Mr. VANIK. That came out of a publication, the travel publication, and I have this on my desk. That is it right there. You look up the passport figures and add up those who indicate they are going to stay less than 30 days and it comes to 14 percent and if you add all the others that are staying for longer than 30 days it comes to the 86 percent.

Now, do we have any idea as to what this 86 percent group consists of? Does your organization know whether they go abroad to live or where they might be located and how they might be taxed? They are the big contributors to the imbalance and it is all chargeable to travel deficits.

Mr. QUINN. The statistics I have indicate that the proposed length of stay for the average applicant is less than 2 months for a million applicants and the remaining perhaps 200,000 applicants stay more than 2 months.

Mr. VANIK. Now, in that first publication you have there if you take the figures, the yellow binder publication, if you look there for 1965 and 1966—I don't think we are looking at the same publication; in the original binder publication.

Mr. QUINN. Yes.

Mr. VANIK. I think you will find there that the percentage under 30 days is less than 14 percent and if you add all the others they are for a longer period of time so I have combined them to make up the difference.

Mr. QUINN. I think if you take the 1-month period that is true but the break-off period appears to be 2 months. In other words, if they stay 2 months or less and the application might indicate that——

Mr. VANIK. You get a better figure for my purposes if you go to 30 days or less. I was talking about a 30-day exemption and how this could serve most of the problem.

Mr. QUINN. I think you have to distinguish here between the estimated length of stay for the tourist and the actual length of his trip. In other words, in order to be on the conservative side they might estimate 2 months but actually stay less than 1 month.

Mr. VANIK. You mean we can't believe the average tourist when he voluntarily tells the passport office he is going to stay for a given period of time, not a bit of information that really up to the present time hasn't involved any greater expense or liability or obligation on his part? I am inclined to think that that statement would be true; wouldn't you?

Mr. QUINN. Generally I am not sure what the question is on the passport form. We would have to look into it and analyze it more precisely for the benefit of the committee.

Mr. VANIK. Well, let me ask this question. Would a 30-day exemption take care of the substantial problem of the travel industry?

Mr. FRANKEL. I would say so; yes.

Mr. VANIK. Your answer is yes.

Mr. FRANKEL. Yes.

Mr. VANIK. Then you would have no objection to a severe taxation and restriction for those beyond 30 days excluding students and teacher's; is that correct?

Mr. QUINN. Again it gets back to the problem here. The statistics indicate that over a million people indicated they would stay for 2 months or less and the remaining 400,000 stayed more than 2 months,