

Senator CRERAR: I deduced it was millions and not hundreds of thousands or billions. So far as the United States is concerned, the change in the exchange rate in 1962-63 was a factor in producing the results we got?

Mr. FIELD: That is right, sir.

Senator CRERAR: As long as that exchange rate stays at its present discount vis-à-vis the American dollar, we will continue to benefit from it. What are the factors? People travel when they are prosperous? Is that the theory?

Mr. FIELD: People travel for many reasons. I read one learned survey about that.

Senator CRERAR: They may have many reasons for travel, but if the tourist, under the definition you gave us—which I thought was a very good definition—is being squeezed at home, if he loses his job or his salary is reduced, he is not so likely to travel, is he?

Mr. FIELD: That is quite right, sir.

Senator CRERAR: And of course the same will be true in regard to Canadians travelling to other countries. What happens if there is a decline in economic activity in the United States and in Canada? Would that, in your judgment, tend to reduce the exchange of tourist traffic?

Mr. FIELD: I think it would have an effect upon the decision of the family to travel. For example, if there were a recession in the United States, we would concentrate on Canada as a place where they could get the most value for their travel dollar. Families will still want to have a vacation, except in those cases where the head of the family is out of work and they simply cannot afford it. Many people who would normally be going overseas or going to high-priced areas—and I hope this does not get back to my good friends in California and Florida—would then become valuable customers for some of our Canadian areas. We would shift the advertising, without downgrading Canada, to urge them to come to Canada rather than go to more expensive places.

Senator CRERAR: If the average American tourist spends \$1,000 on tourist travel—they are the most curious people in the world, anyway—and if he finds the next year that he can spend only \$500, he is more likely to come to Canada than go to Europe. Is that your theory?

Mr. FIELD: That is right, sir.

Senator CRERAR: I think you are probably right in that.

The CHAIRMAN: I suppose you had British Columbia in mind when you were planning to open an office in Los Angeles?

Mr. FIELD: Not only British Columbia. One of the most amazing things about the State of California—it is a phenomenon—is that there is no other area we know of, in the United States or elsewhere, which sends so many people so far. It is a beautiful state and yet they send people by the thousand up to British Columbia and Alberta. I remember that, one year, a count in the City of Quebec in a period of ten days showed 143 cars bearing California licence plates. I believe the reason is that the recreational areas in the United States are vastly overcrowded, and that applies to the State of California. These people have the means and the time to travel, so they come up to the uncrowded recreational areas of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN: It is remarkable to see such a large number of California cars right here on Parliament Hill in Ottawa on Sunday mornings. I count them nearly every Sunday morning.

Senator ASELTINE: I would like to know, if possible, how they arrive at the amount of money that a tourist spends in Canada. Over the weekend I was at Lac La Ronge, about 300 miles north of Saskatoon. Americans were there by the hundreds. I counted about 50 American private planes on the airfield