

known separatist, this would then be a different story, would it not?

Mr. Boucher: What do you mean by a known separatist?

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Someone who is obviously working against the unity of Canada, such as René Lévesque.

Mr. Boucher: Yes. If he asks for support from the Canada Council to pursue that very activity he would not get it.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): Not necessarily to pursue that activity, for any reason, even to go and study music.

Mr. Boucher: I think on this ground you are asking a hypothetical question.

Mr. Martineau: Then let us face it.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): It is not as hypothetical as all that, because two years ago we had a fellow who received through the Centennial Commission a grant to write a book who was a known communist. So, it is not all that hypothetical.

Mr. Boucher: I do not mean by that that it cannot happen, but you are not referring now to Mr. Dorlot.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): No, no, no.

Mr. Boucher: I would say that in all likelihood the application would be first judged on its professional merit, and the question of whether the award would be withheld on the sole ground that there might be some political implications is one problem that the Canada Council has not really considered up to now.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): I understand that you would not have the staff to be able to do that either.

Mr. Boucher: Certainly not.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): You would have to have some kind of an investigation, and so on. I agree that this would be entirely out of your field but I certainly feel, as a personal opinion, that the Canadian taxpayers' money should not be used for people who are working against the country, whether it be separatism or communism, or whatever it might be.

Mr. Boucher: You will grant, though, that family allowances could be used for that purpose and unemployment insurance could be used for that purpose.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): It is not quite the same thing; everybody receives that. It is not everybody who receives a grant from the Canada Council. I would love to have one myself!

Are we going to continue all of the questioning or will we have supplementaries in the middle?

The Vice-Chairman: It is up to the Committee to decide. I have three names on the list now: Mr. Schreyer, Mr. Dinsdale and Mr. Matte.

Mr. Stewart (Cochrane): I have a few other questions I would like to ask.

The Vice-Chairman: And also Mr. Osler. The usual procedure, if I understand it correctly, is that each questioner poses the questions he wants to ask and then we pass to another questioner, unless there is a point of order or a question of privilege. Is this agreeable to the Committee? You may continue, Mr. Stewart.

• 1150

[*Interpretation*]

Mr. Stewart: We might continue in French. I believe that most of us here are French speaking. Normally we do everything in English but I think we should use both languages.

Now there is another question—I am sure that you will be ready for that one—I am thinking of this destructive character who went out West with an axe to break up the piano on the stage.

The Vice-Chairman: Mr. Dwyer.

Mr. Peter M. Dwyer (Associate Director): I think I might take refuge in my mother tongue at this point. Please excuse me. Would you put that question in more accurate terms Mr. Stewart. Do you want to know how or why this grant was given?

Mr. Stewart: I think almost every honourable member has received letters on this subject from their electors. They were wondering why it was that the Canadian government was paying for the transportation costs for this fellow who was coming to Canada to give a "pseudo concert".

The Vice-Chairman: I think you are asking the witness what standards were used in the granting of this grant.