

FORGING A PROFESSIONAL COMMUNITY: THE EVOLUTION OF THE
INSTITUTIONS OF ENGLISH CANADIAN THEATRE – 1955 TO 1979

SHOLEM DOLGOY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

YORK UNIVERSITY,
TORONTO, ONTARIO

DECEMBER 2007



Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-38768-9
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-38768-9

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

Abstract

From 1955 to 1979, English Canadian theatre developed institutions that became part of the support-mechanism for the regular production of Canadian plays. Their development was interrelated with the evolution of the policies of the Canada Council, conceived to foster the establishment and expansion of professional Canadian theatre. Canadian Actors' Equity Association, the Canadian Theatre Centre, the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, and institutions for the training of theatre were all established as this cultural industry expanded. Through the period, the industry developed sufficient political strength, that in 1978 it was able to successfully advocate, with the larger cultural community, that government support for culture should be maintained even during times of financial restraint. In the 21st century, all but one of the studied institutions continues as part of a robust industry. The study finds, however, that despite this growth the training for the industry's administrators has not matched its overall development.

Acknowledgements

As an army marches on its stomach, the mature graduate student first crawls, then walks, and finally marches with the backing of an army of supporters. This study would not have been possible without the nurturing of my Supervising Committee – Pat Bradshaw, Peter McKinnon, and Penni Stewart. Ira Levine, former Dean of the Faculty of Communication and Design at Ryerson University, directed me to the Interdisciplinary Studies program. Its directors Marlene Kadar, Patrick Taylor, and Jamie Scott provided guidance, and program assistant Ouma Jaipaul-Gill ensured that I stayed on track. Professors Christopher Armstrong, Liora Salter, and Stephen Longstaff opened the doors to an understanding of academic research. Research colleagues Kate Cornell, Gregory Klages, and Wendy Reid shared perceptions gained from their own research on Canadian cultural policy. Canada Council librarians Debbie Stenson and Pierette Chabot, and Barbara Benoit, Special Advisor to the Council's Director, helped with sourcing material in the Council's collection. Heather Sherman provided assistance with research. And help with polishing the prose was provided by the copy-editing skills of Christine Higdon and Kimberly Nobel. I was honoured to have Canadian theatre historian Dr. Richard Plant and Canadian cultural policy specialist Joy Cohnstaedt participate in the oral examination and its lively discussion. While I am deeply indebted to all of these people, the richness of the study would not have been possible without the support of the members of the theatre community who agreed to be interviewed. They gave generously of their time to share their enduring passion for, and their participation in, the creation of the modern Canadian theatre industry. Tom Hendry and Paul Schafer were particularly patient and helpful. All of those who are quoted helped with the proofing of their contribution, so that any remaining errors are strictly my own. And finally, thanks to my patient wife Fang-Pin Lee and my family and friends who supported me during the long period devoted to developing this study.

Table Of Contents

ACRONYMS	IX
PREFACE	X
INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 1: 1955, 1958 TO 1969	19
1955	19
<i>Canadian acting community</i>	19
1958	22
<i>Canada Council</i>	22
<i>Manitoba Theatre Centre</i>	25
<i>The Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors' Equity Association</i>	26
1959	27
<i>Canada Council</i>	27
<i>The Canadian Theatre Centre</i>	28
<i>Canadian Advisory Committee, Actors' Equity Association</i>	30
1960	31
<i>Canada Council</i>	31
<i>Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors' Equity Association</i>	33
<i>The Association of Professional Theatrical Producers and Managers</i>	34
1961	35
<i>Canada Council</i>	35
<i>National Theatre School</i>	37
1962	38
<i>Canada Council</i>	38
<i>Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors' Equity Association</i>	41
<i>Centennial Commission</i>	43
1963	44
<i>Secretary of State</i>	44
<i>Canada Council</i>	44
<i>Ontario Arts Council and Canada Council</i>	46
1964	47
<i>Canada Council</i>	48
<i>Tom Hendry</i>	50
1965	51
<i>Secretary of State</i>	51
<i>Canada Council</i>	53
<i>Canadian Theatre Centre</i>	56
1966	57
<i>Canada Council</i>	58
<i>Canadian Theatre Centre</i>	60
<i>Baumol and Bowen</i>	61
1967	63
<i>Canada Council</i>	63
<i>Canadian Theatre Centre</i>	66

1968	67
<i>Canada Council</i>	68
<i>Canadian Theatre Centre</i>	71
<i>Theatre Passe Muraille</i>	73
<i>Secretary of State</i>	74
1969	75
<i>Canada Council</i>	75
<i>Canadian Theatre Centre</i>	77
<i>Ontario Arts Council and the Canada Council</i>	78
<i>National Arts Centre</i>	80
CONCLUSION: 1955, 1958 TO 1969	81
CHAPTER 2: 1970 TO 1979	82
1970	82
<i>Canada Council</i>	82
<i>Canadian Theatre Centre</i>	85
<i>Managers of Producing Theatre Companies</i>	85
<i>Canadian Banks</i>	91
1971	91
<i>Canada Council</i>	92
<i>The Larger Theatres, the Playwrights, the Alternative Theatres and their</i> <i>Unencumbered Federal Grants</i>	96
<i>The Larger Theatres</i>	96
<i>The Playwrights</i>	100
<i>The Alternative Theatres and Their Unencumbered Federal Grants</i>	103
<i>York University</i>	105
<i>Dominion Bureau of Statistics</i>	109
1972	109
<i>Canada Council</i>	110
<i>Canadian Theatre Centre</i>	112
<i>Canadian Executive Committee of Actor's Equity Association</i>	113
1973	113
<i>Canada Council</i>	114
<i>Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association</i>	119
1974	122
<i>Canada Council</i>	123
<i>Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association & League of Canadian</i> <i>Theatres</i>	125
<i>The Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association</i>	130
1975	130
<i>Canada Council</i>	130
<i>League of Canadian Theatres</i>	132
<i>Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association</i>	136
1976	137
<i>Canada Council</i>	138
<i>League of Canadian Theatre</i>	140
1977	141

<i>Canada Council</i>	142
<i>Association of Canadian Theatres</i>	146
<i>Professional Association of Canadian Theatre & Canadian Actors' Equity Association</i>	147
<i>Local Initiative Program</i>	152
1978	152
<i>Government, the economy, and the Canada Council</i>	152
<i>Canada Council</i>	154
<i>Canadian Actors' Equity Association</i>	156
<i>Professional Association of Canadian Theatres</i>	158
<i>Education for Administrators</i>	161
CODA 1979	164
<i>Coda 1979, Canada Council</i>	164
CONCLUSION: 1970 TO 1979	166
CONCLUSION	167
<i>The Community</i>	167
<i>The Macro Economics of Subsidy Support</i>	169
<i>The Theatre Policies of the Canada Council</i>	169
<i>Canadian Actors' Equity Association</i>	171
<i>Canadian Theatre Centre</i>	172
<i>Professional Association of Canadian Theatres</i>	173
<i>Education for Theatre and Theatre Administration</i>	174
<i>Further Study</i>	175
<i>A Final Footnote</i>	176
APPENDICES	178
LIST OF INTERVIEWS	181
WORKS CITED AND SOURCES CONSULTED	183

Acronyms

ACT	Association of Canadian Theatres (see PACT)
AD	Artistic Director
ADC	Associated Designers of Canada
AEA	Actors' Equity Association (New York based American organization)
APTPM	Association of Professional Theatrical Producers and Managers
CAC	Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors Equity Association (first iteration with limited autonomy from the central office in New York City)
CAEA	Canadian Actors' Equity Association (fully independent actors' professional association)
CBAC	Council for Business in the Arts in Canada (later Business for the Arts)
CBC	Canadian Broadcasting Corporation
CC	Canada Council
CCA	Canadian Conference for the Arts
CEC	Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association (transition step towards independence with increased autonomy from New York Office)
CTC	Canadian Theatre Centre
CTA	Canadian Theatre Agreement
DDF	Dominion Drama Festival
Guelph Archives	Archival and Special Collections. McLaughlin Library, University of Guelph
GM	General manager
LAC	Library and Archives Canada
LOCT	League of Canadian Theatres (See PACT)
Massey	Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences
MPTC	Managers Producing Theatre Companies (See PACT)
MTC	Manitoba Theatre Centre
NAC	National Arts Centre
NBC	National Ballet of Canada
NFP	Not-for-profit
N-o-t-L	Niagara-on-the-Lake
NSO	National Service Organization
NTS	National Theatre School
OAC	Ontario Arts Council
PACT	Professional Association of Canadian Theatres (first loosely MPTC, then LOCT, then briefly, ACT)
TC	Theatre Calgary
TFT	Toronto Free Theatre
TNM	Théâtre du Nouveau Monde
TWP	Toronto Workshop Productions
SoS	Department of the Secretary of State
\$xxx {\$xxx}	The first amount is the value in dollars in the indicated year. The {amount} is the rounded calculation for the 2007 value made at http://www.bankofcanada.ca/en/rates/inflation_calc.html

Preface

"The essential point to be made is that the Government will assist in the creation of a national theatre and drama, not by establishing its own theatres in opposition to commercial enterprises, but by giving assistance to educational and cultural forces, which are the real factors in moulding our spiritual life as a nation, and by supporting those Little Theatres and community enterprises and activities already in existence which are deserving of encouragement." Herman Voaden, 1929¹

"There is no National Theatre in Canada and nothing at present to indicate that there will be one. Although witnesses and other authorities on this matter differed in their conception of what a National Theatre should be and of how it should be brought about, there was wide agreement that it should be one of our cultural resources." Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences, 1951²

"... I've come to ask myself if it is really necessary that we should be a great theater country. Indeed, I suspect that perhaps we aren't" Jean Roberts, 1982.³

"I would like to add a word of caution to those who might approach Canadian drama solely by reading the plays. To do so is often to run the risk of disappointment – as may be said of most contemporary drama, with few exceptions such as the plays of Tom Stoppard. But when I have dragged skeptical Americans to the Young Vic to see Barry Broadfoot's *Ten Lost Years*, or up to the back streets of Liverpool to see Théâtre Passe Muraille's *1837* on tour, or to *Billy Bishop Goes to War* at the Royal Alex in Toronto, those Americans have been favourably impressed with the vitality of the productions. As in earlier ages, the performed play's the thing." Christopher Armitage, 1982.⁴

¹ "Government-Owned Theatres?" *Toronto Globe*, November 30 1929, p. 12.

² Ottawa: Printer to the King, pp. 194-195.

³ "The Canada Council and the Theatre: The Past Twenty-Five Years and Tomorrow," Association for Canadian Theatre History/Association d'histoire du théâtre au Canada, 1982, p. 191.

⁴ Introduction to *Slipping on the verge: the performing arts in Canada with theatre as a case study*, Mavor Moore, 1982.

Introduction

From 1955 to 1979, the English Canadian professional theatre community (The Community), with subsidy support from the Canada Council (CC), evolved from a nascent marginal community into a mature national cultural industry, largely populated by not-for-profit (NFP) subsidized enterprises. This study examines the creation and evolution, during that period, of the institutions that endure today. It pays particular attention to the expansion of the institutions' activities through the availability of subsidy capital for NFP cultural enterprise and the CC's policies to manage that capital. The *raison d'être* of many of the actors in this process was their desire to help build a Canadian "national theatre". While over the period under study, the use of the term "national theatre" waned, their efforts contributed to the fulfillment of a long-desired dream – the regular production of Canadian plays.

John Tosh argues: "History is collective memory, the storehouse of experience through which people develop a sense of their social identity and their future prospects" (1991, p. 1). In the areas of its economic and institutional origins, I argue that The Community has lost that collective memory. In its own accounts of its history, it has oversimplified details or has left the maintenance of the memory to others, notably the CC. Academic literature too generally focuses on The Community's contribution to what sociologist Seymour Lipset calls "the quintessential Canadian issue" (1990, p. 42) – Canadian national identity. The net effect is that the richness of the events and the experiences of those who contributed to that richness have become obscured by the passage of time. The purpose of this study is to give robustness to the mythologies of

the creation of The Community's institutions during the crucible of its and the CC's evolution. This is achieved through a thickly-described narrative that is used to build a collective case-study. It is hoped that this study, which appears to be the first of its kind, will prompt further allied research and analysis.

The study uses as its prologue the acting community's 1955 selection of the New York based Actors' Equity Association (AEA) to represent Canadian stage actors' interests. It then traces, year-by-year, the evolution of The Community's institutions and allied events from 1958, the year of the CC's *First Annual Report*, to 1979, the year the CC instituted a policy that its subsidy support for theatres was contingent on quotas of Canadian content. The primary examinations are of the evolutions of Canadian Actors' Equity Association (CAEA), the Canadian Theatre Centre (CTC), and the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres (PACT). Secondary examinations are of the National Theatre School (NTS), the Program of Arts Administration at York University and the Cultural Resources Management Program at The Banff Centre. Tertiary mention is made of the National Arts Centre (NAC), The Department of the Secretary of State (SoS), and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. The backbone of the study is the evolution of the CC's general policies and those specific to theatre, as they changed and adjusted to the CC's available financial resources. (To contain its scope, the study consciously does not question the CC's choices or presented rationales for those choices, although it does acknowledge some of the contemporaneous underlying controversies.) Indicated contemporaneous dollar amounts are followed by {\$\$\$}, representing the value in 2007

as calculated on the Bank of Canada's web Inflation Calculator.⁵ To provide social context, each year includes a brief mention of larger national events.

While not a feature of the study, the period includes the contribution and merger of two generational groups. The first was populated essentially by the generation that grew up with the privations of the Depression, the horrors of WWII, and the onset of the Cold War but was bolstered by the onset of a period of historic sustained economic growth. Many had university educations. Those willing to embark on a professional career in theatre felt they were socially in the shadow of the then more accepted amateur community, as exemplified by the Dominion Drama Festival (DDF).⁶ Practitioners formed companies – largely in actor-manager model – in either the “hoped-for-profit” (Coghill, Interview, 2006) or NFP models. Most companies disbanded when personal energies could no longer overcome financial losses. The first generational group enjoyed the stability that followed the introduction of the CC's program of subsidy, which in turn fostered the emergence of theatre companies generally working under a new administrative model – a triumvirate of an Artistic Director (AD), a General Manager

⁵ http://www.bankofcanada.ca/en/rates/inflation_calc.html. In the study, the 2007 values are rounded up or down. Statistics Canada informed me via email that the calculated values can fluctuate. “A change in the value may vary from month to month depending on the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Also note that effective June 19th, 2007, Statistics Canada has updated the Consumer Price Index (CPI) to reflect changes in the spending patterns of Canadian households. This may also be a factor for the change in the values that you have calculated” (Correspondence, August 8, 2007).

⁶ Director and educator Peter Wylde relates: “In the late 1940s, at a cast party following the final performance of *Arsenic and Old Lace*, the director waxed very drunk and attempted a speech of final summation as to the accomplishment of the assembled company. He became increasingly incoherent and at one point forbade us to refer to the performance as a “show” as this was a goddamn professional word. Clearly to be professional was anathema among the select and noble brotherhood of dedicated amateurs. Crass. Money-grubbing. Unworthy. Listening, I was assailed by pangs of guilt for wanting to become one of those horrible people” (Interview, 2007).

(GM),⁷ and a Board of Directors (Board), who had the final programming and fiscal authority. The Boards were often comprised of members of amateur theatre organizations that had formed an alliance with theatre professionals. At times, in the development of the programming for these theatres, the professionals found themselves in opposition to their Boards over whether to produce those Canadian plays deemed too risky by the Boards themselves. In the spirit of Canada in the 1960s, through the CTC, the first generation forged a partnership with its colleagues in Quebec.

The second generational group, again largely university educated, emerged in the late 1960s. It was comprised of the baby-boom generation and brought a "somewhat belated manifestation of the rebellious spirit of the 1960's ..." (Usmiani, 1983, p. vii). This was the group that largely⁸ launched the Alternative Theatres, in reaction to the perceived conservative programming of the theatres of the first generational group. Relative to the time-line of its emergence, the second group acquired economic stability much more quickly than did the first. This occurred largely through unencumbered capital of federal employment programs and, when those programs ended in the mid to late 1970s, the surviving, artistically robust organizations gained the CC's support. To be eligible for the CC's support, theatres that had not yet structured themselves on the model of AD, GM, and Board, were obliged to do so. By the end of the period, the two groups had merged as part of the evolutions of CAEA and PACT. In the 1970s, as The Community's Quebecois colleagues had turned inward, the spirit of partnership dwindled.

⁷ In this study, *GM*, is used as a generic term. Where it is possible to identify an individual's actual title, it will be used.

⁸ Notably, Toronto Free Theatre's Tom Hendry and Tarragon's Bill Glassco are members of the first group.

The presentation of the data in this study is itself the result of an evolutionary process. As the research evolved it became apparent that the most useful contribution would be to write a story – or case study – in the form of a historical narrative with a concise, annotated, chronological gathering of the events. The case study is formed as a narrative that is a rich and thick-description of the evolution of The Community's institutions, within the context of the evolution of the available public monies for cultural subsidy and the development of the policies that delivered the subsidy. The credibility and trustworthiness of the data comes from the triangulation of the collected material including the use of interviews, archival reviews, and review of other documents.

In *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, Hayden White argues in favour of narrative historical representation, but feels that to succeed “the account must manifest a proper concern for the judicious handling of the evidence, and it must honor the chronological order of the original occurrence of the events The events must be ... narrated as well ... revealed as possessing a structure, an order of meaning, that they do not possess as mere sequence” (1990, c1987, pp. 4-5). The best narration is one that is a thick description. In *Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry, Second Edition* Thomas A. Schwandt suggests to “thickly describe social action is actually to begin to interpret it by recording the circumstances, meanings, intentions, strategies, and so on that characterize a particular episode” (2001, p. 255). In his essay *Case Studies*, Robert E. Stake argues:

With ... less intrinsic interest in one particular case, a researcher may jointly study a number of cases in order to investigate a phenomenon, general population, or general condition. I call this *collective case study*. Individual cases ... are chosen because it is believed that understanding them will lead to a better understanding, perhaps theorizing, about a still larger collection of cases. (2003, p. 138).

My initial point of departure was an interest in exploring a socio-economic aspect of English Canadian Theatre as encapsulated by the question: "Why does The Community have difficulty managing its financial resources?" The question originated from aspects of my education at the Technical Section of the National Theatre School of Canada (NTS) from 1969 to 1971. At that time, the NTS provided no training in the economics or general management of theatre.⁹ As a consequence, at the beginning of my career as a practitioner, my understanding and notions of the complexities of producing theatre were largely self-informed. My personal purpose for this study was to try to find informed answers to the question.

As there is no Canadian equivalent to Thomas Moore's 1968 *The Economics of the American Theatre*, I started with a number of recognized sources. Alfred Bernheim's *The Business of the Theatre: an Economic History of the American Theatre, 1750-1932* relates the evolution of American theatre that led, by the late 19th century, to a hegemonic for-profit "Syndicate" (p. 60) centred in New York City that, for a time, controlled much of North American professional theatre. While the Syndicate's monopoly was successfully challenged by others, in the early 20th century, the content and management of commercial theatre in Canada continued to be controlled in London and New York. It was against this foreign control that in 1912, Canadian man of letters Bernard Sandwell lamented: "Canada is the only nation in the world whose stage is entirely controlled by aliens" (p. 23). During this period, commercial theatre in North America was able to compete with film and radio, but with the onset of the Depression, it

⁹ At that time at the NTS students received practical training in managing the hard costs – set, costumes etc – of production but as the costs of the show were part of costs of running the school the students were sheltered from the macro realities. As a student representative to the board, I was aware that the School had ongoing financial burdens, but was not privy to the details.

had great difficulty surviving other than in New York City. Mavor Moore in his 1994 *Reinventing Myself: Memoirs* relates that in "1929 ... Toronto's resident stock companies collapsed [and theatre professionals] found what other jobs they could ..." (p. 22). Across Canada, amateur theatre, as exemplified by the Dominion Drama Festival (DDF), became the main purveyor of theatre activity. Betty Lee's 1973 *Love and Whisky: The Story of the Dominion Drama Festival* reveals that while the DDF had cultural significance, the management of its fiscal affairs was not its strongest suit. Amelia Hall's 1989 *Life before Stratford: the Memoirs of Amelia Hall* narrates her punishing schedule at a salary in 1949, of "twenty eight dollars {\$259} a week ... just about one quarter of my earnings during the last year [1948] I taught high school" (p. 97). Terry Kotyshyn's 1986 *MA Jupiter Theatre Inc. 1951-1954: the Life and Death of Toronto's First Professional Full Time Theatre* describes the Jupiter's arc (but somewhat in isolation from concurrent professional activities in other parts of the country) prior to the availability of the CC's stabilizing subsidies: "[F]inancing was a constant problem. As Glen Frankfurter cited, 'We couldn't produce professional shows on amateur budgets'" (p. 118). The institution of the CC's program of subsidy brought much needed stability and helped to promote growth. The CC's *Tenth Annual Report 1966-67* narrated the then evolution of regional theatres across the country and indicated: "Audience has risen ... [some] three fold Total operating expenditures have gone from \$1.1 {8.2} million [in 1958] to \$4.2 {\$25} million. The growth has clearly been substantial ... and we expect the growth to push forward" (p. 22). Denis Johnston's 1991 *Up the Mainstream: the Rise of Toronto's Alternative Theatres, 1968 – 1975* argues: "A new pattern for Canadian theatre was established at that time" (p. ix).

From the readings, I developed the following time line of economic development:

- 17th to 19th centuries – subsidy by French and English military of amateur garrison theatre
- 19th and early 20th centuries – dominant foreign commercial theatre
- 1930s to post WWII – dominant amateur and semi-professional with marginal (generally failed) attempts at sustaining professional companies except for the 1953 Stratford Festival and the 1954 Crest Theatre
- 1957 – Canada Council
- 1960s – measured growth of regional theatres out of amateur practices only through the largesse of the CC's subsidy grants
- 1970s – rise of alternative theatres and their regular production of Canadian plays, financed through other federal monies.

As context, I initially proposed that as there was little professional activity prior to the CC, The Community's difficulties with the management of its finances stemmed from its haphazard amateur roots and that it evolved an understanding of good financial governance as a result of the stability provided by the CC's program of subsidy. While I found support for this notion from some of my colleagues in The Community, Tom Hendry, revealed it to be a canard. He urged me to look in detail at the evolution of the CC's policies and at the arc of the operations of the CTC.

I then reviewed Leslie Walter Whittaker's 1965 Ph. D. *The Canada Council for the encouragement of the arts, humanities and social sciences; its origins, formation and the influence upon theatre in Canada 1957-1963* and David Axel Gustafson's 1971 *The Canadian Regional Theatre Movement*. In combination they provide insight into the origins of cultural policy, the theatre community's involvement with Vincent Massey's 1949-1951 *Royal Commission on the National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences* (Massey), and the development of the regional theatre system. But neither provides comprehensive understanding of the extent of professional theatre prior to the CC or the transition from that era to the regional theatres. Whittaker does provide information on the National Theatre School (NTS) and Gustafson does make some, but

only passing, reference to the place Canadian Actors' Equity Association (CAEA) and the CTC.

Literature written after the study's period provides little understanding of central economic issues, as it typically focuses on the development of Canadian plays as literature, or implied larger cultural themes, or the perceived failure of cultural policy to foster the production of Canadian plays. As examples, Eugene Benson's and L.W. Conolly's 1987 *English-Canadian Theatre* approaches the sweep of the history from the viewpoint of "the dramatic literature ... as it emerged ... within the context of performance" (p. vii). Robert Wallace's 1999 *Theatre and Transformation in Contemporary Canada* incorporates much of the contemporaneous literature and, while it includes the economic vagaries of the subsidized theatre during the period of this study, it is from the perspective of the ability of "cultural practice ... to both initiate and respond to social change" (p. 49). Douglas B. Buchanan's 1999 *The Canada Council, the Regional Theatre System and the English-Canadian Playwright: 1957-1975* asks "why ... playwrights had to fight an often losing battle to have their plays produced?" (p. 2). These approaches reflect the preponderance of academic study and are meritorious. But nowhere is there literature using the economics of Canadian theatre as the point of departure.

The next step in the research was to intensify the sourcing and use of primary material. The initial criterion was to accept for possible inclusion any item that could connect to economics and/or to the evolution of related policy. Material was sourced in university libraries, the archives of the CC, Library and Archives of Canada (LAC) in Ottawa, the Archival and Special Collections of the McLaughlin Library at the University of Guelph (Guelph Archives), Toronto's Metro Reference Library (MRL), the Library of

Parliament, the City of Vancouver Archives, the archives of the National Ballet of Canada, the contract collection in the offices of CAEA, York University's Clara Archives and Special Collections, the Paul D. Fleck Library and Archives at the Banff Centre, and from personal collections of some of those who were interviewed. Materials found were public and private reports, meeting minutes, and individuals' correspondence. Some colleagues with similar interests were generous with their findings. The next step in the evolution of the research was the development of the framing context with which to edit and present the considerable assembled materials.

There was the possibility of a quantitative study as suggested by the mid 1960s quantitative research by American economists Baumol and Bowen. They identified that the economics of the performing arts is subject to an income gap caused by the usually rising costs of the 'custom' manufacture of culture compared with the comparative decreasing costs of mass manufactured goods. Their statistics indicated that the 'gap' increases exponentially over time so that the ability to recover the cost of producing culture is constantly decreasing. By the late 1960s the CC began to incorporate the income gap into its policy deliberations.¹⁰ While meritorious for this study, a quantitative study of the effects of the income gap on The Community as a whole was too ambitious. Another alternative was the possibility of a specific case study of one or two theatre companies, namely Theatre Calgary and Toronto Free Theatre as suggested by Thomas Bohdanetzky. In the mid 1970s, Bohdanetzky moved from his position as General Manager at the Manitoba Theatre Centre (MTC) to that of Financial Officer for the CC's

¹⁰ In 1971, Canadian economist Vincent Bladen, who at that time was a member of the CC and on the Board of the National Ballet School, issued *Financing of the performing arts in Canada: An Essay in Persuasion*, a self generated report that argued that due to the income gap and the lack of growth of the CC's capital, the CC should concentrate its support to only the major performing arts institutions. History suggests the report's recommendations did not gain acceptance.

Theatre Section. In 2004, in email correspondence, he related that he had revised the CC's grant-application form: "Theatres were always in financial trouble, people did not know how to plan. I tried to come up with a format that made theatre people think about money." Bohdanetzky indicated that, at the time, he felt that Theatre Calgary and Toronto Free Theatre were among the theatres that benefited most from the new format. For the study, this suggested the possibility of developing a before-and-after case study of either or both organizations. While it had possibilities, I knew from my experiences in The Community that 'financial trouble' is often a product of the personalities involved. As The Community tends to be mobile, an individual brings her/his level of financial acumen to any particular situation. Thus the examination of any particular situation would likely not be indicative of the issues faced at the time by the community as a whole. This then led the study to an examination of the Community's institutions as means of understanding how in its formative period it evolved its mechanisms of its NFP economic model.

Three groups of documents provided the key to the choice of developing the material as collective case study. The first was materials of Association of Professional Theatrical Producers and Managers that included its deliberations, in 1960, around the issues of collective action. The second was the record of CAEA's New York Committee in the early 1960s that traced the considerable process that led to the then Canadian Advisory Committee becoming, in 1963, the Canadian Executive Committee. The third was *The Stage in Canada*, the 1965 to 1972 newsletter of the CTC. Together the documents revealed a vibrant, committed community developing through its institutions. I then reviewed the CC's annual reports from its inception in 1957/58 to 1978/79, within the context of 'follow the money', accepting the CC's statements at face value rather

than in the context of a failure of policy to promote Canadian plays. The arranging of all of the documents in a timeline helped to reveal a group of players engaged in an interconnected process made robust by the public capital available for the subsidy of culture. As the CC provided the most complete available record, I decided to use its annual reports as the backbone on which to hang the development of the other institutions. The approach to these reports was to accept the CC's assessments at face value: 'These were our financial constraints and these were our resultant choices.'¹¹ Once I had completed a rough assembly of the material that I was to use, I then had sufficient knowledge of the events to undertake the majority of interviews with the players of the time. As I had been a member of The Community starting in the second half of the study's period, I was quickly able to develop a rapport with those who were willing to be generous with their time. Their contribution provided an understanding of the reasons for the events that were not readily apparent in the documents themselves. With the tools of the primary sources, the interviews, the literature, and my personal experiences of the various reported aspects, I was able to weave the assembled data into a chronological historical narrative case study that became the answer to my original question.

The resulting study appears to be the first extensive examination of the development of the institutions that today support The Community. It dispels some of the myths that those institutions have created about themselves. In its June 1976 Information Pamphlet, the CAEA suggested: "Equity was founded in Canada in 1955

¹¹ For a sense of some of contemporaneous criticisms and issues of the CC's policies see Peter Hay's "Cultural Politics" in *Canadian Theatre Review* spring 1974 (CTR 2) and articles in the summer 1974 edition (CTR 3) by Brian Boru and Tom Hendry, an interview with Secretary of State Hugh Faulkner, and a listing of cultural policies of the federal political parties. For an economist's perspective, see Steven Globerman's 1983 *Cultural Regulation in Canada*.

... mainly at the request of the actors engaged at the then new Stratford Shakespearean Festival” (p. 1). As Chapter One shows, the interests of the early Stratford acting company were only a catalyst to that process. Concerning PACT, in 1979, Pat Bradley, then its Executive Director, stated in an interview with Zena Rudberg: “One of the original purposes of PACT was to negotiate the Canadian Theatre Agreement (CTA) with Canadian Actors’ Equity Association (CAEA). Then we expanded our activities to include lobbying and advocacy” (p. 48). As Chapters One and Two show, advocacy was as great a concern as the negotiation of the first CTA, to the direct and precursor players who formed PACT.

More serious is the pernicious notion in *The Community* that there was little or no professional theatre prior to the 1957 inception of the CC’s program of subsidy support. This comes in part from the CC’s use of language in its publications that describe its relevance to the history of Canadian theater. As example, in 1977, the CC issued *Twenty plus five*, a discussion paper on its “role in the arts after the first twenty five years” stating:

The authors of the Massey Report conceived of a Council that would respond to the urgent needs of the time. There was no possible way they could have imagined the explosive growth of those needs, however, a growth stimulated in large measure by the Council’s response: 10 symphony orchestras funded by the Council in 1957, 30 in 1977; 3 professional theatre companies 20 years ago, 133 today ...” (P. 7).

The statement is accurate, but can have two deleterious interpretations. First, it can be interpreted that the process was planned, orderly, and unilateral, and second, that there were only three professional theatre companies in 1957. This study reveals that the policy process was variable, that *The Community* was a substantial actor, and that the CC initially had resources only to fund three companies. While not the focus of the study,

the research suggests that there was much greater activity prior to the CC than is generally thought. From the above statement, it can also be inferred that the CC's support flowed in one direction. Chapters One and Two of this study indicate that in at least two instances, The Community's advocacy with government contributed to increases in public capital directed to the CC' programs of subsidy. Indeed, Brooke Jeffrey's 1982 Backgrounder for the Library of Parliament *Cultural Policy in Canada: from Massey-Lévesque to Applebaum-Hébert* notes that concerning the cultural community's 1970s advocacy about "a 'crisis' in the arts ..., it was not until these warnings were couched in the terminology of Canadian national identity and cultural sovereignty that politicians began to take heed" (p. 15).

The study sits within a body of literature that reflects back on, and seeks to dispel myths of, the development of institutions of Canadian culture in the 20th century.

Maria Tippet's 1990 *Making culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission* concludes "that the Canada Council – and the activity it has supported – has a very long lineage" (p. 187). Paul Litt's 1992 *The Muses, the Masses and the Massey Commission* examines the Commission itself and argues:

The Massey Commission was born of the ... belief in public education that had distinguished voluntary associations since the 1920's This was no surprise, since the commission itself was a product of the cultural nationalism of that same generation as it came into power and found the opportunity to pursue its ideals through public policy.
(p. 37)

Jeffrey D. Brison's 2005 *Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts and Letters in Canada* traces those American institutions' working practices and their influence on Massey's recommendations, and argues:

The partnership between Canadian intellectuals and American philanthropy facilitated Canada's transition from a private, localized system of cultural

patronage to a system of corporate cultural patronage with the nation-state as the major patron.
(pp. 11-12)

And finally, this study recounts the evolution of a cultural community as part of the enormous post WWII shift of English language Canada away from its anglo-centric roots. José E. Igartua's *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71* argues that Quebec's better known Quiet Revolution parallels English Canada's change from "essentially a British country" (p. 223) to "new representations of Canadian identity" (p. 225).

The data are in two chapters, both of which trace the evolution of the CC's applicable policies. The first chapter traces the evolution of the nascent professional community as it developed a stable NFP model. The second chapter traces the events that led to the regular production of Canadian plays, the legal establishment of CAEA and PACT, and the founding of programs for the training of administrators.

Chapter One 1955, 1958 to 1969 uses the 1955 opening of the Canadian Advisory Council (CAC) of AEA as a prologue. Thereafter the data is presented in a year-by-year format from 1958 to 1969, using as its backbone material from the CC's April-issued *Annual Reports*, reflecting the performing arts season ending March of each year. 1958 to 1964 traces the policies that the CC developed to maximize its capital available for subsidy support but limited by the income from its endowment fund. The CC support shifted its initial focus from touring operations to the new regional theatre model that arose at the MTC. Starting in 1959, the CC partnered with the voluntary CTC on a number of projects including the creation of the 1960-61 NTS. In 1963, the CAC gained more autonomy as the Canadian Executive Council (CEC), and in the absence of any other NSO considered advocacy to improve the financial situation of its members. In

1965, as part of the country's overall expenditure for the 1967 Centennial celebration, the CC successfully gained direct appropriations from the federal government. This allowed the CC to expand programming, including monies to help the CTC hire its first executive director. The CTC immediately increased its membership to include all members of the performing arts community. The CC and the CTC partnered on projects of education for badly needed arts administrators and the enshrinement of subscription season sales as a means of bringing economic stability to the performing arts community. By the 1967 Centenary, these initiatives increased production and audience attendance, but fostered only limited production of Canadian plays. In 1968, public monies for culture were frozen or reduced. The Community maintained economic viability but only through conservative programming and deficit financing. The later 1960s saw the emergence of the Alternative Theatres. The chapter closes with the 1969 opening of the National Arts Centre (NAC) in Ottawa.

Chapter Two: 1970 to 1979 follows the same year by year format, with the CC's *Annual Report* as the backbone. In the early 1970s, while the CC was facing economic restraint, it initiated a program to help the theatres retire accumulated their deficits. Through this period, the CC began to use its collected economic data as part of its advocacy to parliament to increase support for culture through the argument that culture makes a net contribution to the economy. The CC's financial constraints became more apparent as the increase in production of Canadian plays by the Alternative Theatre community made those theatres eligible to join the CC's client base. The Alternative Theatres were able to finance the plays largely with 'risk capital' unexpectedly available from federal employment programs not directed specifically to cultural activity. Starting in 1973, the CC gained regular increases in its appropriation from the government. Despite

the overall growth, the value of the additional monies began to decrease dramatically with the 1974 onset of double-digit inflation due to a severe increase in the cost of oil. By the end of the period, the constant dollar value of what theatres had to spend resulted in a net decrease in buying power. In 1978, the government signaled that it would reduce its spending on culture as part of an overall program of austerity. The Community joined the larger performing arts community and successfully advocated with government to continue its support of the CC. Parallel to these events, in 1973, the CTC closed down. In 1974, the CEC of AEA negotiated the first national contract regulating the rates and working conditions for its members across the country. The negotiation was with an informal organization representing the interests of management that emerged in 1970 as League of Canadian Theatres (LOCT). In 1976, that group legally formed as PACT, which picked up some, but not all, of the CTC's functions. In 1971, York University established its Programme¹² in Arts Management and Administration, the first of its type in the country and in 1978, the Banff Centre inaugurated its Cultural Resources Management Program, both conceived to provide training for administrators in the cultural sector. Chapter Two closes with the CC's 1979 announcement that its support of any one theatre was contingent on that theatre meeting a quota of Canadian content.

The Conclusion reviews the material thematically: the evolution of The Community from a small group of practitioners struggling to produce 'hoped-for-profit' theatre to a stable community of professional theatre companies, most of which endure today in the 21st century; the evolution of the CC's macro economics from a capital based on income from a fixed Endowment to regular appropriations from government; the evolution of the CC from providing an arms' length subsidy to, of necessity,

¹² *Programme* is used throughout where that was the contemporaneous spelling.

becoming an investor determined to protect its investment; CAEA evolving from a branch office of an American organization to become an independent national representative of labour in the sector; the CTC's rapid rise and relatively short existence as having been the only NSO for the performing arts in the country; the emergence of PACT from the tentative attempts of a few managers to develop an organization representing managements' interests, to a national organization capable of successful negotiation and advocacy; and the emergence of programs for the training of theatre administrators. The conclusion then makes suggestions for further analysis and study. It ends with an articulation of the leitmotif, which has emerged through the study, that the training of theatre administrators has not progressed much beyond the initial attempts as developed starting in the 1960s.

As a final note, while comprehensive, the study does not represent itself as definitive. For the institutions under discussion, I was able to use only a fraction of the sourced primary documents. While of interest, other institutions were not included. As example, the Associated Designers of Canada (ADC), founded in 1964, and the Playwrights Guild of Canada (PGC), including its various iterations starting in 1971, were not included, as they did not achieve bilateral agreements with PACT until after the period under study. The International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees (IATSE) and the American Federation of Musicians (AF of M) were not included as they are each federations of individual union locals, are based in the United States, and do not have bilateral national contracts. The evolutions of ADC, PGC, and the national institutions that do form a part of this study all deserve much greater scrutiny than was possible, and it is hoped that others will be inspired to do so.

Chapter 1: 1955, 1958 to 1969

As it learned to be of service...the Council taught itself to make choices...[with its] limited means.

(CC, *Ninth Annual Report 1965-66*, 1966, p. 1)

...we artists have done wonders with the modest sums entrusted to us over the last ten years. Even now, one can name single European theatres which receive as much subsidy as all of the theatres of Canada put together in any given year. ... Why have we done so well? Because in the main, we have avoided the painful consequences of *dirigisme* and the rigidity it brings with it.
(Hendry, 1968d, p. 6)

1955

Events under study:

- Canadian acting community: opening an office of the Canadian Advisory Committee as an office of New York-based Actors' Equity Association

General events in the country:

- Cape Breton Island is connected to the mainland by the Canso Causeway and the Angus L. Macdonald Bridge connects Halifax to Dartmouth
- Montrealers riot when NHL president Clarence Campbell suspends Maurice Richard
- Glenn Gould's first recording of Bach's *Goldberg Variations*

Canadian acting community: opening the Canadian Advisory Committee as an office of New York-based Actors' Equity Association

In the post WWII period, while amateur theatre, as personified by the dominant Dominion Drama Festival, was still the dominant form of production, English Canadian professional theatre was going through a renaissance. It was largely stimulated by the "ever increasing opportunities for artistic employment" (Whittaker, Walter, 1965, p. 250) first in radio and then in television drama, produced by the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. Theatres generally adopted the 19th century actor-manager model of management and often did not have an individual dedicated to the role of senior manager. Producing theatre was a precarious economic exercise. Amelia Hall, in her memoir *Life Before Stratford* relates that in 1949 "my salary at [Ottawa's Canadian Repertory Theatre of] twenty eight dollars per week {\$260} ... was about one-quarter of

my earnings during the last year I taught high school" (p. 97).¹³ Her duties included acting, directing and artistic direction. Denis Johnston's 2006 *Totem Theatre: Autobiography of a Company* relates that Thor Arngrim, the co-founder of Vancouver's Totem Theatre (1951 to 1954) recalls "a 17% entertainment tax on ticket sales levied by the Province of British Columbia that, incredibly, throughout Totem's existence, was collected by a government functionary every evening after the show began" (p. 243). Despite these economic hurdles, The Community expanded and actors began to seek collective protection.

Theatre director Desmond Scott's unpublished 1986 monograph *The Beginning of Canadian Actors' Equity Association* details how that came about. Some Canadians were members of New York based Actors' Equity "long before there was any Union [in Canada]" (p. 2) through employment in the US or through employment by theatres in Canada that hired American actors. Scott's document indicates that as early as 1952 "there was a strong move within [Association of Canadian Radio and Television Artists] ACRTA¹⁴ ... to [create] a one-card Canadian Union for all performers in stage, radio, film and television" (p. 3). By 1954, management representatives "of the Canadian Repertory Theatre in Ottawa, the Stratford Festival and Jupiter and Crest Theatres in Toronto agreed to form a committee to negotiate with ACRTA" (pp. 4-5). Despite the sentiment of many in The Community in favour of an all-Canadian union, larger issues of jurisdiction and recognition, under the constraint of the American Federation of Labour (AFL), took precedence. In a complex series of events, involving ACRTA, Quebec's Union des

¹³ Hall discretely alludes that the women were paid less than men of the company (*Id.*).

¹⁴ "In 1953 there was a suggestion within the Toronto local that for the sake of euphony it change its name to ACTRA, but that was defeated, and ACRTA it remained until October 1962 when, under a new constitution, it formally became ACTRA" (Scott, 1985, p. 6).

Artistes, the AFL, the American Federation of Radio Artists, the Associated Actors and Artistes of America (Four A's), IATSE, and the AF of M, the New York-based Actors' Equity Association (AEA) became the most likely choice. This was mainly due to AEA's historic North America-wide representation of stage actors, which it had gained in 1913, during the era of the Syndicate. In September 1954, at a series of meetings called by ACRTA, those assembled voted such that "Actors' Equity Association came fully into Canada" (p. 22).¹⁵ At one of the meetings attended by the larger community, the representatives from AEA were asked how "the Equity standard contract would be applied to the many small theatres in Canada" (p. 21). Angus Duncan, the AEA's Executive Secretary "replied that Equity often made concessions to accommodate the individual conditions of a theatre, and that, after all, the working conditions in Canada would be determined by the Canadian actors" (*id.*) through its Advisory Committee. In 1955, the Canadian operation opened as the Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors' Equity Association (CAC); in 1963, it became the Canadian Executive Committee (CEC); and, in 1976, it became the fully independent CAEA.

The culture of Equity's contract concessions was a key element in fostering the growth of The Community. While it was initiated at a time when hoped-for-profit theatre seemed to be the likely direction of the industry, the concessions were maintained after the initiation of the CC's subsidies. It would not be until 1977, with the negotiation of the second Canadian Theatre Agreement (CTA) that CAEA would introduce a fully standardized contract that allowed little room for concessions.

¹⁵ Scott's monograph indicates: "June Dennis suggested joining Equity would make the actors more 'professional'" (p. 20). Actor and director Douglas Campbell, who was also at the meeting, relates that his position was, and continues to be, that it is the effort an actor puts into continually improving the quality of the work that determines whether s/he is, or is not, 'professional' (Interview, 2006).

1958

Events under study:

- Canada Council: promulgating its first policies and initiatives; hiring Peter Dwyer as Supervisor of Arts Programme
- Manitoba Theatre Centre: creating a new model
- The Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors' Equity Association: hiring Larry McCance; unilaterally developing a fee structure

General events in the country:

- John Diefenbaker's Conservatives win the largest majority to date in Canadian history
- The Avro Arrow flies for the first time
- Canada-wide television broadcasting starts

Canada Council: promulgating its first policies and initiatives; hiring Peter Dwyer as Supervisor of the Arts Programme

The CC, in its *First Annual Report to March 31, 1958*,¹⁶ indicated that its working capital came from the "interest return ... on the Endowment Fund of \$50,000,000 {\$378,000,000}" and that it had "a sum of about a million dollars {\$7,400,000} to be used in the support of organizations engaged in the arts across Canada" (pp. 18-19).¹⁷

Walter Whittaker's 1965 *The Canada Council for the encouragement of the arts, humanities and social sciences; its origins, formation and the influence upon theatre in Canada 1957-1963* indicates that in December 1957, the CC invited the cultural community to Kingston Ontario to help the CC determine its policies of subsidy (p. 222-223). In its *Report*, the CC related its policy decisions stemming in part from those deliberations:

¹⁶ The CC's annual reports are issued at the end of each March. As they generally reflect back on the season past, there will be occasional inconsistencies in time lines.

¹⁷ J. L. Granatstein's 1986 *Canada 1957-1967: the Years of Uncertainty and Innovation* explains that the \$50 million capital for the CC's Endowment Fund came from \$100 million in death duties levied in 1956 on the estates of "Izaak Walton Killam and Sir James Dunn, two Maritimes entrepreneurs. ... 50 million to meet the capital needs – or some of them – of the universities [and the] another 50 million to provide an endowment for the Canada Council" (p. 140). The income from the Endowment was to provide support for activities in the arts, humanities and social sciences.

- *Add not Replace...* that to justify assistance from the Council, organizations should not only continue to receive the same local support they have had in the past but, in addition, should aim to enlarge their activities, improve their standards, increase their audiences and raise more local money (pp. 19-20).
- To get good value, The Canada Council will have to exercise every device of philanthropic leverage – matching grants, teaching the teachers, multiplying the results of successful experience, backing success – thus encouraging others – and singling out and emphasizing by every means the importance of creative talent (p. 20).
- ... there are few obstacles which more money would not help to overcome (p. 21)
- [Due to] geography ... [I]n Canada it would be impossible to treat either Toronto or Montreal as if it were *the* art centre (*id.*).
- The first year's experience of The Canada Council has confirmed the view of other foundations that it is not practical to lay down hard and fast rules or "principles" to be followed in considering proposals.
 - (a) As a general rule the foundation should not initiate projects of its own
 - (g) The content of programmes or the choice of plays should not be dictated.
 - (h) Grants should ordinarily be made for one year. There should be no undertaking, express or implied, that a grant will be renewed.
 - (k) Organizations should not use a grant as a basis for borrowing money from others.
 - (o)new buildings or equipment... are local undertakings which can best be carried out with local support (pp. 25 - 26).

Further, it stated:

"The authoritative *Philanthropic Foundations* by F. Emerson Andrews, published by the Russell Sage Foundation, has this to say at page 223:

'Although no course will escape criticism, experience suggests that a foundation should

- (1) before voting a grant, make certain of the integrity and competence of the persons involved, the responsibility of the organization, and the worth of the project".¹⁸

(p. 26)

In the critical decision of which theatre producer would receive the historic first subsidies, the CC stated that its "important function" was for the support of "major attractions [that] cannot be self-supporting outside the big cities." Acknowledging the high cost of touring, the report indicated that it was "exploring ... the possibilities of

¹⁸ This statement was prescient of the furor that arose when, in 1964, the CC elected to suspend its subsidy of Toronto's Crest Theatre.

putting on small shows ... [to] reduce quantity not quality.”¹⁹ To that end, two existing touring companies were each awarded \$30,000 {\$222,700}: Toronto-based Canadian Players to subsidize both the 1957-58 and 1958-59 seasons, and Montreal's Théâtre du Nouveau Monde, for Canadian and European touring (p. 61). The Stratford Festival received \$50,000 {\$371,000}.²⁰

The *Report* indicated that on April 1, 1958 Peter Dwyer was hired as the “Supervisor of the Arts Programme” (p. 5). Dwyer’s commitment and passion would significantly influence the direction of the Council’s performing arts policy until his unfortunate death in 1972. He reported directly to the CC’s first director Albert W. Trueman, whose 1982 memoir *A Second View of Things* describes Dwyer as “the most brilliant officer we had ... well trained in literature and much interested in the arts generally ... ” (pp. 148-149). Dwyer had the “unenviable job of administering the entire Arts Section. ... [He] came to the Canada Council ... after working in the security sections of both the Canadian National Research Council and the Privy Council Offices” (Cornell, 1998, pp. 6,8). Dwyer’s “great sensitivity, spirit of service and humility in the presence of creativity and aesthetics earned him the community’s highest praise” (Schafer, Fortier, 1989, p. 17).

¹⁹ Douglas Campbell, joint founder of the Canadian Players relates that the Players’ first shows were played on a bare stage. The costumes were business attire provided by the actors themselves, and the only properties were chairs provided locally. “The focus was on acting.” (Interview, 2006) Production values did increase over time. The picture of the “spare but imaginative Player’s 1961 touring production of David Gardner’s “Eskimo *King Lear*” in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre* shows inventive costumes and a simple set (Stuart, Lane, 1989, p. 75).

²⁰ The CC’s First Annual Report describes the \$50,000 grant to the Stratford Festival as “for music festival, film festival, generally to ensure continued growth and development” (p. 61). This suggests that despite its desire to bring culture beyond the main urban areas, the Stratford Festival’s then pre-eminence of professional quality took precedence. Of the total \$250,000 {\$1,853,000} for the performing arts, ballet received 52%, professional theatre received 44% and the DDF received 4% (*Id*).

Manitoba Theatre Centre: creating a new model

Winnipeg's Manitoba Theatre Centre (MTC) was founded in 1958 "by an amalgamation of the Winnipeg Little Theatre and John Hirsch's [and Tom Hendry's] semi-professional Theatre 77" (Johnson, Chris, 1989, p. 327). Many consider its inception, and the 1953 founding of the Stratford Festival, as the "two seminal events in contemporary Canadian theatre history" (Stuart, 1984, p. 170).²¹ MTC's philosophy of "serving the community" was expressed through programming "chosen to appeal to the broadest possible audience" (Johnson, 1989, p. 327). Unique for the time, the programming was expressed not only through its stage productions but also through "classes, discussions, and workshops for audiences, amateurs, and students ... provincial tours, and school appearances," all sold through "endless persuasion"²² (Stuart, 1984, p. 170). MTC's model was an appropriate partner for the CC's policies. It was a not-for-profit, professional theatre, connected socially and economically to the city and surrounding region, producing shows with "professionalism" (Ibid., p. 173), and governed by a volunteer board.²³ The triumvirate of administrator Tom Hendry and artistic director John Hirsch working with the volunteer board replaced the previously attempted actor-manager model. In this new model, there was an ordered sharing of the

²¹ Tom Hendry, in *A View from the Beginning* in the Fall 1974 edition of the *Canadian Theatre Review*, wanted to correct what he perceived as the erroneous and pervasive myth that he and John Hirsch were solely responsible for the creation and early successes of MTC. He indicated that Ogden Turner, Gordon Horner, Bill Stobie, David Jones and Don Campbell – all members of the Board of the Winnipeg Little Theatre that became the Board of Governors of the Manitoba Theatre Centre – were equally responsible for the strength of the "intellectual" and organizational underpinnings of the new organization (1974b, p. 13 to 19).

²² Tom Hendry relates that he learned the importance of the marketing of theatre at an early age. As a child in Winnipeg in the 1930s, he found ticket coupons for performances of the John Holden Players in boxes of his morning breakfast cereal (interview 2005).

²³ Tom Hendry relates that corporately, MTC was the merger of Theatre 77, a limited company run by John Hirsch and Tom Hendry, with the voluntary society – amateur – Winnipeg Little Theatre (Interview, 2005).

workload to build strong financial management, marketing, and programming connected to the immediate community. It proved to be suited to the nascent not-for-profit cultural theatre and created a long-term stability that exists half a century later. MTC became a model for similar theatre centres both in Canada and the United States and is “one of the most extensively documented stories in Canadian theatre” (Ibid., pp. 170-171). Despite the fact that MTC’s model completely met all of the CC’s initial criteria, Tom Hendry relates that there was no expectation of federal subsidy,²⁴ and that MTC only applied for grants at the urging of John A. Russell, a member of the CC who lived in Winnipeg.²⁵ In the realm of labour relations, Hendry indicates that he was very supportive of the work that the CAC was doing to improve the working conditions of Canadian actors. His strategy was to advocate to the MTC board for higher wages for the actors by using the CAC as the “bad guy” (Interview, 2005).

The Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors’ Equity Association: hiring Larry McCance: unilaterally developing a fee structure

Vernon Chapman, in his extremely detailed *The History of Canadian Actors’ Equity* (as yet unpublished at the time of this study) reports that in 1958, “Larry McCance became the Canadian Representative, a position he was to hold with distinction during the next twelve years of *sturm und drang* while Equity extended and defended its influence over the Canadian theatrical scene” (Ch. 1, p. 9).²⁶ A critical initiative included

²⁴ In *A View from the Beginning* in the Fall 1974 edition of the *Canadian Theatre Review*, Hendry suggested: “In those days, subsidy was a little-used and slightly ‘improper’ word. It was all right for farmers and railroads to receive s-bs-d—s but downright corrupting for theatres” (p. 16).

²⁵ Hendry further relates that at the time he “thought the Council’s grants were only for those in the east” (Interview, 2005).

²⁶ Mr. Chapman and CAEA were generous to release this valuable history based on his exhaustive transcription of the documentation of the CAC, CEC, and CAEA executive minutes. As of this writing, the work is raw and unpublished. Each chapter was supplied as a separate electronic file, thus the Chapter designation. Page numbers are approximate.

the first fee rate structure, as recommended by the Canadian Contract Committee, based on seat capacity and maximum weekly gross box office.²⁷ To “avoid making operating costs too prohibitive for small theatres”, there was a semi-closed shop policy mandating that a show have no less than 70% Association members in its cast. The rates of the lowest categories were \$65 { \$480 } per week, compared with approximately \$35 to \$40 { \$280 to \$320 } four years earlier (Ch. 1, p. 10). These rates were devised unilaterally and were not achieved through collective bargaining, which would only commence in the early 1970s. Until 1965, the CAC was the only national community organization with a paid staff, and for a time, assumed the role of a National Service Organization (NSO).

1959

Events under study:

- Canada Council: supporting permanent over touring, assessing performance facilities
- The Canadian Theatre Centre: incorporating so as to create the National Theatre School
- Canadian Advisory Committee, Actors' Equity Association: developing its authority

General events in the country:

- St. Lawrence Seaway opens
- Canadian content rules for television are introduced

Canada Council: supporting permanent over touring, accessing performance facilities

In its *Second Annual Report* for the 1958-59 season, the CC indicated that its grants now favoured permanent theatre companies over touring by over four to one

²⁷ “The rates ... were based on the number of seats in the theatre and the potential box office receipts at full capacity. They were given alphabetical classification. A “Z” company had a capacity of 499 seats or less with a potential weekly gross of \$8,900.00 { \$66,000 } or less. A “Y” company had a capacity of 500 to 900 seats with a potential weekly gross of \$9,000.00 { \$67,000 } to \$17,999.00 { \$134,000 }, and an “X” company one with 1000 seats or more and a weekly gross of \$18,000.00 { \$134,000 } or more.” (Chapman, Ch. 1 p. 10)

(p. 15). The CC also announced the first joint collaboration between itself and a NSO – the CTC.

Through its experiences with the Canadian Players, and the dance and music communities, the CC came to understand the paucity, as previously identified by Massey, of the venues across the country. To assess the technical difficulties and local-sponsor limitations faced by touring companies, the *Report* indicated that the CC had given an \$8000 { \$58,600 } grant to the CTC to administer a “survey of play-houses, auditoriums, arenas and concert facilities throughout the country” (p. 26).²⁸ The results were to be made available to the professional community by the CC and the CTC. The *Report* also contained a section on facility construction titled *A National Theatre*. It first analyzed the costs and seating capacities (ranging from 2750 to 4135)²⁹ of the existing, under construction, or proposed, venues in the major cities across the country. The analysis served as the introduction to an argument for the need for a facility in Ottawa, to be built in time for the Centenary. In the report, the CC was quite careful to indicate that it could not participate financially, but it did offer its services. The section concluded with a description of the anticipated lavish gala “in the presence of the Queen” (p. 33-35).

The Canadian Theatre Centre: incorporating so as to create the National Theatre School

From its 1959 legal inception to its 1973 demise, the Canadian Theatre Centre³⁰ was the first, and only, NSO for the whole of performing arts community. The CTC was

²⁸ The *Report* detailed that a survey was already underway and was being conducted by Bruce Swerdfager, who had “traveled widely with the Canadian Players both as an actor and manager” and was, at the time, the front-of-house manager at Stratford (p 26).

²⁹ In the 1960s, as planning for new facilities began in earnest, the theatre community would advocate for the construction of venues with a maximum capacity 900 as more conducive to audiences’ enjoyment of plays.

³⁰ The CTC was, “Founded in 1956 by professors Frank Holroyd and Emrys Jones and Dr. W. P. Thompson” (CTC, 1965b, p. 1).

the legal institution that founded the NTS as the first Canadian theatre school dedicated to training for the profession.

Before the 1960 founding of the NTS, those with talent who wanted professional training went to England or the US or, in the case of French Canada, France. The idea of a National Theatre School emerged after WWII (Gardner, Tovell, 1960, p. 62), and gained momentum within the ranks of the DDF as part of the 1952 adjudications by director and theatre educator Michel St. Denis (Lee, 1973, p. 206).³¹ David Gardner relates that the professional community increased its focus on the creation of a school in 1956, during the merging of the cream of the French and English Canadian acting communities in Stratford's landmark production of *Henry V*³² (Interview, 2005). In 1960, Gardner and Tovell reported that at "the Canada Council Conference held in Kingston, Ontario [in December 1957], the panel on theatre put a National Theatre School at the top of its list of the needs for the theatre in Canada" (p. 64). Gardner relates that then DDF President Pauline McGibbon³³ instructed him and others to "just get on with it" (Interview, 2005). Roux, Garneau, and Hendry (1985, pp. 12-13) and Gardner and Tovell (1960 pp. 62-77) detail the plethora of meetings held, from 1958 to 1960, by a cascade of committees drawn from the DDF, the CTC, theatre companies both French and English, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC), officials of the CC,

³¹ The critical issue was that, without proper professional training, Canadian theatre would not move beyond its amateur DDF ethic. (Roux, Garneau, Hendry 1985, p. 12)

³² John Pettrigrew's and Jamie Portman's 1985 *Stratford, the First Thirty Years* indicates that Michael Langham's production of *Henry V* was a "major success" and that Christopher Plummer's performance "marked the beginning of his stardom. ... The contributions of the French-speaking Canadians [including Gratien Gélinas, and Jean Gascon] were electrifying" (pp 120-121).

³³ Ms McGibbon among many other accomplishments in the cultural and educational spheres was the first "woman to represent The Queen in Canada and in the Commonwealth [as] Lieutenant Governor of Ontario." LAC web site <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/women/002026-816-e.html>. Retrieved July 10, 2006.

Governor General Vincent Massey, and other interested parties. The process refined the artistic and financial model of the School, and led to two legal steps, the first being the incorporation of the CTC, and the second being the founding of the NTS.

The CTC "was issued Letters Patent ... on April 1st, 1959" under the patronage of Governor General George P. Vanier as "a national association of professional theatre groups, organizations, and individuals, who have combined voluntarily to assist in the promotion and development of professional and educational theatre in Canada" (Gardner, Tovell, 1960, p. 2).³⁴ Then, in 1960, the CTC gave legal birth to the NTS, "a professional theatre school of the highest standard, serving Canadians from coast to coast and bringing together both French and English speaking students under one roof" located in Montreal (Roux, Garneau, Hendry, 1985, pp. 11-13).³⁵ (This study's next entry for the NTS is 1961, the year considered at the time as the official opening.)

Canadian Advisory Committee, Actors' Equity Association: developing its authority

By 1959, the membership of the CAC was 943 (Chapman, Unpublished, Ch. 1 p. 12)³⁶ and CAC began a process to acquire greater autonomy from AEA. Meeting

³⁴ Though now a legal voluntary society (i.e. NFP), the CTC would not have paid staff until 1965, when Tom Hendry would be hired as the CTC's first Executive Director. As a grace note to the chain of interconnected events, Tom Hendry relates that as a result of an early CTC meeting concerning the NTS, he and John Hirsch first met Jean Gascon and Jean-Louis Roux, the founders of the Théâtre du Nouveau Monde (Interview 2005) the Quebec equivalent of MTC. Hendry's and Roux's collaboration would, through the 1960s, be key to the ongoing success of the CTC.

³⁵ A NTS brochure, c1961, lists the Board of Governors of the NTS. Included were captains of industry, a Senator, senior bureaucrats of government, heads of universities, those with an interest in theatre, and senior members of the profession. Jean Gascon was the first Executive Director and James de B. Domville was the first Administrative Director (From the collection of David Gardner).

³⁶ "In the first ten months of 1957 there were 101 new members, in 1958, 167, and in 1959, 130. By the end of October of that year there were 943 members, but 278 of those were on honourable withdrawal, indicating how difficult it still was to make a living in the theatre. Many members were on withdrawal because they could not afford to pay the dues when unemployed." (Chapman, Unpublished, Ch. 1 p. 12)

minutes indicate that on November 12, 1959, the CAC met with Angus Duncan, Executive Secretary of AEA, to discuss the "position of the Canadian membership and the CAC" (McCance, 1959³⁷). Items for discussion were:

1. Authorization for CAC to set up elections procedures for, and the composition of, the CAC in Canada
2. Authorization for CAC to set rates and conditions for Canada.
3. Empower the CAC to take disciplinary action
4. Authorization for CAC set up membership meetings and annual membership meeting.

(Id.)

The outcome was the creation of the "New York" Committee, a sub committee of the CAC, charged with developing the proposal for eventual presentation and approval by the main Council in New York. (Chapman, Unpublished, Ch. 1, pp.11, 13) In 1963, the "New York" Committee successfully completed its task.

1960

Events under study:

- Canada Council: favouring professional over amateur, managing its ongoing programming
- Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors' Equity Association: finding mechanisms to assert control yet not hamper the nascent industry
- The Association of Professional Theatrical Producers and Managers: considering the creation of an organization

General events in the country:

- Quebec's Quiet Revolution is acknowledged
- The Canadian Bill of Rights receives Royal Assent

Canada Council: favouring professional over amateur, managing its ongoing programming

In its *Third Annual Report to March 31, 1960*, for the 1959-1960 season, the CC in announcing a global policy on the CC's funding policy based on: "The need to strike a

³⁷ Citation note: LAC contains material as follows:

R4040-0-3-E (Former MG28) Series I-352 Larry McCance Administrative records, Volume 112. Files 19 and 20 contain material from "*The New York*" Committee. The material spans a number of years. For brevity, material from this source, quoted in the body of the work, will be cited as follows: McCance, 19XX, being the year that the document was generated.

balance between support for the best and spreading out to reach more people" (p. 19).

The report related that the Arts Council of Great Britain had experienced a similar dilemma, and that Sir Kenneth Clark, its then Chairman, had categorized the issue as

Raise or Spread:

Should the money be used essentially to raise the standards of the arts, or should it be devoted to spreading whatever arts there may be as widely as possible among the people.

(*Id.*)

The *Report* transcribed Peter Dwyer's February 4, 1960, lecture, delivered at the Royal Conservatory of Music in Toronto, where he articulated that both options had merit. He stated that the CC was faced with legitimate escalating demands that were outstripping its fixed \$1,000,000 {\$7,232,000} for the performing arts. He contrasted the financial implications of each scenario: the choice of *Spread* would put small amounts of money into many organizations resulting in crippling totals, the choice of *Raise* would invest the CC limited resources in a small number of organizations creating an "excellence of the few" (p. 71-72). In its *Report*, the CC announced that it was choosing *Raise*.

In the *Report*, the CC provided information on a number of projects. It had instituted the successful Canada Council Train, as a \$29,000 {\$210,000} program of audience development, to bring students to the Stratford Festival. The project had been launched in conjunction with organizations and institutions of education, and the Canadian National Railways (p. 27). The *Report* also announced the completion of the CTC's Survey of performing facilities across the country as undertaken by Bruce Swerdfager of the Stratford Festival. Information included venue specifications and "recommendations about ticket prices, sponsoring organizations, hotels and travel facilities: "Of particular value are Mr. Swerdfager's own personal notes as a professional

man of the theatre ..." (p. 37). The intention was that the information in the Survey was to be kept current and available through the CTC and the CC. In the listing of grants for that year, the *Report* indicated: "Canadian Theatre Centre: To continue investigation and organization re foundation of national bilingual school of Canadian theatre – \$2000 {\$14,500}" (p. 82).

Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors' Equity Association: finding mechanisms to assert control yet not hamper the nascent industry

Vernon Chapman's unpublished work indicates that, in 1960, the influence of the CAC was spreading across the country through contracts with the Stratford Festival and smaller theatres, including summer stock: "Fees for artists had been revised in 1959 and increased exponentially in pace with the increased cost of living ... but not to the degree that would make employing Equity members prohibitive" (Ch. 1, p. 17). The difficulty faced by CAC was:

the reluctance of some managements to sign an agreement with Equity, and the practice of some Equity members to opt in or out of the Equity fold at will. There were a minority of performers who resented being regulated and others who still feared Equity's activities would squelch the tender theatrical plant even though the CAC and the Canadian Representative had consistently demonstrated that Equity was not unreasonable in its efforts to give protection and win better working conditions for its members while helping to establish producing companies on a sound basis.
(Ibid. p. 15)

Chapman indicates that, in 1960, the CAC launched Equity Showcase, based on a model established in the 1930s in New York. It was:

[a] non-profit company, separate but under the aegis of Actors' Equity. The general aim of Equity Showcase is to encourage and assist actors and directors who are members of Equity, and designers and playwrights who need not be Equity members, by offering them, through Equity-sponsored and partially financed productions, display windows whereby they can reveal their wares to the world and to Canada in particular.
(Ibid. p. 6)

The Association of Professional Theatrical Producers and Managers: considering the creation of an organization

The James de B. Domville fonds at LAC contain a few documents of a self-proclaimed Association of Professional Theatrical Producers and Managers (APTPM).³⁸ The *Minutes of a meeting of the Managers' Association held at the New Play Society, 88 Bloor St. East, Toronto, on the 13th March, 1960, at 2:30 p.m.* indicate that the group had made a request of the CAC, through Larry McCance, asking that APTPM be allowed to "meet the Equity Council to discuss the Studio Contract" (1960a, p. 1). Discussion determined that those members of the Association, who were also members of Equity, should not be sent to meet with the CAC to prevent what could be perceived as conflict of interest. The *Minutes* also indicated that there were discussions about the ability and/or desirability for APTPM to achieve recognition and collective bargaining with the CAC, the Toronto Musicians Union, and IATSE. A major concern was the ability of the proposed organization to police its members in their individual negotiations with Equity, particularly if the Association were not to be national. (p. 2) There were also discussions about "other [possible] aims of [the] association ... not already being carried by the CTC" (p. 1-3).

Notes of a meeting held on May 29 (likely in that same year) suggest the creation of a constitution. APTPM was to be a service organization providing, for its members, group approaches to government, and the facilitation of contract negotiations with

³⁸ The sixteen signing members were: Crest Theatre (Murray Davis), New Play Society (Dora Mavor Moore), Quince Productions (James Domville), Bernard Rothman Productions, Algonquin Productions (Clare Slater), Hart House Theatre (James Hozack, Manager), O'Keefe Centre (Bruce Corder, Ass. Gen. Manager), Canadian Opera Company (Herman Geiger-Torel), Stratford Shakespearean Festival (John Hayes), Freedman-Morse Productions (William Freedman), Canadian Players, L R M Productions (Les Lawrence, W. A. (Wally) Russell, and Leon Major), National Ballet Guild of Canada, Stanley Jacobson Productions, Royal Alexandra Theatre (Ernest M. Rawley), Group of Two (Araby Lockhart)

industry associations and unions, but not to “preclude ... individual” bargaining (1960b p. 1). Contemplated initiatives included: coordinated publicity, a campaign to eliminate the entertainment tax (including tax on foreign productions, on the rationale that any incentive to promote business would result in work for Canadians), discussions with CAC to secure fair rates of pay consistent with the limitations of Canadian production, initiatives to secure liquor licences in theatres, and a survey of existing and proposed venues suitable for live theatre (1960c p.2). The research found no other record of APTPM.³⁹ Many of the issues raised would, ten years later, become the issues of the nascent PACT.

1961

Events under study:

- Canada Council: articulating its granting policies, signaling the emergence of the regional theatre model and the NTS, recounting success of student-audience program
- National Theatre School: inaugurating the Technical Section

General events in the country:

- Saskatchewan legislates Canada’s first government-run health system
- The transatlantic telephone system is launched with a call from the Queen to Prime Minister John Diefenbaker

Canada Council: articulating its granting policies, signaling the emergence of the regional theatre model and the NTS, recounting success of student audience program.

In its *Fourth Annual Report for 1960-61*, the CC articulated its procedure for assessing and awarding grants to individuals and to organizations. For the grants to individuals, it indicated that to administer the process it had secured services of the

³⁹ The sourced documents suggest the existence of other material, but none was found to be available. Neither Jean Roberts, nor Araby Lockhart, who were recorded as attending, could recall any of the proceedings (Interview Roberts, 2006, Interview Lockhart 2005).

Canada Foundation,⁴⁰ which in 1957 had provided advice in this area. The CC took pains to indicate that the CC itself was the final arbiter of all decisions (p. 17). For grants to organizations, the CC indicated that decisions were made in-house. The criteria used were the body of collected financial statements, civic and provincial funding patterns, and the input of the CC's "own network of advisers ... [who supplied] up-to-date information on the standards maintained by [the] organizations [the CC was] helping." The Council was providing this information "in order to emphasize that decisions are based upon as broad and informed view as it seems possible to obtain" (p. 18). For its policy on theatre, the CC indicated that its "grants must be based on a current assessment of the national situation ... [and] that any single grant must be considered not in isolation but in relation to other pressing needs elsewhere in the country at a given time."⁴¹ It particularly noted the "emergence of a new form in the Manitoba Theatre Centre," and concluded "that this is an important addition ... and one that might serve as a model to other communities which have the population to support such a venture." (pp. 32-33). The grant to MTC that year was \$15,000 {\$107,000}.⁴²

The *Report* noted the 1960 opening of the NTS, supported by \$50,000 {\$357,000} from Quebec and \$40,600 {\$290,000} from the CC. The Report reviewed the history leading to the School's inception, and expressed the sentiment that "Great hopes

⁴⁰ The *Canada Foundation fonds*, LAC, indicate the organization operated from 1945 to 1969. "Its main objective ... was to encourage the development of Canadian cultural activities." http://www.collectionscanada.ca/archivianet/02012302_e.html, accessed August 14, 2007.

⁴¹ The *Report* assured the reader that it was not abandoning the Stratford Festival, which "had enjoyed ... a much-publicized surplus" and that it was acutely aware of the "financial obligations out of the construction of its theatre" (p. 32).

⁴² Tom Hendry relates that during his tenure as administrator until 1963, the CC grant was not critical to the financial health of MTC (Interview, 2005).

... rest on it for the future of theatre in Canada" (p. 29). Significantly the appropriation to the NTS was the largest grant that year in the theatre category.

And the *Report* indicated that an expansion of the already successful Canada Council Train to Stratford was bringing "5,000 high school students mainly from rural areas to see performances ... of *The Tempest* ... by the Canadian Players ... [at] 50 performances from Newfoundland to British Columbia." The *Report* placed particular emphasis on the value of teaching Shakespeare in schools and of then hearing the poetry spoken as part of a play (pp. 30-31).⁴³

National Theatre School: announcing its official opening

While the NTS began training programs for actors in 1960, its press opening was in 1961 with the inauguration of the Technical Section. Artistic director and teacher John Hirsch's contribution to *The School: The First Quarter Century of the National Theatre School of Canada* described the event:

The press is here, and all the students – almost seventy of them – as well as the professors who are seated on the stage. Today the production course begins and this is a sort of 'official opening.' 'For the first time in the history of the Canadian theatre,' says Jean Gascon, 'we'll be training our own designers, directors, costume designers, stage managers, lighting technicians. In another five years we won't have to go to England for a stage manager nor to the States when we want someone to light a stage properly.'
(Roux, Garneau, and Hendry, 1985, p. 78)

Through the period of this study, the CC, in its annual reports, regularly articulated the centrality of the NTS's programs of training to the growth of the industry. And, up to the

⁴³ An acquaintance of mine vividly recalls his enjoyment of seeing shows at Stratford through this program. He relates that during post-show question and answer sessions, the younger actors expressed their displeasure of the 'Shakespeare' philosophy. They further articulated their perception that there was a culture in the theatre community, promulgated by the CC, that 'Canadian play' was a dirty word.

late 1960s, the CC expressed the hope that the NTS would be able to include the training of administrators.

1962

Events under study:

- Canada Council: initiating its own fundraising, announcing a new template of support for theatre, recognizing Quebec's Department of Cultural Affairs, calling for more provincial involvement in the arts
- Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors' Equity Association: becoming Canadian Executive Committee with increased local autonomy
- Centennial Commission: additional substantial capital for culture

General events in the country:

- The Trans-Canada Highway opens
- Cuban Missile Crisis, Canada does not put its armed forces on alert

Canada Council: initiating its own fundraising, announcing a new template of support for theatre, recognizing Quebec's Department of Cultural Affairs, calling for more provincial involvement in the arts.

At the end of its *Fifth Annual Report for 1960-61*, the CC announced that it was commencing a program of fund-raising. The CC informed the reader that, as it existed on the fixed income of its endowment, it did "not have the resources and not expect to have resources to bear the responsibility alone" for all its programs. In the area of the performing arts, the CC had recently informed the Federal Government that, because of the increase in activity, the CC's ability to award grants as requested had dropped from 85% at inception to 63% over approximately a three-year period. It forecast that the "percentage will continue to drop" and that unless it could find "the means" to increase its annual revenues it would not be able to support the expansion of activity of "even a modest programme." It identified that its sources of income were "private citizens, business, government at all levels and philanthropic foundations." Encouraged by recent donations, it had "prepared a booklet called 'Private Benefactors and the Canada Council.'" The CC indicated that it mailed "several thousand copies ... to lawyers, legal

firms, trust companies, banks, newspapers” and other interested parties, describing its programs, “financial needs”, its corporate structure and good governance of its Endowment.⁴⁴

Concerning theatre, the CC’s *Annual Report* indicates that the industry was expanding and that the CC was reassessing its original 1958 model of support within the context of its fixed resources. The CC related that it had conducted *in camera* consultations with the theatre community in conjunction with “the Canadian Conference of the Arts at the O’Keefe Centre in May, 1961 ... to consider plans for the future,” (pp. 3-4) and had used those consultations as the point of departure for its analysis and proposed policies. The following is a condensation as found on pages 4 to 8 of the *Report*.

The CC recorded that it was comparing the recent developments in the industry with the received suggestions of models to rectify the “lack of good professional theatre in a number of Canadian cities which might have been expected to support a company ... [as theatre was] a national asset.” Amateur theatre was doing “excellent work ... but this was not at all the same thing.” The expectation was, that to create a “national theatre”, the graduates of the NTS would need to be able to find work⁴⁵ in a series of regional theatres across the country, built on the model of MTC. These theatres might, as had MTC, arise from “strong local support” and the merger of professional and

⁴⁴ The document *Private Benefactors and the Canada Council* is a discrete, small, plain, booklet. It lists Vincent Massey as the Patron, the current and past members of the Council, the investment committee and consultant, and the officers. It articulates the CC’s purpose and activities in the support of the arts, sciences and humanities, its connection to UNESCO, its prudence in its investments, and guidelines for potential for donations. Annex A consists of “Forms of Bequest.” Annex B consists of the *Canada Council Act*.

⁴⁵ Tom Hendry relates having a conversation with the CC where he articulated that if the country were to have a national theatre school the graduates’ expectations would be that they would get paid (Interview, 2005).

"existing amateur theatre" The CC postulated that the amateur theatres could "provide the organizing initiative and even immolate themselves" in the process. As these new theatres would be far from the CBC's lucrative work in Toronto and Montreal, particularly for established actors, it was anticipated that the NTS graduates would provide the talent pool and gain apprenticeship experience in the regions "at a modest salary" Until the lack of sufficient "first class directors" was resolved, foreign talent would be needed in this area. Exchanges of productions between theatres were envisioned, as "the days of touring ... [were] numbered ... as actors of quality [were] increasingly reluctant to take long tours." This model of 'exchange' would reduce the costs associated with touring all of the support staffs. Regional theatres could tour locally, providing less stressful conditions and, therefore, more appealing work. With shorter distances, and possible daily run-outs, production values could be more lavish, as seen in a recent high quality, but short, tour emanating from the Stratford Festival.

The 1961-62 *Report* then indicated that discussions had been held with groups in Vancouver and Halifax to explore the options for establishing regional theatres in those cities.⁴⁶ The Vancouver group did not appear to the CC to have enough cohesion, but in the case of Halifax, the CC had provided a grant to allow Stratford founder Tom Patterson and director Leon Major to meet with interested parties. There were indications that the Saskatchewan Arts Board was supportive of initiatives in Saskatchewan. The CC cautioned "firmly that [it] does not have sufficient funds to bring into being a series of regional theatres in a year or two." Success could only come with strong local support for the difficult tasks of organizing, financing and audience

⁴⁶ Gustafson's *The Canadian Regional Theatre Movement* pp. 149 to 194 provides a detailed exploration of the founding of regional theatres in Vancouver and Halifax.

development. The CC indicated it was “ready to help where it can, but only when it has been demonstrated that the theatre has a reasonable prospect of survival and that it is intended to be one of quality” (pp. 4-8).

The *Report’s* section on Theatre ended with two grace notes. The first was a remark by critic Kenneth Tynan, who suggested: “It is harder by far to live up to a subsidy than to play down to the box office.” The second sounded a note of distress that there were “no [Canadian] playwrights of great talent... lurking round the corner” (p. 8).

In 1962, indicative of the importance that was being placed on the NTS in the development of a national theatre, the CC’s *Report* showed that the School was awarded \$50,000 {\$355,000}, the largest grant in the theatre category (p.116). Through the period of this study, the NTS continued to receive proportionately large subsidies.

Also in 1962, the CC recognized the inception, that year, of Quebec’s Department of Cultural Affairs with its advisory Provincial Arts Council. The CC related:

We do not wish to suggest that what is so clearly admirable in one province would necessarily be suitable for another. But we have no doubt that for the future of the arts in Canada the employment of considerable sums of money by provincial governments ... will become increasingly necessary
(pp. 20-21)

Canadian Advisory Committee of Actors’ Equity Association: becoming Canadian Executive Committee with increased local autonomy

Despite the growth of the CAC and the tendency of Canadians at the time to talk about “American Equity and Canadian Equity” (McCance, 1962a), it was felt that the Canadian wing was still stronger in its adjunct position than if it were to be on its own. On April 23, 1962, the CAC sent a delegation to the AEA’s Council, with a proposal asking for greater autonomy, but not independence. The proposal was the result of the work of the 1959-instituted “*New York*” *Committee*, struck to develop the model for

increased autonomy. That committee's work had broadened to include an assessment of the CAC's ability to regulate the industry and, in turn, had spawned a *Committee for the Development of Theatre in Canada*. The *Development Committee* had identified issues of advocacy with government to improve financial funding for theatre, and issues of worker protection. The Larry McCance Fonds at LAC contains detailed documentation of the evolution of thinking and proposed policy through memos, meeting minutes, document revisions and a transcription of an April 10, 1962 phone call between Larry McCance, as the Canadian Representative, and officials in the New York office, including Theodore Bikel, then President of AEA. The following is a summary.

McCance noted to himself: "The situation in the theatre in Canada can not be considered as stable." Although CAC had garnered acceptance and respect for professional theatre in Vancouver, Winnipeg, and Montreal, when left alone, communities tended to "drift back towards local blackmail and amateurism." (Vernon Chapman's unpublished history indicates that some managements, and even members, were not recognizing the CAC's jurisdiction in the workplace by not signing Equity contracts (Ch. 1 p. 15).) McCance's experience was that CAC members were often "personally involved," and he felt that an impartial CAC office needed to become more aggressive in enforcing the rules. With the requested increased local autonomy, the CAC national office could exert greater authority and could respond with confidence to time-sensitive issues. In the sphere of advocacy, McCance felt that as the CAC was the only national theatre organization with paid professional staff, it was in a position to lobby nationally to enhance the industry. He posited that if the CAC were to have formal positions on the CC or the Board of Broadcast Governors, CAC might be able to foster policies to create more employment for actors. As well, a position on the Centennial

Commission might divert more money to theatres during the expected "spending spree." He imagined that further lobbying activities could include liaison with the Department of Labour concerning issues of income tax, injury compensation and unemployment insurance (McCance, 1962b).

In April 1962, a team from the CAC presented a resolution to the AEA in New York asking to change *Canadian Advisory Committee* to *Canadian Executive Committee* (CEC). The more autonomous CEC was to have the power to "call membership meetings,... appoint ... committees ... responsible to the CEC, ... grant concessions from the Standard Contracts to meet specific national and local conditions," and to discipline members "normally a resident in Canada." On March 15, 1963, Larry McCance wrote to the AEA's Angus Duncan, indicating that all the details of final wording had been resolved. (McCance, 1962a).

Centennial Commission: providing additional capital for culture

The funds available from the Centennial Commission were a key stimulant to the developing theatre industry. While there were local provincial and national activities, the central event was Expo 67 held in Montreal. Paul Schafer's and André Fortier's *Review of federal policies for the arts in Canada (1944-1988)* indicates:

The federal government established the Canadian Corporation for the 1967 World Exhibition in December 1962. ... Expenditures of more than \$400,000,000 {\$2.5 billion⁴⁷} (including several million dollars allocated to national and international artistic events, commissions to writers and artists, and activities involving young companies and artists and arts festivals), added to the cultural contributions of some 60 countries, made their mark in the development and appreciation of the arts ... in Canada. (1989, pp. 19-20)

⁴⁷ 1967 has been used for this calculation. As the start of the distribution of these funds was earlier, the value, in 2007 dollars, is possibly higher.

1963

Events under study:

- Secretary of State: instituting a new unified federal approach to the funding of culture
- Canada Council: examining season's distribution of grants to performing arts, researching practice in England
- Ontario Arts Council and Canada Council: initiating a close relationship

General events in the country:

- Canada refuses to accept American nuclear weapons
- Lester Pearson forms a minority Liberal government
- The Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism is announced

Secretary of State: instituting a new unified federal approach to the funding of culture

In 1963, the new Secretary of State (SoS), Maurice Lamontagne⁴⁸ declared a "war on cultural poverty" (Sheppard, 1966, vol. 1, p. 60). The new ministry would, for the first time in Canadian history, be an umbrella for all federal cultural institutions: the CBC, the Board of Broadcast Governors, the National Gallery, the National Library, the Public Archives, and the National Film Board and, in 1964, the Canada Council, the National Museum, the National Arts Centre, the Queen's Printer and the Centennial Commission (Ibid., p. 59-60). For the rest of this study's period, the SoS was the conduit for the federal government to develop policy and dispense capital for culture. As a result, the SoS was often the focus of the cultural community's advocacies for increased federal support for culture.

Canada Council: examining season's distribution of grants to performing arts, researching practice in England

In its *Sixth Annual Report 1962-63*, the CC concentrated on its responsibilities for the humanities and social sciences. As a result, the *Report* contains little information on

⁴⁸ In 1956, Lamontagne was the senior civil servant in the Privy Council who successfully convinced Prime Minister St. Laurent of the viability of the proposed endowment fund the CC (Granatstein, 1986, pp. 140-142).

the performing arts other than the grants for the 1962-63 season. It is instructive to look at the distribution of the grants to the performing arts in that year as an exemplar of how the CC was balancing its support in the sector prior to the substantial increase in its funding that became available in 1965. The totals below are calculated from the list of individual grants for *Opera, Theatre, Ballet* as found on pages 96 to 98 of the *Report*. There follow percentile analyses. The first list compares the global difference between theatre, ballet and opera. The grants to theatre are then compared as to type (production, education, playwrights, service) and language. For this period, the grants to ballet⁴⁹ and opera could be considered as being in the touring category.

<u>Performing arts: 1962-1963 season</u>		Total \$505,400 {\$3,541,000}
Theatre, English and French (including NTS)	\$239,880	47.5%
Ballet	\$174,500	34.5%
Opera	\$81,000	16.0%
Amateur (DDF)	\$8000	1.6%
Poetry	\$2020	0.4%
<u>Theatre: type</u>		Total \$239,800 {\$1,680,000}
English Theatre	\$103,100	43.0%
French Theatre	\$77,500	32.3%
Bilingual: NTS	\$51,500	21.5%
Playwrights (English and French approximately equal)	\$5000	2.1%
Canadian Theatre Centre	\$2780	1.2%
<u>Theatre: production stationary/touring</u>		Total \$180,600 {\$1,265,000}
Stationary: English and French	\$140,200	77.6%
Touring: English and French	\$40,400	22.4%

An analysis of this and the previous years' grants suggests that the CC was providing annual operating grants, although it had not articulated this change of policy in its annual reports.

⁴⁹ The reader interested in parallel research in the funding issues of dance, is directed to *The Ballet Problem: The Issue of Exclusive Funding in the Dance Office of the Canada Council*, by Katherine Cornell.

On November 18, 1963, Peter Dwyer submitted a report titled: *Notes on a Visit to England and France*. The report is typical of those, as found by this research, that were made by CC officials or designated representatives, who, when visiting institutions in other countries, took counsel from others' experiences. The reports provide background on the directions taken by some of the CC's policies. In this particular report, Dwyer provides "food for thought" (p. 1) gained from his meeting with Mr. Field, the accountant at the Arts Council of Great Britain:

In cases where the assessor and the accountant agreed jointly that an organization's application contained undesirable adventures which could only lead to disaster, then they would recommend to Council that the particular aspect of the project be refused. Mr. Field, like other officers, quoted the case of the Carl Rosa Opera Company where the Council found it necessary to withdraw all support, dig in, and weather the storm of public criticism which followed. The criticism of course was usually not based on a full understanding of the facts. (p. 8)

Dwyer also described the British Arts Council's procedure by which, similar to an investor in a commercial show, the Council received each organization's "weekly box office revenues, its expenditures, and the size of its audience ... [and] a monthly detailed financial statement of its financial position which of course ... show[ed] its accumulated deficit at any given time during the season" (p. 9). Dwyer related that Mr. Field felt that such a rigorous policy was "even for organizations on an even keel ... an ever constant reminder of the need for reasonable economy" (p. 10). Dwyer gently advocated that the CC consider such an option for its own operations. In late 1975, the CC did institute a process whereby theatres gave regular reports of their financial position.

Ontario Arts Council and Canada Council: initiating a close relationship

Roy McSkimming's 1983 *A History of the Ontario Arts Council 1963-1983* relates that, in 1963, Milton S. Carman, the newly hired Executive Director of the Ontario Arts

Council (OAC), and Peter Dwyer, of the CC, met at the OAC's second official meeting where the OAC was beginning the complex job of assessing grant applications (pp. 18-20). The CC's *Annual Report 1963-64*, indicated: "Mr. Peter Dwyer... was invited to speak to members of the Ontario Arts Council on the general problems of subsidy, and Mr. Carman immediately established a working relationship with [the CC]" (p. 35). In 1966, the two organizations began a partnership leading to the 1968 *Ontario Theatre Study Report* (published in 1969 under the title of *The Awkward Stage*) an investigation into creating a more holistic approach to the support for culture. Anna Stratton, who worked as a theatre officer at the CC in the mid 1970s, and again in the mid 1980s, relates that in her experience, the two councils arranged an annual formal meeting to compare policy and discuss emerging issues, but that there was no formal co-operation. The CC had ongoing relationships with the other provincial bodies, but, in Stratton's perception at the time, they were not as significant as the one with the OAC (Interview, 2003).⁵⁰

1964

Events under study:

- Canada Council: arguing for increased Government support, suspending support of Toronto's Crest Theatre.
- Tom Hendry: investigating not-for-profit in other countries, becoming first Executive Director of Canadian Theatre Centre

General events in the country:

- Canadians are issued the first Social Insurance Cards

⁵⁰ Peter Dwyer, in a confidential, hand delivered letter to Mr. E. Gallant, Deputy Secretary to the Cabinet, Privy Council Office indicated: "Our relations with provincial governments in the field of the arts are considerable but consist almost entirely of informal bilateral contacts. One of the reasons for this is that the organizations for officials dealing with the arts at a provincial level differ in kind from province to province, and vary from the Ministère des Affaires Culturelles in Quebec to a single person in Newfoundland" (p. 2). As *January 1970* is mentioned elsewhere in the letter, and a hand written note indicates "typed and mailed by hand Aug. 7", 1970 seems to be the likely date of the letter (Dwyer, 1970).

- Canada adopts its own flag

Canada Council: arguing for increased Government support, suspending support of Toronto's Crest Theatre.

The first portion of the CC's *Seventh Annual Report 1963-64* is an extended argument where the CC articulated the factors that it felt substantiated its call that the government should provide an increase in financial resources for culture. The *Report* stated that given the CC's "importance to Canada" and that the Government "did not respond" to the CC's 1960 appeal for additional support and (p. 3), the Government should add \$30 million {approximately \$200 million} to the CC's Endowment Fund over the next three year period. The CC indicated that due to its own efforts there had been a "gratifying increase" of the principal of its Endowment, but "the growth in revenue [was] far too slight to ... meet the steady and substantial rise in the needs of organizations and programmes already supported by the Council" (p. 2). The CC suggested that the income from the proposed additional capital could create a "graduated improvement in [its] resources ... [enabling] a rational development programme ..." (p. 8).

The *Report* then articulated the factors that the CC deemed were legitimately leading to those increased costs:

- (i) greater demands for services in the communities where they are located;
 - (ii) an increase in the number of communities requiring these services;
 - (iii) improvement in critical standards of the audiences, thus creating the demand for a higher level of performance, which involves increased costs
 - (iv) rising basic costs of production and salaries,
 - (v) the demands of creative and performing artists who are entitled to expect opportunities to make a career in Canada
- (pp. 4-5)

The *Report* added that new ventures, such as the nascent theatres in Vancouver and Halifax, were deserving of the CC's support as they were bringing "arts" to communities that wanted them. The CC underscored the "gravity of the situation ... [where] numbers

of performing groups are carrying heavy and increasing deficits ... which are growing beyond their financial capacities" (p. 5).

As to its own fundraising campaign, launched two years before, the *Report* expressed the CC's gratitude for recent donations, but as they had been "earmarked by their donors for very special purposes," the demand on the general fund had not been decreased. While the CC was still promoting its own campaign, it took pains to convey that it did not want to "risk undermining the fund-raising capacity of individual organizations" (p.9).

The *Report's* section *The Arts* observed that with the opening of the performing arts facilities, then under construction for the Centennial celebration, "financial and human resources will be stretched even further." It identified that there was a small "tired, ... overworked", and underpaid group engaged in arranging all of the Centennial celebrations. The report also identified a shortage of "theatre technicians, production and business managers, lighting experts,⁵¹ and stage managers" (p.12).

While issues of insufficient money and shortage of trained staffs existed across the country, the cause célèbre in Toronto was the CC's September 1964 decision that it was not providing the requested grant for that season to the Crest Theatre. At the time, the Crest was nominally Toronto's civic theatre, and the decision was extremely difficult for the CC. It broke its rule of silence on such matters (contrary to the British Arts Council's caution), and issued a press release laying out the reasons for the suspension of support. Herbert Whittaker's entry *The Crest Theatre*, in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre* lists: an accumulated deficit of \$127,000 {\$886,000}, attendance of

⁵¹ In a 1964 letter, James de B. Domville identifies the pressing need for "technical Directors familiar with electronic preset lighting installations and various forms of stage equipment" (1964).

only 44%, poor critical notices, and "Reports ... from advisors" suggesting that the productions were "indifferent" (1989, p. 120). The CC's *Annual Report 1966-67* indicated that the CC did resume funding the Crest the following year with a grant of \$138,000 {\$889,000} (p. 29), as The Crest attempted to re-define itself through an amalgamation with the Canadian Players. But, as Whittaker's entry indicates, the enterprise collapsed in 1966 (p. 120).⁵² Paul Schafer, noted cultural economist, educator and bureaucrat, relates his observation that the collapse of the Crest was the seminal event that led to the funding, by both the CC and the OAC, of the process that resulted in the *Ontario Theatre Study Report* (Interview, 2005).

Tom Hendry: investigating not-for-profit in other countries, becoming first Executive Director of Canadian Theatre Centre

Tom Hendry relates that, after leaving the MTC in 1963, at the urging of Peter Dwyer and with financial support from the CC, he undertook an extensive tour of the USA and Europe, including Eastern Block countries. The purpose was to ascertain other countries' experiences with not-for-profit theatre and to report back to the CC. One item of interest was his finding that in the Eastern Block countries, the philosophy was that the subsidy to the producing companies was not a subsidy to the artist, but for the audience's ticket price. On his return, Hendry submitted a report in the form of a letter to Peter Dwyer (Interview, 2005). The CC's *Annual Report 1963-64* noted that Hendry felt that Canadians had little to learn from Americans about "production standards" but a lot to learn "about promotional techniques" (pp. 15-16).

⁵² Comments, made by some of the interviewees for this study, indicate that four decades later, discussion of the collapse of the Crest can still engender considerable emotion. See: *Canadian Theatre Review*, Summer 1975; Herbert Whittaker *Crest Theatre* pp. 119-120 *Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*; and Graham Harley "Live at the Crest An important era in Toronto theatre gets a superficial treatment." *Literary Review of Canada* vol. 13, Issue 7, Sept. 2005.

Hendry relates that in late 1964, after his return, he met with Jean-Louis Roux and others of the CTC, as the CTC was interested in hiring Hendry as its first salaried Executive Director (Interview, 2005). Prior to this, and even with its incorporation in 1959, the CTC had operated solely on a voluntary basis. While the study's research found evidence of ongoing activity, the available public record suggests that prior to 1965, the CTC made few visible contributions to the industry other than the 1960 Facilities Survey and the birthing of the NTS. Hendry relates that in late 1964, the CTC received "pledges of grant support from the Canada Council and the Centennial Commission sufficient to hire" him as its first Executive Director (Interview, 2005). The infusion of operating capital allowed the CTC to move from a volunteer NSO to one with resources of paid staff able to implement programs approved by the CTC board. In very short order the CTC established a considerable presence.

1965

Events under study:

- Secretary of State: consulting with the cultural community at Ste-Adèle
- Canada Council: receiving \$10 million from federal government, hiring Andre Fortier as financial officer, identifying lack of training of administrators
- Canadian Theatre Centre: marshalling its full potential

General events in the country:

- The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) is instituted in the US
- Lester Pearson gives a speech at Temple University in the United States that calls for a stop to the bombing of North Vietnam, infuriating President Lyndon Johnson

Secretary of State: consulting with the cultural community at Ste-Adèle.

In January of 1965, at the request of the SoS, the Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA) convened, in Ste-Adèle, Quebec, what might be considered a seminal national conference, attended by many of the cultural community. James Domville reported to the CTC's Board that it "was the first time that a Minister of the Crown had

sought the advice of professionals on how the Federal Government could best provide support – financially and morally – to theatre, ballet, opera, literary and visual arts” (CTC, 1965c, p. 3). Gordon Sheppard, hired in 1965 by the SoS as a Special Consultant of the Arts, wrote that it was part of the SoS’s “groping for ways in which the Government, and particularly the Secretary of State’s Department, could effectively carry on the war [on cultural poverty] in unison with private individuals, the Canada Council, and new provincial and municipal initiatives” (1966, vol. 1, p. 61).⁵³

Tom Hendry, who also attended the conference, relates that the SoS presented a report that proposed that the SoS’s contribution to the performing arts for the Centennial celebrations should be tours by major theatre, music, and ballet companies.⁵⁴ Hendry’s observation was that those of the performing arts community who were present expressed loud vocal concern that the proposal could be perceived as being elitist, as it did not reflect the work from across the country. Through discussion, there was agreement that the programming should be more diverse and local. Hendry relates that, subsequently, Peter Dwyer approached him to research possible total costs. Hendry then made calls across the country, asking what each organization would like to do and how much they thought it would cost. The total was approximately \$10,000,000⁵⁵

⁵³ Sheppard, suggests that the four-volume report was the SoS’s “preface ... of a White Paper on Culture, the first by any Canadian Government” (vol.1, p. 61). Tom Hendry’s 2005 assessment is that the report was so broad and sweeping that it did not give the bureaucrats a focus for specific policy (Hendry, Interview, 2005).

⁵⁴ Hendry’s recollection is that the report had been prepared by Jean Gascon (at that time working as a freelance director (Schonberg, 1984, p. 224)), Stratford founder Tom Patterson, and music impresario Walter Homberger (Hendry, Interview, 2005).

⁵⁵ In the CTC fonds at LAC a file labeled *The Canada Council May 1963 to June 30/65* contains two undated hand written spreadsheets titled *Canadian Theatre Centre Survey of Financial Needs of Member Groups 1965 Statement of Deficit Positions and Statement of Certain Significant Amounts Resulting From a Survey Conducted by Canadian Theatre Centre Among Twenty-Five Theatre, Opera, Dance, Festival and Related Service Organizations*. The total of the two spreadsheets is approximately \$9.55 million (CTC, 1965).

{\$67,126,100} which could be spaced over the approximate three-year period to the Centennial. A shocked Dwyer stated that \$10 million far exceeded what was earmarked but he would see what he could do. While Hendry cannot point to a direct connection, in March of that year, the Government announced that the CC was to receive \$10 million for operating capital over the next three years (Interview, 2005).

Canada Council: receiving \$10 million from federal government, hiring André Fortier as financial officer, identifying lack of training of administrators

As the CC recorded in its *Eighth Annual Report* 1964-65, on March 19, 1965, the Prime Minister announced in the House of Commons that the Council was to receive a grant of \$10,000,000 {\$67,126,100} as a “temporary measure of assistance.” The monies were to be divided equally and spent over a three-year period. The rhetoric used as the rationale for the increased support was very brief (and echoed the Council’s own arguments from 1964): “... the creation and development of new artistic resources to meet the needs of the future.”

The *Annual Report* then provided the CC’s analysis of the announcement. The CC cautioned that, as welcome as it was, the extra capital arrived with attendant constraints. Unlike the income from the Endowment Fund, which was the CC’s to use as it saw fit, the CC perceived that the new capital was at the pleasure of the political process, which at some point in the future might include unwanted interference. But the CC felt that, with its track record, its “essential freedom of action will be preserved” (p. 2). (The issue would lie dormant until 1977, when the Government expressed concern about the CC’s funding of sovereigntist Quebec artists.) The CC indicated that as the interest from the Endowment was running at approximately \$3,175,000 {\$21,312,000}, its working capital would be effectively doubled. This would, in turn, require the hiring of

“additional staff, and the acceptance of [additional] cultural programmes of the Department of External Affairs and of the Centennial Commission.” As the “small staff has been ... under ... considerable strain ... extensive consultation” with others would be required to make the best choices for “the interests of our clients” (pp. 2-3).

The added federal funding brought changes to the CC’s management structure and operations. Senior cultural bureaucrat André Fortier relates that Peter Dwyer and the CC’s Director Jean Boucher recruited him from the Treasury Board⁵⁶ to help the CC manage increased monies and finances (Interview, 2007). Senior cultural bureaucrat John Hobday relates that the new federal funding came with an implied mandate for more accountability through reports (Interview, 2006). Fortier’s first position at the CC was Chief, Financial Management Service,⁵⁷ and later, from 1972 to 1975, he was the CC’s Director. Fortier relates that, in 1968, he initiated the CC’s Research and Evaluation Section and later brought in economist Gérald Rivest to help develop the arguments in favour of public economic support for culture (Interview, 2007).

In November 1965, Fortier submitted a report on his trip to England and France to the CC. Based on his observations he concluded:

...our most important task in the next year or two is to prepare a master plan of the financial needs of ... Canadian artistic organizations...after 1967 and make representations to the Government for additional funds. ...

⁵⁶ Fortier relates that at Treasury his area of responsibility was to analyze the budgets of agencies such as the CBC, the National Archives and the NFB (Interview, 2007).

⁵⁷ André Fortier’s C.V. describes this position as follows: “1965-67 Cadre supérieur au Conseil des arts du Canada, responsable de conseiller les organismes culturels subventionnés pour l’amélioration de leur gestion administrative et financière et d’évaluer les demandes de subventions sous ces deux aspects” (Fortier, 1989, p. 1).

(1965-67 senior staff of the Canada Council, responsible for the counseling of subsidized cultural organizations on how to improve the administration of their management and finances, and how to evaluate the requests for subsidy within these parameters.)

Comment: It may be that long term financial planning is very difficult...in the field of assistance to arts, and therefore certainly not appealing to the planners. However, I believe that attempts should be made...since we must obtain funds from the Government for periods longer than one year.
(1965, p. 4)

Similar to Peter Dwyer's comment made in 1963, he further suggested "... we should insist that major organizations prepare financial statements on a systematic basis...sent to us at least when request for the second or third installment is made" (p. 5). In the report he stressed he was advocating for service rather than control. He had the "impression... that in Great Britain the officers envisage their function on matters of finance as ...control rather than service" It was, in his opinion, "preferable to accentuate the idea of service" as it was "the only approach" suitable in Canada. His recommendation was that the CC's Programme Divisions should have "prime responsibility" as long as the "Finance Officers [could] enter the picture at any time there is a financial problem" (Fortier, 1965).

The CC, in its *Annual Report 1964-65*, took the NTS to task for "not training the housekeepers, the administrators of the performing arts." The CC argued that "such people are desperately needed and after consultation we decided that they should be trained as most housekeepers are, on the job." The CC indicated the CC itself had initiated internships for "four young men ... from outside the world of the performing arts." The CC has looked outside the industry as it feels that "those already ... [in] the performing arts [who are interested] ... would naturally gravitate to administration if they had a talent for it." The CC indicated that, with the assistance of "management consultants, P. S. Ross and Partners," and a criteria-preference for "those with ... a background of business training or experience," they had found suitable candidates who "were reported to be working successfully" (p. 11). In 1978, the report *Theatre Training*

in Canada took the position that the program was a failure as "none of these trainees finally ended up in arts management" (p. 59).

Canadian Theatre Centre: marshalling its full potential

In March 1965, the CTC published the first edition of *The Stage in Canada*, A monthly bulletin of Drama, Opera and Ballet, later titled *La Scène au Canada/The Stage in Canada (The Stage in Canada)*. Until the CTC's demise in the early 1970s, the bilingual magazine was the organization's prime organ of communication.⁵⁸ It was published more or less monthly, and its contents included: editorials, *Acts and Facts*, which was a column consisting of recent news of the business, a theatre calendar of who was performing what and where, the occasional letter to the Editor, reprints of critics' reviews (for a brief period⁵⁹) and feature articles containing interviews with important players or details of the evolving histories of Canadian performing arts organizations. Editorials and articles often reflected the various industry and policy initiatives of the CTC. In the inaugural editorial in March 1965, CTC President Norma Springford wrote that the CTC had hired Tom Hendry as its first full time Executive Secretary and the CTC was looking to harness his "knowledge and wide experience, together with the [available] increased resources ... to speak for all Canadian members of the professional and educational theatre, both nationally and internationally." She articulated that the prime *raison d'être* of the CTC was "communication."

In April 1965, the CTC sent its *Brief to The Canada Council In Support Of Request For Grant In The Amount Of \$20,000 In Support Of The Centre's Activities*

⁵⁸ David Gardner relates that receiving the magazine meant that you were not alone (Interview, 2005).

⁵⁹ In the March/April 1967 *The Stage in Canada* Jean-Louis Roux wrote that in November 1966, "in response to the apparent wish of a majority of our members – as expressed at meetings – the department 'Theatre Criticism Canada' was dropped" (Roux, 1967a, pp. 4-5).

During the Year Ending 31st July, 1966. The brief narrated the CTC's work-history to date, outlined "Budgetary Plans" in the amount of \$45,000 {\$298,000} (p. 6), and under the title "Current Operations" outlined its planned programming: advocacy with government, "dissemination ... of news [nationally and internationally] ... primarily through 'The Stage in Canada'", fulfillment of the CTC's obligations "as a member of the International Theatre Institutes (UNESCO) ... Creation and upkeep of a Canadian Inventory of Human Resources ... Assistance in co-ordination of touring schedules ... promotion of the use of original Canadian creation for theatre" including translated material, development of national library resources, liaison for "the use of non-Canadian personnel in certain areas where experienced personnel are hard to come by" or for Canadians to train abroad, and "Assistance in upgrading standards of professional work" (pp. 7-9).

In 1966, Tom Hendry commented in *The Stage in Canada*:

In many ways 1965 was one of the best years ever for the Canadian Stage. Theatres everywhere expanded audiences and budgets; our opera and ballet companies increased their general scope of their operations; the Canada Council saw its resources suddenly double, passed on the largesse – via the Companies – to the audiences of Canada; Canadian Theatre Centre grew from sixty members to eight hundred; ... 1965 will go down in history as the year during which, however fuzzily, the playwright's potential position at the core of Canadian theatre was first discerned. ... Nobody got into this business to build museums. 1965 could be entered in the records as the year in which we made the first steps – nationally – in the direction of excitement. (1966a, p. 2)

1966

Events under study:

- Canada Council: partnering with Canadian Theatre Centre in Theatre Arts Development Programme
- Canadian Theatre Centre: promoting the value of seasons' ticket programs
- Baumol and Bowen: identifying the 'income gap' in the economics of NFP culture

General events in the country:

- Canada Pension Plan begins operation

- The Munsinger Affair is Canada's first political sex scandal

Canada Council: partnering with Canadian Theatre Centre in Theatre Arts Development Programme

In its *Ninth Annual Report 1965-66* the CC reported that the "Theatre Arts Development Programme [was developed] with advice from the theatre community, and by stealing what seemed useful from the projects of the Theatre Communications Group⁶⁰ (TCG) in the United States." The intention of the Theatre Arts Development Programme (TADP) was to foster a sense of "steely professionalism" (p. 8). As part of the consultation process prior to the launch of the program, Peter Dwyer presented the TADP to the AGM of the CTC's Board of Governors, held in Stratford on August 29, 1965. Dwyer reported that the TADP was capitalized at \$211,000 {\$1,416,000}. He was asking the CTC to "help implement the programme in an attempt to do something positive in the following areas:

1. Management Training Scheme for theatre, ballet and opera.
 2. Apprenticeships for technical stage crafts...
 3. Advanced training for ten technicians to study with their counterparts in Canada or abroad, for a period of up to six months... [at] \$3500 {\$23,500} plus travel per year
 4. Theatre Communications Fund: for 16 performing arts organizations for their respective directors or senior personnel, to travel within Canada to consult or observe the work of other companies, etc.
 5. Consultants Fund: for use in acquiring the services of experts in or outside Canada for periods of 10 days to 2 weeks. \$1000 {\$6600} plus travel in each case
 6. Playwrights and production of new Canadian plays...
- (CTC, 1965c, p. 2)

The program to foster playwrights was to be a comprehensive process of "reading committees', ... awards ... of encouragement" for works accepted by the reading process, and a subsidy of \$5000 {\$33,600} to the producing company should that

⁶⁰ The web site of the Theatre Communications Group (TCG) indicates it was founded in 1961 as the NSO for American regional theatres (2007).

happen, with the guarantee that the “author receive a royalty” (*Id.*) Some seven months later, the CC, in its *Annual Report 1965-66*, articulated that the TADP was “an attempt to meet common problems with common solutions” and that it was a “wise investment for the future of some of [the CC’s] new funds” (p. 10). Despite this optimism, the criteria of the selection of candidates for the Management Training Scheme may not have been sufficiently catholic. John Hobday relates that he thinks he just missed making the final list of candidates for this trial program because he did not have demonstrable accounting skills, in spite of the fact that he had the experience of managing the numerous budgets related to his work as a CBC radio drama producer/director and had always brought in his programs within the budget allocation. He suggests that it later appeared that the new Council program was focused on finding clones of Tom Hendry who had been highly regarded during his tenure at MTC and who was a CA. Hobday indicates that the program was soon abandoned and observes that Hendry’s passion for theatre linked with his CA was a rarity (Interview, 2006). At the time, Hendry advocated that the program was vital and should continue. In July 1966, he wrote to the CC’s Ann Coffin urging “now is not the time to cancel the programme; it is the time to expand it” (1966b). Again in November 1967, he wrote to the CC’s Peter Dwyer: “I cannot understand why this programme is not being pushed for all it is worth. The situation, without exaggeration, is urgent, and getting worse daily” (1967b).⁶¹ (Hendry’s public comments are detailed in 1968.)

⁶¹ In the letter Hendry indicates: “I am now looking for Administrators and/or Assistants for: Manitoba Theatre Centre, Theatre Toronto, Neptune Theatre Foundation. My past prediction is proving correct, and as the Provincial arts bodies grow, they are soaking up Administrative talent” (1967b).

Canadian Theatre Centre: promoting the value of seasons' ticket programs

In 1964, Tom Hendry had reported to the CC that Canadians had a lot to learn from Americans about promotion. The report *Subscription sales seminar, Vancouver – February 12th, 1966* details the CTC's first subscription-sales seminar: "Representatives of over thirty CTC member groups met ... for an all-day discussion on the place of subscriptions in audience-building ... The seminar learned that subscriptions had advanced ... to the point where they often accounted for more than 70% of earned income of operations whose budgets had expanded many times during the past decade, on the average approximately 400%" (p. 1). The argument used in favour of subscription sales was that they provided improved cash flow and guaranteed, to the theatre, audiences who became engaged with the theatre company and its philosophy. In rebuttal to concerns about reduction of artistic quality, it was felt the increased financial stability and a willing audience would "guarantee the Director's right to experiment" (p. 2). In sum, seasons structured around a subscription series were seen as the positive programming-financial model for the economic support of cultural theatre. The CTC had invited Danny Newman, the subscription sales expert of the TCG to "outline the development of subscription sales philosophy and methodology ... [for] regionally-based performing arts organizations in USA and Canada" (*Id.*).

Danny Newman's 1977 book, *Subscribe Now! Building Arts Audiences Through Dynamic Subscription Promotion*, is a bible of subscriptions' programming and, according to the note on the dustcover attributed to the *New York Times*, "Danny Newman is the Billy Graham of subscription theatre." In the book, Newman describes himself as "an unabashed enthusiast" for subscriptions and outlines how they have benefited the performing arts around the world (p. 3). Using case study examples, the

book details all the issues around launching and maintaining successful programs and dealing with the objections raised against them. He argues that one of the central benefits of subscriptions is that the financial stability provided by a season's ticket program outweighs the perceived loss of artistic flexibility and integrity as it can ameliorate the potential risk of "folding [one's] tent after several badly attended seasons, despite unquestioned artistic distinction" (p. 28). The book promotes selling using "the classic press agent's stance, 'If it's my show, it's great. If they're my artists, they're the greatest'" (p. 8). In the book's introduction, Newman states:

I am most grateful to the former Canada Council directors, Peter Dwyer and André Fortier, to their successor Charles Lussier and to Canada Council officials, Timothy Porteous, Hugh Davidson, David Peacock and Monique Michaud, for having opened an entire nation's performing arts plant to my brand of DSP (Dynamic Subscription Promotion). I appreciate, too, that it was Tom Hendry and the Canadian Theatre Centre, who gave early impetus to my activities in so many north-of-the-border places.
(p. ix)⁶²

Baumol and Bowen: identifying the 'income gap' in the economics of NFP culture

In 1966, two American economists William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen, published *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*, the result of a two year study on the economics of not-for-profit and commercial performing arts, commissioned by the American Twentieth Century Fund, an institute dedicated to "progressive public policy"

⁶² John Hobday, then Administrative Director at Neptune Theatre relates: "When Halifax's Neptune Theatre brought in Danny Newman as a consultant, it took a while before the cautious Maritimers could accept his messianic preachings and vivid Chicago Jewish personality. While small in stature, he was a larger than life character. His brash wording to describe plays and his relentless preaching that 'the enemy of the theatre is the single ticket buyer' required some considerable adjustment. Nevertheless, after some toning down, the Neptune's subscription brochures took on a decidedly new look – and it worked." Hobday feels that Newman almost single handedly expanded audiences for performing arts companies across Canada - and around the world (Interview, 2006).

(Twentieth Century Fund, 2006).⁶³ The Fund's director August Heckscher wrote in the forward: "Trustees of the Fund were enthusiastic about ... a study in this field, ... in an advanced industrial society when the material needs of life seem in a fair way of being met and questions of values and goals begin to appear central" (1966, p. vii). The study was part of overall American initiatives surrounding the 1965 institution of their cultural subsidy system through the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA). Heckscher explained that through extensive research, Baumol and Bowen had concluded that the "live performing arts ... come within the sector of the economy where productivity cannot be increased at anything like the general rate. Costs therefore, inevitably mount; revenues do not keep pace" (*Id.*).

In simple terms: as the relative cost of goods goes down due to improvements in manufacturing and economies of scale, the relative costs of the performing arts go up. The arts, because of the intrinsic nature of original creation, do not have the ability to improve their manufacturing: "The faster the general pace of technological advance ... the greater ... the upward pressure on costs in any industry [like the arts,] which does not enjoy increased productivity" (Baumol, Bowen, 1966, p. 171). Baumol and Bowen named the differential 'income gap' and based on the fact that "available data is consistent with the predictions generated by the ... model" (p. 180) determined that year over year, it grew exponentially. As a consequence, in commercial culture enterprises the price of tickets would rise, and would also rise in the not-for-profit sector, unless

⁶³ "Since 1919, the Twentieth Century Fund, a nonpartisan foundation, has been at the forefront researching and writing about progressive public policy. We produce books, reports, and other publications and convene task forces of citizens and experts — all with an eye toward finding fresh approaches to the major issues of the day. We are a resource for journalists, policy makers, academics, and anyone else who wants to make use of the Fund's findings and policy recommendations" (Twentieth Century Fund, 2006).

subsidies increased "to pay the mounting bill" (p. 407). By 1968, the CC was incorporating the income gap's existence into its arguments for additional support for NFP culture.

1967

Events under study:

- Canada Council: taking stock, working on improvements
- Canadian Theatre Centre: developing the performing arts community's resources

General events in the country:

- "O Canada" becomes the official national anthem
- "There's no place for the state in the bedrooms of the nation." - Pierre Trudeau⁶⁴

Canada Council: taking stock, working on improvements

In 1967, the CC was in its tenth year of operation, and could rightly take stock of its achievements. The *10th Annual Report 1966-67* was largely a retrospective of its history. The CC's three events of interest to this study were not noted in the public record: one marked the beginnings of the organization Council for Business for the Arts in Canada (CBAC) (now Business for the Arts), one reflected a policy of bringing The Community's expertise into the CC's staff, and one was an initiative for theatre sharing productions, which would not come to fruition for another ten years.

In January 1967, André Fortier, the CC's Assistant Director and Treasurer, wrote to Trevor Moore, Vice President, Imperial Oil Limited. Fortier outlined the performing arts' experience of the income gap and identified that the Canadian corporate sector was not contributing as much to the cultural sector as its counterpart in the USA:

A quick examination of the totals and percentages ... shows that, with the doubling of operating expenses of the major artistic organizations in Canada over five years, there has been a slight decline in the proportion of expenses recovered at the box office; fortunately the grants from the Canada Council and

⁶⁴ "Trudeau may have made the 'bedrooms of the nation' phrase famous but it was actually coined by The Globe and Mail's Martin O'Malley, now a columnist with cbc.ca. Trudeau thanked O'Malley for the quotation." <http://archives.cbc.ca/400d.asp?id=1-73-538-2671>

provinces increased sufficiently to pick-up some of the decline while the municipal contributions and other donations maintained approximately their proportion You will notice however that, in both 1960-61 and 1965-66, the grants and donations were not sufficient to meet the loss on operations, leaving net deficits which are still burdening the organizations. ...

In connection with the [National Industrial Conference Board] publications, it is interesting to note in particular that the Canadian companies contributed a higher percentage of their profits to charitable organizations than in the USA On the other hand, American companies give a higher percentage of their contributions to culture than their Canadian counterpart ...
(Fortier, 1967, p 1-2)

This discourse can be seen as leading to the 1974 founding of the CBAC.

During 1967, the CC hired Jean Roberts as the first dedicated Theatre Officer. Roberts, who had variously worked for the Crest, founded the Toronto's Central Library Theatre, and been co-artistic director of the Canadian Players (Findley, 1989, p. 471), held the distinction of being the first person from The Community to be on the permanent staff of the CC. In 1982, Roberts related the context for her hiring at a conference celebrating the CC's twenty-fifth anniversary and held by the Association for Canadian Theatre History/Association d'histoire du théâtre au Canada:

... it was Centennial Year, and it was Expo year and there was a tremendous amount of criss-crossing of the country of various performing arts companies. They gave nearly three thousand extra performances in that given year, and they had about 75% attendance in all of those performances. The Canada Council ... detected that although this richness couldn't continue, some of it was certainly going to stick. So they decided at that moment to augment their staff.
(p. 169)

Roberts reported that she "found it very easy ... to tell [her] constituents that the job of a Theatre Officer meant weighing, and watching, and examining, and seeking opinions and advice and making recommendations to the Council. ... [B]ut the Council did make the decisions ... [and was not] a 'rubber stamp' ", as was the "whispered criticism" (p.

171). For the rest of the period under study, the CC continued to hire the Theatre Officer from the English theatre community.

In 1967, the CC continued to promote the creation of mechanisms that could extend programming while facilitating global economies. In February 1967, Peter Dwyer wrote a letter to the major players in the theatre community inviting them to a meeting in Ottawa at the CC's expense.⁶⁵ He wrote that the CC was:

anxious to find ways in which our present theatre resources can be husbanded and put to the best possible use. It may be that some degree of closer cooperation between existing theatres will be desirable We are also interested, though we know this is a delicate subject, in the possible exchange of productions from time to time ..."
(1967a).

In September of that year, Dwyer sent another letter indicating that the meeting discussed such:

non-controversial matters as the areas of cooperation between directors and production managers, the sharing of actors and technicians when necessary to import them from other countries, copyright problems, import duties and taxation. In addition ... what possibilities there might be for exchange of productions ... [and whether] future meetings should be done by the Canadian Theatre Centre.
(Dwyer, 1967b).

It would not be until 1977, ten years later, that PACT and CAEA would negotiate the contractual mechanism that would allow for the regular sharing of shows.

⁶⁵ An attachment to the letter indicates, "This letter has been sent to: Tom Hendry – Canadian Theatre Centre; Malcolm Black – Vancouver Playhouse; Robert Glen – Citadel Theatre; Edward Gilbert – Manitoba Theatre Centre; Jean Gascon – Stratford Festival; John Hirsch – Lincoln Centre Theatre; Leon Major – Neptune Theatre; Michael Langham – Stratford Festival; Hamilton Southam – National Arts Centre; Paxton Whitehead – Shaw Festival; Mavor Moore – St. Lawrence Centre; Mary Morter – Montreal Instant Theatre; Jean-Louis Roux – Théâtre du Nouveau Monde; George Luscombe – Workshop Productions; James Donville – National Theatre School" (Dwyer, 1967a)

Canadian Theatre Centre: developing the performing arts community's resources

By 1967, as suggested by the above letter, the CTC was being considered as a logical locus for policy development and implementation. The CTC was receiving substantial grants from the Centennial Commission, and the provinces of Alberta, Nova Scotia, Saskatchewan, Ontario, and Quebec (CTC, 1967, p. 2), along with the monies from the CC, whose *Annual Report 1966-1967* lists the CTC's grant as \$69,000 {\$429,700} (p. 72), a ten-fold increase in two years.

In 1967, the CTC was engaged in a number of initiatives of policy and programming. One was a Fact Finding Committee, which included Larry McCance of the CEC and Herman Geiger-Torel of the Canadian Opera Company. The committee was addressing issues related to touring and was proposing to "prepare a directory" of accommodations as the conditions faced on tour were a "national problem, which [was] attaining serious proportions" (McCance, 1967). In another initiative, the CTC was investigating the "Ticketron computerized system of ticket handling ... to examine the possible applicability of the system to problems of ticket selling across Canada" (Hendry, 1967a). The CTC was also addressing issues of professional ethics through a committee chaired by Malcolm Black. The membership was presented with the Committee's early recommendations in the January 1967 edition of *The Stage in Canada*. The preamble suggested: "Ethics ... represent those unwritten rules not to be found in union manuals or contract form" (Professional Ethics Committee, 1967, p. 10). The headings of the proposed rules were:

- 1) Get it in writing
- 2) Observe the Golden Rule
- 3) Keep Contracts Confidential
- 4) Keep Fair Play Normal
- 5) Leave Gossip to the Gossips
- 6) Avoid Being a Party to 'Raiding'

- 7) Enhance the Professional Image
 - 8) Accept Responsibility Cheerfully
 - 9) Respect Rights, Respect Rules
 - 10) Use Imagination
- (Ibid., pp. 10,12)

Black relates that, at the time, a shortage of staff qualified to run professional theatres had created competitive hiring practices in The Community. The Committee was an initiative to foster a spirit of co-operation in The Community rather than one of competition (Interview, 2005).

The centrepiece of the CTC's 1967 activities was its hosting of the International Theatre Institute's conference *Colloquium '67: the design of theatres* held in Montreal as part of Expo 67. Jean Louis Roux, writing in the December 1967 *The Stage in Canada*, reported, there were "500 delegates ... from 42 countries ... the widest representation yet encountered at a meeting held under the aegis of the International Theatre Institute. [It was] extremely interesting ... fruitful ... and intellectually nourishing" (1967b, p. 5-6).⁶⁶

1968

After Expo 67 and the success of all of the touring activities of Centennial Year, it became clear that the Federal Government wanted to put cultural activities - and in particular the performing arts - back in small box.
(Hobday, Interview, 2006)

Events under study:

- Canada Council: promoting efficiencies
- Canadian Theatre Centre: seeking improvements to the process of management
- Theatre Passe Muraille: launching the alternative theatre movement
- Secretary of State: increasing government's role in culture

General events in the country:

- Pierre Trudeau becomes Prime Minister, replacing Lester B. Pearson

⁶⁶ In the article Roux gives particular thanks to seminal theatre director and theoretician Jerzy Grotowski from Poland, influential critic Kenneth Tynan from England, playwright and filmmaker Armand Gatti from France, Per Edström of Sweden [also spelled Edstroem in the CTC documentation], actor Enrique Buenaventura of Columbia and "all of the delegates from Africa and Asia" (1967b, pp. 5-6).

- Separatists riot in Montreal on St-Jean-Baptiste Day
- New Divorce Act introduces no-fault divorce

Canada Council: promoting efficiencies

The Centennial celebrations demonstrated that the country was supportive of federal subsidies for culture, and that the revenue from the CC's original Endowment would not provide enough operating capital to sustain desired programming. The CC's *Annual Report 1967-68* announced that the CC's main source of income would, from then on, be from an annual allotment from the Federal Government. For the short term, the CC anticipated no increases. For 1967-69 the federal grant for all of the CC's activities in the cultural and social sciences sectors was \$16,900,000 {\$101,900,000}. With the interest from the Endowment Fund, the total available capital was \$20,500,000 {\$123,600,000}. The anticipated total for the following year was to be \$20,600,000 {\$119,00,000} (p.7). The CC noted the country was showing a "greater social commitment to the arts ... [as] seen by increase in the box office and operating expenditures" (p. 8). Of concern to the CC was that the private sector contribution was not keeping pace with the expansion of the industry. Although in real dollars, private sector support had quadrupled since 1957, the percentage support compared with overall industry expenditures was down from 14% in 1957 to 11%, at the time of the report (p. 10). The *Report* indicated that the "grave concern is...the level of accumulated deficits ...[that] in some cases are alarmingly big." The anxiety was that "if costs were to continue to rise" some organizations faced potential bankruptcy. The CC took the position: "The responsibility to prevent such disasters lies heavily on boards of directors ... " (p. 12). The issue was not confined to Canada. In November of that year, William T. Wylie, then General Manager at Stratford, reported on a trip that he had recently taken to England for the CC. He stated that, in 1966, the British Arts Council had instituted a

three-year program to wipe out accumulated deficits of a large number of organizations. Having agreed to do this they issued instructions to the organizations that they could no longer run in the red and that a balanced budget must be brought forward and maintained.
(1968, p. 1)

In 1970, the CC was able to institute its own deficit retirement program.

In its *Annual Report 1967-68* the CC indicated it was continuing its "substantial grant to the National Theatre School" (p. 28), which in that year was \$189,200 {\$1,140,000} (p. 30). The CC then indicated that through its "Theatre Development Programme" it was providing specific training "for younger people in theatre and company management, publicity and other essential services" (p. 28). This announcement suggests that the CC had ceased looking to the NTS to provide training in the area of administration. James de B. Domville, the General Director of the NTS, relates that the NTS was not able to teach administration, as "we had nowhere near the resources to set up a full curriculum. It was taught to Technical students (Stage and production management) as part of their curriculum, and was only one hour a week" (Correspondence, 2006).

In the *Report* the CC took the position that the cultural sector "must be efficient and must be seen to be efficient" To that end, the CC's "own research staff has recently completed a detailed study of the performing arts in Canada during the 1967-68 season ... [to help provide] the coordination now required in the new phase which our arts have reached" (p.9). From this time onwards, the Research and Evaluation section of the CC issued an increasing number of reports. John Hobday relates that André Fortier fostered the Council's ability to undertake research and analysis to provide the tools to substantiate to Parliament the value of the investment of the new Parliamentary

appropriation which had been introduced to supplement the earnings from the Council's original endowment funds (Interview, 2006).

The *Report* also noted the inception of Coordinate Arts Service (CAS) (pp. 11-12) as a successful manifestation of the CC's exhortations for 'shared resources'. In collaboration with the OAC, the CC had brokered a partnership between the Stratford Festival, Theatre Toronto,⁶⁷ the National Ballet Guild (National Ballet of Canada (NBC)), the Canadian Opera Company (COC), and the Toronto Symphony (pp. 11-12). Pam Ouzounian, the NBC's Executive Assistant and Board Secretary relates:

Coordinated Arts Services was originally established ... to provide joint services to a number of arts organizations One of its main functions was ticketing for the Toronto Symphony prior to its move to Roy Thomson Hall. CAS also was the mechanism for an employee pension plan in force for a number of arts organizations which permitted the plan to have a degree of flexibility. The thought was that staff moving from one arts organization to another would have one consistent pension plan throughout their careers.⁶⁸
(Correspondence, 2007)

Tom Hendry reported in the June 1968 *The Stage in Canada* that the OAC had provided CAS \$50,000 {\$301,000} for CAS' "first year budget." In his opinion it was a good complement to the CTC's audience development program with Danny Newman. He voiced hope for "similar collective endeavours in ... Montreal, ... the Atlantic provinces... and the four Western Provinces" (p. 5-6). In the long term, CAS was not able to fulfill its mandate. Ouzounian indicates: "By 1987, CAS had ceased to provide any services and many of the organizations had withdrawn" (Correspondence, 2007).

⁶⁷ Theatre Toronto was a short-lived amalgamation of the Crest and the Canadian Players (Carson, 1989, pp. 551-552)

⁶⁸ Steve Chadwick of the NBC relates that, from approximately 1967/68 to 1973, functioning under CAS, the COC scenic shop built scenery for its own shows and those of the NBC, and Toronto Arts Productions (Correspondence, 2007).

Canadian Theatre Centre: seeking improvements to the process of management

Through 1968, Tom Hendry wrote a series of articles in *The Stage in Canada* addressing what he perceived were the critical issues facing the performing arts community at the time.

In January, he identified that “one of the most dangerous positions is that of a senior executive in a performing arts organization. ... [T]hat of 18 theatre, opera and dance groups...only six ended 1967 with the same senior management with whom they had begun the year.” He went on to indicate that there was “little unemployment among senior administrative personnel ... [and that] changes take on the quality of musical chairs.” In his opinion, there was going to be an increasing need for administrative personnel both in “regional arts councils... and producing bodies”. He suggested that it was time not to recognize successful managers by “what they used to do...act ... [or] direct” but rather to recognize “their calling for what it is – a highly specialized professional situation”. He conjectured that the creation of a professional body speaking through an “Institute of Performing Arts Management ... could begin to bring some order to this frequently saddening scene” (1968a p. 4-5).

In the March/April and May issues, Hendry editorialized on the dilemma of the need for the responsible accumulation and expenditure of not-for-profit capital for culture, versus the need for risk capital to expand the horizons. In the first editorial, he sought to dispel the prevailing myth that “if only the performing arts can become more efficient in their fundraising efforts, assistance from the private sector of our society can be multiplied many times over.” He identified that “the experience of arts fundraisers ... is simply to keep levels as high as they are”, and observed that as society “is abandoning non-profit-making areas of activity to government ... that the arts in isolation

cannot reverse [the] trend." He argued that the CBC, Air Canada, and the Department of External Affairs are not expected to fundraise, as: "Canada as a society, will happily support an efficient Air Canada, an informative, entertaining C.B.C., a well-run, truly representative Department of External Affairs." In his opinion "the energy devoted to fund-raising is out of all proportion to the hoped-for results" and would be better spent "in the areas of production and audience development." He decried the "hit-or-miss system of assembling boards of directors" of Canadian organizations and called for a mechanism to "establish bonds of responsibility between arts manifestations and society in general rather than between very tiny fractions of society." Hendry stressed the importance of "the private donor, particularly in the formative years of any organizations" but felt that "progress can only be based upon increasing commitments from governments and their agencies (1968b, pp. 4-5).

In the second editorial Hendry suggested that, "... as private giving to the arts is down ... the arts must look increasingly to public subsidy for financial stability." He then argued that the evolution of responsible public subsidy in Canada was creating an "artistic Establishment ... [that] is self-perpetuating." Finally, he asked: "If this general proposition is correct, then a serious gap becomes immediately evident in Canadian artistic development. ...[O]nce subsidizing bodies are behaving – correctly – in a more-or-less conservative manner regarding policies, who will provide (for a set of activities notable for their high costs) the risk capital for necessary and frequently revolutionary innovation?" (1968c, pp. 4-5).

In the August/September 1968 issue of *The Stage in Canada*, Hendry commented on the efficacy of the CC's Management in-Training Scheme. Over the recent "four years", the Scheme had received "two hundred applications" and each year

had placed an average of three acceptable candidates, not all of who had continued in the industry. Hendry identified that from the perspective of the business community, this was a reasonable outcome. His concern was that the Scheme did not foster management positions other than senior ones. Hendry identified a number of factors: the paucity of salaries for assistants, rigidities in the Scheme's model,⁶⁹ and the Scheme's orientation that promoted candidates who viewed themselves as "managers in training, rather than trainees who *may* become managers." He expressed concern about "training courses in Universities" as the education would be "in isolation from the actual work" and that "general managers like actors, directors, writers, and designers are born, not made." Despite these criticisms, Hendry felt that overall, the Scheme was "a modest, practical answer to a portion of future needs" (1968e, p. 4-5). [Hendry's observation about University training stemmed from the initiative (then in gestation at Toronto's York University) that was developing what would be the first arts administration program in the country.]

Theatre Passe Muraille: launching the alternative theatre movement

The alternative theatre rushes [in] where the commercial theatre fears to tread. The alternative theatre continues a ceaseless flirtation with chaos and ruin. The alternative theatre carries hope for the future.
(Kareda, 1972, p. 3)

The Alternative Theatre Movement can be seen as answering Tom Hendry's call for the risk capital – both human and monetary – necessary for innovation. The 1968 founding of Theatre Passe Muraille (TPM), as part of the programming at Toronto's radical Rochdale College, marked what is generally considered a defining event of the

⁶⁹ Hendry suggested that one fault in the model of the Scheme was that the companies did not have complete control "in the choice of trainees", and that the company and the trainee were not able to mutually chose the best time for the training period "rather than on a single specified date, as is presently the case" (1968e, p. 5).

Movement. Theatre historian Alan Filewod has written that the “impact of the [Alternative Theatres] can be felt in every aspect of Canadian theatre: in new forms of drama, in new approaches to design and directing, in new critical perspectives ... and perhaps most importantly in new styles of acting” (1989, pp. 19-20). For this study, the founding of TPM is used as a point of demarcation not as the definitive start. Similar to the diversity of events in the late 1940s and the 1950s, TPM’s emergence was not in isolation. While Denis Johnston, in his 1991 *Up the Mainstream: The Rise of Toronto’s Alternative Theatres*, takes the position that the “small group of small theatre companies in Toronto, completely changed the way Canadians thought about their theatre” (p.3), he also argues that George Luscombe’s 1959 Workshop Productions, later Toronto Workshop Productions (TWP) was the true inception of alternative theatre in Toronto (p. 18). Renata Usmiani’s *Second Stage: the Alternative Theatre Movement in Canada* includes John Juliani’s 1966 company *Savage God* that: “Like Passe Muraille ... began under the auspices of an avante-garde educational institution ... [Vancouver’s] Simon Fraser University” (p. 74). Ross Stuart’s 1984 *The History of Prairie Theatre: the Development of theatre in Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan 1833-1982* indicates that, also in 1968, “some dissatisfied University of Saskatchewan drama students” established Theatre Project (p. 203). What distinguishes TPM, from many of the other theatre companies of that era, is that it still continues today in the 21st century.

Secretary of State: increasing government’s role in culture

The overarching policy event of 1968 occurred in Montreal when “on October 28, 1968 Secretary of State [Gérard] Pelletier” made a speech to the Montreal Board of Trade noting “that the Secretary of State is in fact, the federal Minister of Cultural Affaires ... and that the governments intended ... to co-ordinate ... [cultural] activities

through a veritable cultural policy” (Schafer, Fortier, 1989, p. 25). For the rest of the period under study, this policy resulted in increased federal funds for culture, provided largely through the CC, and an increase in the federal bureaucracy’s investigation of culture’s impact on the society and its economy.

1969

Events under study:

- Canada Council: dealing with the freeze in funding; awarding of study grants
- Canadian Theatre Centre: assessing the landscape of provincial support for culture, gaining a new Executive Director
- Ontario Arts Council and the Canada Council: publishing the ground-breaking Ontario Theatre Study Report
- National Arts Centre: creating a national institution

The events of ancillary interest are:

- FLQ terrorists bomb the Montreal Stock Exchange
- The Official Languages Act makes French and English equal throughout the Canadian government

Canada Council: dealing with the funding freeze; awarding of study grants

In 1968, the CC signaled that for the 1968-69 season, there was to be no increase to its own allotment from the federal government. In the *Annual Report 1968-69*, the CC posited that the issue was essentially about “a marriage of the arts and politics” and that CC was “the servant of two masters” – the artist and Parliament – both of whom “go through the fine print with their particular toothcomb” (p. 7). The *Report* underscored that the cultural community was part of the CC’s decision-making process through the Advisory Arts Panel and the Review Committees, which juried the individual grants. The CC argued it was “perhaps the only organization of its kind in the world to offer its clients [such a] special service which is much admired abroad” (pp. 7-8). The report recognized the “paradox ... [that] the most admired achievements may have the most uncertain financial underpinnings” but suggested that with the advent of increasing

public subsidy some organizations were giving "less attention to possible new sources of revenue." The CC indicated that it comprehended that the "income gap" was an ongoing issue, but, in a statement unique for its type during this period, the CC cautioned that "organizations' admirable energy and talent have exceeded the expectations they and the unions may have had of [the available] wealth" (pp. 10-11).⁷⁰ Despite the chastisements, the CC concluded:

But arts organizations across the country have done so much, and have done it so well and with such dispatch, that we assess the conquest of instability not to be beyond their eventual grasp.
(p. 11).⁷¹

In 1969, David Peacock, Chairman of the Directorate at NTS, wrote two reports, one preliminary and one final, *Concerning the Awarding of Study Grants in Theatre to Canadian Applicants*.⁷² His preamble framing the preliminary report stated:

With the increasing difficulty in obtaining funds coupled with the ever increasing number of requests for aid, it seems to me to become vitally important that we ensure the monies given be used as efficiently and as effectively as possible.
(1969a, p. 1)

⁷⁰ The study's research found two 1969 internal memos from André Fortier to Peter Dwyer some months after the statement in the *Annual Report 1967-68*. At a July meeting of the managers of orchestras in Jasper, Fortier reported that an "Alan Wood was very clear; the unions will ask for increases much higher than what could be reasonably expected"; Fortier believed, "we should not encourage the organizations to yield" (Fortier, 1969a, pp. 1-2). On September 15, 1969, Fortier suggested that the CC should "not ... send formal written warnings to the orchestras" as any policy of static or negative growth in grants "could be justified only if we believe that the two major symphonies [then in negotiation] are not national artistic assets of top quality" (Fortier, 1969b).

⁷¹ Earlier, in the September 1968 issue of *The Stage in Canada*, in an article entitled *Consequences of the Freeze*, Tom Hendry had taken a different tack to the same issue. In his opinion, the arts were faring well, as other federal programs were facing a "reduction in annual available funds." His concern was that since in the economy at large "a very much unfrozen inflation is affecting the cost of all the goods and services the theatre must have in order to exist", the 'freeze' was tantamount to a having a "cutback ... equal to the inflation." He postulated this would lead to "super-conservatism in ... repertoire", a bypassing in the "production of Canadian plays", a reduction in programming for youth leading to a loss in "long-term audience" (p. 4-5).

⁷² In the October 1968 *Stage in Canada*, Tom Hendry reported that "enquiries from young people wishing to enter the profession seem to be on the upswing" (1968f).

It contained his suggestions on how to structure applicant criteria with appropriate experiences abroad, based on his knowledge of what was available in England and the Continent. The second portion (or rather what was available in the CC's funds at LAC) consisted of the report of his subsequent visit across the Atlantic, and the strengths and the pitfalls of organizations potentially receptive to participating in the program. The report recommended that there be a series of checks and balances to ensure good use of the monies. Peacock's conclusions stressed that it was vital that any recipient should be diligent and appreciative, and that the CC should follow the process so that "the bursaries would then become far more desirable on the one hand, and far more greatly valued by the holders on the other" (1969b, p. 54).⁷³

Canadian Theatre Centre: assessing the landscape of provincial support for culture, gaining a new Executive Director:

In the January 1969 edition of *The Stage in Canada*, Tom Hendry connected the expansion of provincial support for the arts with a federal economic initiative then in progress in the Atlantic Provinces. He reported: "The rapid expansion of the activities of the Canada Council has been paralleled by, and to some extent provoked by an equally rapid augmentation of provincial activity." He listed the "remarkable growth of the Quebec Department of Cultural Affairs, ... the Ontario Council for the Arts, ... the Alberta Cultural Development Branch ... [with a] budget of 1.5 million {\$8,976,000}, ... the BC Centennial Cultural Fund ... beginning with a guaranteed annual income of three hundred thousand dollars {\$1,795,000}, ... despite economic difficulties, Nova Scotia[s] ... astonishing commitment to the arts, [professional theatrical activity] in Prince Edward

⁷³ His proposals can be seen as a counter to then 'urban myth' in the performing arts community that one could get 'holidays in Europe' on the CC's tab.

Island, New Brunswick, and Newfoundland, [and imminent] enabling legislation [for] a provincial arts council ... [in] Manitoba." Hendry suggested that the previous, "essentially negative", keeping up with the "federal Joneses" was being replaced with a "very positive desire to search out and serve the needs of society on a regional and sub-regional basis." His exposition was in support of his argument that culture should become an integral part of the developing programs of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, targeted for Atlantic Canada. In his opinion, it was vital that policy initiatives of economic development should include cultural components "at the point when the patterns are being formed, not when they are fixed and rigid" (1969a, pp. 4-6).

In the July edition of *The Stage in Canada* Tom Hendry indicated that he was leaving his position as Secretary General of the CTC. His advice for the future was that as "governmental preoccupations change" the performing arts community would need to develop its own "professional brains and expertise within professional instruments, like the Centre, against the day when government ... goes looking for other worlds to assist" (1969b, p. 4). In August 1969, Hendry's replacement Gilles Rochette reported in *The Stage in Canada* that he was in the midst of a national tour "to get acquainted with the people and to learn to know their needs and ask for advice" (1969, p. 4).

Ontario Arts Council and the Canada Council: publishing the ground-breaking *Ontario Theatre Study Report*

In 1969, the OAC, in conjunction with the CC, published *The Awkward Stage: the Ontario Theatre Study Report*. Paul Schafer relates that the report was an innovative and holistic look at the business of not-for-profit theatre.⁷⁴ His observation is that it

⁷⁴ Attesting to its perceived value beyond its intended audience, the *Study*, through the internet, is to be found in almost every university library across the country, including francophone ones, and

stemmed from the CC's 1964 decision to suspend grants to Toronto's Crest Theatre, at that time perceived as that city's only major civic theatre. The Crest's ongoing financial difficulties were an issue of great concern to the Board of the OAC, composed largely of businessmen supportive of culture. At that time, Schafer was working for the OAC as a cultural economist and was part of the core team that shaped the scope of the report. Schafer notes the report was initiated shortly after Baumol and Bowen published their findings on the 'income gap' and that the 'gap' framed much of the report's context (Interview, 2005). In the December 1969 *Stage in Canada*, John Evans noted the report's publication, the performing community's extensive contribution to it,⁷⁵ and that the "study lasted two years and cost \$100,000 {\$598,000}" (pp. 4-5). Others participating in the study were Paul Schafer of the OAC, and Brian Dixon and James Gillies of York University (Ontario Arts Council, 1969, p. viii).

The report was a detailed analysis of all of the socio-economic, management, infrastructure, community, and educational issues affecting the place of not-for-profit theatre in Ontario at the time. It targeted its eight-six recommendations to civic, provincial, educational, federal, and business institutions, and architects, and the boards of governors of theatres (pp. 197-206). The introduction to the recommendations states:

All recommendations having to do with the economic aspects of the theatre, in particular those related to funding and grants of various kinds, must be read with the following in mind: an annual increase of from 8 per cent to 10 per cent is required to sustain existing levels of artistic activity and excellence in the face of inflationary pressures, and *additional* funds are required if new programs are to

in the libraries of UCLA, Yale, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and Carnegie Mellon, in Pittsburg Pennsylvania.

⁷⁵ "The Planning Committee included members from Actors' Equity Association, the Dominion Drama Festival, the Canadian Players and the Crest Theatre, the National Arts Centre, the St. Lawrence Centre for the Arts, the Canadian Theater Centre, the Stratford Shakespearean Festival, the Shaw Festival, the National Theatre School, the Canada Council and the Ontario Arts Council" (Evans, 1969, pp. 4-5).

be developed, standards raised, and the recommendations of this Study implemented.
(p. 196)

Of particular interest to this study, recommendation forty-six was addressed to universities and colleges: "Encourage training in the administrative and business aspects of arts activities, through co-operation between appropriate faculties and cultural agencies" (pp. 202-203). This statement was a reflection of a process that was already underway at York University.

National Arts Centre: creating a national institution

1969 saw the opening of the National Arts Centre (NAC) located in Ottawa. Initially started as a regional project, in 1966, the NAC became a national institution, legally mandated to "assist the Canada Council for the Arts in the development of the performing arts elsewhere in Canada" (Canada, 1985, Section 9). The performing arts community had been very active in shaping aspects of the design and the planned programming. A feature article in *The Stage in Canada* reported that in July 1967, Prime Minister Pearson stated: "In planning this Centre ... the federal government sought the most expert advice in the country. We did more – we took it" (1968, p. 16).⁷⁶

The value of the NAC to the development of Canadian theatre has been debated as its fortunes have waxed and waned through successive artistic and management regimes.⁷⁷ Of interest to this study, in 1973, the NAC became a player in the creation of

⁷⁶ *The Stage in Canada* relates "the theatre committee advised that the theatre be reduced in size from 1100 seats to about 900" (1968, p. 16), and the theatre now holds 879 seats.

⁷⁷ James Noonan, writing in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre* observes: "The NAC has been only moderately successful in carrying out its mandate for theatre, partly because of the lack of a consistent policy, and partly because of a decrease in the government funding in the 1980s" (1989, p. 363). However, on February 19, 2007, the *Globe and Mail* reported: "Peter Herrndorf's contract as President and CEO of the National Arts Centre has been extended until

the CC's Touring Office, and through its personnel and capital resources it helped to incubate the 1976 establishment of the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres (PACT).

Conclusion: 1955, 1958 to 1969

From 1955 to 1969, The Community, in partnership with the CC's expanding programs of support, brought economic and organizational stability to an enterprise where little had previously existed. The advocacy of the performing arts community likely contributed to the federal government's decision to provide annual direct support to the CC, allowing the CC to increase its programs. The CEC of AEA brought a measure of protection for actors and the CTC became the NSO for the performing arts in general, and for The Community in particular. The training of administrators for theatres was identified as being a critical necessity.

July 31, 2009, the organization announced over the weekend. Herrndorf took over the job in September, 1999 with the agenda of expanding its focus on youth and educational development in the arts while increasing its national scope" (p. R.2). And on March 27, 2007, Globe and Mail reporter Kamal Al-Solayee reported that the NAC announced that it had an accumulated surplus of "\$404,000" (p. R.2).

Chapter 2: 1970 to 1979

[There] were hopeful signs that after many years of building and equipping theatres throughout Canada, and of training artistic and technical personnel, that now in the seventies would [sic] finally be possible to pay attention to what was to go into these theatres. It is the plays we produce for ourselves that will be the real justification for the great investment of time and money that has gone into our theatres.

(Report on a Playwrights Conference Niagara-on-the-Lake, 1971, p. 10)

1970

Events under study:

- Canada Council: advocating for tax relief for the cultural industry, stagnating revenues, continuing support for the NTS, making difficult choices due to austerity
- Canadian Theatre Centre: collapsing under its own weight
- Managers of Producing Theatre Companies: launching an initiative that becomes League of Canadian Theatres
- Canadian Banks: refusing to allow future grants as collateral on loans

General events in the country:

- The October crisis and the War Measures Act
- The Royal Commission on the Status of Women

Canada Council: advocating for tax relief for the cultural industry, stagnating revenues, continuing support for the NTS; making difficult choices due to austerity

In 1970, the CC engaged in larger policy development concerning taxation.

Closer to home, it was forced to reduce programming, due to stagnation in the growth of its revenue.

In its 13th *Annual Report 1969-1970*, the CC reported that it was participating in the federal consultations on a White Paper on Taxation. The CC indicated that it had submitted for a "second time" to the federal and provincial governments, a December 1968 brief based on "a study ... [made] in consultation with the community of artists" (p. 58). The CC's main position was that "artists should be allowed the same latitude [as]

farmers and fishermen” for issues such as income averaging.⁷⁸ The CC also recommended, “that wage earners be allowed full deduction from employment earnings of their actual professional expenses, [as the CC] considers that the proposed limit of \$150 {\$827} is too restrictive” (p. 58).⁷⁹ The CC’s original submission, the 1968 *Taxation and the arts: a brief*, additionally addressed the issue of the federal manufacturing tax as it was applied to theatres (1968b, pp.18-19).

The CC’s *Annual Report 1969-70* praised the ongoing work of the NTS in developing actors, designers and technicians who were being “absorbed into the profession” but indicated that the School has “faced many money problems since its beginning, and even [the CC’s] substantial annual grant has not been sufficient to guarantee financial stability” (p. 69).⁸⁰ The CC’s *Report* noted that provinces other than Ontario and Quebec were giving “modest support” to the School (p. 69). As a measure of the continued centrality of the NTS to the CC’s funding policy, in that year, the CC’s grant to the NTS was \$291,164 {\$1,605,000} exceeded only by TNM’s at \$325,000 {\$\$1,792,000} and Stratford’s at \$475,000 {\$2,481,000}.

⁷⁸ William E. Shrank’s article in the Spring 1998 edition of *Journal of Canadian Studies* indicates that in April 1957 fishermen entered the unemployment insurance system: “... the goal of the advocates of fishermen’s unemployment insurance was to supplement fishermen’s low incomes. [The advocates’] goal never had anything to do with unemployment insurance. ... Since ‘income supplementation’ is a euphemism for a form of subsidy, and given the importance of the United States market to Canada’s fisheries, and the American propensity to invoke countervailing tariffs in the face of foreign subsidies, Canada could not admit that income supplementation was the goal. Some device was necessary to conceal the subsidy. Unemployment insurance ultimately proved to be the only device that could both provide the income supplement and conceal its nature” (p. 79-80).

⁷⁹ These themes reappear in the 1978 *Federal Tax Issues of Concern to the Arts Community in Canada: an Analysis* also known as the *Disney Report*, after its author accountant Russell Disney, who was active in the CCA.

⁸⁰ Betty Lee’s *Love and Whisky* suggests that by 1970 the NTS’ deficit was approximately \$150,000 {\$827,000} (p. 211)

The *Annual Report* also indicated that due to “financial austerity” the CC had suspended the “Theatre Arts Development Program, which was proving to be one of the more useful of the Council’s contributions to the performing arts” and additionally, had not been able to “assist entirely new ventures.” The CC indicated that that choice had been made so it could give “modest support to some important developments which have already been planned” (p. 69).

John Hobday, then Administrative Director at Neptune Theatre relates how the CC’s austerity affected his theatre. He and AD Heinar Piller were working on the planning for the next cycle of plays to follow up on the success of the 1969/70 season that had turned a significant inherited deficit into a surplus of \$101.00. (The situation had been greatly helped by a bail-out grant from Robert Stanfield’s provincial government.) The CC had recently introduced a new formalized grant application form, the introduction of which had meant a complete re-organization of the theatre’s accounting system. Hobday appealed to the CC’s André Fortier to make some accounting expertise available but was told this was not possible and they would have to do the best they could. Pillar, who had training as an accountant, and Hobday made a complete revision of all of the budgeting and accounting practices, which had been in place since the theatre started. However, in spite of their considerable efforts that had increased the audience from 29% to 96% over two years, that had produced a recent modest surplus, and that had converted the accounting system to conform to the CC’s new application process, the CC chose to freeze Neptune’s grant for the coming year. It seemed that the CC needed the funds to prop up the Canadian Opera Company and, as the CC perceived that Neptune seemed to be doing well, additional support was not to

be forthcoming. Hobday relates that on learning this news he went home and cried. (Interview, 2006).

Canadian Theatre Centre: collapsing under its own weight

By 1970, the CTC was facing fundamental difficulties as its working culture changed. The new executive director was having difficulties in adjusting to the position and the organization was facing pressures of maintaining a bilingual organization that were in turn exacerbated by the increasing sovereigntist interests of Quebec's artistic community.

Leon Major, then President of the CTC, in his August 1970 *Report of the President*, indicated that the previous "two years ... have been difficult." He explained that Gilles Rochette, Tom Hendry's replacement as Executive Director, had moved from Montreal to Toronto and that it had been a difficult adjustment. Major cited the rapid changes in Canada and urged that the CTC "must ... see how [it] relates to the 70's. The original concepts and energies ... may not be valid." Major indicated that the CTC was initiating a "committee for the future" but that an obvious major problem was "serving the theatrical profession" and improving communication, considering "the size of this country." While Major was hopeful, as he stepped down at the end of his two-year mandate, he cautioned: "We must be careful that the C.T.C. does not develop into a bureaucracy that perpetuates itself for the sake of itself" (1970, pp. 1-2).

Managers of Producing Theatre Companies: launching an initiative that becomes League of Canadian Theatres

In the winter and fall of 1970, the Managers of Producing Theatre Companies (MPTC) met "to discuss common problems and to help each other resolve same" (1970a, p1). Administrator Gerry Eldred relates that the meeting coalesced out of

individual conversations as “the community was so small that everyone knew everyone” (Interview, 2006). For the next few years the loose arrangement went under various names. Prior to 1976, the most common one was League of Canadian Theatres (LOCT) and, in 1976, it legally became the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres (PACT).⁸¹ At the January 1970 meeting in Vancouver, there were eight attendees⁸² with four regrets. At the November meeting in Winnipeg, the attendance was sixteen⁸³ with fifteen regrets, including some from the francophone community. For both meetings, the Canada Council provided “generous contribution towards traveling costs” (MPTC, 1970a, p. 1).

The following is taken from *Minutes of a Meeting of Managers of Producing Theatre Companies January 18th, 1970, Hotel Vancouver, British Columbia* and *Minutes of a Meeting of Managers of Producing Theatre Companies November 21st and 22nd, 1970, Manitoba Theatre Centre, Winnipeg*. Both act as a case study to provide the context for the economic and allied issues that were of concern to theatre managers at the time.

In the *Minutes* of the first meeting in January, deficits were identified as an “urgent problem.” There was a suggestion that Peter Dwyer of the CC should “speak to boards of directors ... to give them a greater sense of their importance to the

⁸¹ For clarity, LOCT is used in citations until the emergence of PACT. Gerry Eldred relates from his perspective that ‘League of Canadian Theatres’ (LOCT) was a joke on his part, chosen as a parallel to the League of American Theatres. By 1972 he was working for the National Ballet and did not participate in any initiatives in the theatre community until his tenure at Stratford in 1982, he expressed surprise that the name LOCT had been the moniker of the organization until it became PACT (Eldred, Interview, 2006).

⁸² Vancouver Playhouse, Theatre Calgary, The Globe Theatre, Citadel Theatre, Manitoba Theatre Centre, Shaw Festival, Neptune, and Charlottetown (LOCT, 1970a, p. 1)

⁸³ Saidye Bronfman Theatre Centre, Théâtre du Nouveau Monde, NAC, MTC, Vancouver Playhouse, Citadel Theatre, Neptune, Globe Theatre (2), Charlottetown Festival, Theatre New Brunswick, Theatre Calgary (2), Shaw Festival, Lindsay Academy Theatre (LOCT, 1970b, p. 1)

development of theatre nationally,” and that André Fortier should visit each region to address “Boards ... [and] provincial and civic... representatives” (p. 2). Union relations were compared and there was general agreement that “Actors’ Equity was very approachable... and dealt in most cases equally fairly with actors and management” (p. 3). The “Federal sales tax” – imposed on the manufacture of production elements – was discussed, and it was found that some organizations were not even aware of the existence of the tax.⁸⁴ There was an awareness of the CC’s report *Taxation and the Arts* and it was decided to try to enlist the CC’s support in that area (p. 4). Other issues included Workmen’s Compensation, methods of fundraising, ticket prices, amusement tax,⁸⁵ and the development, via Coordinated Arts Services, of a pension vehicle for those in administration.

The assembled group felt that the “function of the Canadian Theatre Centre was not as clear as it might be... [and] that one of the [CTC’s] functions could be exactly what the theatre managers had done themselves ... get [people] together for common discussion. ... Richard Dennison of Theatre Calgary was asked to investigate [with the CTC]... and report back ... ” (p. 6). There was a similar question about the Canadian Conference of the Arts (CCA) “and John Hobday of Neptune Theatre was asked to investigate and report back.” Hobday was also to ask Jean Roberts about the outcome of a rumoured CC conference on the “structure of boards of directors.” In addition: “The

⁸⁴ In March of 1970, John Hobday wrote to the CC’s Marilyn Janes indicating that the annual manufacturing tax paid by theatres per year varied from \$15,000 {\$82,700} at Stratford to \$2000 {\$11,000} at the Vancouver Playhouse (1970). (The construction of scenery, props, and costumes was deemed by the Revenue Canada to be manufacturing. While theatres with tax numbers were exempted from paying tax on raw materials, the tax applied to the final manufactured goods was a net cost.)

⁸⁵ Of the theatres present, only Neptune paid a “10% [amusement tax] on the price of each ticket” (MPTC 1970a, p. 6).

very serious problem of [finding] good staff was brought to the conference. ... Question: – where are we going to find and train good technicians, production and administrative personnel?” (p. 7). On the topic of touring, most felt that “their external growth was affected drastically by trying to hold their budgets in line.” In summary those assembled felt that “The arts organizations have passed into a new era. All ... felt it urgent to meet on a regular basis ...” (p. 8).

The *Minutes* of the November meeting indicated that there was an equally full agenda that consisted of reviewing the activity generated out of the first meeting as well adding a number of new issues. (Outlined below are only the items of direct relevance to this study.)

It was generally agreed that CTC had “strayed from its original function.” Complaints included: “lack of information re actors and technical staff; the magazine [*The Stage in Canada*] is generally two weeks too late and practically has no value whatever; lack of leadership; no development. It was suggested that the CTC could possibly organize Theatre Manager’s Conferences and national auditions.” The meeting was given to understand that the CTC was setting up a “Committee of the Future” and Robert Ellison of the Vancouver Playhouse was asked if he might report to the CTC the gathered “criticisms and suggestions” (p. 2-3). Similarly, the CCA was deemed not effective. Its “large meetings ... were expensive and a waste of money.” It was reported that the CCA had “cut down its board from 200 to 40.” It was felt that the real function of the CCA “was to lobby” Walter Learning of Theatre New Brunswick (TNB), and John Hobday of Neptune were to convey the group’s “feelings” to the CCA (pp. 4-5).⁸⁶

⁸⁶ Hobday, who at the meeting reported his dissatisfaction with the CCA, was, by 1971, the CCA’s first full time National Director (Hobday, Interview, 2006).

Concerning the NTS, the “managers endorsed [the NTS] in principle... but felt that it was essential that the School have a closer relationship with the people it [was] serving” to facilitate the hiring of its graduates. The group was also hoping the NTS could facilitate “national auditions” (p. 7).

In the area of labour relations, concerns were now being expressed about the CEC. It appeared that Equity was granting fewer concessions to allow the hiring of non-member performers. Ken Kramer of the Globe Theatre reported that for his company he “was acting as artistic director and stage manager. Equity had forced him to hire a stage manager which he did not need and could not afford.” It was felt that Equity’s fee schedule and rules were “killing the Theatre financially”, that Equity was not “visiting a theatre and understanding their individual problems”, and that managers meeting with “the Canadian Executive Committee ... were faced with rudeness and incompetence.” Dennis Sweeting, who in 1955 had been Equity Canada’s first paid staffer, was to investigate “in order [to hold] a meeting ... between Actors Equity and all the Theatre Managers in the spring of 1971” (pp.7-8).

Jean Roberts, newly departed from the CC, reported on various recent initiatives of the CC:

The Canada Council most certainly understood the struggles that companies were having with the rather complicated brief forms.⁸⁷ [While realizing the need for] extensive change ... it was decided not to undertake a change until the solution of debt retirement and therefore, the forms [were to] remain the same for at least another year.
(p. 10)

⁸⁷ Further research is required to determine if these are the first grant application forms as recalled by John Hobday or are part of the data collection that was used for the 1973 study *Group of Twenty Nine*.

In the area of relations with Boards, she reported that a manual had been prepared based on industry consultations. The Council's dilemma was that it did not want to be perceived as:

dictating to the voluntary Boards of Directors [and] ... that it was ... impossible to encompass all performing arts organizations. Therefore the Council felt that if it could not come up with something practical, it would be better to say nothing at all.

(p. 12)

(In a follow-up letter to Muriel Sherrin, who had represented the Shaw Festival at the meeting, Peter Dwyer of the CC conveyed that "the manual is in first draft and our difficulties stem from the fact that we are not satisfied that it is quite good enough to deal with an extremely sensitive problem" (1971).) On the topic of taxation, Roberts reported to the meeting that the CC "had written to the Secretary of State two years [prior] ... and had received no reply" (p. 8).

As to the "problem of acquiring good ... administrative personnel" identified at the January meeting the managers were given to understand there was "a movement afoot at York University to go into administration courses ... " (p. 13).

At the end of the meeting, the assembled group "generally agreed that the Managers not form an official organization at this point ... however ... the Managers and Artistic Directors should continue to meet regularly" (p.14). In the summer of 1971, Robert Ellison, administrator of Vancouver's Playhouse Theatre, issued a follow up memorandum to the group, entitled *A formally Constituted Association*. He advocated for continued efforts in communal action and articulated that he perceived that the notion of a "formal" organization had been discarded due to perceived loss of "flexibility" and concerns that it "would scare our Boards of Directors." In the event that the "majority [were] to be in agreement with the setting up of ... an Association" he included, as a

guide, a sample agreement of the American organization the League of Resident Theatres (p. 1). While never formally or legally constituted, *LOCT* became the banner under which many of managers of The Community would operate until 1976.⁸⁸

Canadian Banks: refusing to allow future grants as collateral on loans

On January 12, 1970, a Canadian Press item in the *Toronto Daily Star* reported that banks were "refusing to lend the [Atlantic Symphony Orchestra] the \$40,000 {\$220,000} to pay deficits acquired in the past two years. Further, 'Dr. Richard Goldbloom, symphony committee chairman [said] 'Banks are not prepared even to advance money on assured grants' The orchestra [was to] get the balance of its \$135,000 {\$744,000} Canada Council grant in March" of that year (p. 26). This could be seen as a harbinger of the CC's deficit retirement program that was launched later that year.

1971

Events under study:

- Canada Council: addressing deficit reduction, illuminating dysfunctional governance of arts organizations, responding to rise of Alternative Theatres, hiring David Gardner as new Theatre Officer
- The Larger Theatres, the Playwrights, the Alternative Theatres and their Unencumbered Federal Grants: mandating the production of Canadian plays
- The Larger Theatres: producing safe programming, experiencing fractious relationships between staff professionals and boards
- The Playwrights: meetings to effect change
- The Alternative Theatres: making use of their unencumbered federal grants
- York University: inaugurating its Programme in Arts Administration
- Dominion Bureau of Statistics: starting to track cultural statistics

General events in the country:

- The Canadian Radio-Television Commission introduces Canadian content regulations (60% overall) for public and private TV

⁸⁸ More research is required to see if there was any other activity until 1973-74 when *LOCT* represented the theatres during negotiations for the first Canadian Theatre Agreement with the CEC.

- Canada's first gay rights demonstration, organized by George Hislop, takes place on Parliament Hill.

Canada Council: addressing deficit reduction, illuminating dysfunctional governance of arts organizations, responding to rise of Alternative Theatres, hiring David Gardner as new Theatre Officer

In its 14th *Annual Report 1970-1971*, the CC reported it had launched a program to address the previously identified issue of "perennial ... accumulated deficits ... [through] special grants of about \$350,000 {\$1,883,000} ... [for] a field where excellence and adventurousness in programming do not necessarily guarantee satisfactory box-office revenues." The CC related that this has been done in concert with additional recent support from British Columbia and Nova Scotia, as well as past contributions from Quebec. Ontario was mentioned for its "magnificent" contribution of \$1,120,000 {\$6,025,00}. Note was made that the organizations had themselves raised funds and that "well conceived plans" by some for the coming year point "towards a more stable financial future for the performing arts in Canada" (p.10).⁸⁹

The *Annual Report* also announced the CC had issued the "soberly" titled *Readings on the Governing Boards of Arts Organizations* "only to persons directly connected with the arts organizations in Canada" (p.10). The 1971 report, as issued by the CC's Information Services, cautioned that it was "neither for sale nor for publication" (p. 1). At the 1982 conference celebrating the CC's 25th anniversary, Jean Roberts recounted that she initiated the report, because, in the late 1960s and early 1970s, the "road to theatre seemed to be strewn with the rolling heads of administrators and the blood of artistic directors" (p. 174). The introduction to *Readings* suggested: "Any bias

⁸⁹ Paul Schafer, relates that at the time the CC's Peter Dwyer was adamant that thereafter, in the interests of community survival, theatres were to toe the balanced-budget line. At the time, Schafer felt that Dwyer was being unduly optimistic about the balance between the creative process and economic constraints (Interview, 2005).

there may be comes from the fact that most of the literature on the subject emanates from management rather than governing boards. The readings are meant to stir up discussion rather than to present any ready-made solutions to the organizational problems facing the arts in Canada" (p. 1).

As indicated by its table of contents, the report consisted of reprints from other sources:

- P.3 "The Functioning Board": a document resulting from a meeting at Stanley House, New Richmond, Que., in August, 1969.
 - P. 20 Keynote Address by Peter C. Swann,⁹⁰ Director of the Royal Ontario Museum. Delivered November 27th, 1970 at the Trustees' Seminar: "The Role of the Trustee in the Seventies", sponsored by the Ontario Association of Art Galleries.
 - P. 32 Extract from The Awkward Stage: The Ontario Theatre Study Report pages 7 and 8
 - P. 35 "The Acceptable Few," a memo by Tom Hendry, former Director of the Canadian Theatre Centre.
 - P. 43 Extract from The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects, Rockefeller Panel Report on the future of theatre, dance, music in America, pages 150-160
- (p. 2)

Each contribution provided different approaches to the common theme that there needed to exist partnership and trust between Boards and the professional staffs, so that both could work towards the common goal of creating artistic excellence.

The group that met at Stanley House parsed the "responsibilities and prerogatives" (p.19) through sections entitled: *Underlying Assumptions*, *Organizational Considerations*, and *Operational Considerations*. Peter Swann identified issues of control:

Yes each side has it arrogance. The director thinks he knows the best ... the trustee, who often has been through the fires of business success, may feel he knows best how it should be run.
(1970) p. 22)

⁹⁰ Peter Swan was instrumental in the 1976 founding of Associate of Cultural Executives (ACE).

The extract from *The Awkward Stage* saw the artistic and production creators surrounded by the “structure of boards, managers and publicists.” It identified that, whether an organization was initially started by artists or by arts-oriented citizens, “the real impetus often comes from a single individual.” It warned about the difficulty of triumvirates created “after the departure” of the single individual who had “governed single-handed.” It concluded that “the governing body of a producing organization reaches downward into the ... activity on the operation level, and upward to ... social organizations and to government” and observed that, in its opinion, the connection between the two levels seems to be “most effective when liaison is entrusted to non-voting representatives” (OAC, 1969, pp. 7-8).

Tom Hendry provided “[a] cursory view of the position of the arts boards of directors in Canada” (Hendry, 1971, p. 35). He analyzed the structure of the not-for-profit board in sections entitled *Function of Boards*, *Organizational Continuity*, *Policy*, *Financial Stability*, *Hiring and Firing*, and *The Sounding Board Syndrome*. His conclusions suggested that a chief criticism of the existing construct was “that – despite the provision of public support – the system places ... control firmly in the hands of a very tiny portion of our society.” He identified that a “considerable sum of public money will each year be spent in unswerving satisfaction of the cultural needs of a very tiny segment of society [i.e. the boards themselves]” (p. 39). While he suggested that the “appointment of ten more artists, to the Canada Council itself, would have far reaching [positive] consequences” in his summation he conceded: “There is far too large an investment – in terms of status, privilege and position – in the present board system, to permit its being dropped in favour of some alternative” (p. 39).

The Rockefeller Panel's 1965 *The Performing Arts: Problems and Prospects*

identified:

Whenever performing arts organizations reach the stage of development where permanence is sought, they almost invariably become nonprofit corporations headed by a board of trustees vested with the responsibility of maintaining and expanding the organization.

This board has certain obvious functions: to determine the larger objectives of the organizations, to retain the best available artistic direction and business management, and, having accomplished the latter, to back their judgment when the inevitable conflicts with artists or with elements of the community arise. (p. 150)

The CC chose to end the report *Readings on the Governing Boards of Arts*

Organizations with an observation by the Rockefeller Panel: "If the artistic standards an organization sets for itself do not rise steadily upward, neither will quality, and performance will be doomed to spiritless mediocrity" (p. 160).

Continuing with the CC's *Annual Report 1970-1971*, the CC observed (in contrast to the 1968 concern that union demands were exceeding the "available wealth"):

One of the more curious problems ... is the widespread lack of recognition that [artists] are professionals who are important to society ... there is a tacit acceptance of the situation of artists as an economically depressed minority ... (pp.10-11)

The *Report's* section on theatre identified what it saw as the current state of the theatre market. It reported:

... larger companies [were feeling] pressure from the rise of youthful 'counterculture' on one hand and the continuing tension of economic austerity on the other. Relations between Boards of Directors and their professional staffs were not always smooth, ... there was an unusually high turnover of artistic leadership ... [and] in some cases programs were curtailed or made 'safer' from a box-office point of view (p. 21).

In 1971, David Gardner became the newly appointed Theatre Officer, replacing Jean Roberts. At the 1982 Conference, he explained that Peter Dwyer had instructed

David “to tackle two new main areas – subsidy for the rising alternate theatres and the dilemma of playwriting in Canada” (pp. 174-175). (The successful support of new work had been an ongoing dilemma for the CC and the CC’s lack of sustained success was being underscored by the success of new monies from other federal programs.)

Gardner’s appointment marked an expansion of the staff of the CC’s performing arts section. Monique Michaud, formerly André Fortier’s assistant, took on the new position of Dance Officer (Fortier, Interview, 2007). From this time forward, the Theatre Officer was now responsible for only the theatre community.

The Larger Theatres, the Playwrights, the Alternative Theatres and their Unencumbered Federal Grants: mandating the production of Canadian plays

1971 was the watershed year that eventually led, in 1979, to the CC’s policy that its subsidy grants were conditional on a quota of Canadian content. The signal events of 1971, as detailed in the next three sections, were the larger theatres’ limited production of Canadian plays, the new activism of Canadian playwrights, the support given to the playwrights by the Alternative theatres, and the unexpected availability of federal capital, unencumbered by existing cultural policy, with job creation as the only objective.

The Larger Theatres: producing safe programming, experiencing fractious relationships between staff professionals and boards

By 1971, it was evident that the creation of economically stable regional theatres was no guarantee of the regular production of Canadian plays. As seen in Mark Czarnecki’s analysis in *Canadian Theatre History: Selected Readings*, many theatres settled into a “judicious mix of the three C’s ... classics, [foreign] contemporary”, and one Canadian play, often the “risk” play of the season, with some artistic directors and their Boards, not bothering “with the risk.” Czarnecki argued that this partially stems from the

nature of subscription sales, which he suggests worked best “with a conservative opera audience” who are content in the knowledge that on a particular night each month or so, they will be sitting in ‘their’ seat to be entertained by a completely known quantity. The regimented schedule of subscription “prevents capitalizing on hits, unless a transfer house is available”⁹¹ (1996, pp. 282-3). Douglas B. Buchanan’s 1999 Ph.D “contend[s] that the result of the Canada Council approaches and practices (intentional or not) ... in the area of direct commissions was the neglect of the Canadian dramatist in favour of a repertoire of foreign material” (pp. iii-iv). At some of the larger established theatres, the professionals and the boards were not able to create the required partnerships as articulated in the *Readings on the Governing Boards of Arts Organizations*. Each situation was unique, but typically, tight money, and/or differences between the AD and the Board in the approach to risky Canadian programming, were some of the roots of the issue.

As exemplar, the Vancouver Playhouse experienced four ADs from 1967 to 1973, where, as Malcolm Page reports, money was generally tight and Boards frequently “preferred light entertainment” (1989b, p. 578). Malcolm Black, AD from 1964 to 1967 relates that he had a “good relationship with the board”, was able to mount three new Canadian plays and, with special Centennial funds, was able to commission George Ryga to write the iconic *The Ecstasy of Rita Joe*,⁹² subsequently produced by Black’s successor, Joy Coghill (Interview, 2005). Coghill relates that during her tenure, 1967 to

⁹¹ In 1951, Massey identified that there was lack of suitable inventory of venues for the transfer of successful shows (p. 196) and the 1960s building program for the Centennial did not alleviate the situation.

⁹² Christopher Innes describes *Rita Joe* as a “landmark in modern Canadian theatre.” After its premier in Vancouver, it played in Ottawa, London England, Washington DC, and Edinburgh and was adapted into a popular ballet (1989, p. 190).

1969, she experienced an uneasy relationship with the Board.⁹³ “For instance, at a private luncheon meeting in 1969, called by the outgoing president, the incoming president declared, he ‘would not stand as president if Joy continued as Artistic Director.’ And yet, when I offered my resignation to the board, I was requested to help find and recommend a new Artistic Director.” During a planning session for one particular season, Coghill found that each Board member’s first impulse was to advocate for the play, or type of play, that had first “opened each of them to the experience of theatre,” rather than first look at how to thematically develop the overall content of the season (Interview, 2006). David Gardner, who was AD from 1969 to 1971, relates a “chalk and cheese” relationship with the board. He resigned over the Board’s cancellation of Ryga’s new play *Captives of the Faceless Drummer*. Gardner’s experience was that after a member of the Board read a preliminary draft of the play well in advance of its rehearsal, the board hastily convened a Play Reading Committee that pronounced that the play was in no state of readiness for production. Gardner felt that there was no understanding or sympathy for a process that would likely have refined and improved the play through further rewrites and the production process (Interview, 2005).⁹⁴ Significantly, Michael Dobbin, who was Managing Director during Christopher Newton’s tenure as AD from

⁹³ Coghill continues: “The uneasiness on their part could relate to the fact that I had just produced *Grass and Wild Strawberries* by George Ryga - 120% attendance, a drug scene, a sex scene and live rock by Chilliwack; plus there had been the amusing little curtain raiser *The Filthy Paranesi* (in which two men had kissed) which had caused questions at City Hall the year before” (Interview, 2005).

⁹⁴ Malcolm Page, in his *Change in Theatre in Vancouver* in the Spring 1981 edition of *Theatre History in Canada/Histoire du Théâtre au Canada* suggests that the Board’s decision may have come from other pressures: “A secret deal with the provincial government was rumoured: in return for the money [an emergency grant to help cover a deficit of \$100,000 {\$545,000}], the Playhouse would avoid ‘experimental, vulgar or controversial’ productions. ... The dispute ... about whether the script could be ready in time, ... concealed the argument about possibly dangerous political content” (p. 42).

1973 to 1979, recounts that Newton's interpersonal skills ameliorated (Interview, 2006) "serious financial and community controversies" (Page, 1989, p. 578) arising out of several years of unclear management and what appeared to have been a serious disconnect between the Board and the previous administration (Dobbin, Interview, 2006) during AD Paxton Whitehead's tenure, from 1971 to 1973.⁹⁵

As another example, Gerry Eldred, who as Administrative Director at MTC from 1969 to 1972, experienced three artistic directors in the three-year period. He relates that there the issue was one of lack of communication and not one of financial concerns. In at least one instance, the Board was not listening to the prospective candidate for AD during the interview. The Board was quite astonished when the new AD proceeded to implement the style of programming that he had espoused in the interview (Interview, 2006), that is implement a season deemed less safe by the "nervous Board" (Johnson, 1989, p. 328).

Conversely, at Halifax's Neptune Theatre, John Hobday relates that during his tenure as Administrative Director, he and Heinar Piller, who was Artistic Director from 1968 to 1971, worked hard to develop a good working relationship with their large board. However, in view of the serious financial situation, the essential first step was to survive their first season. The second step was to create a program with wider appeal more

⁹⁵ Dobbin observes: "As companies age and mature, there is one constant that determines their success or failure and that is the way in which the Board and the senior management relate to one another and work together. I believe success in the job of running a theatre in Canada is tied to being willing to commit at least 40% of one's time and energy toward the 'management' and development of the board. It is an ongoing task and one which had, it seemed, seen sporadic stewardship in the years prior to Christopher Newton's engagement. After he was hired, the Board changed, there was new, inspired and supportive leadership in the chair, and all senior managers at the company were encouraged to be part of keeping the Board strong, stimulated, and onside. It was hard work but necessary for success" (Interview, 2006).

tailored to the community's taste. Thirdly, their efforts were directed towards marketing the upcoming season through an enhanced subscription process. Fourthly, assuming that this was a success, turning their attention to the need to help with reform of the board by weeding out and/or replacing those of the sixty-three members who were not actively using their position to bring in the required resources.⁹⁶ They were keenly aware of the low level of donations (Hobday, Interview, 2006).

In the end, Boards had the final responsibility for the financial health of the theatre. They had the authority to determine the programming and during this period their typical choice was the safety of the three C's.⁹⁷

The Playwrights: meeting to effect change

In the summer of 1971, Canadian playwrights met twice to discuss the lack of meaningful production of Canadian plays. Each meeting issued its own report and the material below is a précis of each.

In 1982, David Gardner related that as Theatre Officer in 1971, he "gathered all the hot-heads and the prickly pears from coast to coast, French and English [T]he purpose was to bitch and then construct realistic recommendations for the best theatre in general and the Council in particular, which I would do my best to implement" (Theatre History in Canada/Histoire du Théâtre au Canada, 1982, p. 175). The meetings were held July 19 to 23, 1971, at the CC's conference facility at Stanley House in the Gaspé.

⁹⁶ Hobday further relates that when he broached the subject of easing out a board member who was not attending meetings or contributing, he was faced with the concern of the President that "Mr..X was very useful to us when the theatre was starting, so we can't let him go." Hobday's thoughts to himself were "Is he useful now? I haven't seen him at a board meeting or a performance in two years!" (Interview, 2006).

⁹⁷ Dan MacDonald relates his perception that some audiences were less conservative than the boards. During 1973 his cross-Canada trip to consult with CEC members, he recalls seeing sold out houses at the MTC's 'experimental' Warehouse (Interview, 2006).

The resulting report was entitled *A Strange Enterprise: the Dilemma of the Playwright in Canada. Conclusions and recommendations of a Seminar sponsored by The Canada Council at Stanley House, July 19 to 23, 1971*. The manifesto-styled report argued that there were deleterious effects caused by the lack of production of Canadian plays:

We believe there is no meaningful Canadian theatre except where our playwrights take a major role in it.

That they have not done so to date is a scandal and disgrace.

(p. 1)

Nineteen points of desired policies and initiatives were proposed to remedy the situation. These included programs of funding for direct financial support of playwrights, for translation, for publication, for marketing initiatives, and for production of original Canadian plays. The report called for improvements in copyright legislation, stronger regulation in favour of more Canadian content in television and greater "cooperation with the NFB, the CBC and the Canada Council, to make more extensive use of the Canadian dramatic writer" (p. 6). A key demand was: "That the Canada Council and the other grant giving agencies make it their policy that the theatre in Canada become predominantly Canadian in content." This was to be achieved by the stipulation that "not later than the first of January, 1973, any theatre receiving funds would be required to include fifty percent Canadian content" (p. 2).

The report of the second meeting was entitled *Report on a Playwrights Conference, Niagara-on-the-Lake August 14, 15, 1971*. The report quoted host Brian Doherty's invitation:

I refuse to believe that there is something about Canada and Canadians that makes it impossible for us to develop good playwrights and plays. ...

All we need is a determined, dedicated group who will concentrate their experience and energy on breaking the apparent deadlock.

(p. 1)

There were thirty-seven attendees⁹⁸, and the “meeting was organized independently of ... the [one] at Stanley House ..., but proved to be a valuable opportunity to test some of the proposals of the Gaspé meeting among a different group of writers” (pp. 1-2). The report was a sober second-thought review plus embellishment of the proposals promulgated by the first group. A number of proposals found eventual implementation.

Out of the “the need for the publication of produced plays” (p. 8), in 1971, the playwrights founded the Playwrights Co-op (Johnston, 1989, p. 434) to publish and market Canadian scripts. From the assembled group’s agreement “that [playwrights’] agents are needed”, in 1972 playwright John Palmer and administrator Ralf Zimmerman created Great North Agency, which, by 1975, represented “twenty-two playwrights, directors and actors ... ” (Zimmerman, 1975, p. 125). Out of the group’s call for a “flexible” (p. 8) quota system for the production of Canadian plays, in 1979 the CC announced “a set of theatre policies which assign priority to Canadian plays, Canadian artists, and the employment of Canadians for senior artistic and administrative positions with publicly funded theatres” (22nd *Annual Report 1978-79*, p 15). And the Niagara group’s demand that “proper payment to playwrights [include] ... ten percent of the gross box office receipts” (p. 8) became, in the mid 1980s, the compensation bi-laterally negotiated by the playwrights and the theatres in their first collective contract (Dobbin, Interview, 2006).⁹⁹

⁹⁸ As illustration of the bifurcation of the Anglo and Francophone communities, both communities were at the first meeting as hosted by the CC. The second meeting remarked: “[T]here were not French Canadian Playwrights present, though they had been invited. The meeting noted that they understood why their French-Canadian colleagues were not present inasmuch as their work is closely tied in with where they are, and offered them its encouragement and support” (p.8).

⁹⁹ Dobbin relates that, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, PACT advocated to government the philosophy (as brought in 1964 by Tom Hendry from the Eastern-block countries) that the subsidy

The Alternative Theatres and Their Unencumbered Federal Grants

Starting in 1971, federal employment programs became the unanticipated solution that provided the capital needed to foster the regular production of Canadian plays. In 1968, Tom Hendry writing in *The Stage in Canada* asked: "[W]ho will provide (for a set of activities notable for their high costs) the risk capital for necessary and frequently revolutionary innovation?" (1968c, p. 5). In 1971, the CC's David Gardner was charged with the task of developing "subsidy for the rising alternate theatres" (Gardner 1982, p. 175) and the *Playwrights Conference in Niagara-on-the-Lake* stated: "Once the play has been written [the playwright] needs opportunities to have the work produced" (p. 2). In 1971, two federal employment programs, Opportunities for Youth (OFY) and Local Initiatives Program (LIP),¹⁰⁰ inadvertently provided the desired risk/subsidy capital and opportunity, although neither program was directed specifically to the cultural sector.

¹⁰¹ The capital, unencumbered by existing cultural policy, freed theatre practitioners from the exigencies of financial survival based on programming, and allowed them to follow their ideological and stylistic impulses. Across the country the community of Alternative

for culture was a subsidy for the ticket not for the artists. Dobbin relates that playwright Sharon Pollock, negotiating on behalf of all the playwrights, took the position that subsidy reduced box office income which in turn reduced the amount of playwrights percentage-of-the-box-office income. Therefore Canadian playwrights should receive a minimum 10% of the gross, and not the typical lower percentages found in commercial theatre (Interview, 2006).

¹⁰⁰ LAC's web site provides the following information for OFY and LIP. "The Opportunities for Youth (OFY) program was established in 1971 and was initially administered by the Department of the Secretary of State. ... The intent of the Program was to challenge students' creativity by providing funds to create and manage their own socially relevant employment. ... In 1977, the OFY program was canceled and replaced by the Young Canada Works Program" (LAC web site ArchivaNet *Opportunities for Youth, Biography/Administrative History*).

"The Local Initiatives Program (LIP) was launched in 1971 [by Department of Manpower and Immigration] and survived until 1977, when it was replaced by the Canada Works Program. ... [C]riteria for LIP applications stipulated that eligible projects had to produce previously non-existent facilities and services or utilize untouched resources within the community ... (LAC web site ArchivaNet *Local Initiatives Program, Biography/Administrative History*).

¹⁰¹ Cultural statistician John Gordon suggests that the cultural sector was successful at gaining the grants as it was used to filling out forms (Interview, 2006).

Theatres expanded dramatically. David Guilford's 1981 MA *The Development of Professional Theatre in Vancouver* indicates: "In the first year [1971-1972], fifteen theatre projects were funded by [LIP] at a cost of nearly three hundred thousand dollars {\$1,614,000}" (p 49). Notable in Toronto was Tom Hendry's 1971 inception and 1972 opening of Toronto Free Theatre supported with an initial LIP grant of approximately \$104,000¹⁰² {\$560,000}.¹⁰³

Significant for this study is the cascade of related events. The rapid expansion of professional activity profoundly affected the economic position of the theatre section of the CC.¹⁰⁴ The expansion was a catalyst that led to the CEC's 1976 independence from

¹⁰² The grant was based on 20 person weeks at \$100 {\$517} per person for 52 weeks (Hendry, Interview, 2005)

¹⁰³ Tom Hendry relates that he first learned of the LIP at the playwrights' conference at Niagara-on-the-Lake (Interview, 2005).

¹⁰⁴ At the 1982 conference celebrating the CC's 25th anniversary, David Gardner related:

"My last year [as theatre officer in 1972] was characterized by battles of a different sort: the OFY and LIP grants which in the long run did some marvelous seed work. New groups like Toronto Free Theatre and Tamahnous emerged. But for every successful experiment an extraordinary amount of theatrical money, in my opinion, was also being wasted. They were designed, of course, as 'make-work' projects and assigned on a regional basis. But there were no real merit considerations at all. Theatre was just a good labour-intensive project to submit, but it meant that while I struggled to scrape together a first seven {35} thousand dollars operations grant for Tarragon and eleven {50} thousand dollars in Lennoxville, the Sudbury Little Theatre was given \$90,000 {\$452,000} to mount a single production and they were amateurs. I don't know what they did with the money! Obviously they paid everybody rather well. And suddenly one federal level was being pitted against another and frankly, the Canada Council was being upstaged and to the tune (I did a survey) of nearly 4 {20} million dollars in terms of theatre, equal in fact to the Council's theatre budget. As one wit observed, however, it was a means of getting sustenance to the sparrows without having to go through the horse!

"Finally, near the end of the program, I was allowed to meet the federal officer who gave out the theatre monies and he was a charming young guy with long hair, but he admitted no theatre expertise, and he was a bit startled when I quietly and gently pointed out the inequities that were happening in this so-called democratization process. Of course, the good new groups were worth it, but when they became successful it meant that they appealed to the Council to be sustained. So the Council was served a double whammy.

"However, the federal 'make-work' programs did point out a great Council weakness – the lack of funding available to respond to new initiatives. The growth of companies during my tenure doubled the work load and, with no increase in staff, the toll quite frankly began to tell" (pp. 176-177).

its American parent. That process was a critical component of the first Canadian Theatre Agreement (CTA) that was, in turn, a catalyst for the 1976 inception of PACT. And by 1978, PACT was engaging in advocacy with government. Parallel to these events, in 1971, Toronto's York University officially launched its program for the training arts administrators.

York University: inaugurating its Programme in Arts Administration

In its *Calendar 1971-72*, Toronto's York University's Faculty of Administration listed, for the first time, its Programme in Arts Management and Administration. The calendar reads: "The Programme ... is the first of its type in Canada and one of a very limited number available throughout North America" (p.8).

The genesis of the programme at York came from the personal support of a number of players who actively brought it to fruition: Paul Schafer, who at the time of the report was a cultural economist working for the OAC and head of the Centre for Arts Research in Education; James Gillies who was the Dean of the Faculty of Administrative Studies at York; and Brian Dixon who had a background in theatre. Dixon relates he had previously done research in management training for the CTC and had been successfully hired by Gillies away from McGill University in Montreal, as Dixon "felt that only York had the flexibility to launch [an arts administration] program" (Correspondence, 2006). The other key player was Joe Green of York's Faculty of Fine Arts (*id*). Paul Schafer relates the contribution of the core team and others, but feels that the program would not have been possible without the commitment of James Gillies. Schafer feels that many in the Faculty, and in the larger business community, did not share Gillies' passion for education in administration for government and the NFP sector. His

understanding was that Gillies had to advocate for its inclusion in the Faculty (Interview, 2005). Gilles relates that his interest in arts administration came from his involvement, around 1968, as Board member of Theatre Toronto. His experience was evocative of the issues described in the 1971 *Readings on the Governing Boards of Arts Organizations*, but from the optics of a Board member. He relates he was “horrified” that the theatre professionals did not seem to have a sense of business. At the time he felt that they saw the function of the business members of the Board as only to raise money and not to participate in any other aspect of running the company. Conversely in his experience: “Boards had no difficulty in questioning the theatre administrators. Every Board member seemed to have their own view of the appropriate program to offer and were inclined to try and micro manage and had little compunction about differing with, and firing, administrations.” In his mind, this was not the true partnership that could be beneficial to both parties. Gillies felt that there should be a more productive process and, with this motivation, brought arts management training into his Faculty (Interview, 2005).

The planning and initial inception of the program prior to 1971 included the creation of a committee of interested parties (see appendix A), consultation across the continent, and a series of “short courses for Arts Managers in Marketing, Legal Aspects, and Accounting, attended by a wide range of arts managers from as far away as Chicago. ... [There was also] a conference ... with participation from Harvard, UCLA and Wisconsin – being the universities which had programs in Arts management of some form” (Dixon, 2006). Tom Burrows, who at the time was the General Manager of the Shaw Festival, relates he participated in one of the consultation groups. His preference was that the program be housed in a School or Department of Theatre, and/or

Performing Arts, and/or Visual Arts – not in a School or Department of Business Management. In his proposed model, the home department would determine the curriculum and training, with the cooperation of Departments of Management and/or Law. As example, the Yale Program was, and continues to be, housed in the School of Drama (Interview, 2006). Brian Dixon, Joe Green, Paul Schafer, and James Gillies publicly replied to the industry's concern about the suitability of a university-based program through a feature *Globe and Mail* article by Betty Lee in December 1970, written prior to the fall 1971 official launch. Lee asked Dixon, Green and Schafer their response to the statement: "You can't teach people about the arts in a university. You've got to work in the field." She condensed their reply:

That's what business used to say about university-trained business administrators a quarter century ago. Actually, we agree there are many things about the arts that are un-teachable. Personal sensitivity to the artistic temperament, for example. But this summer, we plan to expose students interested in enrolling in the course to arts organizations across the province. This, we hope, will weed out those who quickly realize they are not psychologically suitable for this kind of job.
(Lee, 1970, p. 7)

In her article, Lee described the program as a "post-graduate academic course leading to a masters degree in business administration (with major concentration in arts management and administration) ... [and that] the program would be lodged under the roof of Administrative Studies but would 'plug into' the academic facilities of the Faculty of Fine Arts" (*Id*). Dixon relates: "I tried to persuade Jules Heller, at the time Dean of Fine Arts at York, that the program should be suspended between Admin. Studies and Fine Arts, but he would not go along with this. Personally, I think it was a mistake and the program would have drawn more students and had a better impact if he had gone along" (Interview, 2006).

Paul Schafer relates that funding for planning and inception came from a number of sources. In 1968, as part of the process of the *Awkward Stage*, the Centre for Arts Research in Education, a department of the OAC, gave a grant of \$5000 to establish a committee to look into setting up an arts administration program somewhere in Ontario. The Canada Council and the Donner Canadian Foundation provided additional start up funding. Shortly after the inception of the program, the Donner Canadian Foundation providing an additional grant of \$40,000 {\$211,000} to undertake research and related activities (Interview, 2005).

Early students of the programme did benefit from the program and did have an impact on the industry. Peter Sever relates he had "no prior interest in the arts." His introduction to the arts was through a summer position (arranged by Paul Schafer) as producer of a touring programme of classical music. After graduation in 1972, he was so engaged by his first experience that he took the position as assistant to Gerry Eldred, who himself had just taken on the position of Administrative Director at the NBC. Sever subsequently founded General Arts Management Inc. a major agency for performing artists (Interview, 2006). Bill Poole, who would also work at the NBC, and John Gordon, who would go to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics (DBS) (Interviews, 2006) indicate that while still students, they did primary research in the OAC's files that was incorporated into Sam Book's *Economic aspects of the arts in Ontario: a study*. They relate that they had prior interest in the arts. Ralph Zimmerman, who was administrating at Factory Theatre Lab while he was still a student at the programme, went on to found Great North Agency (Johnston, 1991, pp. 85-86).

Dominion Bureau of Statistics: starting to track cultural statistics

In the later 1960s, the CC began a process of evaluation and reports and by 1971, government agencies were beginning to recognize the economic impact of the industry. The May 1971 issue of *The Stage in Canada* carried an item that announced:

The Cultural Section of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is beginning a survey of professional drama companies in Canada. It is essentially a preliminary study ... to be published as part of a larger publication involving all of the performing arts. ... A representative of DBS will visit all the companies in the spring.
(p. 12)

John Gordon relates that an impetus for the inception of the Cultural Section of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics (DBS) was a call from Harris Poll, an American organization, which at the time was conducting polling for the State Arts Council of New York. Harris Poll offered to do similar work for DBS. DBS declined and developed its own department in partnership with the SoS and the CC. DBS then began to compile statistics for the CC's annual assessment of its annual operating grants (Interview, 2006). The inception of federal collection of cultural statistics was a significant event in the evolution of the industry, as the data became a useful tool in promoting the economic benefits of culture.

1972

Events under study:

- Canada Council: expanding funding resources, initiating research, hiring David Peacock as Theatre Officer.
- Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association: attempting to develop a consolidated contract
- Canadian Theatre Centre: ending an era

General events in the country:

- Ban on cigarette advertisements on film, radio, and television, goes into effect and those advertising monies move to support of culture and sports
- Heritage Canada is established
- Canada defeats the USSR in the hockey summit

Canada Council: expanding funding resources; initiating research; hiring David Peacock as Theatre Officer.

In its 15th *Annual Report 1971-1972* the CC reported its ability to support expansion of activity, its activities of analysis, and its planning for the addition of a major program: "Many organizations received Council assistance for the first time in 1971-72, and other groups which may have had earlier help for specific projects, were awarded first operating grants".¹⁰⁵ Despite this growth, the "Council continued to worry aloud ... about the financial problems of artists who wish to make a living from the practice of their art." The CC reported it had commissioned the Department of Manpower and Immigration to "survey ... training, employment opportunities and income of performing artists across Canada ... to obtain objective information on ... regional disparities in the arts." The CC's own Research and Analysis Section had initiated *Group of Twenty-Nine*, an analysis of economic information and analysis of "five years of 29 major arts organizations," that was to be published the following year. The CC indicated it had commissioned York University's Program in Arts Administration to study "subsidy patterns for the performing arts in Canada" (p. 10). The *Annual Report* announced a partnership between the SoS and Statistics Canada researching "leisure-time activities," and that Statistics Canada planned "to produce annual statistics on performing arts organizations" (pg. 11). And the CC indicated that "together with the National Arts Centre" it had commissioned a report on the "needs of a national touring service" (pg 10).

Specific to theatre, the expansion of the production of Canadian plays and support for playwrights was a key issue for the CC. As a consequence of "the Gaspé

¹⁰⁵ It would take a year for the LIP capital to make its presence felt. The CC reports it as an issue in its *Annual Report 1972-73*.

Conference ... [and] its recommendation ... that called for government-subsidized theatres to program 50% Canadian content," the CC indicated it had "sent out a questionnaire to the companies it subsidizes asking what Canadian plays they had staged over the years and how they felt about the Gaspé recommendations. While reluctant to impose quotas, the Council formally appealed to the companies to include more Canadian plays in their schedules." The CC reported a "warm response" and that "close to 50%, or about 107 of the 228 plays to be produced 'mainstage' in 1972-73 by Council supported companies will be by Canadian authors. This figure does not include the studio and children's programs of the larger companies, which rely very heavily on Canadian plays." The Alternative Theatres were recognized through Toronto's "Factory Lab Theatre, ... which produced the astonishing total of 44 original works." Amongst others, Factory Lab Theatre received CC grants "for the first time." The CC noted: "In all, 46 theatre organizations received grants during the year, nine more than the year before. We expect the number to grow rapidly as the Council moves to recognize small new experimental groups." The *Report* noted that for playwrights, as much support as possible was being given to individuals through "Awards and Bursaries, Short Term, Project Cost and Travel Grants" as well as eligibility "under [the] writing" category. The CC continued its support of the NTS "for the very high percentage of its graduates who are quickly absorbed into the Canadian" profession. And there was continued support for its Communication Fund to assist "Professional staff of theatre and other performing arts companies ... to [be able to] compare notes with their colleagues in other parts of the country" (p. 21).¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁶ Administrator Paul Eck relates that during his tenure as Administrator at Theatre London, from 1974 to 1981, he found the program immeasurably useful. It allowed him to visit a one theatre a

David Gardner relates that, in 1972, he resigned as Theatre Officer after a gall bladder operation health brought on by the stress of the job, due to a very small staff of only one assistant. Despite his short tenure, Gardner feels that a major accomplishment was his introduction to the CC of twenty-five alternative theatre companies (Interview, 2005). In his place the CC hired David Peacock, who came from the NTS.

Canadian Theatre Centre: ending an era

In a letter dated November 27, 1972, the CTC's Secretary General, Jack Gray informed the membership that on the previous day:

... the decision was taken to wind up the affairs of the CTC and surrender the charter. This is to be completed by May 31, 1973.

This final decision ... comes after several years of work ... to find an effective focus for the work and program of the Centre, a task which the Board felt it had not accomplished when, at the recent Annual Meeting, its proposals for a reorganization of The Centre failed to gain the necessary majority to allow them to be implemented. These proposals, which were circulated to all members in September, called for a major restructuring of the Centre, including the establishment of sections to handle the theatre in French Canada and English Canada.

While the Board felt that The Centre would not longer carry on its program, the decision to wind up the present Centre was not taken in a spirit of pessimism. On the contrary, the Board believes that the growth of the theatre in Canada in the sixteen years since the Centre was founded has brought us to a new situation, which the old structure of the CTC is no longer adequate to deal with. It is far better to honorably retire the CTC, which over the years has made a real contribution, than to further attempt to patch it up, thus leaving the way clear for new groups to develop which will be better equipped to deal with the exciting decades ahead.
(CTC, 1972)

In the spring 1975 edition of the *Canadian Theatre Review*, Don Rubin gave his assessment of the CTC in this period. He reported that "constant bickering between the French and the English-language wings of the organization ..., a lack of trust and good

year across the country to learn how another theatre addressed all of its management and production issues (Interview, 2006).

will on both sides, a philosophical intransigency by the Quebecois, an insistence that all services be offered in both official languages, a doubling of costs as first one office, then two and then a single office was operated, all contributed to the organization's ultimate demise" (p. 4).¹⁰⁷

Canadian Executive Committee of Actor's Equity Association: developing a consolidated contract

In 1972, the CEC was attempting to move from regulation based on American contracts to a regulation based on a consolidated contract. Vernon Chapman's unpublished history of CAEA relates:

At a meeting on March 23, 1972, the Contract Committee submitted its recommendations for such an agreement which would consolidate in one book most of the American agreements being used.

Because the theatres were not organized in any type of federation, it was easy for Equity to tell a producer, if you want to use our members, these are the terms and conditions, although, as has been pointed out, the first Canadian Representatives and the Canadian Advisory Committee members were so concerned not to stultify the growth of the Canadian theatre, that they were extremely flexible in adapting the terms of those books to the conditions confronting individual producers.

(Ch 4, p.18)

It would not be until 1977 that the CAEA and PACT would bilaterally negotiate a contract with unified terms and conditions.

1973

Events under study:

- Canada Council: delineating the economic dilemma, launching the Touring Office

¹⁰⁷ Tom Hendry and Jean-Louis Roux relate their observations. Hendry feels that the mix of personalities played a part (Interview, 2005) while Jean-Louis Roux feels that the CTC was a casualty of the move by Quebec's cultural community away from the ethos of bi-culturalism to the sovereigntist cause (Interview, 2006). While CTC Board's prediction, that other groups would rise to replace it, was prophetic, PACT and CAEA represent the narrower interests of management and labour rather than the pan-industry focus of the CTC. The CTC remains as having been the only truly national NSO for all of Canadian performing arts.

- Canadian Executive Committee: expanding its sense of nationalism, exerting greater control in The Community, relating with government

General events in the country:

- Montreal launches Canada's first lottery to help pay for 1976 Olympics
- OPEC dramatically increases the price of oil
- A Quebec jury refuses to convict therapeutic abortionist Dr. Henry Morgentaler

Canada Council: delineating the economic dilemma, launching the Touring Office

In its 16th *Annual Report 1972-1973* the CC suggested that while there was

demonstrable success in the growth of the performing arts industry, a number of

pressing factors were forcing the need for more monies for its program of subsidies:

Millions of Canadians have purchased tickets ... [and] the opportunities for Canadians of talent to practise the arts are greater than ever before. Everything points in fact to an explosion in public participation in the arts.

A great deal of money will be needed to meet the challenges posed by this growth. The Council will be called on to give much more money, and so will governments at all levels and the private sector.

(p. 12)

As proof of the success and its cost, the CC turned to the findings from its about-to-be-released *Group of Twenty-Nine: Financial and Operational Statistics of Twenty-nine Performing Arts Organizations from 1966 to 1972*.¹⁰⁸ The CC reported that the data for the report had been taken from the "operations of ... 13 theatre companies or festivals and 10 orchestras, as well as 3 opera companies and 3 dance companies, all of which received Council operating grants during the period. ... In the period of the study the total paid attendance increased by 53%" which the CC attributed to "higher levels of quality." The CC's position was that this success at the box office was not

¹⁰⁸ The report's forward states: "In recent times Canadian society seems to have been devoting more and more attention to artistic and cultural matters. Evidence ... can ... be discerned in statistical reports of government and other agencies, allowing us to measure the extent of the changes taking place. ... For instance, we can see ... that during the latter half of the '60s, family expenditures for attendance at plays, concerts and museums rose faster than those for food, clothing or attendance at sports events or movies. Over the same period, government expenditures for recreation and culture increased almost as rapidly as for health and education, and faster than for any other major category" (p. i).

translating to net financial success. The CC reported that while from 1966 to 1972 operating costs doubled “from \$12 {\$76.7} to \$24 {\$123.8} million” and ticket sales increased, the “operating revenues increased by only 88%.” The CC argued that to compensate, funding levels would have to be increased. The data indicated that the CC’s grants had tripled “from \$1.8 {\$11.1} million in 1967 to \$5.4 {27.8} million in 1972. ... Provincial subsidies doubled. ... Municipal grants increased by ... a third, ... [and] private contributions increased by 50%.” But this overall increase had created a less-than-proportionate net support; the CC’s share of operating expenses was only an improvement of “15% to 22%”, ... the provinces remained unchanged at 9%, ... municipal decreased from 6% to 4%, ... [and] private” support dropped from 14% to 10%.” Across the 29 organizations studied, this was leading to an “accumulated total deficit of \$1.1 {\$5.67} million during 1971-72.” The CC stressed this was due to the identified income gap where costs were increasing “faster than operating revenues, ... not to poor management. There simply was not enough money for them to carry out their programs.” The CC speculated that by 1976-77 “operating costs ... could be twice as high This would mean that twice as much would be needed ... in donations and subsidies” (p. 13).

The *Annual Report* then related information from Canada Manpower’s as yet unpublished 1974 *Analysis of Selected Performing Arts Occupations: a study carried out at the request and with the cooperation of the Canada Council in the summer of 1972*. The Manpower report analyzed the data collected of “2,729 responses” to “9,727” questionnaires (p. 83) sent to the performing arts community. The report analyzed

income, years of experience, and training.¹⁰⁹ While the report indicated that “the mean income in 1971 of professional performing artists was \$6500 {\$33,500} which was lower than that of the entire labour force (\$6905) {\$35,607},” it concluded: “Generally, the results are somewhat favourable in terms of artists’ career expectations” (pp. 2-3). In its *Annual Report 1972-73* the CC argued that as the “average income ... was ... well below the national average ... [c]ontinued improvement in the working conditions of professional performing artists is absolutely necessary ... and this will ... cost money” (p. 14). The CC’s own statistics suggested that, “little more than half of the money spent in 1972 was for artistic salaries” (p. 13). The CC reported that the breakdown of \$24 million {\$123.8 million¹¹⁰} total of expenditures for the 29 organizations for the 1971-72 season was:

Artistic salaries	\$12.4 million	{\$63.94 million}
Production salaries	\$2.2 million	{\$11.34 million}
Production material	\$1.4 million	{\$7.22 million}
Venue and related	\$3.3 million	{\$17.01 million}
Publicity and promotion	\$2.2 million	{\$11.33 million}
Administration	\$2.5 million	{\$12.89 million}

(p. 13)

The report noted that the last item, Administration, was “somewhat less than twice the amount spent in 1967, which may help dissipate fantasies of arts administrators arriving at broadloomed offices in chauffeur-driven Bentleys” (p. 13). The *Report* calculated that, based on the rate of increase in the examined four years, for the 1976-77 season “it is reasonable to expect that the operating costs ... could be twice as high ... ” (p 13).

¹⁰⁹ “Professional performing artists in music earned the highest mean incomes (\$7500) {\$38,700} while artists in dance earned the lowest (\$4500) {\$23,200}. ... Male artists earned approximately \$2000 {\$10,300} more than females for all performing specialties. ... [P]erforming artists who have recently trained, generally indicated less difficulty establishing themselves career-wise compared to their counterparts who were trained twenty years ago.” (p. 2).

¹¹⁰ With rounding, the below amounts in 2007 dollars may have a different total.

The *Annual Report* noted: "Canadian plays accounted for close to half of last year's mainstage productions by Council-subsidized theatre companies, a dramatic increase from the year before." While acknowledging that the production of new Canadian plays was "riskier work", the CC cited "the need to provide more generous royalties to playwrights, and to have the time and money to work with them in developing new plays" (p. 14). The *Annual Report* identified the positive effects of the LIP and OFY "make-work programs" that were putting "badly needed money into experimental theatre when funds of the traditional sources of support ... were largely committed." But the CC argued: "Neither O.F.Y nor L.I.P. emphasized artistic quality" and suggested "inexperienced groups were enabled to have a few months of affluence while more experienced companies in the same communities continued to struggle to make ends meet." The CC nevertheless concluded "these make make-work schemes did a great deal of good for the arts in Canada" (p. 15).

The *Annual Report* noted the 1973 inauguration of the Touring Office and suggested that it might help to bolster the "flourishing of a national performing arts community" (p 14).¹¹¹ In 1988, as part of a fifteen-year review of the Touring Office, the Council commissioned *Evaluation Study of the Touring Office of the Canada Council*.¹¹² The report provided an encapsulation of the creation of the Touring Office and the

¹¹¹ The 1973 inception of the Touring Office allowed the community to resurrect a centuries' old model of marketing that had become too expensive. Support of touring had been an early CC policy, but had been abandoned as it became prohibitively expensive to tour quality shows. Historically, theatre toured to increase the market for a company of players or to increase economic return on the investment into a specific show. In the 19th century it was the model used by all North American companies as well as for British ones. Tracey Davis writes in *The economics of the British stage, 1800-1914* "It was through touring, and especially foreign touring [to North America] that [Henry] Irving's business succeeded.... [it] makes an enormous difference in the balance sheet" (pp. 221-222).

¹¹² The Touring office also issued the 1981 *Report on the First Seven Years, 1973 – 1980* by John Crompton.

results of its programmes. What follows is a condensation of relevant portions of its contents.

In its historical review the *Study* related that despite the awakening of interest in the performing arts during the 1967 Centennial, it was:

clear that talent alone could not carry Canada's performing artists ... it was clear that a specific instrument was required to promote and fund tours ...

The Touring office was launched through two studies:

- (i) Proposal regarding the creation of a National Booking Office by David Haber (October, 1971); and
 - (ii) Feasibility Study of a National Booking Office for the Performing Arts by Woods, Gordon, & Co (January, 1972).
- (p. 23)

In the period from 1973/74 to 1977/78, overall expenditures grew from \$591,000 {\$2,534,000} to \$2,995,000 {\$12,840,000} (p. 43). Companies received benefits as subsidy for touring costs, other programs, and information services. The *Study* noted the success of the Showcase Contact "talent show" program as a "valuable marketing device" that provided a forum for performing artists to showcase their wares to local promoters, particularly in smaller centres (p. 34). An Apprenticeship Program was established in 1975 for training "in the fields of tour management and artists' management ... [that] has reaped many returns of filling a noticeable gap ..." (p. 36). The Touring Office also issued publications to deal "with the often complex logistics involved in carrying out a tour" (p. 31). The *Study* reported that between 1973 and 1983 "the growth of touring performances has been limited to *small* artistic organizations (i.e., annual expenditures of less than \$100,000 {\$193,000¹¹³}) ... suggesting that ... larger companies have developed audiences and have established venues at home, therefore, having less of a need (or opportunity) to tour" (p. 30). Most significantly, the *Study*

¹¹³As it is unclear as to which year the \$100,000 refers, 1983 is assumed.

indicated that between 1973/74 and 1979/80, dance experienced the greatest increase in the number of touring performers at 329%, followed by music at 121%, and followed by theatre at 88% (p. 39).

The CC's web site indicates that the Touring Office continued as an independent entity until 1996/97 when its "resources ... [were] integrated into five disciplinary section (*sic.*) - Music, Dance, Theatre, Media Arts and Visual Arts".¹¹⁴ In the 21st century, the *Contact* program continues under the aegis of provincial arts funding bodies.

Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association: expanding its sense of nationalism, exerting greater control in The Community, relating with government

1973 was a significant year in the maturation of the CEC. It marked acceleration in the CEC's drive for independence from its American parent; the CEC won a significant judicial ruling concerning minimum wages; and the CEC's membership chose tax exemption relief over eligibility for Unemployment Insurance.

Constitutionally, the CEC had limited local autonomy, as the AEA in New York had to approve all major decisions. Vernon Chapman's unpublished history of CAEA relates:

...[in] 1973, after a fact finding trip across the country C.E.C. Chair Dan MacDonald reported "the membership would like to see AEA in Canada legally capable of more independent action, while at the same time retaining some connection with New York." He concluded that Equity in Canada "should work toward de facto autonomy for the Canadian wing of AEA."
(Ch 4, p. 3)

Dan MacDonald recalls that the impetus for the trip developed out of discussions amongst the CEC's approximately 1,500 members. On the trip, he was accompanied by another CEC member so that he could not be "accused of leading the process." He had

¹¹⁴ <http://www.canadacouncil.ca/aboutus/history/> accessed 5 August 2007.

a list of 20 questions that addressed the various issues of the day.¹¹⁵ The central themes that emerged were the younger members' wish to "be able to work in and encourage Canadian theatre and playwrights and that the Canadian acting community must be able make its own decisions." MacDonald recalls that the sentiments of the actors working in the burgeoning Alternative Theatres were a significant factor in the decision for the CEC to seek greater autonomy (Interview, 2006).

Chapman's document recounts that, in November 1973, representatives from the CEC, including MacDonald and Canadian Representative Burnard Chadwick, traveled to NYC to sign a Memorandum of Agreement. Its purpose was to grant more autonomy to the CEC in the interests of fiscal and constitutional efficiency. To allay concerns of the free flow of work opportunities, it was agreed that there was to be an open border allowing both Canadian and American actors access to each other's markets (Ch 4, p. 9).

On the domestic front, the CEC was escalating its intervention in situations where it felt that its members were being exploited. In *Up the Mainstream*, Denis Johnston relates that the "dispute" in late 1972 between the CEC and The Factory Theatre Lab "nearly closed the Factory..." (p. 95). There were two conflicting positions: Factory's assertion that it was developing non-traditional programming that did not match the relatively narrow contractual definition of how shows could be rehearsed; and the CEC's demand that Factory honour the minimum wage of \$65 {\$335} per week, as compared with Factory's offer of \$50 {\$256} for the entire project. Dan MacDonald relates that from the CEC's perspective Factory was engaging in kickbacks (Interview,

¹¹⁵ In the interview, MacDonald was not able to recall the specifics of the questions.

2006). Johnston reports that in a press release Factory's artistic director Ken Gass accused the CEC of "stifling the future of Canadian theatre 'through irrelevant, inapplicable rules and bureaucracies.'" The dispute remained "unresolved [and as] Canada Manpower could not allow itself to support an employer which violated collective agreements ... the anticipated LIP grant of \$40,000 {\$206,000} was lost. Administrative salaries at the Factory were stopped as of 20 December 1972, the day Equity's sanctions were imposed ..." (pp. 96-97). Alternatively, Tom Hendry relates that at the inception of Toronto Free Theatre in 1972, he negotiated with the CEC the acceptability of LIP's weekly wage of \$100 {\$515} (Interview, 2005). Johnston argues that the "founding of Toronto Free Theatre, on a fully paid and professional basis, operating within the guidelines of Actors Equity ... heralded a new concern for adequate compensation among young theatre professionals ..." (p. 181).

However, it is in the arena of the dance community that CEC achieved perhaps its greatest gain in this period. On December 14, 1973, the CEC sent a notice to its membership indicating that in the binding arbitration between the CEC and the National Ballet of Canada (NBC), Chief Judge H.T.G. Andrews awarded "a considerable increase in earnings for all the dancers stage manager and assistant stage manager" (CAEA, 1973). Dan MacDonald relates that at the request of the dancers, the CEC had proposed binding arbitration as a preferred mechanism to resolve the wage dispute rather than cripple the NBC with a labour stoppage (Interview, 2006). As part of its defence of its offered salary scale, the NBC, in its October 5, 1973 submission, outlined its overall economic difficulties and summarized its argument as "Our ability to pay ..." (p. 23).

Noting that “[d]ancers are very poorly paid”,¹¹⁶ the Judge ruled in favour of the CEC’s higher salary request and stated, “... this award is not concerned with the source of the funds supporting the art ...” (Andrews, H.T.G., pp. 6-7). In 1974, Burnard Chadwick, the CEC’s Canadian Representative found that the arbitration ruling gained the CEC greater visibility with government.

In 1973, John Turner, the federal Minister of Finance, resolved the longstanding issue of actors’ eligibility with regards to Income Tax Exemption and Unemployment Insurance. Vernon Chapman’s work indicates that government was confused as to whether actors were employees, eligible for Unemployment Insurance, if they could gain employment “for at least thirteen weeks”, or independent contractors, not “eligible for vacation pay” but able to declare deduction expenses for Income Tax. In 1973, Turner “informed the performers’ associations that performing artists could have either Unemployment Insurance or the Income Tax exemptions they were allowed, but not both. ... In a referendum, the members opted for the Income Tax exemption” (Ch. 16, p. 1).

1974

Events under study:

- Canada Council: assessing the value of cultural activity and its public subsidy, seeking to stimulate private sector support for culture, launching the Explorations program
- Canadian Executive Committee of Actors’ Equity Association & League of Canadian Theatres: negotiating the First Canadian Theatre Agreement
- The Canadian Executive Committee of Actors’ Equity Association: advancing advocacy

General events in the country:

- Ralph Steinhauer becomes the first Aboriginal person to be a Canadian Lieutenant Governor when he is appointed to that role in Alberta

¹¹⁶ The Judge quoted “a study conducted for the CC by McKinsey and Company, Inc. Management consultants, dated April, 1973 and entitled ‘Directions for the Dance in Canada’” (Andrews, H.T.G., p. 6).

- Québec legislates French as official language of government and business
- The report of the Le Dain Commission argues marijuana should be decriminalized

Canada Council: assessing the value of cultural activity and its public subsidy, seeking to stimulate private sector support for culture, launching *Explorations* program

In its 17th *Annual Report 1973-74* the CC indicated that it had traveled extensively across the country, was initiating a process to improve corporate support for culture, and had launched *Explorations* program "to reach for new kinds of activity..." (p. 16).

Reflecting on its travels, the CC took the theme: "What good has this continued faith in the arts produced, and what can we expect from it in the future?" (*Id*). In the case of theatre it suggested: "Little theatre companies in the cities enroll the services of local people to create pieces in which neighborhood problems and history are dramatized." Overall, the CC reported: "[It] believes that this constant growth of artistic activity has done much to make a better and more expressive life among Canadians" (p. 17).

In the *Annual Report* the CC advocated for public support for the cultural sector noting that such support was not needed for popular commercial cultural enterprises, such as "rock groups" that can "make it on their own... ." The CC argued that "where arts activities are not self-supporting, [a] 'partnership' ... formula ... of the artists, the paying customers, private donors and governments" was essential to "protect creativity from being forced into ... government formulas ... however ... well meaning" ¹¹⁷ The CC then stressed the importance of "private donors." Its concern was that while "the Federal government has been generous," the CC's "projections ... indicate that by the early

¹¹⁷ André Fortier, the CC's director, was promulgating this theme to all parts of the cultural community. On May 4, 1974, Toronto Star critic William Littler reported that Fortier, in an address to the Association of Canadian Orchestras, stated, "the way of continually larger government subsidies leads to 'state art,' the condition that conjures up cultural dictatorship, or at the very least, less than friendly dictatorship" (p. F3).

1980's *four* times as much subsidy will be required by the arts, an increase that governments of all levels [would] find difficult to meet." By way of amelioration, the CC hoped "for a strong upturn in business support for the arts." Its concern was that estimates revealed "that between 1962 and 1971 business contributions dropped from 16% to 7% of total arts subsidy" (p. 18).

As remedy, the Council reported that it was embarking on an initiative to develop a partnership with the business community to find mechanisms to increase corporate contributions to \$35 million {\$89 million} by 1980 (p. 18). André Fortier, the Director of the CC, relates that the impetus to discuss the pressing issue with the corporate sector grew out of the CC's report *Group of Twenty-Nine* (Interview, 2007). In April 1974, the CC's Information Services published *Business and the Arts, a Backgrounder Paper* "with the assistance and guidance of a group of businessmen who acted as a planning committee ... " (p. 2).¹¹⁸ Fortier relates that with the assistance of the SoS, in June 1974 (CC, 1974, p. 18), the CC convened a meeting in Ottawa of the captains of Canadian industry (Interview, 2007).¹¹⁹ The result was the June 1974 founding of the Canadian Council for Business and the Arts (now the Council for Business and the Arts in Canada (CBAC)) under the chairmanship of Edmond C. Bovey, chair and CEO of Northern and Central Gas Corp Ltd.. As reported in the *Toronto Star*, Mr. Bovey stated that "increasing

¹¹⁸ The report suggested: "Current tax policy gives corporations a good deal of room for artistic support but no direction or priority guidelines, and corporate executives tend to be uncomfortable when forced to make value judgments for the whole society" (p. 7).

¹¹⁹ Fortier relates that his understanding at the time was that the Ottawa airport was congested with a large number of private jets (Interview, 2007).

financing of the arts is a challenge, 'but only if we participate actively in this growth will we be able to share in the general social advantage it will bring'" (1974, p. E20).¹²⁰

The CC's *Annual Report 1973-74* heralded the launch of the *Explorations* program, directed primarily to "new kinds of activity in the arts as well as the humanities and social sciences" (p. 16). While *Explorations* was not a significant direct source of support for the theatre community, various listings of individuals' awards in the CC's Annual Report indicate that some new work for theatre did benefit.

Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association & League of Canadian Theatres: negotiating the First Canadian Theatre Agreement

In 1974, the CEC and LOCT completed the negotiations for the first Canadian Theatre Agreement (CTA). The negotiation centred on two fundamental issues. First, as this was first bilateral negotiation for the first made-in-Canada contract, the CEC was hoping it would eliminate, or at least reduce, the complexity of its various contracts and the culture of contract concessions.¹²¹ Second, while operating under the banner of LOCT, the theatres did not yet have a legally constituted organization representing their collective interests. Both issues contributed to a final agreement that was less than complete.

¹²⁰ For the period under study, it is difficult to assess the ability of the CBAC to meet the CC's desired goal of increased corporate support for the arts. The research found scant material in public archives and the CBAC seemed unreceptive to requests for access to its archives. Tom Hendry relates that in his experience the CBAC has not been forthcoming with published details of its activities (Interview, 2005).

¹²¹ Commencing with the 1955 opening of the Canadian office, the practice of the CAC/CEC was to issue contractual and rate bulletins under the banner *Equity Reserves The Right to Determine The Type And Classification Of Any Company And The Type(s) Of Contract To Be Used By That Company* (Equity, 1970). The workplace was regulated by a panoply of American-based rulebooks including, Special Amateur Production, Weekly Stock, Touring, Repertory, Low-Scale Studio, Summer Theatre, Unit, and "Rules Governing Rule 'A' which dealt with theatrical agents" (Chapman, Unpublished, Ch 1, pp. 16-19).

By 1973, as Michael Dobbin relates, everyone knew that a Canadian contract was coming as a result of the CEC's drive for autonomy. Indeed, one of Dobbin's first duties early in 1974, as the newly minted Managing Director of Vancouver's Playhouse Theatre, was to travel to Toronto to join the LOCT team negotiating on behalf of the theatres (Interview, 2006). Both sides were wary. Vernon Chapman indicates the CEC was concerned about the "weakening of Equity's ability to persuade individual producers to adhere to Equity rules and regulations" and of "negotiating with an organization [LOCT] that did not yet legally exist" (Unpublished, Ch 4 pp. 18-19). Dobbin relates the LOCT team questioned the CEC's level of commitment to negotiate, had concerns about The Community's diversity being homogenized into one entity, and was anxious about subscribing to "something that someone else will not respect" (Interview, 2006). Nevertheless, as Andis Celms related, the underlying issue was that the existing practices did not fit with the needs of the Canadian industry and, as The Community needed a contract negotiated and agreed to by both sides, the negotiations proceeded (Interview, 2005).¹²²

Michael Dobbin as management and Dan MacDonald as labour, both relate that the salient negotiation was the creation of what became known as the *Equity Categories* and issues regarding stage management (Interviews, 2006).

The categories of the first CTA changed the method of calculating CEC members' minimum compensation. Vernon Chapman writes that previously, Equity determined salary rates largely through formulae of X, Y, Z categories calculated on an American commercial theatre seating model that used "receipts at full capacity"

¹²² This information was conveyed in an informal telephone conversation to arrange for a formal interview. Mr. Celms passed away before the interview could be conducted.

(Unpublished, Ch 1, p 9). The theatres' position was that it was inappropriate to calculate salaries based, in part, on public subsidies and private support. The final negotiation created a system of Company Categories delineating ranges of minimum salaries tied to earned box office income, with Category A having the highest of each and Category G having the lowest. The Category calculation was and continues to be:

Based on full potential weekly box office gross. (Calculation: Number of tickets multiplied by the regular selling price, multiplied by the number of performances given in a paying week) less applicable entertainment tax.

(CAEA, PACT, 1977, p. 10)

While Michael Dobbin recalls that Andis Celms, LOCT's negotiating chair, and Burnard Chadwick, the CEC's Canadian Representative, after looking at several possible models, created the Categories as "the best of a bad lot" (Interview, 2006), a CEC document dated July 25, 1972, suggests that the system may have been in gestation prior to the negotiation.¹²³

For the negotiation concerning stage managers, archival documents suggest that The Community was having difficulties adjusting to a bilateral negotiating culture. The details of the following exchanges are an informative case study of the issue. On February 12, 1974, at a regularly scheduled meeting, the CEC discussed whether Stage Manager's rules, which had been in gestation for some time, should be implemented. Canadian Representative Burnard Chadwick advocated for their implementation. When a member of the committee pointed out to him that the CEC was in "a negotiating situation" with LOCT, Mr. Chadwick "remarked that [the CEC] had not reached the

¹²³ The PACT archives contains a single typed page, dated July 25, 1972, issued by Actors' Equity Association, and entitled *CEC Proposed Categories for the New Canadian Contract*, that lists wages for categories A to F. A handwritten note "Mainstage in town" suggests it could have been written by an administrator (1972).

negotiating stage with LOCT.” After considerable discussion, the CEC voted in favour of issuing the rules (CEC, 1974a, pp. 6-8). Providing context, Dan MacDonald relates that at some point in the negotiations with LOCT, LOCT took the position that stage managers were management, not labour, despite Equity’s historical jurisdiction (Interview, 2006). If MacDonald’s recollection is correct, this could have been a subtext of Chadwick’s position with the members of the CEC. On February 25, 1974, Burnard Chadwick, on behalf of the CEC, sent the bulletin *To All Managements Employing Equity Stage Managers* that stated:

I have been directed by the Canadian Executive Committee to distribute once again the Equity Rules Governing Employment of Stage Managers in Canada ... promulgated by the C.E.C in the summer of 1973, and ... the result of some three years’ work

At its meeting on February 12, 1974, the C.E.C. passed a resolution “reaffirming its original decision to implement these rules and in cases where this cannot be done, the managements concerned should apply to the Committee for special consideration.

A copy of these rules should be attached to each individual contract and signed by both parties to the contract.

If there are any areas where some of these rules cannot be implemented or may cause undue hardship or inconvenience, then you are requested to get in touch with us immediately.

(CEC, 1974b)

On March 5, 1974, Andis Celms, on behalf of LOCT, wrote a letter to Chadwick stating, “... LOCT has not at any time refused to consider Stage Management rules as part of this important document.” He then questioned if the CEC’s negotiating committee’s was empowered “to negotiate”, and suggested: “The CEC does not want a Canadian Theatre Rule Book but would rather continue working” under amended American practice. He demanded that “any rules governing the employment [of stage managers] must be included ... as part of the discussion for a new rule book ...” (Celms, 1974a).

Simultaneously, Celms wrote to LOCT members asking each to reply to the CEC in kind "so as to give us a unified voice ..." (Celms, 1974b).

Despite this imbroglio, on August 29, 1974, Celms was able to write to the LOCT membership:

After two years we are nearly there!

...the Negotiating Committee ... has reached an agreement ... on what is expected to become the Canadian Theatre Rule Book. ... The negotiating meetings were conducted in an atmosphere where both sides tried to consider each others (*sic.*) problems and ... the result is a fair and workable agreement.

... there is not enough time to compile and print this lengthy document for distribution [before the October 1 deadline]. It has therefore been [mutually] agreed ... that we would present for ratification ... only the most important clauses ... leaving the remainder ... for ratification at a full LOCT meeting. It was further agreed in the interim period ... all other conditions of employment relating to Equity members would remain the same as in your present agreements. (Celms, 1974c)

LOCT ratified the contract in January 1975 (LOCT, 1975, p. 1). Vernon Chapman

provides the CEC's perspective on the results of the incomplete nature of the contract:

After that the Stock, Repertory and Production Agreements would be phased out, their essential terms and conditions having been included in the CTA along with some new ones. The Studio Production Contract would remain in effect until the CTA had been ratified, when a new Studio Contract would become an addendum to the CTA. Although the major motive behind the creation of an umbrella agreement to which companies collectively adhered was to diminish the negotiations with individual managements, no sooner had the CTA come into effect than the requests began to pour into Equity for concessions to the CTA, because it could not possibly fit all the varied types of theatrical operations nor the myriad different conditions producers across this vast country had to face. It did not cut down on the work load for Equity's staff and actually increased the number of requests for concessions with which the CEC had to deal.¹²⁴

¹²⁴ Dan MacDonald relates: "Although much of the language in the new 'rules' was based on the old American contracts (there were several 'yellow rulebooks'), the CTA now provided only one book of rules and these were written to specifically address the situation pertaining to our Canadian Theatre scene" (Interview, 2006). The research was not able to locate a copy of the rulebook of the first CTA. After the study's period of sourcing primary documents, the Guelph Archives appears to have re-catalogued material. *Canadian Theatre Agreement - constitution*

(Unpublished, Ch 4, p. 20)

The Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association: advancing advocacy

On February 28, 1974, at a regular meeting of the CEC, Burnard Chadwick reported on the events of his recent meetings in Ottawa. There he had met with representatives of the Secretary of State, Manpower and Immigration, the National Arts Centre, and at least one politician. "Chadwick added ... that he was very impressed with one thing, at every turn. That was the prestige and the stature that this Association seems to have. This has grown over the last two years. ... the ballet arbitration seems to have spread far and wide – much beyond our own efforts at public relations." (Equity, 1974b, p. 4-5)

1975

Events under study:

- Canada Council: expressing optimism in the face of double digit inflation, formulating economic arguments for public support of culture
- League of Canadian Theatres: working towards incorporation, addressing ongoing issues of the CTA negotiation
- Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association: initiating penultimate step to independence, grappling with models of governance, increasing interactions with League of Canadian Theatres

General events in the country:

- Federal government introduces wage and price controls to limit inflation
- Sylvia Ostry appointed Canada's first female Deputy Minister
- The beaver becomes an official symbol of Canada

Canada Council: expressing optimism in the face of double digit inflation, formulating economic arguments for public support of culture

The CC's 18th *Annual Report 1974-75* contrasted the "pride and optimism in the achievements of our artists" against the "ravages of double digit inflation" that were

and revisions with miscellaneous correspondence, 1974 XZ1 MS A600000 may now contain a copy. Similarly, portions of the Canadian Actors Equity Association fonds 1954 to 1979 at LAC which at the time were categorized as restricted are now open for research.

creating a difficult economic climate for arts organizations and were restricting "the possibilities for 'catch-up' increases in artists' incomes." This was producing "concern about the future of the arts in our society." The report surmised "it was unlikely that private donations or public subsidies from any level of government have risen at current rates of inflation" (p. 82). Inflation had risen 11% in one year, and since 1971 had risen 35%. LIP grants were drying up and the CC wanted to give money to smaller newer groups "that might otherwise die" (CEC, 1974d, pp. 8-9), so the funding policy for the 1974-75 season was one of "severe restraint on the increases in ... grants to ... larger companies" in favour of smaller, newer ones. The CC saw this as a temporary measure as it was anticipating "a substantial increase in ... funds available to subsidize the performing arts in the 1975-76 season ..." (*Annual Report*, p. 82-83). This optimism was likely based on the federal treasury's February 1975 announcement that the CC's allocation was to be "about \$17.5 {\$68} million a year, up 38 per cent from \$12.7 {\$49.3} million" (*Toronto Star*, 1975, p. E5). This increase by the federal government to the CC's allocation was in stark contrast to the government's decision of a year earlier, as reported in the *Toronto Star*, not to accede to the CC's request for increased funds to meet the "rapidly rising costs" due to inflation (Gray, 1974, p. D6).

Also in its *Annual Report* the CC indicated that it had recently published two reports on cultural economic issues. The first was *An Analysis of Selected Performing Arts Occupations*, which the CC examined in its 1971-72 *Annual Report*. The second was *An Assessment of the Impact of Selected Large Performing Companies upon the Canadian Economy* by Urwick, Currie and Partners, Ltd., Management Consultants. The report analyzed the "aggregate grants" to The Royal Winnipeg Ballet, The Toronto Symphony, and Montreal's TNM and concluded that the grants "do not constitute a net

drain on the public treasuries” because all levels of government taxes and other receipts gained through the organizations’ economic activity “equal or exceed the grants disbursed ...” (p. vi). The report also recognized that, while essentially non-quantifiable, cultural activity could be considered to constitute an economic benefit. The report pointed to literature that suggested that “industry ... welcomes ... the performing arts” as their presence makes it easier to “attract young executives (and their wives) to communities where the arts contribute significantly to the quality of life” (pp 18-19).¹²⁵ The CC’s *Annual Report* related the *Impact* report “is a best seller among arts administrators and we hope it will enjoy an equally wide circulation among legislators” (p. 84).

League of Canadian Theatres: working towards incorporation, addressing ongoing issues of the CTA negotiation

In 1975, LOCT accelerated its process to become a legal entity and its contract sub-committee issued a report to resolve the ongoing negotiations with CEC concerning small theatres and the CTA. The following case study comes from an analysis of letters found mainly in the PACT fonds in the Archival and Special Collections, McLaughlin Library, University of Guelph.

In 1971, after the 1970 meetings of the Theatre Management Association, attendee Robert Ellison, of Vancouver’s Playhouse Theatre, wrote a letter to the group, advocating that the Association should form a legal entity. While he acknowledged that the consensus at the time did not favour the creation of a formal organization, he

¹²⁵ David Leighton, who in the 1970s was President and CEO at Alberta’s Banff Centre, relates that in the 1970s: “Alberta’s Premier Lougheed felt that a strong Cultural focus in Alberta would help shed the province’s image as a “Red Neck” place, and would attract business, academics, researchers and other leaders (e.g. health-care research leaders) to the province, and to work with the province in meeting his (Lougheed’s) goals for the province, which included developing a leadership reputation in health care” (Interview, 2006).

argued: "I think a formal Association is necessary if we are ever going to seriously get on with things like collectively bargaining with Equity" (Ellison, p. 1). His letter included an agreement of proposed objectives, constitutional structure, and (as found on one copy) a map showing proposed regions. Later, in 1973, at least two theatres sent \$50 {\$239} as part of their compliance "with the resolution passed at the Ottawa meeting ... to help defray the cost of preparing ... for negotiations with Actors Equity Association" (Learning, 1973).¹²⁶ The cheques were sent to Secretary Treasurer June Faulkner, General Manager at TWP. The sourced material suggests that activity increased substantially in 1974. In January 1974, LOCT Chairman Muriel Sherrin, of Halifax's Neptune Theatre, wrote to Faulkner asking: "Could you advise me where we are with regards to the legality of LOCT? Who is on the legal sub-committee? How many theatres have we heard from – positively, negatively, or not at all?" (Sherrin, 1974a). While some theatres sent notes indicating their and their Boards' support, in February 1974, Hamilton McClymont of Toronto Arts Productions wrote: "the Board of Directors ... is not prepared to approve the formalization of LOCT ... and will be pleased to reconsider ... when LOCT's objectives and proposed methods of operation are clearly defined" (McClymont, 1974). Also in February, Sherrin wrote that a March meeting had been "postponed" and reported "that the Sub-Committee has gone through the entire Canadian Theatre Agreement with Equity" (Sherrin, 1974b). Also in March, Tom Burrows, General Manager at the Shaw Festival, received a letter from lawyer P. G. Cathcart, of the firm McMillan, Binch in Toronto, that included "a draft application for letters patent ... a draft general bylaw" and Cathcart's comments, including "that the

¹²⁶ The quoted letter is from Theatre New Brunswick. Thomas Bohdanetzky sends a similar letter on behalf of MTC (1973).

name is not available as it is confusing with some other name ... " (Cathcart, 1974, p. 1). In Calgary in September 1975, Natalie Chapman, Administrative Director at Theatre Calgary, wrote the draft minutes for a two day LOCT meeting "west of Toronto for the first time" (LOCT, 1975a, p. 1-1). Issues discussed included the CEC and CTA, theatre in education, the legalization of LOCT, and the charitable status of non-profit organizations. On day two, Burnard Chadwick and Dan MacDonald of the CEC attended a portion of the meeting to answer questions about interpretation and implementation of the CTA, particularly with respect to the Small Theatre category. As a result, the meeting developed two initiatives: a "Committee to negotiate the Small Theatre contract" chaired by Shain Jaffe of Toronto Free Theatre (p. 2-2), and "the 'Pro-Tem Board for the Legalization of LOCT" chaired by Greg Poggi of MTC (p. 2-3). In late December, Poggi sent a package to "Theatre Professionals" consisting of a cover letter, a list of LOCT's 1975-1976 Executive, a membership application, and the Objectives (Poggi, 1974a). As a means of encouraging the organization's growth, Poggi sent packets of the material to June Faulkner in Toronto and Andis Celms in Ottawa "for soliciting memberships" (Poggi, 1974b, 1974c).

At the same time, LOCT's members were addressing issues left unresolved during the negotiations of the first CTA. The following case study outlines portions of the process that led to the resolution of the Small Theatre portion of the CTA, as applied to Alternative Theatres. During the main negotiations, "... the LOCT Negotiating Committee, A. Celms Chairman, maintained the premise of future discussion of amendments to the CTA for studio or small theatre[s] ..." (LOCT, 1975b). LOCT's strategy was to continue the negotiation process, post implementation of the main contract, "to better represent the particular studio needs" (*Id.*). That process was initiated

at LOCT's January 1975 general meeting that ratified the CTA. By the September meeting above, it became apparent that activity was moribund. As a guest at that meeting, Burnard Chadwick of the CEC explained that the CEC had, on its own, drawn up "*Concessions to Category G*"¹²⁷ ... to expedite matters" and that the Concessions were already being used by some theatres (LOCT, 1975a, p. 2-7). At that same meeting, Shain Jaffe became the chair of the committee "to negotiate the Small Theatre Contract" (LOCT 1975b, p. 2). In October 1975, after consultation across the country, LOCT's Sub-Committee on Small Theatres issued a report. It included the background history, the committee's process of consultation, survey questions designed to help LOCT develop an understanding of the issues faced by the Small/Alternative theatres, and a comparison of the CEC's 1969 *Studio Contract* and CEC's newly issued *Concessions to G*. One aspect is worth noting: LOCT's counter proposal to the CEC's *Concessions to Category G* included the key demand: "Equity ... will use as one of its primary criteria actual gross box office receipts" (LOCT, 1975c, Appendix E, p. 1), as opposed to *potential* box office receipts that had already been established in the First CTA. On October 17, 1975, the CEC's Burnard Chadwick wrote that the CEC might take *actual* "into consideration, but [it] cannot be regarded as primary criteria" (1975, p. 1). Dan MacDonald relates that the CEC was reluctant to develop *Concessions to Category G* but that it did so as part of its commitment to supporting the development of new Canadian plays (Interview, 2006).¹²⁸

¹²⁷ Category G was, and today continues as, the category with the lowest box office income and fee range, other than Theatre for Young Audiences.

¹²⁸ It is reasonable to conjecture that subsequent to LOCT's proposal, the CEC did not accept *actual*, as *potential* continues today as the model for calculating all theatres' salary categories.

Canadian Executive Committee of Actors' Equity Association: initiating penultimate step to independence, grappling with models of governance, increasing interactions with League of Canadian Theatres

In 1973, the CEC gained approval in principle from AEA to enter into a process that would lead to independence. In 1975, the CEC and AEA initiated the mechanisms for final implementation. The following material is from Vernon Chapman's unpublished history of CAEA, Chapter 4, *Coming of Age*. At the time, Chapman was Chairman of the CEC and was instrumental in the development of the constitution for the soon to be Canadian Actors' Equity Association (CAEA).

With the CEC's move to independence, a critical issue for its members, and for its parent AEA, was that both memberships be able to maintain the ability to work freely in each other's jurisdiction. The chosen mechanism was to allow the reciprocal purchase of membership cards at a reduced rate. Discipline was to be by the organization of jurisdiction, not by the one of primary membership. On another issue, to establish the clarity of the separation, the CEC purchased from the AEA whatever could be considered as assets for \$1,000 {\$3,600}. In late August 1975, through a referendum, the Canadian membership voted and approved the move to independence "with an overwhelming majority" (p. 11). Actual independence occurred in 1976.

Chapman reports that the consultation process leading to the referendum revealed that those members at a distance from the Toronto office were prone to feeling disenfranchised. The challenge was to find a model that efficiently vested authority in the hands of a highly mobile membership rather than the paid staff.

The Constitutional Review Committee (CRC) concluded that the [committee] system in existence up to February 1974 was more efficient, democratic, and less expensive than the other two systems [*board* and *convention*] suggested, but the CRC continued to examine various ideas for solving the problem of regional representation and the inefficiency of the sub-committee system. Because this was an interim report, the CEC was asked to accept the report but was not asked to act

on any of it at that time. However, in a discussion on the report it was revealed that some members felt apprehension that increased regionalism would be divisive of the Canadian Equity that was yet to be.
(p. 8)

Also in 1975, the CEC began to look to LOCT to try to resolve community issues. In May, CEC's Burnard Chadwick wrote a letter to Jean Roberts, Director of Theatre, National Arts Centre, in which he addressed issues stemming from police censorship of "Theatre Passe Muraille's production of 'I Love You, Baby Blue'" He called on LOCT to join the CEC in advocating "against the kind of censorship in the theatre which we find abhorrent" (Chadwick, 1975a). In June, Chadwick wrote to LOCT Chairman Tom Burrows, General Manager at the Shaw Festival, and explained that "about 2/3 of the managements presently in operation are in arrears" with payments to the actors' "Registered Retirements Savings Plan, which is part of the Canadian Theatre Agreement." Chadwick indicated that while "not all of the ... managements are members of L.O.C.T., ... the majority of them are", and he wanted LOCT to address the issue (Chadwick, 1975b).

1976

Events under study:

- Canada Council: expanding its support in concert with its own expanding resources
- Association of Canadian Theatres: becoming the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, developing its resources
- Professional Association of Canadian Theatre & Canadian Actors' Equity Association: negotiating the Second Canadian Theatre Agreement
- Local Initiative Program: ending

General events in the country:

- Over a million workers stage a one-day strike to protest wage and price controls.
- René Lévesque's Parti Québécois forms a majority government in Québec
- Supreme Court rules provinces cannot censor movies
- The Timbit is introduced and the Eaton's catalogue is discontinued

Canada Council: expanding its support in concert with its own expanding resource

In its 19th Report 1975-76, the CC reported:

... the Council is helping the arts reach more people in more places ...; we wish to show how Canadian artists have put to good use the impressive sum that Parliament put at the Council's disposal during the year in review. We do not pretend that the arts budget of \$30.4 {\$109.4} million came close to enabling the Council to solve all of the financial problems of the arts
(p. 38)

In the case of theatre, the CC had increased the allocation to theatre by 50% from the previous year, or 38%, in constant 1975 dollars (*Id.*) The *Annual Report* related the success of the Touring Office in bringing "big companies to places that usually see small touring groups" (p. 41).

Significantly, the *Report* announced: "A new dimension to the theatre program was added last year when the Council gave grants for the first time to assist the work being done for young audiences by 20 established companies" (*Id.*). In 1978, Linda Gaboriau, who at the time was Theatre Officer for French theatre and Theatre For Young Audiences (TYA) in both languages, wrote *Reevaluation Report on Council's Assistance to Theatre For Young Audiences*. Gaboriau relates that her advocacy for greater support for TYA grew out of her observations that "TYA was a thriving component of the community. TYA was producing multi-disciplinary high quality work based on movement and visual treatments similar to that of Robert Lepage. In my mind, the work was more interesting than what 80% of the mainstream companies were producing at the time" (Interview, 2007). Her 1978 report described the process leading to the CC's 1975-76 decision to specifically fund TYA, reviewed funding to date, advocated the value of TYA, and made recommendations for future policies.

In 1973, Linda Trott, then Assistant Theatre Officer, conducted a comprehensive survey of professional TYA activities in Canada. This survey led to her report entitled Theatre for Young Audiences, which was approved first by the Advisory

Arts Panel and then by Council in December of 1973. On the basis of this report, Council approved in principle that support be granted to professional theatre companies performing for Young Audiences, as soon as funds became available.

In the 1975/76 season, the Theatre Section was at last in a financial position to grant "developmental" monies to TYA companies. In early February, 1975, David Peacock and Linda Trott held a meeting in Ottawa with twelve TYA Consultants who advised them on the allocation of the "developmental" funds.
(pp. 1-2)

Gaboriau's report noted that from 1975-76 to 1977-78 there had been no growth in funding for TYA. She argued that the range of the subsidies, from \$3,000 {\$9,000} to \$15,000 {\$45,000} and over, could only be considered as "seed money". ... This money seems to have been well invested and TYA is now harvesting the results of Council's support (which coincide, it must be said, with growing recognition from other funding sources)" (p. 2). She based her arguments for more support on a strategy report (edited and published in 1977 as *Twenty plus five, a discussion paper on the role of the Canada Council in the arts, after the first twenty years (1957-77)*) that "stated that the Canada Council 'has a duty to set as its highest priority the exposure of children across Canada to meaningful professional arts experiences before they leave school.'" (p. 1).

Unfortunately, Gaboriau's initiative occurred just as the federal government was implementing a drastic reduction in public spending in all sectors and her concept of a "clearly defined programme to improve the lot of this branch of the theatre community" (p. 7) did not come to fruition. Nevertheless, Anna Stratton, who, as English Theatre Officer, was Gaboriau's colleague, relates that the CC's dedicated, if limited, funding of TYA was a significant positive advancement in the CC's regular funding policy as, in her opinion, "children's theatre was a major source of original Canadian plays" (Interview, 2003).

League of Canadian Theatres: achieving legal status as the Association of Canadian Theatres

In 1976, the members of LOCT accelerated their activity to build the organization and, by the end of the year, LOCT achieved legal status.

Through 1975, LOCT had embarked on a concerted membership drive. In January 1976, Mona Luscombe, Administrator at TWP, wrote on behalf of June Faulkner and reported that 14 theatres had submitted their \$25 {\$90} (p. 1) fees – a total of \$700 {\$2500}. On April 2, 1976, LOCT Chairman Greg Poggi sent a Memo on MTC letterhead to the LOCT Board, titled *Incorporation of LOCT*. He reported “that 35 professional theatres across Canada have endorsed the concept of incorporation ... ” and that they “represent a majority of bona fide, on-going producing managements ... [that] span the range of professional theatre activity With this mandate” he had instructed the legal firm, which in 1974 had drawn up the application for Letters Patent, “to proceed with the details related to the legalization of LOCT” (1976a). He also asked the LOCT membership for input on best next steps. Four days later, TFT’s Shain Jaffe replied with his suggestions for important initiatives: potential for the CC’s support of LOCT, LOCT’s constitution, overall structure including addressing regional issues, staffing, negotiations for the new CTA, second phase membership drive, and the assembly of “raw data for lobbying purposes when it is fresh” (1976). In September 1976, Poggi wrote to all “LOCT Members – Artistic Directors and Managers” requesting that they attend a “three day meeting ... December 2,3 and 4” in Toronto, the purpose being to “elect the leadership of LOCT under the constitution and by-laws which are now being incorporated, ... to determine those issues facing the profession which require immediate consideration, [and] to begin preparation for the coming negotiations with Equity on the Canadian Theatre Agreement which expires in June, 1977” (Poggi, 1976b).

While the study's research was unable to find any documents from the meeting itself, a 1977 brochure provides a reasonable indication of the results. The incorporated name was *Association of Canadian Theatres* (ACT). (In 1977, this changed to *Professional Association of Canadian Theatres* (PACT).) The brochure stated: "There are well over 75 professional non-profit theatre companies in operation ... ACT stands for this theatre constituency and was established to provide a national forum to represent the interests of the profession" (c1977a, p. 1). The brochure explained that the membership structure was by geography (as suggested by Robert Ellison in 1970) and by Equity Category of potential box office (ACT, c1977a). A letter from Eric Macdonald, Business Manager at Victoria's Bastion Theatre, indicated that Bastion paid its annual membership fee based on the "formula worked out at the recent Toronto meeting001" of a theatre's "gross budget" (1976).¹²⁹

1977

Events under study:

- Canada Council: defending against political interference, reflecting on its accomplishments on its twentieth birthday – its past and its future, issuing new grant application form for theatre
- PACT and CAEA: negotiating the second CTA
- PACT: launching advocacy
- Local Initiative Program: ending

General events in the country:

- The Charter of the French Language is passed by the Parti Québécois government
- Gerald Hannon's controversial article "Men Loving Boys Loving Men" is published in the *Body Politic*

¹²⁹ In 2007, the PACT web site indicates that the cost of full membership continues to be based gross budget (2007).

Canada Council: defending against political interference, reflecting on its accomplishments on its twentieth birthday – its past and its future, issuing new grant application form for theatre

In its 20th *Annual Report 1976-77* the CC contrasted the criticism it was facing from politicians concerning its funding of Quebec sovereigntists against the praise it was receiving from critics on its twentieth anniversary. The CC reported pride in its accomplishments and expressed disappointment in the Montreal Olympics cultural programming, which the CC had partially funded. While not noted in the *Report*, the CC also began the use of a revised grant application form.

In 1977, for the first time, the name of the Chairman of the CC appeared as the author of the *Report's* Forward. In it, Chair Gertrude Laing reported that politicians were concerned that the CC's funding might be going to support sovereigntist Québec artists.¹³⁰ She quoted from her address to the Parliamentary Committee on

Broadcasting, Films and Assistance to the Arts where she assured the politicians:

We are in the business of promoting the arts ... [T]hose who are concerned about the independence of Quebec in the positive sense ... do appear before us with requests for grants in the pursuit of their artistic and scholarly functions. We do at that time consider their applications only on that basis
(p. x)

In the *Annual Report* Laing stressed the CC "is ... not indifferent to the question of national unity. It means rather that the Canada Council ... wishes to maintain ... a spirit and a way of operating ... that have won the respect and co-operation of thousands of artists and scholars of every leaning" (*Id*). The *Annual Report* informed the reader: "We still glow at the recollection of, for example, Sandra Gwyn writing in *Saturday Night* that

¹³⁰ In 1976, the Parti Québécois had been elected as the government in Québec, on a platform that Québec should separate from the rest of Canada. Historian John Saywell suggests that the support of the cultural community was important for the PQ. "Excitement was caused when Geneviève Bujould, the ... star of [the movie] *Kamouraska*, announced that she had become a Péquiste" (1977, p. 78).

the Council has remained true to its sometimes difficult mandate, and that it 'somehow managed to become the nerviest and most life-enhancing [institution] this country has ever produced'"(p. xi).

In its overall comments on the year past, the *Annual Report* observed, "at the 1976 Olympic Games in Montreal ... the success gauge of the cultural program generally hovered between failure and outright disaster..." (p. xiv). Despite the lack of critical success, the model used to fund the Canadian cultural content for the Olympics was a success. John Gordon, who at the time was working in the cultural office of the Olympics, relates that there was one-time-only tripartite funding for the cultural program: the Touring Office for artistic costs, the provinces for travel costs, and the Canadian Olympic Committee for venue and marketing costs (Interview, 2006).¹³¹

Specifically in theatre, the CC's *Report* reported that companies were "building audiences for the future ... through special programs for youthful audiences, including special production in their main theatres and visits to the schools." It also reaffirms centrality of the "Canadian playwright ... on Canadian stages" (p. xv).

Also in 1977, the CC issued *Twenty plus five, a discussion paper on the role of the Canada Council in the arts, after the first twenty years (1957-77) and over the next five*. In its introduction, Gertrude Laing stressed: "This is not a policy statement ... it is a discussion paper. The suggestions and proposals presented here have not been codified into formal recommendations; the stilted wording of such statements invites

¹³¹ Gordon subsequently worked for the cultural section of Statistics Canada. He relates that from his perspective, the monies made available for the Olympics were analogous to the LIP and OFY monies, and that they postponed the funding freeze for culture that finally occurred in 1978 (Interview, 2006).

paralysis ... " (p. 5). As seen in 1978, under financial austerity, the CC shelved exploration of any of the paper's wide ranging ideas.

In 1977, the CC did not publicly report that the Theatre Section had introduced a new grant application form to assist theatres with fiscal management. The following is a brief case study of the evolution of the CC's grant application form and reporting process.

From the CC's inception to the mid 1970s, the research suggests that the grant documentation evolved through three steps, each requiring increasing detail. Tom Hendry relates that, in the 1960s as General Manager at the MTC, he made application by a "simple letter", describing planned programming and need (Interview, 2006).¹³² In September 1971, the CC issued the form *Request for Assistance to Performing Arts*. The form's cover page, dated September 1971, states: "Applicants will find reporting of the basic data by major activity useful in controlling revenues and production expense. ... Suggestions for the improvement of these forms to meet your needs will be welcomed." As seen in 1970, there are indications that the form had been in gestation for about a year, and as John Hobday relates, while there was "no disputing the validity of a more rigorous application form," its introduction created additional unwelcome work as he had to reorganize Neptune Theatre's accounting system (Interview, 2006). An examination of Theatre Calgary's (TC) Request for Assistance for the 1973-74 season, is an exemplar of the form's use. The application provides details of TC's proposed

¹³² Similarly, in April 1969, the CTC made its grant request for the 1969-70 financial year via a detailed letter. The letter describes the successful programming during the preceding four years, provides a description of the dialogue between the CTC and CC staffs concerning what both feel is sustainable in the upcoming year, the CTC's planned programming, and the CTC's request for \$70,000.00 {\$386,000} for "continued assistance" (Gascon, Major, Roux, 1969, p. 1-4).

season, personnel, box office income projections, financial statements, and budgets of proposed expenditures broken down by departments and shows for the 1975 season. Theatres made progress reports to receive the second and third installments of the grant. As letters from TC indicate, cash flow from the CC was of paramount importance. In cover letters of TC's installment requests to the CC, Natalie Chapman, Administrative Director, reports in April 1974 that "cash flow is down to the barest minimum" and, in January 1975, the "urgent need of our second installment" (Chapman, 1974, 1975).

The introduction of the third application form came from the initiative of a member of The Community. In the mid 1970s, Tomas Bohdanetzky became the Theatre Section's Financial Officer after leaving his position as General Manager at MTC. Bohdanetzky relates that he initiated the change in the form "because I realized that Theatres were always in financial trouble, people did not know how to plan. I tried to come up with a format that made theatre people think about money." After he had devised the form, he "visited all companies to explain the new format" (Correspondence, 2004). The new form was "sent out to all theatre companies in January [1977]" (Bohdanetzky, 1977). TFT used the new form, as part of its Request for Assistance for the 1979-80 season (TFT, 1979). The two salient additions from the CC's previous form were a written commitment from the theatre as to how it would deal with a short fall in income, and a mandated format for progress reports. Directly below the section *Plans for theatrical development and new activity* was a section titled: *If all original budgeted income is not realized, how will the company alter its plans? List in order of priority areas of possible savings on expenditures* (TFT, p. 1 1979). The mandated format for progress reports was a separate spreadsheet for each production, with a column detailing production expenditures followed by five columns: *Original Budget, Revised Budget, two*

Actual to Date, and *Final Actuals* (Ibid., p. 8). The instructions indicated that this portion was to be updated and sent to the CC.¹³³

Association of Canadian Theatres: becoming the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, developing its resources

In 1977, ACT was compelled to change its name to PACT, as outlined below, hired its first staff member, and gained operational support from resources available at the National Arts Centre.

On January 14, 1977, The Association of Community Theatres (ACT) sent a letter to the Gregory Poggi, the newly elected Chairman of the newly incorporated Association of Canadian Theatres (ACT). After explaining its bona fides, the Association of Community Theatres requested that the Association of Canadian Theatres consider changing its name so that identical acronyms would not “create confusion in the minds of the public as well as in theatre circles ... and detract from each others’ efforts ... “ (Fisher, 1977, pp. 1-2). Within a year the Association of Canadian Theatres became the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres with the acronym PACT. (For the balance of this study, PACT is used so as to minimized confusion, even for the period of 1977, as ACT has disappeared from the collective memory.)

In 1977, PACT hired Curtis Barlow as its Executive Director and first employee. Barlow relates that he was pursuing a career in corporate law when he answered PACT’s help wanted advertisement in the *Globe and Mail*. During the interview process, it became evident that the Board was looking for an individual “willing to travel, active,

¹³³ Malcolm Black, who became artistic director of Theatre New Brunswick shortly after the new form was issued, relates that the form was “major achievement and a brilliant document.” It enabled the inexperienced theatre manager to create a realistic budget, by providing a checklist of all the elements required to produce a show. Black feels that the section requesting details of a theatre’s proposed alternate choices in the event of an income shortfall was an important feature (Interview, 2005).

articulate, committed to a small organization” and who came with “no baggage.” Once hired, and until PACT opened its office at 3 Church Street in Toronto, he spent his first days in the tiny offices of TWP, where June Faulkner was General Manager. He relates: “Listening to June talk on the phone was the best education for understanding how the business and community worked” (Interview, 2006). Michael Dobbin relates that in its initial years, Andis Celms, PACT’s chair of negotiations and later president, who had a senior position at the NAC, was able to support the nascent organization through resources available at the NAC, for example, the government trunk phone line and the photocopy equipment as, in the 1970s, those costs were significant (Interview, 2006).

Professional Association of Canadian Theatre & Canadian Actors’ Equity Association: negotiating the Second Canadian Theatre Agreement

In 2007, the CTA, through its regulation of the wages and conditions of work for most Canadian directors, choreographers, actors, stage managers and fight directors, is central to the business model of English Canadian not-for-profit theatre. The 1977 successful negotiation of the second CTA is as equally significant as institution of the first CTA in 1974, as both PACT and CAEA were on equal legal footing to represent their respective constituencies. This made the negotiation “truly bilateral” (Dobbin, 2006). The second CTA contains, on 79 pages, 55 Rules, many with substantial subsections that provide protection for artists, in a business where change and innovation are a constant. The inside covers of subsequent iterations of the CTA bear this description:

The second Canadian Theatre Agreement (1977-1980) was the first Agreement negotiated between Canadian Actor’s Equity Association and the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres. This Agreement introduced clauses for Joint Productions and School Touring, and included separate clauses for Directors and Choreographers.
(CAEA, PACT, 2006, inside cover)

The first issue, Joint Production, resolved a long-standing impediment to theatres sharing a show and thereby reducing costs. As early as 1960, the CC promoted the concept of shared resources. In November 1976, Ron Pollock, General Manager at Victoria's Bastion Theatre, proposed: "Exchanges in which the participating companies are in residence at the co-operating company's theatre for a week or more should not be classified as touring" (1976, p. 1). The language that defined *Joint Production* (CAEA, PACT, 1977, p. 70) enshrined Pollock's model. The model saved the costs of touring salaries, and other expenses for CAEA members, as well as salaries and expenses of stagehands traveling with the show. Dan MacDonald relates that the PACT team allayed the CAEA team's concerns that the use of one show in two different theatres would lead to a loss of work for CAEA members, through the logic that artistic directors would never accept a model that demanded that theatre companies share artistic vision in the planning of a season (Interview, 2006).¹³⁴

The second key issue of the second CTA was the enshrinement of rules for school touring productions, which the CC noted had been increasing. The second CTA devotes five pages to *School Touring*, which today is known as *Theatre For Young Audiences* or *TYA*. The rules were an attempt to balance the vagaries of school touring with appropriate worker protection. As example, in December 1975, Kenneth Kramer, Artistic Director of Regina's Globe Theatre, sought relief from full-hour penalties due to "invasion of rest period ... [caused not by] the fault of the management in terms of planning, but the fault of the school in terms of late starts or visiting schools' bus breakdowns ... particularly in rural areas ..." (1975b, p. 1). Kramer's proposed solution

¹³⁴ Thirty years later, the model continues to see sustained use and is typically called *Co-production* or *Co-Pro*.

of penalties based on half hour increments was successfully negotiated as part of rule 5502 (F) (CAEA, PACT, 1977, p. 77). Kramer was not successful in getting relief from CAEA's position that all shows must have a dedicated stage manager. In July of 1975, he wrote to the CEC's Graham Spicer arguing "... that until we radically change our production style ... we [do not need] a stage manager who ... is a stage manager only ... and who cannot act" (Kramer, 1975a, p. 3). The second CTA stated in rule 5001 (G): "The Manager must engage an Equity Stage Manager" (p. 75).¹³⁵

The third key issue, of the second CTA was the inclusion of Directors and Choreographers into CAEA's ranks. This was highly contentious for both sides. Vernon Chapman's unpublished work indicates:

In 1974 directors Timothy Bond and Stephen Katz approached Equity to initiate talks to investigate the feasibility of Equity officially representing directors and choreographers in Canada.

... The directors were concerned that although they had power to hire performers who often regarded them as part of management, they did not look upon themselves as such and, unless they held the position of Artistic Director, were vulnerable to exploitation. They were concerned that the tendency to regard them as management would lead the actor-dominated AEA to refuse to represent them forcing them to go it on their own and form a separate organization at considerable expense. They feared that they would find themselves in the same dilemma as the designers with a small organization lacking any strength and with a membership spread thinly across the country.
(Ch 4, pp. 20-21)

Chapman indicates that, in 1974, the CEC had reservations, as the costs of adding directors and choreographers to the membership could become a net drain on the CEC's resources. Despite this concern, in March 1976, CEC's Burnard Chadwick wrote to LOCT's Gregory Poggi signaling that the CEC was accepting the inclusion of directors

¹³⁵ In contrast, Rule 44 deals with the duties of a stage manager in 'regular theatre' and contains no clause mandating the hiring of a stage manager (CTA, 1977, p. 55).

as an employment category, and that “in June 1977 [the CEC] shall be including ... proposals terms and condition governing Equity Directors” (Chadwick 1976).

Michael Dobbin relates that for PACT, the potential categorization of directors as labour posed a problem. At the time, PACT's optic was that directors were management and that this was accentuated when a director was the AD of a theatre company. Dobbin's experience was that the issue prompted much discussion. He relates that David Peacock, head of the CC's Theatre Section, asked the question: 'How do know how to define an AD?' The general consensus was that the AD was the artistic visionary of a theatre company and that s/he directed plays. An additional complication was that a director's income was under different jurisdictions when working as a salaried AD or when working as a freelance director. As an AD, an individual's compensation was set individually and administered by the theatre company of employment. As a freelance director, whether working for other theatres or her/his own, the compensation was under CAEA jurisdiction (Interview, 2006).¹³⁶ The issue was of sufficient complexity that, in January 1977, Gregory Poggi wrote to Burnard Chadwick indicating:

The membership [of PACT] has decided that it is not feasible to discuss Rule 43 [concerning directors] during the current negotiations ... and believes that proper consideration ... requires the particular scope, sensitivity and input of the artistic directors across the country. Such proper consideration can only happen in due course.
(Poggi, 1977)

The letter stated, however, that PACT would recognize those directors already members of CAEA. Chapman relates that the CAEA persevered and brought its proposal to the

¹³⁶ Dobbin relates that an added complication emerged when Registered Retirement Savings Plans were introduced to the CTA and all directors' retirement contributions were processed through the CAEA's plan. Theatre companies began inventing ways to contract their AD's (when directing plays), using CTA contracts and deducting the total payable from the overall salary for the AD or, conversely, splitting the fees payable to their AD into salaried section as 'employee' and contractor fee sections under the CTA (Interview, 2006).

negotiating table. He indicates that a compromise was successfully reached but that PACT twice attempted delaying tactics. In both cases the CAEA responded by signaling that its members would “withdraw services” from PACT theatres (Ch. 4, p. 22).¹³⁷ The compromise reached was that non-CAEA directors would be “engaged under terms and conditions no less favourable” than those of the CTA and that a nominal Filing Fee tariff would be paid to the Actors’ Fund of Canada (CAEA, PACT, 1977, p. 50).

Actor Diane D’Aquila, who was on the CAEA’s negotiating team, relates some of the context of the process from her perspective at the time. She observed that those with experience with the practices of AEA were much more aware than those with only exposure to CAEA’s practices, that the acting community was divided between those who work in the small theatres and those who work in the large theatres, and that the negotiation process represented “a changing of the guard as older members were no longer the only artists attending meetings.” As the contract would likely have the most effect on the small theatres, the negotiating team was composed largely of “firebrands in our twenties, determined to make the contract our own.” She indicates that director Tim Bond had a “brain for business and was fearless” in his advocacy for the inclusion of the language in the Second CTA that provided for cost of living allowances (COLA). She also indicates that the *Concessions to Category G* was eliminated (Interview, 2006).

Michael Dobbin confirms that Tim Bond fought for COLA language in the contract. PACT was aware that “changes were afoot” with regards to compensation and was acutely aware of the CAEA’s legal victory concerning the compensation of the dancers of the National Ballet of Canada. He indicates that “for the sake of the

¹³⁷ The CAEA took this position under a rubric as explained by its member Frank Hogg. “... Canadian Equity ... is legally not a union, but a “voluntary association which acts like a union when necessary” (Zwicker, 1976).

advancement of Canadian theatre” the managers “gritted their teeth and hoped that they would be able to afford” the substantial increases agreed to in the contract (Interview, 2006).¹³⁸ To help pay for these increases, PACT began a program of advocacy for increased funding to theatre.

Local Initiative Program: ending

In 1977, the LIP program came to an end and was replaced by the Canada Works Program (LAC).

1978

Events under study:

- Government, the economy, and the Canada Council: dealing with stagflation and deficit
- Canada Council: separating culture and academic, reacting to government cutbacks, addressing accountability, reviewing its own economic history, hiring Walter Learning as Theatre Officer English Section, instituting new policies to support new companies and Canadian plays
- Canadian Actors' Equity Association: gaining a measure of control over the hiring of foreign workers
- Professional Association of Canadian Theatres: developing experience in advocacy
- Education for Administrators: identifying deficiency of training programs, influences of the Harvard University's Institute of Arts Administration, founding of the Banff Center's Cultural Resources Management Program

General events in the country:

- Supreme Court of Canada declares unilingual legislatures and courts unconstitutional
- Under the new immigration act homosexuals are no longer an inadmissible class

Government, the economy, and the Canada Council: dealing with stagflation and deficit

In the period of this study, overall economic expansion and prosperity supported the expansion of subsidized cultural activity. In 1978, the effect of escalating inflation put a stop to that expansion. From 1957, the year of the CC's inception, to 1974, inflation

¹³⁸ Over the three-year duration of the Second CTA, actors' salaries increased by an average of 25% (CAEA, PACT, 1977, pp. 12-14), and directors' fees nearly, or did, double (CAEA, PACT, 1977, p. 50). These increases were separate from the provision for COLA.

averaged 3.25% per year. In 1974, the dramatic increase in the cost of oil began a spiral of inflation. From 1974 to 1978, the inflation that averaged close to 9% per year resulted in stagnant business growth and increasing unemployment that was counter-pointed by an expectation that salaries should increase beyond, or at a minimum keep pace with, the rate of inflation. This new economic condition was named *stagflation*. In 1978, the Trudeau government's mandate was running out, and the Liberals were constitutionally obliged to call an election. To try to maintain voter loyalty, the government initially looked to tax cuts, but soon found that it had to turn to cost cutting. In January 1978, Peter Ward opined in *Canadian Business*:

The recession in Canada is just about over, and the government is undertaking stimulatory measures in view of the upcoming election. While payroll income tax deductions have been lowered and wage and price controls are being phased out, even more stimulation is needed to revive the economy. Attached to more popular measures is a proposal by Finance Minister Jean Chretien to raise his borrowing authority by \$9 {\$27.5} billion, which would allow him to cut taxes significantly before the election. Considering the huge federal deficit, such borrowing may only cause problems in later years. Recovery will raise tax revenues in 1978-1979, however.

(P. 20)

In a February 1978 editorial, the *Globe and Mail* reported: "The Auditor-General has said that the federal Government has pretty well lost control of the public purse" (1978a p. P.7). In May 1978, Trudeau "asked all federal departments to find ways of slicing \$500 {\$152.9} million from this year's budget." In September, the *Globe and Mail* reported:

Budget cuts affecting the federal Government's cultural agencies now are virtually complete and arts organizations must take the initiative to earn more money and public support, Secretary of State John Roberts said yesterday. He said in an interview that the Government has shown its support of the arts and cultural activity of the country by limiting the cuts, after most people had expected they would be severe.

The boards of directors of arts companies now must respond by showing they can earn more money independently and by persuading both the federal and the other levels of government they deserve more support.

The object, he said, is to postpone projects rather than cut grants to organizations in such a way as would mean their death. ...

'The basic budget of the Canada Council will actually go up next year to about \$39- {\$118} million from \$36{\$109}-million," Mr. Roberts said.

He said some of the larger performing arts organizations are more able to stand reductions in federal subsidies than smaller, struggling theatre, dance and music organizations.
(1978d, p. F7)

The CC, in its *Annual Report 1978-79*, used 1971 as its benchmark constant dollar to show how the cultural spending had been adversely effected by the 72% inflation from 1971 to 1978. More succinctly, \$1 {\$5.38} in 1971 was worth \$0.58 {\$1.81} in 1978, in 1971 constant dollars.

Canada Council: separating culture and academic, reacting to government cutbacks, addressing accountability, reviewing its own economic history, hiring Walter Learning as Theatre Officer English Section, instituting new policies to support new companies and Canadian plays

(As this is the study's last fully examined year some items from the CC's 22nd *Annual Report 1978-79* are included as they reflect events in the calendar year 1978.)

In 1978, the CC relinquished responsibility for the humanities, addressed the potential onset of increased political interference, dealt with the effects of rampant inflation, exacerbated by government freezes, and announced that it had instituted new policies to determine support for new theatre companies.

In the Forward to *21st Annual Report 1977-78*, the CC's Chairman Gertrude Laing first related that through federal legislation the CC would in the future be "primarily an arts council" as opposed to its original mandate that included "the humanities and

social sciences.” A sister organization, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) had become the new vehicle to provide grants to that sector.¹³⁹ Laing then reported: “During the year the members of the Council were preoccupied with three basic problems ... planning for the future, the constant problem of funding of the present programs, and issue of independence and accountability.” She related that the CC had hoped to move forward “on a five year planning period” as recommended by the report *Twenty plus five*, but while the “process was begun... [it] unfortunately had to be abandoned owing to lack of funds [B]y the end of the year the Council found itself hard-pressed to maintain essential core activities already in existence” (p. 6). In a section titled *Money*, Laing explained that the current “period of inflation and technological change” was making the regular effects of the income gap more “acute.”¹⁴⁰ The consequence was that “federal support for the arts through the Canada Council had decreased in purchasing power.” She argued: “What we must somehow achieve is a recognition by governments and by the Canadian people ... that

¹³⁹ André Fortier relates that, in 1965, the strategy of the CC was to use its program of grants for the social sciences as the basis to develop political support for grants to the more politically controversial cultural sector. Fortier indicates that by the mid 1970s “the heads of universities were advocating for their own council for the social sciences and humanities, as the medical and engineering communities were moving much faster in gaining grants. The universities saw their continued inclusion with culture as an impediment to growth” (Interview, 2007). Fortier became the first head of SSHRC. Anna Stratton, who worked in the Theatre Section of the CC before and after the split, relates that, in her opinion, the “level of discourse” by the Council itself was not as strong, once the social sciences departed (Interview, 2003).

¹⁴⁰ To illustrate the CC’s financial situation, the *Report* for 1977-78 and for 1978-79 each contained graphs, titled *Support to the Arts in Current and Constant Dollars*, that showed the gap between that year’s current and 1971 constant dollars. The 1978-79 graph illustrated that while in current dollars its total support had grown from approximately \$12 {\$63.6} million to approximately \$40 {\$110} million, it represented under \$20 {\$55} in constant 1971 dollars (p. 5). The 1977-78 graph also showed that the performing arts received the lions’ share and the greatest year-over-year increase as compared with writing and publishing and the visual arts (p. 53).

the arts are essential to an acceptable quality of life, and are consequently a necessary and desirable charge on society" (p. 7).

In the section titled *Independence and Accountability*, Laing defended the importance of the CC in its role as the "buffer" between the innovation and controversy of the arts and the "accepted conventions of [the] times". She explained that the CC's ability to do just that was being abraded "partly because the protection afforded by the Council's endowment has been eroded by increasing dependence on annual government appropriations." Finally she argued:

[The CC] should be accountable to Parliament ...and ... to artists ... [but] from a position of independence. The arts are products of the human spirit of free individuals, and will best flourish when cultural judgements turn only on artistic criteria applied by knowledgeable people. The Canada Council is committed to this policy, but it can be maintained only if the Council's independence is guaranteed by law, recognized by government, and supported by the arts community and the public at large.
(pp. 7-8)

The CC's 22nd *Annual Report 1978-79* welcomed to the Theatre Section director/artistic director "Walter Learning as its new Head and Claude Des Landes as its Associate Head responsible for francophone companies." Additionally, the *Report* indicated that in December of 1978, "an anglophone and francophone panel, each composed of working professionals in the field of theatre, had assessed all project and operating grants for \$25,000 {\$71,000} and under submitted by theatre companies. This procedure is a response to the ever-increasing number of new companies who are now, or soon will be, eligible to apply for assistance" (p.15).

Canadian Actors' Equity Association: gaining a measure of control over the hiring of foreign workers

In April 1978, Globe and Mail reporter David Lancashire reported that the Department of Immigration and Manpower was instituting policies whereby it would

consult with CAEA when deciding which off-shore talent was of sufficient international stature to be allowed to work in Canada (1978 p. P.7). CAEA, as part of its members rising nationalism and as an attempt to increase work opportunities for its members, had been advocating for some time that the importation of non-Canadian acting and directing talent should be restricted. In 1974, *Toronto Star* staff writer Sid Adilman reported: "Actors' Equity Association of Canada has instituted stern measures aimed at blocking wholesale importation of non-Canadian actors. ... Should theatre management proceed regardless, Equity cast members would withdraw immediately. ... Equity hopes to have a computerized talent information service for theatre managements to discover what Canadians were available for certain roles. ... [I]f the system works well [federal government officials] would consider funding its operation" (p. E5). In 1976, Adilman reported that the CEAC had prevented the MTC from "bringing in British actress Renee Asherson" and that it was considering similar action against the Stratford Festival over "actress Margaret Tyzack" (p. F1). In 1977 Adilman reported:

Peter Coe, named artistic director of Edmonton's Citadel Theatre under heavy opposition from Canadian Actors' Equity, has received a one-year work visa from the Department of Manpower and Immigration. Citadel's board requested unconditional entry status for the British-born Coe, but Ottawa wants time to study the claim by Equity that qualified Canadians were bypassed.
(p. C 1)

In 1978, a spokesperson for the "immigration department says ... Canada's rules are no more stringent than the restrictions of other countries. ... Andis Celms of the National Arts Centre ... [counters that] imported artists are a benefit to the country; we learn from working with them" (Lancashire, 1978, p. P 7).

Professional Association of Canadian Theatres: developing experience in advocacy

After its December 1976 incorporation, PACT launched a project to lobby the federal government to increase funding for theatre. The following short case study provides the context and a narrative of how PACT fared.

PACT's initiative sprang from the decline of theatres' purchasing power. Starting in 1974, the value of all grants including the CC's and box office income eroded due to the steep increase in inflation. The 1977 second CTA had provisions for a 25% general increase in fees for actors and stage managers, and as much as 100% increase for directors. Additionally, for those theatres that started on LIP grants, this source of funding ended in 1977. By 1978, PACT calculated: "Despite ticket price increases ... two-thirds of [its] members [had] to cut back the number of ... productions, 55 per cent ... had to lay off staff, 74 per cent ... had to reduce the number of actors employed, and 55 per cent have incurred a greatly increased deficit" (Johnson, 1978b, p. 21).¹⁴¹

In an attempt to rectify this situation, in 1977 PACT decided to embark on a strategy to convince the federal government to increase funding for theatre. Curtis Barlow, then Executive Director, relates that the stratagem was to demonstrate to the government that there was public support for theatre and that theatre deserved enhanced support. The rationale developed was that the 'subsidy' was for the ticket buying public in order to keep ticket prices down, and not so much a direct contribution to the artists.¹⁴² The tactic employed was a petition campaign, where theatres across the

¹⁴¹ In December 1977, *Toronto Star* reporter Sid Adilman writing about TFT, indicated "... the staff took a two-week vacation without pay and ... everyone ... agreed to a 10 per cent salary cut. ... Theatre manager Judith Hendry says ... [the theatre] launched a corporate fundraising campaign. But that's been revised downward ... 'because several firms say they won't have money for us because of the economy'" (p. C 2).

¹⁴² This echoed Tom Hendry's 1964 findings on the philosophy employed in Eastern Europe.

country asked their patrons to sign a prepared post card indicating their support for theatre.¹⁴³ The intention was to go to Ottawa and embarrass Secretary of State John Roberts into providing more funds for theatre by dumping "50,000 postcards at his feet." In Barlow's opinion, the campaign would not have happened without the conviction and energy of TFT's Judith Hendry. In retrospect, Barlow feels that once in Ottawa, the impact of PACT's presentation was undercut by its own internal issues and by the CC's concern that PACT may not have put its best foot forward in its choice of iconic Canadian born and trained Donald Sutherland to act as spokesperson. PACT had attempted to enlist leading Canadian-resident actors to speak on its behalf, but all of those who were approached were unavailable. Barlow was able to contact Sutherland who agreed, at his own expense, to come to Ottawa from Los Angeles where he was living, to help advocate on PACT's behalf. Barlow relates that despite the fact that Sutherland "was inspired and did a great job," the CC's David Peacock was angry at this final choice as he felt that PACT would undercut the credibility of its message by not having a prominent Canadian resident as spokesperson (Interview, 2006).

At the time, Reporter Bryan Johnston of the Globe and Mail wrote that the PACT meeting in Ottawa considered calling for Roberts' resignation but opted for issuing:

... a press release headed 'Theatres badly served by Secretary of State.' [A] hurt Roberts [says] [s]hooting at me, they're shooting at the wrong person. ... It's true that I have been urging groups to take their cause and show that there is grassroots support for the arts. ... [but you] can't just come up to Ottawa for two days and, bingo, go home with more money. ... But that campaign is still a good thing. I can take that to the Cabinet and say, 'Look, we have to do something about this.' ... It's going to be very hard now to get increased support for the arts. Money was given out for the past 15 years in a sort of ad hoc way when it was pretty plentiful. But now the Government is reluctant to give it out on a project-by-project basis. ... They want some sort of over-all strategy. We're doing a complete review

¹⁴³ Michael Dobbin relates "in Vancouver it was relatively easy to get support from the audience and that all 14 theatres of the Vancouver Theatre Alliance participated" (Interview, 2006).

which should be ready by autumn, then we'll go to the Cabinet with an over-all arts policy and the hope is that there'll be more support then.
(p. 21)

Concerning the campaign and the events in Ottawa, Curtis Barlow relates that PACT was undergoing internal difficulties and he feels that the process was not well managed, but that "it was our first effort at advocacy" (Interview, 2006).¹⁴⁴ Michael Dobbin relates that his feeling in retrospect is that PACT had "more clout than we thought we had and, given the burgeoning of other Arts Service Organizations, that power has not been accorded since" (Interview, 2006).

In September 1978, Roberts announced substantial cuts to cultural funding, as part of the government's overall austerity program. In response, the nation's cultural community¹⁴⁵ organized the *1812 Committee* – "so named because we intend to win" (Globe and Mail, 1978b, p. P 6). In an October 26 editorial the Globe and Mail observed,

... cultural and artistic groups in a series of nation-wide events scheduled for today, ... have dubbed [today] Arts Day [and] they will be taking their case to the people.

Significantly, they have tempered their past approach which, on the evidence of an initial manifesto, was lean on substance and heavy on bombast, and have replaced it with a simple but compelling argument. Arts and culture in this country, they say,

¹⁴⁴ PACT was able to get corporate support for its initiative. A promotional brochure titled *The Case: Interesting facts and fallacies about the theatre business in Canada* acknowledged the generous support of The Samuel and Saidye Bronfman Family Foundation for their assistance in this project" (p. 6).

¹⁴⁵ The 1812 Committee: Association of Canadian Orchestras, Association of Canadian Publishers, Association of Canadian Television and Radio Artists, Association of Cultural Executives, Book & Periodical Development Council, Canadian Actors Equity, Canadian Artists Representation, Canadian Authors Association, Canadian Book Publishers Council, Canadian Booksellers Association, Canadian Broadcasting League, Canadian Child and Youth Drama Association, Canadian Conference of the Arts, Canadian Crafts Council, Canadian League of Composers, Canadian Library Association, Canadian Museums Association, Canadian Music Centre, Canadian Music Council, Council of Canadian Film Makers, Dance in Canada, Directors Guild of Canada, Guild of Canadian Playwrights, League of Canadian Poets, Periodical Writers Association of Canada, Periodical Distributors of Canada, Playwrights Co-op Inc., Professional Art Dealers Association of Canada Inc., Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, Union des Artistes, Writers' Union of Canada. (Globe and Mail, 1978a, P.7)

remain a doorway to our past, and a unique reflection of the present, putting us in touch with what we feel about the world we live in. But in addition, they constitute an industry - a vital industry which not only serves the artistic community but has an economic ripple effect which benefits the community as a whole.

We must, says the 1812 Committee, stop treating our arts and culture like a balloon, pumped up for the birthday parties but quickly deflated when politicians get nervous or the economy gets tight. The Government must be informed on issues relating to the arts, recognize the repercussions which budget cuts produce, and, armed with a cohesive policy, dispense with its philosophy of the arts as frosting on the social cake, a frill which can be thrown to the wolves at the first sign of budgetary pressure.

(p. P.6)

Education for Administrators: identifying deficiency of training programs, influences of the Harvard University's Institute of Arts Administration, founding of the Banff Centre's Cultural Resources Management Program

In 1978, the CC published *Report on Theatre Training in Canada*, a national assessment of training for the profession. The introduction indicated: "The suggestion to do so was made formally by the Canada Council in 1975, and after much discussion at a joint meeting of the Council's staff and its Advisory Arts Panel, it was decided on January 12, 1976 that the inquiry should take place" (p. 1). During the period when the CC had been investing resources in the conservatory-style training at the NTS and short-term apprentice training as the perceived best for entry into the profession, there had been a tremendous growth in other post-secondary programs. In 1960, at the time of the founding of the NTS, six universities had departments of theatre or drama.¹⁴⁶ By 1975, the year the *Report on Theatre Training in Canada* was conceived, as seen in appendix B, some thirty-seven additional programs had opened in universities and other post-secondary institutions. The Committee that wrote the report was charged by the CC

¹⁴⁶ For an understanding on how cultural subjects came to be taught in Canadian Universities, see Maria Tippet's *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission*. For the development of theatre in education see E. Ross Stuart's *The History of Prairie Theatre* and Paula Spurdakos' introduction to her book *Dora Mavor Moore: Pioneer of the Canadian Theatre*.

to "examine the needs for trained personnel in Canadian theatre and the manner in which these needs are being met" (p. 2).¹⁴⁷ The Committee traveled across the country to meet and consult with educators, students and professionals, and collected additional data via a questionnaire, directed at those already in the profession, that asked about training and post-training experiences.¹⁴⁸ What is informative for this study was the report's assessment of the training for administrations:

Until recently theatre administration was largely a disaster area in this country. In the last few years a number of first-rate people have emerged. However a shortage still exists. It appears that most of these people have come up through stage management, although there are inevitable exceptions.
(p. 59)¹⁴⁹

The report indicated: "Norma Springford¹⁵⁰ teaches the subject at a fairly comprehensive level at Concordia University but again for a duration of only one year. York University is now giving an MBA in Arts Management" (*Id.*). The report reviewed the inconclusive attempts by the CC (as seen in 1966) to foster apprentice-style training.¹⁵¹ It then reviewed, similar to the debate in the 1960s, the central conundrum of formal training versus informal training. Formal training was seen as desirable as: "With the growth of the grant-giving structure, the business manager is responsible to many

¹⁴⁷The Committee consisted of: Malcolm Black, Chair, (the *Report* is also known as the *Black Report*), Gilles Marsolais, Jean-Pierre Ronfard, Gordon Peacock and Cameron Porteous.

¹⁴⁸ In 1981 the CC published *National Theatre School of Canada, 1960-1980, Survey of Former Students*: "A group of 65 respondents who were working primarily as actors, artistic directors or directors in live theatre in 1979 was compared to a similar group of 230 respondents from a parallel Statistics Canada survey" (p. i).

¹⁴⁹ The report further indicates: "Publicity and public relations were ... excluded [from the study] because, as far as we could ascertain, there is no full-time training for theatre publicity. It is covered in some management courses, but it is a vitally important field that appears to be undernourished" (p. 3).

¹⁵⁰ In 1965, Springford was President of the CTC.

¹⁵¹ The report indicated: "The Council had a scheme in 1965-66 by which four people from the business community were attached to theatres to learn theatre management. As has been pointed out to the Committee, the failure of this program (none of these trainees finally ended up in arts management) should not discourage further attempts in this direction" (p. 59).

different people.”¹⁵² Informal training was favoured for its ability to “provide the artists’ perspective, which is such an important part of being a good manager” (p. 60). Underscored was that “good management people are creative, require tact and diplomacy and must be leaders. It is hard to teach these things” (p. 61). While not making a conclusive recommendation for either approach, the report concluded: “Even the people who made it though the ranks usually had a broad range of theatre experience before electing to go into management” (p. 61).

Contemporaneous with the report’s process were two management training initiatives relating directly and indirectly to Harvard University’s Institute of Arts Administration. Administrator and educator Paul Eck relates that, in 1974, the CC requested that he join a group of six, selected from across the country, to take Harvard’s intensive summer Arts Administration course.¹⁵³ The CC’s criteria for the candidates were that they were to be mature students and that they must have had at least five prior years experience in arts administration. The caveat was that all were to return to Canada and assist in the development of arts training programs.¹⁵⁴ Eck found that the curriculum was largely based on case study analysis (Interview, 2006). David Leighton, a MBA graduate of Harvard and, in the 1970s, President and CEO of the Banff Centre, relates that the Banff Centre’s Cultural Resources Management Program made intensive use of

¹⁵² Malcolm Black relates that, in the 1980s, as artistic director of Toronto’s Theatre Plus, the theatre was making grant applications to four levels of government: federal, provincial, metropolitan, and city. The time required placed an enormous burden on a small staff (Interview, 2005).

¹⁵³ Eck’s reports that, to the best of his recollection, tuition was \$4000 {\$16,400} per person and that the CC had set approximately \$25,000 {\$107,000} aside to cover the costs for all six participants. In addition, he received a grant of approximately \$3000 {\$12,300} from the Bronfman Family Foundation to cover the costs of transportation, accommodation, and books. He did not know if the others were similarly supported (Interview, 2006).

¹⁵⁴ Eck relates that he teaches or has taught at eleven institutions (Interview, 2006).

Harvard's model of case study analysis. Leighton indicates that in 1973, he, Alan Anderson, the head of Banff's School of Management and also a Harvard MBA, and Neil Armstrong, the head of the Banff School of the Arts and formerly administrative chief at the Western Ontario Business School (now Ivey), began the program (Interview, 2006). Jane Parkinson, archivist at the Banff Centre, provided to this study the following encapsulation based her review of available documents:

The Cultural Resources Management Program began in 1973 with a variety of short courses on various specific topics relating to arts institutions. It went very successfully for a few years, and expanded, then enrollments began to fall and fewer courses were offered. In 1978, in addition to the short courses, the program offered a three-week course on general management development for arts administrators. It was offered every year until 2001, when the whole management division was restructured and it was dropped. (Correspondence, 2007)

Dance administrator Ellen Busby relates that, in 1981, her studies at Banff's program were instrumental in giving her useful tools for her transition from the sphere of production to arts administration (Interview, 2007).

Coda 1979

Coda 1979, Canada Council: appointing Mavor Moore as Chairman, thanking cultural community for its support, promoting the cultural industry, announcing policy of priority for Canadian plays, artists and senior artistic and administrative staff

In the CC's 22nd *Annual Report 1978-79*, newly appointed Chairman Mavor

Moore continued Gertrude Laing's tradition of authoring the *Report's* Forward:

Canada now has an estimated 65,000 artists. The arts are a labour intensive industry generating up to 300,000 jobs, with spin-off effect which increase tourism and benefit everyone from innkeepers to babysitters. For some time now, Statistics Canada has been telling us that more Canadians attend performing arts events than sports events. According to the Association of Cultural Executives, the overall economic impact of the visual, performing and literary arts in 1976 was \$5.6 {\$20.38} billion (or 2.9% of the GNP).

Such statistics can measure the size of the industry. What they can't measure is more significant: the importance to our civilization of a vital culture through which we define and discover ourselves.

In the course of this dramatic year, the Canada Council was gratified by the warm support it received from Canadian artists, belying the hoary but oft-repeated slur that it is a frivolous spendthrift. Over and over again the cultural community not only asked for more adequate government funding but also advocated that increased funds be channeled through the Council.

(p. 4)

In the section on theatre, the *Annual Report* announced that, in March 1979, the

CC:

endorsed a set of theatre policies which assign priority to Canadian plays, Canadian artists, and the employment of Canadians for senior artistic and administrative positions with publicly funded theatres. ... These policies evolved over time, through consultation between the Council and the theatrical community, and do not apply to companies whose mandate specifically excludes Canadian plays.

The newly clarified policies have met with strong support across the country. There has, of course, been some negative reaction, based for the most part on the fear that the Council is interfering in artistic decisions and is, in a sense, acting as a censor. In a time of severe financial restraints, however, the Council agreed that its priority must be the development of Canadian plays, artists and theatre personnel. In the Council's view the guidelines represent a policy of inclusion, not exclusion; they recognize that the encouragement of Canadian talent is the Council's first responsibility.

This past year will also be remembered as the year in which financial restraints forced the Council to make some very difficult decisions regarding organizations served by the Theatre Section. Given a finite amount of money, long-recognized historical disparities, and real threats to the existence of some organizations, unpopular decisions had to be made. In every case these were made in the hope that the Council can maintain part of what has been accomplished and still encourage new theatrical activity.

All was not gloom. An overwhelming number of theatres reported substantially increased attendance, and fund-raising in the private and corporate sectors was on the upswing.

Theatre people are both cursed and blessed with an almost super-human ability to survive and grow under the worst possible conditions. This has often been used to their disadvantage. One can only hope that this will be less true in 1979-

80. The Council is proud of the accomplishments of the Canadian theatre community and hopes to be given a more than adequate chance of participating in its future growth.

(pp. 15-16).

Conclusion: 1970 to 1979

From 1970 to 1979, The Community achieved the regular production of Canadian plays largely in newly created theatre companies. The increase in overall activity accelerated the CAEA's drive for independence, which it achieved in 1976. This in turn prompted the managements of The Community's theatres to form, in that same year, PACT as a legal organization representing the interests of managements. The capital to support this expansion came from the CC, which enjoyed an increase in its own appropriations from the government, and other federal monies not directed specifically to culture. Training programs for arts administrators were established. At the end of the period, The Community successfully advocated to the federal government the importance of supporting culture even in times of general financial restraint.

Conclusion

In this study I have provided a thickly described narrative of the events that unfolded between 1955 and 1979 in the English Canadian NFP Theatre Community and that led to the regular production of Canadian plays. The study's purpose is to reveal that the evolution of both the CC's policies and The Community's institutions was more complex than is typically understood. By filling in the gaps in our understanding of events of this time period, the study brings greater veracity to The Community's mythologies of its own creation. What we see is the emergence and interconnected evolution of the CC, CAEA, the CTC, PACT, and the institutions of education for theatre, that together provided the foundations of a robust sector that continues today in the 21st century. The conclusion encapsulates what this study has described in terms of the evolution of each body, and the economics that affected that evolution. I then propose avenues of analysis and further study as suggested by the findings. Finally, I provide a brief perspective on how in the 21st century the training of administrators appears to have not progressed beyond that of its inception during the period under study.

The Community

Through the period, The Community evolved from a small group of dedicated individuals struggling to re-establish professional theatre, striving to include the production of Canadian plays, to a nation-wide industry seen as a critical component of the country's cultural identity through the regular production of Canadian plays.

The study suggests that in the post WWII period, there was greater critical mass of activity than is frequently perceived. The small group of practitioners was populated by those who had grown up with privations of the Depression and War. Many

had university educations. Those willing to embark on a professional career felt they were socially in the shadow of the then more accepted amateur community. Practitioners formed companies as either 'hoped-for-profit' or NFP. Most companies disbanded when the personal resources could no longer overcome the financial losses. In the early 1960s the regional theatre model developed, largely stabilized by the availability of the CC's subsidy grants. Regional theatres were typically formed by collaborations between professionals and the boards of amateur organizations. This model heralded the rise of the senior positions of artistic director and arts administrator. Through this period, the notion of realizing a career in theatre gained acceptance. Starting in the mid 1960s, the community adopted and enshrined subscription sales as the model to increase financial stability. While financially sound, the model tended to promote conservative programming, particularly when a company was under financial constraint. Starting in the mid 1960s, another generation of largely university educated theatre practitioners brought the energies and perceptions of the counter-culture to the production of theatre. Starting in 1971, this group made use of monies from general employment programs as the risk capital to finance theatre companies, many of which had a mandate that included the regular production of new Canadian plays. With the assistance of the CC, playwrights proposed policy mechanisms by which the CC could ensure the regular production of Canadian plays. In the mid to late 1970s, as the employment monies dried up, the surviving companies typically gained regular subsidy grants from the CC and adopted the structure and marketing strategies of the regional theatres. The forged model of small and larger theatres was so robust that many of the 1979 companies continue, in the early 21st century, to make cultural contributions to their communities.

The Macro Economics of Subsidy Support

The evolution creating the mature industry was largely dependant on the evolution of the CC's financial resources. Initially, the CC's granting capital came solely from the income derived from a fixed endowment. In 1965 the CC received, as part of larger support for the 1967 Centennial celebrations, the first of what became an annual appropriation from Parliament. Provincial and civic Centennial programs provided additional subsidies for theatre and culture in general. Immediately after the Centennial, the CC experienced no growth in its resources. In the early 1970s, as part of a declared federal policy of 'democratization of culture', the government began to increase the CC's appropriation. Initially, the growth was not sufficient for the CC to extend 'risk' capital to the production of new Canadian plays. Risk capital became unexpectedly available through general employment programs, and was exploited by the theatre community outside the influence of the CC. As appropriations to the CC grew, the CC became able to provide support for the new companies. Starting in 1974, the CC's growth in real dollars became limited, and then reduced, by the onset of double-digit inflation. By 1977, the general employment funds were no longer available, and the CC absorbed the robust companies into its client base. In 1979, the CC survived a general reduction in federal spending through the successful advocacy of the cultural community's 1812 Committee.

The Theatre Policies of the Canada Council

In the sphere of theatre, the CC evolved from being an arms-length patron providing limited, but crucial, subsidy to a small, but developing, community to being a cornerstone participatory investor of a national cultural industry. While some originating policies remained constant, others changed with the CC's larger evolution.

Two policies that did not change were the CC's choice of its constituency and the type of its financial contribution. Early in its existence the CC chose to 'raise' a smaller qualified group rather than to 'spread' it to a larger grass-roots community. This overarching policy did not change and directed all of the CC's future programs towards building a professional cultural community. As a condition of its financial contribution, the CC mandated that its subsidies could not be the sole source of any one enterprise. The producer had to have other sources such as earned income and other subsidy support from the larger community.

The policies of the CC's actual financial support did evolve considerably. Initially, it took the position that there was to be no expectation by any organization that it would receive ongoing support. While never formally acknowledged, by the early 1960s, the CC, through practice, signaled to established companies that they could have the expectation of annual appropriations. Amounts fluctuated with the CC's own resources and with the CC's perception of the needs of one organization compared to the others in its client base. Until the late 1960s, theatres applied for grants with a simple letter stating programming and how the requested amounts contributed to the overall financial plan. In the early 1970s, the CC introduced a formal grant application form to foster fiscal control. During this time the CC formed a partnership with Statistics Canada to facilitate the collection of data on the growing cultural sector. At the same time, as a means of protecting its investment, the CC extended funds to help companies retire deficits. In 1976, the grant application form was upgraded. This provided a tool to theatres for greater fiscal control and, in turn, gave to the CC more timely information on the financial health of each theatre.

Critically, in the sphere of programming, the CC maintained, until 1979, a largely hands-off approach to programming, although in periods of financial constraint it did encourage conservative programming. In 1979, the CC tied the successful attainment of its grants to the production of Canadian plays.

In the sphere of the difficult relations between the professionals and their Boards, the CC took a decidedly cautious approach.

Canadian Actors' Equity Association (For simplicity, CAEA will largely be used throughout)

CAEA evolved from a branch office of an American organization with limited control over its small community's affairs, to being the representative of Canadian professional actors, ballet dancers, opera singers, directors, choreographers, and stage managers in almost all of the professional performing arts community.¹⁵⁵ By 1979, CAEA was capable of achieving its demands through the threat of labour action and was able to advocate successfully with the federal government for control of foreign workers entering the country.

The 1955 founding of CAEA came from the community's and AEA's belief that, even in a period where there was no expectation of a subsidy system, there was a sufficient body of business, beyond that of the Stratford Festival, to support a professional stage actors' association. The establishment of CAEA was felt by some as a validation of their 'professional' status. From inception, CAEA adopted a policy of granting show-specific concessions to its commercially based contracts, as a means to nurture the community. While the policy did foster the community's growth, CAEA found that the policy perpetuated what it saw as amateur business practices. Until the 1965

¹⁵⁵ The evolution of CAEA's representation in the dance and opera communities, although not as pervasive as in The Community, developed concurrent to the events in theatre.

expansion of the CTC, CAEA was the only national organization with paid staff. As such, CAEA contemplated what advocacy it could do with the CC and government to improve the financial position of its members. While initially this achieved few tangible results, later the CAEA gained advocacy successes.

At its founding, there was an expectation that CAC of AEA would become independent. This transpired in two stages. In 1962, CAC gained greater local autonomy as CEC. Beginning in 1973, increasing initiatives led to full independence in 1976. A catalyst for the 1973 initiative was the second generation of practitioners that was producing Canadian plays. Concurrent with the second stage, in 1974, CEC negotiated the first CTA. While it patriated the contract, it did not substantially alter the systemic culture of concessions. The second 1977 contract was a step away from concessions and both contracts form the foundation of the contract that has endured into the 21st century. During both negotiations, CAEA made use of the threat of labour action to help achieve its negotiating position. In 1978, CAEA joined the larger cultural community's 1812 Committee to advocate to government on behalf of the CC.

Canadian Theatre Centre

From 1965 to 1969, the CTC burned bright and effective as the NSO for the whole of the Anglophone and Francophone performing arts community. In 1970 it waned, and it died in 1973.

In 1956 a small group working in prairie educational theatre founded the CTC. In 1959, members of the professional Anglophone and Francophone theatre communities incorporated the CTC as the vehicle to birth the NTS. In 1965, the Anglophone and Francophone performing arts communities combined forces to move the CTC from a volunteer organization to a fully funded NSO with salaried staff. Using funding primarily

from the CC but also from provincial sources, the CTC rapidly expanded its membership and programming. The membership was catholic, as it consisted of individuals, producing companies, and organizations representing labour. While its official *raison d'être* was for all of the performing arts, its direction favoured the issues of the theatre community. In partnership with the CC, the CTC developed programs to support playwrights and the training of production personnel and arts administrators. The CTC's lasting substantive contribution was its promulgation, with the CC, of subscription sales as a means of bringing economic stability to the performing arts. Until its decline, starting in the late 1960s, the CTC activities and communications provided for the individuals, in the still small community, the sense that they were not alone. The CTC began to wane in 1970 and died in 1973, as the Francophone performing arts community turned increasingly to Quebec's sovereignty.

Professional Association of Canadian Theatres (For simplicity, PACT will be used throughout.)

While PACT's official emergence happened late in the period under study, once started, its activities were vigorous.

From 1955 to the early 1970s, there was no institution representing the collective interests of management. The research found indications of a 1960, Toronto-centric group that was exploring the possibility of a producers' organization. It appears not to have gained momentum, partially due to individuals' concerns about losing their flexibility in negotiations with CAEA. The research did not find documentation of additional activity until two 1970 meetings of managers representing most of the established NFP theatres from across the country. That group discussed a broad range of issues including deficits, labour relations, taxation, fundraising, the paucity of good administrative staff, and the

apparent loss of direction by the CTC. The group initiated action on some of the issues, but the consensus was not yet to create a formal organization. One concern was that individual boards would not see the value. It was observed that the impending patriation of CAEA would likely be the catalyst forcing the theatres to create an organization representing managements' interests.

In 1974, an informal grouping of theatre companies working under the banner of League of Canadian Theatres completed the negotiations of the first CTA with CAEA. The incomplete nature of the contract perpetuated CAEA's culture of concessions. The first CTA formalized the CAEA's jurisdiction in the new alternative theatres and, after the main negotiation, those companies continued to resolve ongoing issues. In 1976, PACT formally incorporated and hired an executive director. In 1977, it negotiated the second CTA and launched a campaign to convince government to increase funding to theatre to allow the industry to keep pace with the double-digit inflation. In late 1978, PACT joined the larger cultural community's 1812 Committee successful advocacy with the federal government to maintain funding for the CC.

Education for Theatre and Theatre Administration

While there was university instruction in theatre and drama in the post WWII era, The Community and the CC viewed the 1960 founding of the NTS as the true beginning of training for theatre in the country. The NTS was conceived as a national, co-lingual institution, with conservatory training that exited graduates directly into the industry. For the period of this study, the CC invested substantial capital in the NTS to provide trained individuals for the expanding industry. At the same time, many other post-secondary programs opened across the country and by 1978 there were approximately fifty offering a variety of programs.

Despite the expansion of training for theatre in general, there was a deficit of training for managers of the arts who could deal with the complexities of the management model of AD, GM, and Board, and the financing model of income from a variety of sources. The CC looked to the NTS to institute the training of arts administration but the NTS could not afford to do so. In the mid 1960s, the CC attempted programs of apprenticeship for arts administrators but had limited success possibly due to inflexible criteria in the selection of candidates.

The 1969 report *The Awkward Stage*, funded by the CC and the OAC, recommended the nesting of a program of training for arts administrators into York University's Faculty of Administration. When officially launched in 1971, it provided the first institutional training in the country. For a period in the 1970s, the CC funded a program that sent qualified individuals to Harvard University's intensive summer Institute of Arts Administration. In 1973, the Banff Centre's Cultural Resources Management Program began to offer short courses relating to arts institutions, and in 1978 formally offered an intensive three-week course on general management development for arts administrators. The 1978 *Report on Theatre Training in Canada* identified that the lack of training for administrators was of grave concern.

Further Study

The research for this study was conceived as leading to further analysis and study.

Analysis prompted by this research could include:

- Did the CC's policy of directing resources only to professional enterprises give the CAEA, as the first nation-wide professional organization, an unfair advantage in the market place?
- What was the impact of the evolution of the CC's grant application forms on the business practices of theatres?

- Did the emergence of the alternative theatres accelerate the patriation of CAEA and the creation of PACT?
- How did and does the development of the NFP model – also known as Third Sector – for culture compare with the development of other Canadian Third Sector social enterprises such as health care, social services, and education?

Areas of further research could include:

- The economics of the professional theatre community from after WWII to the institution of the CC
- The place and influence of the Advisory Arts Panels on the development of the CC's policies
- The evolution of the community and the CC after the period of study
- The evolution of the CC's policy and practice on individual arts awards
- The evolution of provincial and municipal funding parallel to that of the CC's.
- A comprehensive study of the CTC using the 25.9 m of documents housed at LAC
- The parallel growth of the dance and opera communities
- The hegemonic growth of CAEA in theatre, ballet, and opera.
- The evolutions of the Associated Designers of Canada and what is now the Playwrights Guild of Canada
- The evolution of the language of cultural policy as used by government departments and agencies
- The evolution of the use of the economic argument to support public support of culture

A Final Footnote

An unanticipated leitmotif of this research is the finding of the lack of progress, during the period, in the development of programs of training for administrators. The CC, despite its mid 1960s rhetoric about the importance of improving this aspect of its constituency's skills, seems to have provided only sporadic support for training programs and only in good economic times. When under general financial constraint, the CC dropped funding in this area. By 1978, the *Report on Theatre Training in Canada* suggested that there had been little progress. Sadly, a generation later in the early 21st century, little seems to have changed. In 2000, PACT, together with Orchestras Canada and the Professional Opera Companies of Canada commissioned the report *Leadership*

Development and Renewal: A Learning Strategy for Senior Performing Arts Managers. It articulated:

There is a crisis of people leaving the field and the next generation of leaders not being there to replace them. ... The funding cuts of the mid 1990s decimated the ranks of upcoming young managers and now there is a squeeze: the current generation of managers is quitting or retiring and the succeeding generation is insufficient to provide replacements.
(p. 16, p. 21)

The report identified one of the contributing issues: "A weak and underdeveloped training/learning infrastructure – with limited quality offerings" (p. 4). It would appear that, despite the success of The Community and the CC in developing stable institutions to realize our National Theatre through the regular production of Canadian plays, the training of those who can manage the process of producing those plays has been given insufficient consideration.

Appendices

Appendix A: Committee struck to investigate creation of Programme of Arts Administration, York University

(reference p. 110)

- Paul Schafer, Chair, Assistant Director, Ontario Arts Council
- Louis Applebaum, Composers Authors and Publishers Association of Canada (CAPAC)
- John Becker (McLaughlin College York)
- Dr Gerry Carrothers, Dean Environmental Studies York University
- Mr. J.K. Crossley Superintendent Curriculum Section Department of Education Province of Ontario
- Dr Brian Dixon Administrative Studies, York University
- Dr. James Fleck Associate Dean Administrative Studies, York University
- Arthur Gelber President Canadian Conference of the Arts
- Dr. James Gillies Dean Faculty of Administrative Studies, York University
- Dr. Joseph Green, Associate Dean Fine Arts, York University
- Peter Harris, Director St. Catherines and District Arts Council
- Dr. Jules Heller Dean Faculty of Fine Arts, York University
- Mr. Ross McLean Executive Producer Public Affairs CBC
- (Dr.) Mavor Moore Gen Director St Lawrence Centre
- James Norcop Executive Director Coordinated Arts Services
- Dr. John Saywell Dean Faculty Arts and Sciences, York University
- Dr. Peter Swan Director Royal Ontario Museum
- Mr. William Wylie General Manager Stratford Shakespearean Festival
- Mr. Milton Carmen Executive Director Ontario Arts Council
- Prof. Anthony Adamson Chair Ontario Arts Council

Appendix B: Inception date, to 1979, of post secondary Canadian institutions that teach theatre (p. 160)

Data distilled from *Directory of Canadian Theatre Schools* edited by Alison Cranmer-Byng and Don Rubin. c 1980

Type: U Grad = Undergraduate **Grad** = Graduate **C/C** = Community College **Cons** = Conservatory

Tech/Prod = training in technical and/or production. **Admn** = training in administration

All programs offered training in acting.

#	Year	Institution	Type	Name	Tech/ Prod	Admn
1	1946	University of Saskatchewan	U Grad	Dept of Drama	yes	no
2	1947	Queen's University, On.	U Grad	Dept of Drama	yes	no
3	"	University of Alberta	U Grad	Dept of Drama	yes	no
4	"	"	Grad	Dept of Drama	no	no
5	1958	University of British Columbia	U Grad	Department of Theatre	yes	no
6	"	"	Grad	Dept of Theatre	yes	no
7	"	University of Windsor, On.	U Grad	School of Dramatic Art	yes	no
8	1960	National Theatre School, Que.	Cons	National Theatre School of Canada	yes	no
9	1965	Vancouver Community College, BC	C/C	Studio 58, Theatre Arts Department	yes	no
10	1966	University of Guelph, On.	U Grad	Dept of Drama	yes	no
11	"	University of Regina, Sask.	U Grad	Drama Dept	yes	no
12	"	"	Grad	Dept Drama	no	no
13	"	University of Toronto, On.	Grad	Grad Centre for Study of Drama	no	no
14	"	University of Victoria, BC	U Grad	Theatre Department	yes	no
15	"	"	Grad	Dept of Drama	no	no
16	1967	Bishop's University, Que.	U Grad	Dept of Drama	yes	no
17	"	University of Winnipeg, Man.	U Grad	Theatre Division	yes	no
18	"	University of Calgary, Alta.	U Grad	Dept of Drama	yes	yes
19	"	"	Grad	Dept of Drama	no	no
20	1968	Banff Centre School of Fine Arts, Alta.	U Grad	Theatre Crafts and Design Diploma Program,	yes	no
				Stagecraft Internship Program		
21	"	Brock University, On.	U Grad	Dept of Drama	yes	no
22	"	Collège Lionel Groulx, Que.	C/C	Theatre Option	no	no
23	"	Dalhousie University, NS	U Grad	Dept of Theatre	yes	no
24	"	McGill University, Que.	U Grad	Drama Program, Dept of English	no	no
25	"	University of Ottawa, On.	U Grad	Department of Theatre	yes	no
26	"	York University, On.	U Grad	Department of Theatre	yes	yes

Appendix B: Inception date, to 1979, of post secondary Canadian institutions that teach theatre (p. 160)

#	Year	Institution	Type	Name	Tech/ Prod	Admn
27	1969	Collège Régional Bourchemin, Que.	C/C	Theatre Option	no	no
28	"	Niagara College of Applied Arts and Technology, On.	C/C	Niagara College Theatre Centre	yes	no
29	"	Université du Québec à Montréal	U Grad	Dept of Theatre	no	no
30	"	"	Grad	Department of Theatre	no	no
31	1970	Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, On.	U Grad	Theatre Department	yes	yes
32	"	Vanier College, Que.	C/C	Theatre Department	yes	no
33	1971	Camosun, BC	C/C	Actor Training Program	no	no
34	"	Concordia University, Que.	U Grad	Theatre Arts Section	yes	yes
35	"	Humber College of Applied Arts and Technology On.	C/C	Humber Theatre	yes	yes
36	"	University of Lethbridge, Alta.	U Grad	Department of Dramatic Arts	no	no
37	1972	University of Waterloo, Ont.	U Grad	Drama Dept	yes	no
38	"	Université de Sherbrooke, Que.	U Grad	Theatre Option, Department of French Studies	no	no
39	1973	John Abbott College, Que.	C/C	Professional Theatre Program	yes	yes
40	"	McMaster University, Ont.	U Grad	Program in Dramatic Arts	no	no
41	1974	Mount Allison University, NB	U Grad	Drama Dept	yes	no
42	"	Sheridan College, Ont.	C/C	Department of Performance Studies	yes	some
43	"	York University	Grad	Dept Theatre	no	no
44	1975	Playhouse Acting School, BC	Cons	Playhouse Acting School	no	no
45	"	University of Toronto	U Grad	University College Program in Drama	yes	no
46	1976	George Brown College of Applied Arts and Technology, On.	C/C	Theatre Arts Department	yes	no
47	"	Malaspina College, BC	C/C	Department of Theatre	yes	no
48	1977	Université de Montréal, Que.	U Grad	Theatre Option, Department of French Studies	no	no
49	1978	Grant MacEwan Community College, Alta.	C/C	Theatre Program	yes	yes
50	1979	Confederation College, On.	C/C	Performing Arts Management	no	Yes
51	**	Capilano College, BC	C/C	Theatre Program	yes	no
52	**	Selkirk College, BC	C/C	David Thompson Visual & Performing Arts Centre	yes	some

** : no date given, but likely no earlier than mid 1970s

List of Interviews

Each interviewee was asked to sign a Letter of Consent, which had been pre-approved by Graduate Studies.

All of those who are quoted in the study were provided with a copy of the proposed use of their quote. Requested changes were made and approved to the individual's satisfaction.

Thor Arngrim	February 23, 2006	Telephone
Malcolm Black	December 14, 2005	In person
Curtis Barlow	March 23, 2006	In person
Thomas Bohdanetzky	April 12, 2004	Email
Bernie Bomers	July 21, 2005	Telephone
Tom Burrows	January 25, 2006	Telephone
Ellen Busby	July 20, 2007	Telephone
Douglas Campbell	February 23, 2006	Telephone
Henry Chartrand	January 15, 2006	Telephone
Joy Coghill	March 1, 2006	Telephone
Diane D'Aquila	July 1, 2006	Telephone
Richard Dennison	July 3, 2006	Telephone
Michael Dobbin	February 5, 8, 2006	Telephone
	July 24, 2006	Telephone
James Domville	February 20, 2006	Email
Joyce Doolittle	March 6, 2006	Email
Brian Dixon	March 12, 2006	Email
Gerry Eldred	March 27, 2006	Telephone
Paul Eck	January 4, 2006	In person
André Fortier	January 10, 2007	Telephone
Linda Gaboriau	August 10, 2007	Telephone
David Gardner	November 14, 2005	In person
James Gillies	February 6, 2004	In person
John Gordon	March 15, 2006	Telephone
Tom Hendry	November 18, 2005	In person
	August 10, 2006	Telephone
John Hobday	July 14, 2006	In person
David Leighton	January 27, 2006	Telephone
Araby Lockheart	January 11, 2006	In person
Dan MacDonald	July 27, 2006	In person
Clair Pillar	March 15, 2006	In person
Gregory Poggi	February 1, 2006	Telephone
Bill Poole	February 8, 2006	Telephone
Penny Ritco	July 1, 2007	Telephone
Jean Roberts	July 28, 2006	Telephone
Jean-Louis Roux	December 13, 2005	Telephone

(continued on next page)

Paul Schafer	June 30, 2005	In person
	December 22, 2005	Telephone
	February 23, 2006	Telephone
Peter Sever	July 6, 2006	Telephone
Anna Stratton	December 18, 2003	In person
Vincent Tovell	February 10, 206	In person
Peter Wylde	August 14, 2007	Email

Works Cited and Sources Consulted

Notes

- Archival and other primary materials:
 - The format of the material is identified in [].
 - The location of source is identified in { }.
- Archive abbreviations:
 - Guelph Archives: Archival and Special Collections. McLaughlin Library, University of Guelph.
 - LAC: Library Archives Canada, in Ottawa.
 - MRL: Metro Reference Library, Toronto, Performing Arts Collection
- Personal communications: Author to Recipient
- Reports:
 - Alternate name is indicated in []
 - Distribution of unpublished reports is indicated as (confidential)
- Unpublished material: form if applicable is indicated as [typewritten]

Actors' Equity Association. *Contracts and Weekly Rates Applicable in Canada as of April 1st 1970*. [Information Bulletin.] 1970. {City of Vancouver Archives, Playhouse Centre of British Columbia fonds, Add. MSS. 1032, Loc. 562-G-4, File 1, General Correspondence.}

----- *CEC Proposed Categories for the New Canadian Contract*. [Typewritten.] 1972. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}

Adilman, Sid. "Equity Aims to Block Import of 'Mediocre' Foreign Actors." *Toronto Star*, January 15 1974, p. E 5

----- "English Actress Could Be Barred." *Toronto Star, The*, (Toronto) December 16 1976, p. F.1.

----- "Eye on Entertainment." *Toronto Star*, December 19 1977, p. C.1

----- "Free Theatre Staff Take a Salary Cut as Times Get Tough." *Toronto Star*, December 20 1977, p. C.3.

----- "The Two Sides of Kate Reid: Shrew Versus Superwoman." *Toronto Star*, January 7 1978, p. D3

Al-Solaylee, Kamal. "National Arts Centre Reports Small Surplus." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) March 27 2007, p. R.2.

Andrews, H.T.G. *In the Matter of the Arbitration of a Contract Between: The National Ballet of Canada and the Actors' Equity Association*. 1973. {National Ballet of Canada Archives.}

Armitage, Christopher. *Introduction to Slipping on the Verge: The Performing Arts in Canada with Theatre as a Case Study by Mavor Moore*. Center for Inter-American Relations at New York. 1983. Canadian Embassy: Washington D.C.

- Association, Actors' Equity. *Extension to Already Existing Contract: Stock Jobbing Contract*. [Individual actor's contract.] 1974. {Courtesy Dan MacDonald.}
- , *Canadian Theatre Agreement Contract*. [Individual actor's contract.] 1975. {Courtesy Dan MacDonald.}
- Association for Canadian Theatre History/Association d'histoire du théâtre au Canada. *The Canada Council and the Theatre: The Past Twenty-Five Years and Tomorrow*. Annual Conference at Ottawa. Fall 1982. University of Toronto Graduate Centre for Study of Drama and Queen's University in Kingston, Vol. 3 No. 2.
- Association of Canadian Theatres, The. *The Association of Canadian Theatres: History, Objectives, Membership List*. [Information bulletin.] c1977. {MRL; Performing Arts Special Collection; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres; hanging files.}
- Association of Professional Theatrical Producers and Managers. "Minutes of a Meeting of the Managers' Association Held at the New Play Society, 88 Bloor St. East, Toronto." 1960a. (Issued to Members) {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 21.}
- , "Constitution of the Association of Professional Theatrical Producers and Managers." 1960b. (Issued to Members) {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol.1, File 21.}
- , "To Members of the Association: Approved Constitution." Association of Professional Theatrical Producers and Managers, 1960c. (Issued to Members) {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol.1, File 21.}
- Baker, Robert Osborne. "The International Alliance of Theatrical and Stage Employees and Moving Picture Operators of the United States and Canada." Ph.D., University of Kansas, 1933.
- Ball, John and Plant, Richard. ed. *Bibliography of Theatre History of Canada: The Beginnings through 1984/Bibliographie D'histoire Du Théâtre Au Canada: Des Debuts-Fin 1984*. Toronto: ECW Press, 1993.
- Barber, Teresa. "A History of the Bastion Theatre 1963-1975." M.A., University of Victoria, 1975.
- Baumol, William J. and Bowen, William G. with a forward by August Heckscher. *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1968, c1966.
- Benson, Eugene and Conolly, L.W. *English-Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- , ed. *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Bercuson, David Jay. *True Patriot: The Life of Brooke Claxton, 1898-1960*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Bernheim, Alfred L. *The Business of the Theatre : An Economic History of the American Theatre, 1750-1932*. New York: B. Blom, 1964. First published in Equity magazine, July 1930-Feb. 1932.
- Bladen, Vincent. "Financing of the Performing Arts in Canada : An Essay in Persuasion." Toronto: Massey College, 1971.

- Bohdanetzky, Thomas to June Faulkner, LOCT. "Letter Re LOCT Expenses \$50." May 25 1973. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- , to Allan Sheppard, Theatre Calgary. "Canada Council's New Grant Application Form." March 30 1977. {National Archives Canada, (Former MG63), 430701-A-1976-0637 Accession 1983-84/598 File A76-0637 Theatre Calgary.}
- Boru, Brian. "Corporate Citizenship, Its Possible Effects on Canadian Theatre." *Canadian Theatre Review*. No. 3, (1974): p. 120-122.
- Brison, Jeffrey D. *Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Canada: American Philanthropy and the Arts and Letters in Canada*. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2005.
- Bryce, Robert B. *Maturing in Hard Times: Canada's Department of Finance through the Great Depression*. Kingston and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1986.
- Buchanan, Douglas B. "Canada Council, the Regional Theatre System and the English-Canadian Playwright : 1957-1975." Ph. D., Université de Montréal, 1999.
- Campbell, H.L. *Curriculum Trends in Canadian Education*. Toronto: W. J. Gage and Company Limited, 1952.
- Canada. *National Arts Centre Act (R.S., 1985, C. N-3)*. 1985.
- Canada. Bank of. *Inflation Calculator*. Accessed: June 2006 to August 2007.
http://www.bankofcanada.ca/en/rates/inflation_calc.html
- Canada. Committee of Inquiry into Theatre training in Canada "Report on Theatre Training in Canada." ["The Black Report on Theatre Training".] Ottawa: Canada Council, 1978.
- Canada Council Information System. "Business and the Arts: A Background Paper." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1974. (Unpublished).
- Canada Council, The. "Annual Reports." Ottawa: The Canada Council, 1958 to 1979.
- , "Private Benefactors and the Canada Council " Ottawa: Canada Council, c1961.
- , "Taxation and the Arts: A Brief." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1968..
- , "Functioning Board, The." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1971. (Restricted circulation)
- , *Request for Assistance to Performing Arts Organizations, Theatre*. [Blank Form.] 1971. {Courtesy Canada Council.}
- , "Twenty Plus Five, the Canada Council." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1977.
- , *A Brief History of the Canada Council for the Arts*. Accessed: May 24, 2007.
<http://www.canadacouncil.ca/aboutus/history/>
- , Information Services. "Readings on the Governing Boards of Arts Organizations." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1971.
- Canada. Dominion Bureau of Statistics Dominion - Research. "Recherche-BFS/DBS Research." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 6, No. 7 (1971): p. 12.
- Canada. Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. *Report: Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences*. Ottawa: Printer to the King, 1951.

- Canadian Actors' Equity Association. *Membership Information Pamphlet*. [Pamphlet.] 1976. {MRL; Performing Arts Special Collection; *Canadian Actors' Equity Association* hanging files.}
- Canadian Actors' Equity Association and Professional Association of Canadian Theatres. *The Canadian Theatre Agreement 2006-2009, Begins June 30, 2006, Terminates June 28, 2009* [Contract Rules.] 2006.
- , *Canadian Theatre Agreement and Rules, June 1977, Terminates June 8, 1980*. [Contract Rules.] 1977.
- Canadian Advisory Committee: Actors' Equity Association. "'New York' Committee." Toronto: CEC of AEA, 1959. (Issued to Committee) {LAC, Larry McCance Administrative Records, MG 28-I352, "New York" Committee - Notes, Reports (1962-1963) Vol. 112, Files 1 - 20.}
- , "Committee for the Development of Theatre in Canada " Toronto: CEC of AEA, 1962a. (Issued to Committee) {LAC Larry McCance Administrative Records R4040-0-3-E (Former MG28-I352) Vol. 112 Files 1-19.}
- , "Transcript of Telephone Conference of April 10, 1962 between Larry McCance and the Committee of Council on Canadian Advisory Affairs, April 10, 1962." Toronto: CEC of AEA, 1962b. (Confidential) {LAC Larry McCance Administrative Records R4040-0-3-E (Former MG28-I352) File 19.}
- , "Minutes: Canada Council - Proposed Freeze of Grants." 1974d. {LAC, Thomas Best Hendry fonds, R5270-9-2-E (Former MG 31-D59) Vol. 34, AEA Exec. Council.}
- Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. *Trudeau May Have Made The "Bedrooms of the Nation" Phrase Famous but It Was Actually Coined by the Globe and Mail's Martin O'Malley*. Accessed: June 24 2007. <http://archives.cbc.ca/400d.asp?id=1-73-538-2671> (Tab: *Did you know?*)
- Canadian Conference of the Arts. *Who's Who: A Guide to Federal and Provincial Departments and Agencies and the People Who Head Them. Who's Who: Répertoire des Ministères et Agences Fédéraux et Provinciaux et de leurs Responsables*. Toronto: Canadian Conference of the Arts, 1975.
- , *Who We Are. Qui Nous Sommes*. Toronto: Canadian Conference of the Arts, 1976.
- , *Who Does What*. Toronto: Canadian Conference of the Arts, 1977.
- , *On Behalf of the Arts*. Canadian Conference of the Arts at Dalhousie Arts Centre, Halifax. April 27 and 28 1978.
- Canadian Executive Committee: Actor's Equity Association. "Minutes: Stage Managers' Rules." Toronto: CEC of AEA, 1974a. (Issued to Membership) {LAC, Thomas Best Hendry fonds , R5270-9-2-E (Former MG 31-D59) Vol. 34, AEA Exec Council.}
- , "To All Managements Employing Equity Stage Managers." Toronto: CEC of AEA, 1974b. (Issued to Industry) {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- , "Minutes: Prestige and Stature Gained through Ballet Arbitration." Toronto: CEC of AEA, 1974c. (Restricted to Membership)

Canadian Theatre Centre. *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. v.1 - v.7, No. (1965 - 1971).

-----: "Subscription Sales Seminar, Vancouver – February 12th, 1966." Toronto: CTC, 1966. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol.1, File 26.}

-----: attributed to Tom Hendry. "Canadian Theatre Centre Survey of Financial Needs of Member Groups 1965 Statement of Deficit Positions and Statement of Certain Significant Amounts Resulting from a Survey Conducted by Canadian Theatre Centre among Twenty-Five Theatre, Opera, Dance, Festival and Related Service Organizations." Toronto: CTC, c1965a. (Confidential) {LAC R4487-0-3-E (Former MG28-I170), Vol.71, The Canada Council May 1963 to June 30/65.}

-----: Jean Gascon Chairman of the Board of Governors, Norma Springford, President of CTC. "Canadian Theatre Centre, Brief to the Canada Council in Support of Request for Grant in the Amount of \$20,000 in Support of the Centre's Activities During the Year Ending 31st July, 1966." Toronto: CTC, 1965b. (Grant application) {LAC R4487-0-3-E (Former MG28-I170), Vol. 71, The Canada Council May 1963 to June 30/65.}

-----: Board of Governors. "Minutes of Meeting of Board of Governors, Canadian Theatre Centre " Stratford Ontario: CTC, 1965c. (Issued to Membership) {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol.1, File 31.}

-----: The Secretary General. "All Members of the Canadian Theater Centre." Toronto: CTC, 1972. (Published to members) {LAC, Thomas Best Hendry fonds, R5270-9-2-E (Former MG 31-D59) Vol. 44, Canadian Theatre Centre, 1972.}

Canadian Theatre Review: Staff "Burnard Chadwick." *Canadian Theatre Review*. No. 1, (1974): p. 38-44.

-----: "View from the Top." *Canadian Theatre Review*. No. 3 (1974): p. 17-28.

-----: "Party Platforms." *Canadian Theatre Review*. No. 3, (1974): p. 28-33.

Canadian Press. "Businessmen's' New Council Seeks to Increase Aid to the Arts." *The Toronto Star*, June 19 1974, p. E.20

Carson, Neil. "Theatre Toronto." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Cathcart, P.G. to Tomas B. Burrows, LOCT. "Incorporation of the League of Canadian Theatres." March 28 1974. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}

Celms, Andis to Burnard Chadwick, CEC. "Canadian Executive Committee's Directive Concerning Stage Managers." March 5 1974. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}

----- to June Faulkner, LOCT. "Canadian Executive Committee's Directive Concerning Stage Managers." March 5 1974. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}

----- to LOCT Members. "Successful Conclusion of CTA Negotiations." August 29 1974. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}

- Chadwick, Burnard. "National Ballet - Arbitration." *Equity News Letter*, (Toronto) December 14 1973.
- to Jean Roberts, LOCT. "Censorship." May 30 1975. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; *Professional Association of Canadian Theatres*, 1976-1988 administration.}
- to Tom Burrows. "LOCT Theatres Arrears RRSP Payments." June 17 1975. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; *Professional Association of Canadian Theatres*, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- to Shain Jaffe, LOCT Sub-Committee for Small Theatres. "Concessions to Category G." October 17 1975. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; *Professional Association of Canadian Theatres*, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- to Gregory Poggi, President LOCT. "Directors in CAEA." March 11 1976. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; *Professional Association of Canadian Theatres*, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- Chansky, Dorothy. *Composing Ourselves: The Little Theatre Movement and the American Audience*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.
- Chapman, Natalie to David Peacock. "Theatre Calgary: Progress Report ... to Request Third and Last Installment." April 10 1974. {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-0-7-E (Former RG63), Accession 1983-84/152 Box 51, File A75-1766 Theatre Calgary.}
- to David Peacock. "Theatre Calgary: Progress Report to Request Second Installment." January 31 1975. {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-0-7-E (Former RG63) Accession 1983-84/098 Box 60, File A74-1809 Theatre Calgary.}
- *Meeting Minutes* Meeting: League of Canadian Theatres, hosted by Theatre Calgary at QR Centre, 830-9th Ave. SW Calgary. September 3 and 4 1975. (Handwritten) {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; *Professional Association of Canadian Theatres*, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- Chapman, Vernon. "Whatever Happened to Showcase?" *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 4, No. 3 (1968): p. 6-7.
- *"Who's in the Goose Tonight?": An Anecdotal History of Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: ECW Press, 2001.
- and ed. Tweed, Terry. *The History of Canadian Actors' Equity*. [Unpublished.] 2006. {Courtesy Vernon Chapman.}
- Chapnick, Adam. *The Middle Power Project: Canada and the Founding of the United Nations*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2005.
- Commission, Centennial. *Architectural Requirements for the Performing Arts in Canada, a Seminar*. at Ottawa Ontario. June 1 and 2 1964. Centennial Commission. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 2, File 2-4 }
- Conolly, L.W. ed. *Theatrical Touring and Founding in North America*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1982.

- Cornell, Katherine. "The Ballet Problem: The Issue of Exclusive Funding in the Dance Office of the Canada Council." Major Research Paper, York University, 1998.
- Cranmer-Byng, Alison and Rubin, Don, eds. *Directory of Canadian Theatre Schools*. Downsview, Ont.: CTR Publications, c1980.
- Creighton, Donald. *The Forked Road: Canada 1939-1957*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1976.
- Csillag, Ron. "Andis Celms, Producer and Director: 1938-2005." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) January 19 2006, p. S7
- Curry, Jane Kathleen. *Nineteenth-Century American Women Theatre Managers*. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1994.
- Czarnecki, Mark. "The Regional Theatre System." in *Canadian Theatre History: Selected Readings*. Toronto: Copp Clark Ltd, 1996.
- Davis, Tracy C. *The Economics of the British Stage, 1800-1914*. Cambridge NY: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Doherty, Brian to James de B. Domville, Montreal Quebec. "Letter: Request to Contact Graduates of National Theatre School." March 26 1963. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 6.}
- , *Not Bloody Likely: The Shaw Festival, 1962-1973*. Don Mills, Ontario: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1974.
- Domville, James de B. to G.A. Stone, Winnipeg. "Letter: Auditoria Capacity Regina and Saskatoon." October 7 1963. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 5.}
- to Mel Carter, Brampton Ontario. "Letter: Lack of Trained Theatre Technicians." July 10 1964. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 7.}
- Dwyer, Peter to Malcolm Black, Vancouver Playhouse. "Invitation to Meeting: Sharing Resources." February 3 1967. {City of Vancouver Archives, Playhouse Centre of British Columbia fonds, Add. MSS. 1032, Loc. 562-G-5, File 5, Canada Council Correspondence.}
- to James Domville, National Theatre School. "Invitation to Meeting: Sharing Resources." August 4 1967. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 14.}
- to Muriel Sherrin, General Manager, Shaw Festival. "Letter: Canada Council Manual on Board of Directors." January 19 1971. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 35.}
- to E. Gallant, Deputy Secretary to the Cabinet, Privy Council Office. "Draft No. 3: Assessment of Federal-Provincial Consultation." c August 7 1970. {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-8-1-E (former RG 63) Vol. 1349, Fed-Prov. Relations.}

- Edwards, Murray D. with a forward by Mavor Moore. *A Stage in Our Past, English-Language Theatre in Eastern Canada from the 1970s to 1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968.
- Ekos Research Associates Inc. "Evaluation Study of the Touring Office of the Canada Council, Revised Final Report." Ottawa, Toronto: Canada Council, 1988. (Unpublished)
- Elder, Glen H. Jr., Pavalko, Eliza K., Clipp, Elizabeth C. *Working with Archival Data: Studying Lives*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1993.
- Ellison, Robert to Theatre Management Association Members. "A Formally Constituted Association." August 19 1971. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 35.}
- Euringer, Fred. *A Fly on the Curtain*. Ottawa: Oberon Press, 2000.
- Evans, John. "The Awkward Stage." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 5, No. 8 (1969): p. 4-5.
- Faculty of Administrative Studies. *Calendar 1971-72*. [Annual Calendar.] 1971. {York University archives and special collections: open shelves.}
- Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee. "Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee." ["The Applebaum-Hébert Report"] Ottawa: Information Services, Dept. of Communications, Government of Canada, c1982.
- Filewod, Alan. "Alternate Theatre." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*, The. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- *Performing Canada: The Nation Enacted in the Imagined Theatre*. Kamloops, B.C.: Faculty of Arts, University College of the Cariboo, 2002.
- Findley, Timothy. "Roberts, Jean." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Fortier, André. "Report on the Visit to the Offices of the British Arts Council and La Direction du Théâtre, de la Musique et de L'action Culturelle Du Ministère des Affaires Culturelles de France." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1965. (Confidential) {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-8-1-E (Former RG63) Vol. 1348, File: British Arts Council Pt 1.}
- to Vice President Trevor Moore, Imperial Oil, Toronto. "Levels of Corporate Support for Culture." January 18 1967. {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-8-1-E (Former RG63) Vol. 1349, File: Fed-Prov. Relations.}
- to Peter Dwyer. "Meeting of the Orchestra Managers at Jasper." July 14 2006. {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-8-1-E (Former RG63) Vol. 1351, File: Comments & opinions on organizations.}
- to Peter Dwyer. "Warnings to Orchestras for Union Negotiations." September 15 1969. {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-8-1-E (Former RG63) Vol. 1351, File: Comments & opinions on organizations.}
- *Curriculum Vitae*. [Typewritten.] 1989. {Courtesy Paul Schafer.}

- Gaboriau, Linda. "Reevaluation Report on Council's Assistance to Theatre for Young Audiences." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1978. (Confidential) {Private collection of Linda Gaboriau.}
- Gardner, David. "Variety." in *Later Stages : Essays in Ontario Theatre from the First World War to the 1970s*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- , and Tovell, Vincent. "A Plan for the Establishment of The "National Theatre School – École Nationale De Théâtre Cu Canada"; Recommendations Prepared By "The Canadian Theatre Centre – Centre du Theatre Canadien" As Ratified by the Board of Directors." Toronto: CTC, 1960. (Report: "FINAL DRAFT: Not for General Release or Publication") {Courtesy David Gardner.}
- Garebian, Keith. *William Hutt: A Theatre Portrait*. Oakville Ont.: Mosaic Press, 1988.
- Gascon, Jean Major, Leon and Roux, Jean-Louis to Canada Council. "Canadian Theatre Centre Grant Application." April 10 1969. {LAC, Canadian Theatre Centre fonds , R4487-0-3-E (Former, MG 28-I170) Subject Files, Vol. 72, File 7.}
- Gilbert, Reid. "New Play Centre, The." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Gilmore, G. P. ed. *Canada's Tomorrow: Papers and Discussion, Canada's Tomorrow Conference, Quebec City, November 1953*. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1954.
- Globe and Mail, The: Canadian Press. "Arts Centre Chief Prays for Cash." *Globe and Mail, The*, (Toronto) October 28 1978, p. P.40
- Globe and Mail, The: Editorial Staff. "The Manifesto of the 1812 Committee." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) September 11, 1978, p. P.7
- , "A Strategy for the Arts." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) October 26 1978, p. P.6
- Globe and Mail, The: Staff. "Ottawa Talk Sought in Citadel Dispute." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) July 18 1978, p. P.11
- , "Petition over Citadel Policy." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) June 20 1978, p. P.16
- , "Budget Cuts 'Limited' Says Roberts." *The Globe and Mail*, September 13 1978, p. F.7
- , "Funds for Art's Sake." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) September 12, 1978, p. P. 6
- , "Artists Protest Spending Cuts." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) October 27 1978, p. P.17
- , "Herrndorf to Continue Helming Arts Centre." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) February 19 2007, p. R.2
- Globerman, Steven. *Cultural Regulation in Canada*. Montreal: The Institute for Research on Public Policy/L'Institute de recherches politiques, 1983.
- Granatstein, J.L. *The Ottawa Men: The Civil Service Mandarins, 1935-1957*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1982.
- , *Canada 1957-1967: The Years of Uncertainty and Innovation*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1986.

- Gray, Jack, Secretary General, CTC to All members of the Canadian Theatre Centre. "Termination of CTC." November 27 1972. {LAC, Canadian Theatre Centre fonds, R5270-9-2-E (Former MG31-D59), Vol. 44, Canadian Theatre Centre, 1972.}
- Gray, John. "Spending Restrictions Stall Ottawa Arts Policy." *Toronto Star*, April 29 1974, p. D.6
- Guilford, Peter Frederick. "The Development of Professional Theatre in Vancouver." M.A., University of British Columbia, 1981.
- Gustafson, David. "The Canadian Regional Theatre Movement " Ph. D., Michigan State, 1971.
- Hall, Amelia Wells and ed. Mew, Diane. *Life before Stratford: The Memoirs of Amelia Hall*. Toronto: 1989.
- Harley, Graham. "Live at the Crest. An Important Era in Toronto Theatre Gets a Superficial Treatment. Class Cage: The Crest Theatre Story." *Literary Review of Canada*. Vol. 13, No. 7 (2005): p. 16-17.
- Harwood, Ronald. *All the World's a Stage*. London: Methuen, 1984.
- Hay, Peter. "Cultural Politics." *Canadian Theatre Review*. Vol. 2, No. (1974): p. 7-15.
- Hendry, Tom. "Tennis Anyone?" *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 1, No. 11 (1966a): p. 2.
- to Ann Coffin, Canada Council. "Management Training Scheme." July 4 1966. {LAC, Canadian Theatre Centre fonds, R4487-0-3-E (Former MG281-I170), Vol. 72, File: Dec 31, 1966.}
- , "The Centre Begins to Find Its Place." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 2, No. 8 (1966c): p. 2,4.
- to James Domville, National Theatre School. "Letter: Ticketron Computerized Tickets." September 25 1967. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 33.}
- to Peter Dwyer, Canada Council. "I Am Now Looking for Administrators and/or Assistants." November 1 1967. {LAC, Canadian Theatre Centre fonds, R4487-0-3-E (Former MG281-I170), Vol. 72, File: Dec 31, 1966.}
- , "Do We Need a Management Institute." *Scène-Canada-Stage* Vol. 3, No. 11 (1968a): p.
- , "Ways and Means, Part I." *Scène-Canada-Stage* Vol. 4, No. 1/2 (1968b): p. 4-5.
- , "Ways and Means, Part II." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 4, No. 3 (1968c): p. 4-5.
- , "Ways and Means, Part III: Change Brings Opportunity." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 4, No. 4 (1968d): p. 4-6.
- , "Managers: A Central Need." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 4, No. 6 (1968e): p. 4-6.
- , "Consequences of the Freeze." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 4, No. 7 (1968f): p. 4-5.

- Hendry, Tom. "The Centre's Programme 1968-1969." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 4, No. 8 (1968g): p. 4-5.
- "Shadows Cast by Coming Events." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 4, No. 9/10 (1969a): p. 4-5.
- "A Start Has Been Made." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 5, No. 2 & 3 (1969b): p. 4.
- "The Acceptable Few: A Cursory View of the Position of Arts Boards of Directors in Canada." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1971.
- "The Muses and the Masses." *Canadian Theatre Review*. Vol. 3 (1974a): p. 6-10.
- "A View from the Beginning." *Canadian Theatre Review*. No. 4 (1974b): p. 13-21.
- Hirsch, John. "John Hirsch on the National Theatre School." in *L'école / Conçu et Réalisé, sous la Direction de Jean-Louis Roux, Par Michel Garneau et Tom Hendry = the School / Initiated and Prepared under the Supervision of Jean-Louis Roux, by Michel Garneau and Tom Hendry*. Montreal: Stanké, 1985.
- Hobday, John to Marilyn Janes, Canada Council. "Letter: Re Federal Sales Tax." March 2 1970. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 35.}
- Hoffman, James. "Risk, Sydney." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Igartua, José E. *The Other Quiet Revolution: National Identities in English Canada, 1945-71*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2006.
- Illidge, Paul. *Glass Cage: The Crest Theatre Story*. Toronto: Creber Monde, 2005.
- Innes, Christopher. "Ecstasy of Rita Joe." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- International Theatre Institute. *International Theatre Institute*. Accessed: July 20, 2006. <http://www.iti-worldwide.org/>
- Jaffe, Shain to All League of Canadian Theatres (LOCT) Members; All other concerned professional and/or semi-professional theatre organizations. "Studio Theatre Amendment to C.T.A." September 12 1975. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- to Greg Poggi, LOCT. "Your Memo, April 2, 1976." April 6 1976. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- Jeffrey, Brooke. "Cultural Policy in Canada: From Massey-Levesque to Applebaum-Hebert." Ottawa: Library of Parliament, Bibliothèque du Parlement, 1982.
- Johnson, Bryan. "Theatre, Sutherland at Conference." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) February 16 1978, p. pg. 16
- "Grant Freeze Leaves Theatres Cold, Some Smaller Ones May Even Perish; and What About That Pesky \$13.6 Million?" *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) March 25 1978, p. pg. 21

- Johnson, Bryan. "Tirade against Nationalism, Comparison to South Africa Coe Pours Salt in Theatre Wounds." *The Globe and Mail*, July 17 1978, p. P.13
- , "Theatre Strike Possible – Pact." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) September 8 1978, p. P. 15
- , "Pact Comes up Empty-Mouthed." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) September 20 1978, p. F.18
- Johnson, Chris. "Manitoba Theatre Centre." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Johnston, Denis. "Professional Organizations." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- , *Up the Mainstream: The Rise of Toronto's Alternative Theatres, 1968-1975*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- , "Totem Theatre: Autobiography of a Company." in *Theatre and Autobiography: Writing and Performing Livers in Theory and Practice*. Vancouver: Talonbooks, 2006.
- Johnson, Chris. "Manitoba Theatre Centre." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Kareda, Urjo. "Alternative Theatre Offers Hope for the Future, Toronto Star, September 16, 1972." in *Up the Mainstream: The Rise of Toronto's Alternative Theatres, 1968-1975*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991.
- Kotyshyn, Terry G. "Jupiter Theatre Inc. 1951-1954: The Life and Death of Toronto's First Professional Full Time Theatre." M.A., University of Alberta, 1986.
- Kramer, Kenneth to Graham Spicer, Assistant Canadian Representative, Actors' Equity Association. "Globe Theatre and C.T.A." July 24 1975.
- to Dan MacDonald, CEC of AEA. "School Touring Invasion of Rest Period." December 29 1975. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- Lancashire, David. "Imported Talent Choking on Canada's Tight Rules." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) July 10 1978, p. P.7
- Lawrence, Robert G. "Touring Stars and Companies (American)." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Learning, Walter to June Faulkner, LOCT. "Letter Re LOCT Expenses \$50." May 23 1973. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- Lee, Betty. "Will New Course Brighten the Canadian Arts Scene?" *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) December 28 1970, p. 7
- , *Love and Whisky: The Story of the Dominion Drama Festival*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1973.
- Lewis, Tom, Baeker, Greg and Marsland, Jane. "Leadership Development and Renewal: A Learning Strategy for Senior Performing Arts Managers." Orchestras Canada, Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, Professional Opera Companies of Canada, 2000.

- Library and Archives Canada. *Local Initiatives Program, Biography/Administrative History*. Accessed: August 12, 2006. http://www.collectionscanada.ca/archivianet/02012302_e.html
- , *Opportunities for Youth: Biography/Administrative History*. Accessed: August 12, 2006. http://www.collectionscanada.ca/archivianet/02012302_e.html
- , *Canada Foundation Fonds*. Accessed: July 3, 2007.
- , *The Honourable Pauline M. McGibbon* Accessed: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/women/002026-816-e.html>.
- Lipset, Seymour. *Continental Divide: The Values and Institutions of the United States and Canada*. New York: Routledge, Chapman and Hall, Inc, 1990.
- Litt, Paul. *The Muses, the Masses and the Massey Commission*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992.
- Littler, William. "Spectre of Cultural Dictatorship Looms with Government Aid to Orchestras." *Toronto Star*, May 4 1974, p. F.3
- LOCT, Sub-Committee for Small Theatres, Shain L. Jaffe Chairman. "Report and Recommendations Re: Negotiation of "Studio" Agreement." LOCT, 1975. (Issued to membership) {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- Londré, Felicia Hardison and Watermeier, Daniel J. *The History of North American Theater: From Pre-Columbian Times to the Present*. New York: Continuum, 1998.
- Luscombe, Mona to Gregory Poggi, LOCT. "LOCT Membership Fees." January 26 1976. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- Macdonald, Eric to Greg Poggi, LOCT. "Bastion Theatre LOCT Annual Dues." December 30 1976. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- Major, Leon. "Report by the President, to Annual General Meeting of The Canadian Theatre Centre." Winnipeg: CTC, 1970. (Issued to membership) {LAC, Canadian Theatre Centre fonds, R4487-0-3E (Former MG28-I170), Vol.: 3, File: Minutes - Annual General Meeting, 1970.}
- Managers of Producing Theatre Companies. *Minutes of a Meeting of Managers of Producing Theatre Companies*. League of Canadian Theatres at Hotel Vancouver, BC. January 18 1970. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 35.}
- , *Minutes of a Meeting of Managers of Producing Theatre Companies* League of Canadian Theatres at Manitoba Theatre Centre, Winnipeg. November 21 and 22 1970. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 35.}
- Marquis, Alice Goldfarb. *Art Lessons: Learning from the Rise and Fall of Public Arts Funding*. New York: Basic Books, 1995.

- McCance, Larry to Herman Geiger-Torel, Canadian Opera Company. "Letter: Accommodation on Tour." March 3 1967. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 1, File 33.}
- McClymount, Hamilton to June Faulkner, LOCT. "Toronto Arts Productions & LOCT." February 5 1974. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- McFarland, Janet. "NAC Head Takes a Rest, Seven Years and a Revolution Later. David Leighton Was Tough on Cronyism." *The Globe and Mail*, (Toronto) May 29 2006, p. B.6.
- McSkimming, Roy. *For Arts' Sake: A History of the Ontario Arts Council, 1963-1983*. Toronto: Ontario Arts Council, 1983.
- Melillo, Joseph V. *Market the Arts!* New York N.Y: Foundation for the Extension and Development of the American Professional Theatre, 1983.
- Montagnes, Ian. *An Uncommon Fellowship: The Story of Hart House*. University of Toronto Press, 1969.
- Moore, Mavor. *Reinventing Myself: Memoirs*. Toronto: Stoddart Publishing Co. Ltd., 1994.
- Moore, Thomas. *Economics of the American Theater*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1968.
- National Ballet of Canada. "Actors' Equity Association and the National Ballet of Canada." Toronto: National Ballet of Canada, 1973. (Submission for Arbitration) {National Ballet of Canada Archives.}
- National Theatre School of Canada. *The National Theatre School of Canada, in Montreal and Stratford*. [Brochure.] c1961. {In the collection of David Gardner.}
- Neatby, Hilda. "Cultural Evolution." in *Canada's Tomorrow: Papers and Discussion, Canada's Tomorrow Conference, Quebec City, November 1953*. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1953.
- Newman, Danny. *Subscribe Now! Building Arts Audiences through Dynamic Subscription Promotion*. New York City: Publishing Center for Cultural Resources, 1977.
- Niagara-on-the-Lake, Playwrights Conference. "Report on a Playwrights Conference, Niagara-on-the-Lake, August 14, 15, 1971." 1971. (Unpublished) {LAC, Thomas Best Hendry fonds, R5270-2-X-E (Former MG31-D59) Vol. 5, File: Playwright conference 1971 Niagara-on-the-Lake.}
- Noonan, James. "National Arts Centre, the/Centre National Des Arts, Le." In *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Ontario Arts Council, The and Canada Council, The. "The Awkward Stage: The Ontario Theatre Study Report." Toronto: Ontario Arts Council, Canada Council, 1969.
- Ostry, Bernard, with an introduction by Robert Fulford. *The Cultural Connection*. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978.
- Ouzounian, Pam to Sholem Dolgoy. "History: Coordinated Arts Services." July 25 2007.
- Page, Malcolm. "Change in Vancouver Theatre." *Theatre History in Canada/Histoire du Théâtre au Canada* Vol. 2, No. 1 (1981)

- Page, Malcolm. "Arts Club, The." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989a.
- , "Vancouver Playhouse." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989b.
- Panasuk, Christine. "Analysis of Selected Performing Arts Occupations: A Study Carried out at the Request and with the Cooperation of the Canada Council in the Summer of 1972." Ottawa: Canada Council Information Services, 1974.
- Parkinson, Jane, Banff Centre to Sholem Dolgoy. "History: Cultural Resources Management Program - Banff." August 9 2007.
- Pasquill, Frank T. and Horsman, Joan. *Wooden Pennies: A Report on Cultural Funding Patterns in Canada*. Downsview, Ont.: York University Programme in Arts Administration, 1973.
- Patterson, Tom and Gould, Alan. *First Stage: The Making of the Stratford Festival*. Toronto: Firefly Books, 1999.
- Peacock, David. "A Preliminary Report by David Peacock Concerning the Awarding of Study Grants in Theatre to Canadian Applicants." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1969a. (Confidential) {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-8-1-E (Former RG63) vol. 1351, File: David Peacock - report on study grants.}
- , "A Report by David Peacock Concerning the Awarding of Study Grants in Theatre to Canadian Applicants." Ottawa, Ontario: Canada Council, 1969b. (Confidential) {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-8-1-E (Former RG63) vol. 1351, File: David Peacock - report on study grants.}
- Peacock, Gordon. "Banff Centre School of Fine Arts." in Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Perkyns, Richard. "Neptune Theatre." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Perry, J. Harvey. *A Fiscal History of Canada: The Postwar Years*. Toronto: Canadian Tax Foundation, 1989.
- Pettigrew, John and Portman, Jamie. *Stratford, the First Thirty Years; V. 1. 1953-1967*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1985.
- Poggi, Gregory to Board Members of LOCT. "Incorporation of LOCT." April 2 1976. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- to All LOCT Members – Artistic Directors and Managers. "LOCT National Meeting." September 29 1976. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- to Burnard Chadwick. "Act Not Willing To Discuss Directors as Part of CTA." February 16 1977. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- Pollock, Ronald W. to Gregory Poggi, LOCT. "Items for Discussion for Upcoming LOCT Meeting." November 23 1976. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}

- Powell, Kerry. ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Victorian and Edwardian Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Professional Association of Canadian Theatres. *The Case: Interesting Facts and Fallacies About the Theatre Business in Canada*. [Pamphlet.] 1978. {MRL; Performing Arts Special Collection; *Professional Association of Canadian Theatres*; hanging files.}
- , *Membership Dues*. Accessed: August 7, 2007.
<http://www.pact.ca/joi.cfm?subsection=due>
- Professional Ethics Committee, Canadian Theatre Centre. Chair: Malcolm Black. "Report of Professional Ethics Committee." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 2, No. 11 (1967): p. 10, 12.
- Rewa, Natalie. "Garrison Theatre." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989..
- Rittenhouse, Jonathan. "Quebec, Theatre in (English)." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: 1989.
- Roberts, Jean to Dwyer, Peter. "Danny Newman." June 21 1968. {LAC, Canada Council fonds R834-8-1-E (Former RG63) Vol. 1351, File: Comments and Opinions on Organizations.}
- Roberts, John to The Globe and Mail: Letters to the Editor. "Arts Subsidies." November 2 1978. p. P.6.
- Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Inc. *Performing Arts: Prospects: Rockefeller Panel Report on the Future of Theatre, Dance, Music in America*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Roux, Jean-Louis. "A Short History of the Stage in Canada." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 3, No. 1/2 (1967a): p. 4-5.
- , "Aims Hold True in Definition." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 3, No. 10 (1967b): p. 4-6.
- , Garneau, Michel and Hendry, Tom. ed. *L'école / Conçu Et Réalisé, Sous La Direction De Jean-Louis Roux, Par Michel Garneau Et Tom Hendry = the School / Initiated and Prepared under the Supervision of Jean-Louis Roux, by Michel Garneau and Tom Hendry*. Montreal: Stanké, 1985.
- Rubin, Don. "Winding up the CTC." *Canadian Theatre Review*. Vol. No. (1975): p. 4-6.
- , ed. *Canadian Theatre History: Selected Readings*. Toronto: Copp Clark Ltd, 1996.
- Rudakoff, Judith. "Holden, John Porter." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Rudberg, Zena. "Pat Bradley." in *Questionable Activities : The Best*. Toronto: Playwrights Canada Press, 1977.
- Ryan, Toby Gordon. *Stage Left: Canadian Theatre in the Thirties*. Toronto: CTR Publications, 1981.
- Saddlemeyer, Ann, ed. *Early Stages: Theatre in Ontario 1800-1914*. Toronto: University Toronto Press, 1990.

- Saddlemeyer, Ann, and Plant, Richard. eds. *Later Stages: Essays in Ontario Theatre from the First World War to the 1970s*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Sandwell, Bernard K. "The Annexation of Our Stage." *The Canadian Magazine of Politics Science, Art, and Literature*. Vol. 38, (1912): p. 22-26.
- Sayre, Shae and King, Cynthia. *Entertainment & Society: Audience, Trends, and Impacts*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2003.
- Saywell, John T. *The Rise of the Parti Québécois, 1967-1976*. Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1977.
- Schafer, D. Paul and Fortier, André. *Review of Federal Policies for the Arts in Canada (1944-1988)*. Ottawa: Canadian Conference of the Arts, 1989.
- Schonberg, Michal. "Gascon, Jean." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Schwandt, Thomas A. *Dictionary of Qualitative Inquiry, 2nd Ed*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2001.
- Scott, Desmond. *The Beginning of Canadian Actors' Equity Association*. [Monograph.] 1986. {Courtesy Desmond Scott.}
- Scott, Robert B. "Professional Performers and Companies." in *Later Stages: Essays in Ontario Theatre from the First World War to the 1970s*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Sheppard, Gordon. "A Special Report on the Cultural Policy and Activities of the Government of Canada 1965-66, Vol. 1 to 4." Ottawa: Secretary of State Canada, 1966.
- Sherrin, Muriel to June Faulkner, LOCT. "Status of LOCT." January 30 1974. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- to All LOCT members. "LOCT Meeting Postponed." February 27 1974. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}
- Shrank, William, E. "Benefiting Fishermen: Origins of Fisherman's Unemployment Insurance in Canada, 1935-1957." *Journal of Canadian Studies/ Revue d'études canadiennes*. Vol. 33, No. 1 (1998): p. 61-87.
- Smith, Brian. "National Theatre School of Canada, The/ L'école Nationale de Théâtre du Canada." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Southam, G. H. to Secretary of State Canada. "Memorandum to the Secretary of State: National Repertory Theatre Policy: Meeting with Messrs. Langham, Gascon and Hirsch." May 31 1964. {LAC, James de Beaujeu Domville fonds, R5700-0-4-E (Former MG31-D248), Vol. 4, File: National Theatre Project, 1963-64 }
- Sperdakos, Paula. *Dora Mavor Moore: Pioneer of the Canadian Theatre*. Toronto: ECW Press, 1995.

- Springford, Norma. "Editorial Comment." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 1, No. 1 (1965): p. 2.
- Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada: Staff. "Funding Acknowledgements." *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 3, No. 6 (1967): p. 2.
- , "Why Ottawa/ Pourquoi Ottawa?" *Stage in Canada, The/La Scène au Canada*. Vol. 3, No. 12 (1968): p. 8-15.
- Stake, Robert E. "Case Studies." in *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2003.
- Stanley House Seminar on Playwriting. "A Strange Enterprise: The Dilemma of the Playwright in Canada." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1971. (Unpublished) {LAC, Thomas Best Hendry fonds, R5270-2-X-E (Former MG31-D59) Vol. 5, file: Playwright conference 1971 Niagara-on-the-Lake.}
- Stein, Charles W. ed. *American Vaudeville as Seen by Its Contemporaries*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1985.
- Stuart, Ross E. *The History of Prairie Theatre: The Development of Theatre in Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan 1833-1982*. Toronto: Simon & Pierre Publishing Company Ltd., 1984.
- , and Lane, Harry. "Canadian Players, The." in *Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre, The*. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- , Whittaker, Herbert and Davis, Donald. "The Crest." *Canadian Theatre Review*. Vol. 7, No. (1975): p. 8-45.
- Sullivan, Mary C. "Group of Twenty-Nine : Financial and Operational Statistics of Twenty-Nine Performing Arts Organizations from 1966 to 1972." Ottawa: Canada Council, Research and Analysis Section, 1973.
- Swann, Peter. *The Role of the Trustee in the Seventies (Reprinted In: Readings on the Governing Boards of Arts Organizations)*. Ontario Association of Art Galleries at Ottawa. November 27 1970. Canada Council.
- Taylor, Michael V. *The Canadian Kings of Repertoire: The Story of the Marks Brothers*. Toronto: Natural Heritage/Natural History Inc., 2001.
- Theatre Calgary to Canada Council. "Request for Assistance to Performing Arts Organizations, Theatre." July 5 1973. {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-0-7-E (Former RG63), 430701-A-1973-1766 Accession 1983-84/152 Box 51, File: A75-1766, Theatre Calgary }
- Theatre Communications Group. *Mission Statement*. Accessed: July 9, 2007. <http://www.tcg.org/about/index.cfm>
- Tippett, Maria. *Making Culture: English-Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission*. Toronto; Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1990.
- Toronto Daily Star: Canadian Press. "Symphony Complains About Banks." *Toronto Daily Star*, (Toronto) January 12 1970, p. 26

- Toronto Free Theatre to Canada Council. "Request for Assistance to Theatre Companies; Arts Division, Canada Council." April 1 1979. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A836000, Toronto Free Theatre Grants, 1975-85 - administration.}
- Toronto Star: Canadian Press. "Canada Council Grants to Performers Going up 38 Per Cent." *Toronto Star*, February 7 1975, p. E.5
- Tosh, John. *The Pursuit of History: Aims, Methods, and New Directions in the Study of Modern History 2nd Ed.* London ; New York: Longman, 1991.
- Touche Ross & Co. "Federal Tax Issues of Concern to the Arts Community in Canada: An Analysis." ["The Disney Report"]. Ottawa: Department of the Secretary of State, 1978.
- Trueman, Albert W. *A Second View of Things: A Memoir.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982.
- Twentieth Century Fund, The. *The Twentieth Century Fund.* Accessed: July 21, 2006. <http://www.uiowa.edu/policult/politick/smithson/tcf.htm>
- Urwick, Currie and Partners, Ltd., Management Consultants. "An Assessment of the Impact of Selected Large Performing Companies Upon the Canadian Economy". Ottawa: Canada Council, 1974.
- Usmiani, Renate. *Second Stage: The Alternative Theatre Movement in Canada.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1983.
- Voaden, Herman. "Government-Owned Theatres?" *Toronto Globe*, November 30 1929, p. 12
- Vogel, Harold L. *Entertainment Industry Economics: A Guide for Financial Analysis.* New York Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Wagner, Anton. "Theatre in Ontario." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- , "Herman Voaden's Symphonic Expressionism." Ph. D., University of Toronto, 1984.
- Wallace, Robert. *Theatre and Transformation in Contemporary Canada.* Toronto: Robarts Centre for Canadian Studies, 1999.
- White, Hayden. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1985.
- , *Content of Form, The.* Baltimore Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990, c1987.
- Whittaker, Herbert William. "Crest Theatre." in *The Oxford Companion to Canadian Theatre.* Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- , ed. Bryden, Ronald with Boyd, Neil. *Whittaker's Theatre: A Critic Looks at Stages in Canada and Thereabouts, 1944-1975* Greenbank, Ont.: The Whittaker Project, 1985.
- , and Rittenhouse, Jonathan ed. *Setting the Stage: Montreal Theatre, 1920-1949.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1999.
- Whittaker, Walter Leslie. "The Canada Council for the Encouragement of the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences; Its Origins, Formation and the Influence Upon Theatre in Canada 1957-1963." Ph. D., University of Michigan, 1965.

- Wilmer, S.E. *Theatre, Society, and the Nation: Staging American Identities*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Woodcock, George. *Strange Bedfellows: The State and the Arts in Canada*. Vancouver/Toronto: Douglas and McIntyre, 1985.
- Wylie, William T. "Report Trip to England Nov. 3 to Nov. 26, 1968." Stratford, Ontario: Canada Council, 1968. (Confidential) {LAC, Canada Council fonds, R834-8-1-E (Former RG63) Vol. 1348, File: British Arts Council Pt 1.}
- Yeo, Leslie; ed Johnston, Denis. *A Thousand and One First Nights*. Niagara-on-the-lake ON: Academy of the Shaw Festival and Mosaic Press, 1998.
- Young, Debra A. and Dunton, Davidson. "National Theatre School of Canada, 1960-1980, Survey of Former Students: A Report Submitted to the Canada Council for Dr. Davidson Dunton." Ottawa: Canada Council, 1981. (Published)
- Zimmerman, Ralph. "Great North Calling." *Canadian Theatre Review*. No. 6 (1975): p. 125-126.
- Zwicker, Linda to Peter Zaz, Simon, Dick, Martin. "I Find This Interesting ... 'Actors' Equity'." June 25 1976. {Guelph Archives; XZ1 MS A600027; Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, 1976-1988 - administration.}