

*The Address—Mr. Loisel*

pleases him more than do the great American tourist attractions. Old Montreal and Mount Royal would therefore be far more appreciated than the buildings of Place Ville-Marie.

Mr. Speaker, I am not exaggerating when I say that here, in Canada, there is no truly organized tourist industry. For years now, governments, federal and provincial, private enterprise, have been going ahead with their promotions, according to their own whims and small concerns. There is no real tourist policy in Canada. There is a free-for-all. Mr. Speaker, that situation cannot last any longer. We must plan, even now, our tourist development for the 1980s. That is a priority we must set for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to elaborate on a few suggestions I discussed with a citizen whom I have learned to admire greatly because of his thorough knowledge of tourism. I am speaking here of a citizen who really thinks in terms of the interest of his country, namely, Mr. Jean-Marie Guay of Gatineau. I was also deeply interested in the proposal of the Minister of Tourism with regard to developing an over-all strategy for tourism in Canada. Mr. Speaker, we too feel that our tourist deficit is of prime concern. In that regard, with the co-operation of Mr. Guay, I looked into certain measures designed to reduce our deficit, and as an example we took the case of Quebec.

● (2130)

Statistics indicate that 52 per cent of Quebecers do not travel. If half of these 52 per cent of Quebecers had spent \$180 travelling in 1976, that is the average spent by those Quebecers who do travel, this average of \$365, Quebec's \$200 million deficit would have been replaced by a \$50 million surplus. If the duration of the trips made by Quebecers in Quebec had been extended by 10 per cent, \$70 million could have been recovered from the 1976 deficit. If the number of Quebecers travelling outside Quebec had been reduced from 24 to 20 per cent, and if these Quebecers had spent in Quebec half of the average of \$365, the deficit could have been reduced by \$45 million. A 30 per cent increase in non-American foreign tourists would have brought in an additional \$30 million. A 15 per cent increase in Canadian tourists from other provinces would have brought in \$15 million in additional revenues. A 10 per cent increase in American tourists would bring \$15 million more.

Mr. Speaker, these measures could be applied to Canada as a whole without much difficulty. Contrary to what occurs in other areas, there is probably in Canada and elsewhere in the world no organization, either public or private, which is involved in serious research in tourist leisure and the implementation of its findings. Many people have some experience in the tourism industry, but as far as I know there is no real graduate in that field. First of all, Mr. Speaker, it seems important to me to consider the creation of an independent tourism research and development institute. This institute

[Mr. Loiselle.]

would be financed by both public funds and private funds coming from associations involved in tourist matters. Once set up, the institute would, as a first step, evaluate the Canadian tourist product as well as current and potential, customers for that product.

The Canadian tourist product is more than just natural beauties or historic sites. A full evaluation of the tourist product would also look at the whole service sector—the carriers, hotels, restaurants and tourist circuits. That step seems to me of prime importance. How could one expect, Mr. Speaker, to develop any tourist strategy if one has not beforehand made an inventory of what are the country's tourist attractions, development potential, and customers to develop it?

The institute being an independent agency, its evaluation of the product would be most objective since it would not have to yield to parochial interests. So the end result of this evaluation would take into account only those tourist attractions and services which are most worth while and eliminate a great many others which have very little interest.

There is no intention on my part to favour one region at the expense of another but one must understand that not everything is worth seeing in Canada and that we must first develop what is most profitable. The evaluation of our tourist product would enable us to establish uniform classification criteria for the services available. For instance, the traveller would know that a three-maple-leaf hotel or restaurant has the same meaning in Vancouver as it does in St. John's, Newfoundland, which would quite often spare him very unpleasant surprises and would largely contribute to the elimination of a great many exploiters who make a living out of the false representation of the services rendered.

The identification of the clientele would allow for better planning of our tourist development in accordance with the varying tastes of travellers. It is as important to provide the culture minded type of visitor with a product that will capture his interest as it is in the case of the sports fan or the travelling gourmet. The proposed institute could play a leading role in the preparation of training programs for tourist agents who, once defined, could become precious instruments for the provincial departments of education. The institute could also raise the interest of young people for tourism. Students and youngsters are the future of our country. The institute could develop certain instruments such as, for instance, tourist educational games which could be integrated as complements to the social sciences courses provided in the schools. The institute could also carry out marketing studies in the field of tourism and try to improve on the Canadian product.

We believe, Mr. Speaker, that this institute should have an independent status. This must not be construed as a refusal to co-operate with the various levels of government and private enterprise engaged in the development of tourism. The institute could also make governments and the private sector