

Canadian hotels and resort operators would certainly not like to lose, but if somebody does come from Europe, that person is going to stay two weeks, anyway. Whereas the average person who makes a trip from the border—the average number of days that person stays is about nine.

Senator GROSART: Do I understand you regard about 10 of the 30 million border crossings as tourist crossings?

Mr. FIELD: That's right.

Senator SMITH (*Kamloops*): In considering the proper basis for the expenditure, what about the Canadian population? Is it a proper factor in determining how much you should spend, or for arriving at a comparative figure with our competitors? Is it not an interesting and valuable factor if we could arrive at the spending of competitive agencies of, say, Mexico on this continent, and big spenders like Spain and other countries in Europe? Do you use the factor of expenditure per capita of that country as a comparable figure to see where we stand in our advertising and promotion?

Mr. FIELD: We have some comparative figures about present competitors' spending, and by the expenditure of other countries compared with Canada. So far as formula is concerned whether we should spend one per cent or five per cent, I reached a conclusion, because I had to, in the last year. I prepared a paper for the International Union of Official Travel Organizations on the formulation of publicity and advertising policy, and in my studies I reached the conclusion that you cannot really lay down a hard and fast formula as to whether it should be one per cent of the total amount spent by visitors to this country, or not. If that formula were followed in our case and if we got \$600 million then the travel bureau's budget should be a mandatory \$6 million. I prefer instead to go by program, and to present to my department, and through my deputy minister and minister to the Treasury Board, a program aimed at a certain objective.

We now have a three-year plan which is designed to produce for Canada \$1 billion of tourist income in 1967. We have advanced these projects in a series of steps which we believe will produce that amount of money by that time. This means that by 1967 the travel bureau could be asking for an appropriation of up to \$7 million, and we will have to fight very hard to get both the department and the Treasury Board to agree. But, here we are dealing with specific programs and not with any formulae, and not with any percentage of the national per capita income that should be devoted to promoting tourist travel.

Senator GROSART: Mr. Field, it would seem obvious that your program is based on reinforcing its success year by year until you reach your saturation point.

Mr. WALLACE: I think Senator Grosart has stated exactly how we feel about it. We are not alone in this because the provinces are backing us up, and so are the transportation companies. These blue lines shown here in Chart No. 1 represent millions of dollars of expenditure by our bureau, and the red lines should be ten times as big. After the war we spent \$0.7 million to obtain an income of \$22 million, but we do not claim all of the credit. All we point out is the very interesting correlation that is seen here, that when the promotion was a little bit static or a little bit sluggish we had a low income, but when promotion began to take off, as here, then the income seemed to pick up the same sort of momentum or acceleration. We now believe that the acceleration shown here will continue. As Mr. Field indicated, we are not suggesting we level off, because if we level off or relax at our present level, we must then expect these income lines to slow down. As long as we do not get less than \$140 for every dollar we spend then we feel it is a wise investment to keep this line up; to keep pushing our effort up until our returns show signs of slowing down. Our objective is up there in the air—a billion dollars. We have been given the ob-