

[Text]

programs through which cooperation between the council and the private sector might be more possible. We do not have any programs of that kind at the moment except for the Canada Research Fellowships Program, which I mentioned earlier, which, in a sense, is a program whereby we match private sector contributions. In that case, as I also pointed out, the actual contribution from the private sector was just about nil; so most of that money—even for the Canada Research Fellowships—came, by and large, from university endowments. I do not think the comparison holds with our council.

Senator Stewart (Antigonish-Guysborough): Is that because you really have only the second channel?

Dr. Heintzman: Yes, at this time, that is true.

Senator Stewart (Antigonish-Guysborough): I have a question which follows on from that reply. It is based on what was said at pages 5 and 6. You talk about a large volume of funds, and you go on to say that the large volume was due mainly to the fact that a broad definition of "private sector" was allowed. You then give us something of a breakdown. You say that of the \$24.7 million of eligible private sector contributions, 42.4 per cent came from university endowments and trust funds, and a further 13.9 per cent came from private foundations and trusts. Contributions from business organizations amounted to \$3.7 million—in other words, roughly 14.9 per cent of the total.

When I add up those percentages, I do not get 100 per cent. What did you decide was irrelevant?

Dr. Heintzman: If you like, I will go right down the column. It is 14.9 per cent from business; 12.7 per cent from individuals; .9 per cent from crown corporations; 6.5 per cent from private non-profit organizations; 13.9 per cent from private foundations and trusts; 7.9 per cent from charitable organizations; 42.4 per cent from university endowment trust funds; and .8 per cent from others. I am assured that that adds up to 100 per cent.

Senator Stewart (Antigonish-Guysborough): I am looking for an answer to the following question: Of the total, how much money would have come in, either through the universities directly or through the council, without this program? How much impact did the program have in eliciting support for research in your discipline's field?

Dr. Heintzman: As I mentioned in my opening remarks, that is something that we really cannot tell at this point. We will have to await the evaluation study which MOSST, in cooperation with the granting councils, is designing at the present time.

It would be a fair research hypothesis in our case that a considerable portion of these funds are not new funds and were not attracted into the university system by the matching grants program. I only say that on the basis that such a large proportion have come from university endowments and the like, and that such a small proportion has come from the private sector directly.

[Text]

Until the exact source and motivation of that private sector contribution and other private charitable contributions are studied more carefully, I do not think we can answer the question.

Senator Stewart (Antigonish-Guysborough): Let us focus in on the 14.9 per cent which you report as contributions from business organizations. Would that include contributions to university fund-raising campaigns where, let us say, a university says, "We need a new building to house the social sciences and humanities departments."

Dr. Heintzman: I do not believe that contributions to overhead of that kind would be eligible. I think they would be ruled ineligible. However, private sector contributions made to the university through a general appeal in that year, which were, as it were, earmarked for a particular type of research support, would be eligible. In other words, if I understand your question, it is conceivable that a considerable portion of that 14.9 per cent might have come into the universities from the private sector anyway through its normal fund-raising activities in the course of that year. However, as I say, we cannot answer that question at the present time.

On the specific question of contributions for a building program, I believe they would be ineligible under the matching-funds program.

Senator Stewart (Antigonish-Guysborough): I realize that that is an unfortunate example. I know of one university which has a fund-raising drive in process at the present time. It is proposing to endow the St. Thomas Aquinas Chair in Human Civilization. Presumably that will be eligible for matching. I suspect that the university would be able to raise that money with or without this program.

Dr. Heintzman: Having raised it, it would be able to report it.

Senator Stewart (Antigonish-Guysborough): Senator Marsden asked you questions regarding centres of excellence. Do you have a plan for centres of excellence in the social sciences and humanities?

Dr. Heintzman: At this time we do not have a fully developed plan because we have never been able to come very close to achieving the kind of funding that would make it sensible to start very detailed planning.

In broad, conceptual terms we have given a certain amount of thought to it, and are giving considerable thought to it at this moment, in cooperation with the other granting councils, as a result of the government's own initiative in the area of centres of excellence. The answer to your question would have to be "no", that we do not have a developed plan for centres in this country at this time.

We do believe it is important, as does the government, for the country and the granting process to be able to focus funds in a way that reinforces excellence and brings excellence together. Our council is very much in sympathy with the approach—that is common these days in reflection on centres of excellence—that they, in large measure, should, in fact, be