

that seem to me clearly can be done in the private sector because there is enough remuneration.

You ought to be putting in your own research and development, but we are in trouble because everybody takes the easy way, comes to the Federal Government, and then spends this easy money. I would ask you to review these recommendations of yours of whether you really do want USTS to be spending this money to promote travel in this country or whether you don't want to do it yourself.

Mr. FRANKEL. If I may.

Mr. CURTIS. Certainly.

Mr. FRANKEL. There is a difference here in that we recommend that the efforts by the USTS and the expenditures accorded them be on parity with what other governments are spending to attract people from this country.

Mr. CURTIS. Let me stop you there. Good Lord, this country is the one that should be setting the example of private enterprise, not copying these other countries that have never learned private enterprise. Why do you come in and say that because other countries use their governmental sector in what I would say is a foolish way we should copy them?

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Curtis, if I may, I don't want to get involved in a philosophical discussion about Government spending—

Mr. CURTIS. This is not philosophical. This is the thrust of the matter.

Mr. QUINN. The thrust of our recommendation is that there should be a cooperative effort by Government and industry. The Government, we feel, has a part to play; but industry has perhaps a more major one. We point out one interesting aspect of the proposal is not only would it not reduce Government spending, but according to the Customs Bureau in a press release or a wire service report on February 6 just to enforce the new recommendations the Customs Bureau would have to hire 535 more people, and the cost of that if you also include the cost of—

Mr. CURTIS. Don't they have any productivity increase in this kind of endeavor? It looks like the Government is the only place where you don't have productivity increase. You always have to have more people if you do more things. I reject that thought too. But go ahead.

Mr. QUINN. The point is, I think there has been no estimate as to how much it would cost to enforce this program; so if you are talking about Government effort overall, this should be taken into consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. We are probably on different wavelengths here, but it is, in my judgment, a very crucial thing to make these determinations. I, incidentally, reject this very idea of partnership with the Government.

Look, Government is a servant, not a partner of the people. You have it in your recommendations as a partner and this can only lead to trouble. I think the Government has a proper function and certainly can help in this area, but you put it in only because it has been and is easy to get Federal money.

Your objectives are fine. I agree with the objectives, but as I said to the other witnesses, it leaves me cold when I find that this problem