributions to the alleviation of that problem. Enactment of H.R. 15651 will offer a great assist to the travel industry in achieving that goal.

The cultural, political and economic benefits of international travel have long been recognized. These factors, as well as the impact of foreign exchange travel earnings upon international trade balances, have prompted many countries to undertake successful programs to promote tourism to their shores. The President's own Special Task Force on Travel has launched a vigorous and imaginative program to that end in this country. In terms of reducing the "travel gap", such an affirmative program can and will be far more effective than measures to restrict the travel of our citizens abroad. In short, there is no reason why we should make our own people miserable if we can accomplish the same thing by making other people happy.

As the President and his Special Task Force have recognized, the simplification of border-crossing formalities such as the waiver of visitor visas has played a highly significant role in the tourism programs of other countries. Thus, United States citizens now enjoy visitor visa waiver privileges granted by some 35 nations. By authorizing the Attorney General and the Secretary of State jointly to issue regulations exempting pleasure and business visitors to the United States for 90 days or less from the visa requirement, H.R. 15651 will bring this country into step with that long list of host nations.

The last decade has seen dramatic changes, not only in the United States but throughout the world, in disposable income levels, leisure time, and consumer spending habits. Years ago, international tourism was popularly considered a luxury solely within the reach of an affluent minority. Today, with the immeasurable stimulus offered by the technology of the jet age, this is no longer true. The United States stands in competition with all other countries as a destination area for international travel.

Our obsolete visa requirements represent a handicap to that competitive effort. We cannot expect to secure a position in the front ranks of the world's host nations if we issue a warm invitation and then require the invitee to go to some lengths to get permission to come—indeed, to prove that he is not ineligible to come. We must do all that we can to make these guests welcome.

While the favorable impact of increased tourism upon our balance of payments is self-evident, it should be recognized that another, indirect benefit is inherent in this proposal. Data have been submitted to the Committee reflecting the magnitude of our visa issuance effort abroad today. Substantial savings can be realized by the sharp reduction in visa processing requirements promised by this Bill.

In urging that H.R. 15651 be enacted, we would support promulgation, by government regulation, of certain requirements for visa-free visits to this country, as outlined in the President's letter. Specifically, possession by the visitor of a non-refundable departure ticket should, in and of itself, satisfy the condition prescribed in Section 2 of the bill to accomplish the visitor's departure from the United States.

Enactment of the Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968 would greatly assist the Government and the travel industry in their common mission to encourage more citizens of other lands to visit the United States. We therefore urge this Committee to give prompt and favorable consideration to H.R. 15651. We respectfully request that this letter be included in the record of the hearings on this proposal.

Cordially,

S. G. TIPTON,
President.

AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1968.

HON. MICHEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. FEIGHAN: On behalf of the 10,700,000 member American Automobile Association, I would like to take this opportunity to advise you of this organization's support for H.R. 15651, the Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968, and to request that you make this letter a part of the printed record of your deliberations on this subject.

As you know, the legislation before you is one of the principal recommendations advanced by the President's Task Force on Travel, a group on which the AAA was honored to serve.

The recommendation embodied in the bill before you for consideration is the most important, forward-looking, positive step yet taken by the Administration in its attempts to alleviate travel's part of the dollar drain.

For many years the AAA has worked for freedom of travel across international boundaries while promoting tourism. This looks toward not only individual enjoyment, but also an interchange of peoples to bring about better understanding which can contribute to peace among nations.

We have a long-standing resolution on this subject, which reads as follows:

"In order to assure the success of efforts to increase tourist traffic from other countries to the United States, we, as a nation, must develop an atmosphere of hospitality which begins the moment the prospective tourist arrives at the U.S. Embassy or Consulate abroad for his visa. Every means must be sought, consistent with our national security to make it as simple and convenient as possible for foreign nationals to enter our country as temporary visitors.

"The AAA recommends amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act, establishing a new 'tourist visa' category for 'an alien or a resident in a foreign country who desires to enter the U.S.A. as a tourist for a period not to exceed ninety days.' The amendment should provide for reciprocal privileges from other countries and for summary deportation in the event of violations."

Thanking you for your consideration in this matter, I remain, with all best wishes,

Sincerely,

GEORGE F. KACHLEIN, Jr.,
Executive Vice President.

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAVEL AGENTS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 20, 1968.

Re H.R. 15651.

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The American Society of Travel Agents, Inc. (ASTA), on behalf of its more than 7,000 members throughout the world involved in travel and tourism, urge your Subcommittee to give prompt and favorable consideration to H.R. 15651, a Bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the entry of foreign tourists into the United States.

President Johnson, in a letter dated February 23, 1968 urging Congress to enact this proposal, noted that it had been recommended by the President's Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel. ASTA supported the work of the Task Force in formulating its recommendations, and has promised its continued cooperation with the Presidential Commission on Travel also headed by Ambassador Robert M. McKinney. This Commission was established to implement the recommendations of the Task Force.

ASTA, on behalf of the travel agency industry, has long sought the elimination of unnecessary and cumbersome barriers to travel. We, therefore, would welcome the elimination of certain visa requirements as proposed by this Act.

It appears that the provisions of the Act which give the Attorney General and Secretary of State discretion in designing regulations concerning temporary visitors for business or pleasure are adequate to assure against possible security problems. We welcome the provision in the Act which makes the extension of the no-visa requirement available on a basis of determination that such designation would promote the foreign policy of the United States in addition to the basis of reciprocity with other governments.

As the result of widespread talk about possible Congressional action which would restrict the right of U.S. citizens to travel outside the Western Hemisphere, our country has suffered a loss of prestige throughout many areas in the world. In addition, our reputation as the No. 1 host country has tended to suffer with the possibility that the government may impose mandatory restrictions on the right of our citizens to exercise freely their Constitutional guarantee of right to travel. It is ASTA's firm conviction that the imposition of such travel restrictions is not only highly undesirable, but unnecessary.

One of the best analyses concerning the proposed travel restrictions is that contained in the 1968 Joint Economic Report issued on March 18 by the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress of the United States wherein it stated:

"The proposed travel expenditure tax, designed to save \$250 million by restricting American travel to Europe, is too restrictionist in principle, likely to lead to widespread evasion, likely to lead to retaliation and unlikely to realize its objective."

The report goes on to state:

"It should be shelved and replaced by an all-out immediate effort to save some \$250 million by vigorously implementing the February 19 McKinney Committee recommendations for attracting European travelers to the United States with package discounts."

As we have indicated, one of the specific recommendations of Ambassador McKinney's Committee was the enactment of H.R. 15651. Therefore, in order to offset the adverse publicity and loss of prestige which our government has suffered throughout the world as a result of the talk of imposing travel restrictions on U.S. citizens and in order to establish conclusively the determination of the Congress to take positive steps to attract tourism to the United States, thus substantially reducing our travel deficit, we urge the Committee to give prompt and favorable consideration to this Bill.

Sincerely,

GEORGE L. FICHTENBAUM,
Executive Director.

TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1968.

Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Board of Directors of the Transportation Association of America, I wish to submit a statement in support of H.R. 15651, entitled the "Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968."

Our supporting statement is based on TAA's International Transportation Facilitation policy to encourage action to facilitate the movement of passengers and cargo across international boundaries. This policy was adopted by the Board of Directors on May 23, 1967, after endorsement by member representatives of users, investors, and air, freight forwarder, highway, oil pipeline, railroad, and water carriers.

Also enclosed is a January 1968 publication entitled "Transport Technological Trends", referred to in the statement. This TAA publication summarizes the current trends for all transport modes, including airlines and maritime carriers which serve the international markets of the world. Under Secretary of State Katzenbach emphasized transport technology in his statement on March 21, 1968 in support of H.R. 15651.

We respectfully request that our statement be included in the record of hearings on H.R. 15651. In view of the fact that copies of this letter and the enclosures are being sent to all members of your Subcommittee, you may wish to include the publication in Committee files rather than include it in the printed transcript of the hearing.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD F. HAMMOND.

Mr. Chairman and Members of Subcommittee No. 1, my name is Harold F. Hammond. I am President of the Transportation Association of America (TAA), with general offices located at 1101 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. This statement is submitted on behalf of TAA to express its policy position in support of H.R. 15651, a bill designed to facilitate the entry of foreign tourists into the United States.

I. DESCRIPTION OF TAA AND ITS ACTIVITIES

For the record, TAA is a non-profit national transportation policy-making organization which devotes its entire time and effort to the development and implementation of sound national policies for the maintenance of the strongest possible transportation system under private ownership and management.

The membership of TAA is comprised of representatives of transport users of all types, investors, and carriers of all modes, including air, freight forwarder, highway, oil pipeline, railroad, and water carriers. Its membership also includes individuals such as educators, transportation consultants, lawyers, and other professional persons.

TAA does not engage in the promotion of one form of transport against another, but seeks to represent what is best in the broad public interest. We have set up a careful procedure for the establishment of policy, in order to assure fair and thorough consideration of pending subjects before final positions are adopted.

The procedure is briefly as follows: Issues are raised for study and analysis by eight permanent advisory committees or "Panels" of recognized national leaders in the transportation industry. Approximately 300 such leaders participate in this continuing activity of the User, Investor, Air, Freight Forwarder, Highway, Pipe Line, Railroad, and Water Carrier Panels. It is in this echelon of policy-making that constructive compromise solutions to specific issues are reached among the represented interests.

Panel recommendations are reviewed in turn by the Policy Development Committee, comprised of the chairmen of the respective Panels, following which the subject under review is then submitted to the 117-man Board of Directors for action. The Board includes not only top executives of all carrier modes just mentioned, but also senior officials of leading banks, insurance companies, investment companies, manufacturers, suppliers, agricultural interests, and professional persons.

II. TAA POSITION ON THE PENDING LEGISLATION

H.R. 15651 was introduced on February 28, 1968 by Mr. Celler, Chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, following transmittal on February 23, 1968 of a letter from President Johnson to the Congress urging passage of such legislation. In essence, the bill would authorize the Secretary of State and Attorney General, by regulation, to waive the existing requirement for foreign businessmen and other visitors traveling to the United States to obtain visas from an American Consul abroad. Such waiver would apply to persons visiting this country for 90 days or less, provided they possessed a valid passport and a non-refundable round-trip ticket.

Pursuant to the bill, (1) the Secretary of State would designate the countries, on the basis of reciprocity, whose citizens could be so treated, (2) foreign nationals convicted of serious crimes or narcotics traffic would still be barred, and (3) visiting aliens would still be examined by Immigration and Naturalization Service officials at the points of entry.

For many years TAA has had some policies affecting international transportation and gave increasing attention to this subject in the past two years. The Board of Directors, on May 23, 1967, adopted the following general policy on International Transportation Facilitation:

"TAA should encourage action to facilitate the movement of passengers and cargo across international boundaries."

Since then, a detailed facilitation program has been developed and just recently announced. Included in such program is the following item:

"Legislation should be enacted to provide for waiver of United States visas, on a reciprocal basis, for travelers from friendly countries when visiting the United States."

It is believed significant to state that all eight TAA Panels, representing all carrier modes, as well as user and investor interests, supported the adoption of the above-stated policy position.

III. SUPPORTING ARGUMENTS

The arguments in support of this legislation have been advanced very persuasively by President Johnson in his above-mentioned letter of February 23, 1968; by the testimony of Under Secretary of State Katzenbach and Director Black of the United States Travel Service; and by supporting statements already filed by industry representatives, notably that of the President of the Air Transport Association, Mr. Stuart G. Tipton. The need for positive steps to facilitate the flow of overseas visitors and businessmen to the United States is not only readily manifest, but it has become all the more imperative from the fact that we *require* visas for travelers from 35 countries which *do not require* visas for American travelers.

We have noted the testimony by Mr. Katzenbach to the effect that rapid advances in the volume of international travel is in part attributable to what we describe as the "transportation technological revolution." He states:

"Magnificent technological developments have taken place over the past few decades in the field of international transportation.

* * * * *

"Technology is not standing still. And with mammoth aircraft and faster-than-sound flight, we may expect the annual number of tourists to the United States to increase by geometric progression."

TAA has been devoting increasing attention in recent months to the actual or possible national transportation policy implications of technology trends. The subject legislation is an example of an international transport policy issue affected by such "revolution".

Accordingly, we hope that your Subcommittee and the Congress will support the enactment of H.R. 15651.

(The following telegram was received for insertion in the record at this point:)

APRIL 1, 1968.

Hon. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.:

The National Association of Travel Organizations, trade association for the U.S. travel industry, whose membership includes over 800 key travel organizations, as well as the State travel offices, respectfully urges that prompt and favorable consideration be given to H.R. 15651, a bill to facilitate the entry of foreign visitors into the United States. Passage of the Nonimmigrant Visa Act of 1968 would immeasurably aid in encouraging more citizens from abroad to visit the United States thereby helping to ease our balance-of-payments situation.

We'd appreciate having this telegram inserted in the record.

Respectfully,

JAMES C. GROSS,
Executive Director, National Association of Travel Organizations.





