

Duties on the two estates came to an even \$100 million, which was immediately earmarked for the council. Ironically, the arts and letters had not been among the favorite charities of either tycoon in his lifetime.

The amount of money in the council's hands places it seventh in order of importance among the trusts and foundations of the United States and Canada. But even this comparison exaggerates the council's wealth. Only half is a permanent fund. The other \$50 million was earmarked as a university capital grants fund, to be given away—capital and interest—on a 10-year schedule to help Canadian universities in long-overdue building assistance.

This means that by 1967 the Canada Council's total capital will be reduced to \$50 million, unless it receives more in the meantime. The council is so constituted that gifts may be sent to it tax free, a privilege few Canadians have exercised. They seem to take the attitude that, once the council was created, the finger was in the dike, the crisis averted. If the council couldn't cure whatever was wrong with Canadian culture with its present funds, at least it had enough to produce a good definition of the trouble.

Although the largest grants, at present, are being made from the university capital grants fund, the council activity that has attracted the most attention has been the assistance to artists, artistic organizations, and scholars, fields in which there are no fixed standards. The decision to support the work of a particular composer or painter must be made on much more subjective grounds than a grant of *x* million dollars to a university for a new library or auditorium. The test relates to the search for an identity previously remarked.

To this end, the council has disbursed something in the neighborhood of \$4 million in fellowships to composers, painters, and writers, in direct gifts to artistic organizations, and in financing the transportation of audiences from small towns and rural communities into nearby population centers to give them an idea of what Canadians are doing in the way of expressing themselves.

Such priming of the artistic pump is only one of several functions of the council, and the one expending the smallest amount of their funds. Other responsibilities relate to allotment of scholarships in social sciences and the humanities, and the operation of the Canadian National Commission for UNESCO. Among these, after administrative costs have been deducted from the endowment fund, 55 percent of the remainder goes to the arts. Grants from these funds, in the last budget, include such things as \$206,500 to symphony orchestras; \$7,400 to commission orchestral works; \$162,500 to festivals; \$85,000 to permanent theater companies; \$36,000 for touring theater companies; \$145,000 for ballet; \$72,000 for opera, and so on.

In the minds of most people, benevolent foundations deal largely in fat, round sums, giving comfort to the student in Paris or sustenance to the archaeologist in the Cyclades, sums with a ring to them—sums in six figures, or \$10,000, certainly nothing less than \$2,000.

For this reason, it might surprise some to find listed in the Canada Council reports such entries as the following: \$120 to Maria Pellegrini, of Ottawa, to enable her to go to Toronto for an audition; \$50 to Dr. James Reaney, of Winnipeg, a travel grant to go to Toronto to assist in the production of his play "The Killdeer" (this would take Dr. Reaney only halfway, and he would have to pay the rest himself); \$300 to Mrs. Dorothy MacPherson, a travel grant to participate at the fifth annual Robert Flaherty film seminar at the University of California.

These small sums must not be taken as an indication that the council's eye is on the sparrow. It means, rather, that it is slicing carefully a very small budget for a very big job. When you consider the handful of Canadian people rattling around in the third largest country in the world (larger than the continental United States but with only about a tenth of the population) it is difficult to talk about culture. If the population of Canada were spread evenly over its territory (momentarily ignoring the fact that many of them would have to be amphibious), they would not be within sight of each other, let alone talking or spitting distance. The actual distribution is a little different, though almost as curious. Seventy percent of Canadians live within 100 miles of the U.S. border, almost as though this strip of towns and cities were snuggling up to an imaginary wall for warmth.

The council's job might be described as trying to persuade the Canadians that south is not the only direction in which to face, or that they have been left "outside." An important aspect of the problem was well defined in a recent article by one of its officers: "While contemporary creative activity abroad is