

our client organizations, and the same with regard to research done in universities. This does not quite answer your questions but I think this gives you the . . .

Mr. Martineau: Right, but we have received fewer you see—we received \$600,000 from the Molson Foundation \$16 million from the Killam estate and we have just received \$735,000 from another estate which I would ask you not to ask me to name now because it is not announced yet. But large bequests in Canada cannot be expected because it takes a very rich man to leave half a million dollars to an institution.

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, I take it then that the Council has now reconciled itself to the fact that it will have to depend on support from public funds.

Mr. Martineau: Mostly, yes, but we are expecting and we hope that in the years to come we will get more of these bequests. We just received one, as I said of \$735,000 and now we need about \$2 million.

Mr. Dinsdale: Well does this not mean that we are facing the problem that was debated so sensitively in 1957 that the Canada Council is becoming more and more an arm of government? Therefore, I think this has been demonstrated by the questions this morning, it is in that very sensitive and delicate area of public opinion, and its deliberations and its awards and its decisions will have to be taken on the basis of public response. I would say these three recent episodes have done considerable damage to the reputation of the Canada Council far out of proportion because it is the eccentric situations that seem to hit the headlines and all the other policies and projects that are outlined in the book do not get into the limelight of publicity at all. But now, Mr. Boucher said you have decided to take the risk. You have decided to take the risk, you are going to have to face the situation where you will come more and more under public scrutiny. I think you will find with budgets for cultural affairs going up and budgets for other items going down that you are not going to get the sort of encouragement from the public that you might otherwise receive.

Mr. Martineau: May I say . . .

Mr. Dinsdale: Let me say, let me just finally make this statement. I was strongly in support of the Canada Council when it was

established because the physical sciences were receiving assistance, the social sciences were not. We are still out of proportion in this respect but the physical sciences are not as controversial as the social sciences, and this is a very important decision.

Mr. Martineau: That is right. We have to start thinking of that and we are, sir. But, if I may say for the gentlemen of the press here, when the Ortiz matter or another one came out in one newspaper in Ottawa it was on the first page in red; on the third page there was a series of gifts and grants given by the Council in the Ottawa region for hundreds of thousands. That rated only the third page but this small incident was in red on the first page. So what can we do?

• 1235

Mr. Boucher: No, I think we are quite conscious of that. It is healthy for us to appear before a committee of the House because this is really the ultimate control. We have to report to the House and we have to sense the disposition of the House to vote more money for these purposes. I think also you have to realize that we are not terribly easy about these last incidents. We are not happy about them; we caught up with them after they had occurred; they made a big splash in the papers. We do not know what we can do to stop that forever, but we certainly are determined not to place ourselves in the position of having too many repetitions of these unfortunate incidents. But having said that I think I have to say that there is still the possibility that it will again occur. We are certainly not inviting these things to happen, and we are as conscious as you are that they do not help the over-all cause we are serving.

[Interpretation]

The Vice-Chairman: If this happens too often, Mr. Boucher, we will contract the habit . . .

[English]

Mr. Dinsdale: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate those sentiments from Mr. Boucher and I think by counselling together we might have resolved part of the difficulty because I was very disturbed by your statement comparing public expenditures of this kind with family allowances which seemed to miss the point of responsiveness to public opinion in this delicate and sensitive area and, secondly, when you said you decided to take the calculated risk. Now, if you do this you can bring down