

In addition, The French Line made the following expenditures through the company's travel agency for the promotion of tours, primarily to North America.

1964	-----	\$40,000
1965	-----	75,000
1966	-----	90,000
1967	-----	150,000

Similarly, substantial expenditures to promote travel to the United States are made by sea carriers such as Holland-America, Cunard, Italian, United States, American Export-Isbrandtsen, Swedish-American, Norwegian-America, Matson, P & O, etc.

It is estimated that in 1968 an additional \$5,000,000 will be spent abroad on "Visit U.S.A." promotion by commercial operators such as bus companies, car rentals companies, hotels, tour operators, etc.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the best way is to leave the record open, if you can get the information, but put it in the context of the other witnesses. Namely, what are the expected amounts of money to be spent for 1968 and 1969, and then what will be the impact of the Government program of cutting back on capital expenditures abroad on this very planned expansion.

I think we need to know it because here the Government, the administration is doing something strange. On the other hand, in its package program it is saying:

We are going to cut back on private investments abroad, but in this area of encouraging travel to the United States we are asking Congress to increase what Government can spend abroad.

Frankly, I am not about to substitute Government dollars for private dollars for another basic reason. I just know from experience that the private sector spends money with a great deal more intelligence than the Government because there is the discipline of the marketplace. The private sector spends dollars in order to get dollars back.

A bureaucrat in Government may be well intentioned in his expenditures, but he is not under this kind of discipline. If anything, the discipline that he is under is to get rid of the money. So private promotional spending abroad is the kind of data, if you can provide it, which would be helpful. I think we will just leave the matter there.

One other point. I notice on page 19 in arguing your case that you derogated the United States by referring to the fact that we spent only \$3 million for travel promotion and little Ireland spent \$10 million.

I would be curious to know what Ireland spends in the private sector to encourage people to come to Ireland. I suspect not very much. Then I would like to see what does Ireland as a nation, as a society, spend—both governmental and private—in relation to what the United States spends—governmental and private. Then we have the full picture. Then we know what we are talking about.

But let's not go on the assumption that, because Ireland spends \$10 million through its Government, therefore, Ireland is doing a good job and because we only spend \$3 million through our Federal Government, the United States isn't doing much in the area of encouraging people to come to this country so that we will remain the No. 1 host nation, which I am very pleased you point out.

You see what I am getting at? I am not trying to argue the point, but let us get the data first. Then I hope that the people who are