

F/L930P70

C

ultural Capital

the care and feeding of Toronto's artistic assets

Tom Hendry

930070 ii
Council Robert W. Hendry
City

CULTURAL CAPITAL: THE CARE AND FEEDING OF TORONTO'S ARTISTIC ASSETS

THIS DOCUMENT IS DEDICATED TO THE ARTISTS OF THE CITY OF TORONTO AND TO THE TORONTO PUBLIC FOR THE ARTS. TOGETHER THEY CONSTITUTE A UNIQUE REALITY MAKING UP THE CULTURAL CAPITAL OF OUR CITY.

Tom Hendry
Toronto
January, 1985

"The arts are not a cost to the community, but an investment; not a luxury, but a necessity; not something for a narrow elite but vitally important for the mainstream of life here."

Mayor Arthur Eggleton

This report and its recommendations were commissioned during 1984 by the Toronto Arts Council. The Arts Council wishes to thank the City of Toronto, the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture of the Province of Ontario and the Department of Communications of the Government of Canada for enabling the Council to put forward this report for the consideration of the Council of the City of Toronto.

CULTURAL CAPITAL:

THE CARE AND FEEDING OF TORONTO'S ARTISTIC ASSETS

Consultant:

Tom Hendry

Support Staff:

Evelyn S. Ruppert - Project Supervisor

Nigel Baines

Anne Bermonte

Jean McNeil

Ellie Rubin

ADVISORY COMMITTEES:

Members of the Advisory Committees helped me greatly with advice, information and data. The use I have made of the tools they provided is my own. I hope they agree with my analyses, conclusions and recommendations, but their position as committee members does not necessarily imply their endorsement of this report.

Arts Advisory

Anne Billings - Executive Director - Toronto Theatre Alliance

Peter Herrndorf - Publisher - Toronto Life Magazine

John Hirsch - Artistic Director - Stratford Festival

Brian Macdonald - Director - Stratford Festival

John Miller - Executive Director - Canadian Music Centre

Peter O'Brian - Peter O'Brian Independent Pictures Inc.

Diane Pugen - Vice-Spokesperson - Canadian Artists' Representation Ontario

John P.L. Roberts - CBC - Ottawa

Muriel Sherrin - Sherrin Productions

Patricia Wilson-General Manager - Trinity Square Video

City of Toronto Advisory

Charlotte Empey - Senior Communications Officer - Public Information
and Communications Division- City Hall

Heather Hatch - Curator - The Market Gallery

Roy Henderson - City Clerk - City Hall

Scott James - Managing Director - Toronto Historical Board

Stephen McLaughlin - Commissioner - Planning and Development
Department - City Hall
Herb Pirk - Commissioner - Department of Parks and Recreation - City Hall
Mary Lynn Reimer - Landscape Architect - City of Toronto
Urban Design Group

General Advisory

Adrienne Clarkson - Agent General - Ontario House - Paris
Jane Jacobs - Writer
Richard Kirschner - Theatre Development Fund - New York
Dr. Helmut Liede - Director - Goethe Institute - Toronto
David Peacock - Counsellor (Cultural) Canadian High Commission - London
Professor Abraham Rotstein - University of Toronto
Marcia Thomson - Ford Foundation - New York
Peter Zeisler - Director - Theatre Communications Group - New York

Communities and Neighbourhoods Advisory

Jackie Claxton - Social Development Officer - Department
of Secretary of State
Moe Diakowsky - Executive Director - Multiculturalism -
Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture
Christina Hnatiw - Social Development Officer -
Department of Secretary of State
Rosanna Scotti - Director - Multicultural Relations -
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto
Andrey Tarasiuk - Theatrical Producer

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION - MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	p. 1
2. THE AIMS OF CULTURAL POLICY.....	p. 21
3. WHAT IS THE PUBLIC GETTING FROM THE ARTS AND CULTURE IN TORONTO?.....	p. 25
4. THE EXISTING COMMUNITY.....	p. 29
5. THE ARTS AND THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FABRIC OF TORONTO....	p. 35
6. THE TORONTO ARTS AND CULTURAL COMMUNITY'S MOST URGENT NEEDS.....	p. 43
7. SUPPORT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE CITY OF TORONTO AND THE TORONTO ARTS AND CULTURAL COMMUNITY.....	p. 59
8. WORKING FOR A BETTER DEAL.....	p. 67
9. METRO AND TORONTO.....	p. 79
10. TORONTO - A GREAT CENTRE OF ARTS AND CULTURE.....	p. 93
11. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS.....	p.103
12. APPENDICES	
(i) Why Should a City Like Toronto Subsidize Its Resident Artistic Organizations.....	p.111
(ii) Basis of Sector Population Estimate.....	p.114
(iii) Vancouver, Montreal, New York, London, Paris, Amsterdam: An Overview.....	p.115
(iv) Toronto: Missing Elements.....	p.129
(v) Tables.....	p.135
(vi) Acknowledgements.....	p.149

C

ultural Capital

Introduction -

Major Findings and
Recommendations

CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study makes public a considerable quantity of important but previously uncollected, unanalyzed, sometimes unknown information about the non-profit arts and cultural community made up of artists, arts organizations, suppliers, subsidizers and the public for the arts and culture in Toronto:

- (1) The community is much bigger than it was previously thought to be. During the year ended June 30, 1984 the arts and culture in Toronto attracted about six million attendances. Total spending by the sector during the same period was more than \$111-million. The local economic impact of the sector was at least \$250-million in 1984; the national economic impact was at least \$500-million. These figures do not include any pertaining to libraries.
- (2) The sector is growing at a rate much faster than that of the economy as a whole and appears to be recession-proof. During the three years ended June 30 1982, 1983 and 1984 the sector spent \$72.5-million, \$85.9-million and \$111.1-million respectively. This growth of 18.5% (1982-83) and 29.3% (1983-84) during two recessionary years, is several times that of the economy as a whole. Audiences for the arts are growing twice as quickly as the audience for sports.
- (3) Although municipal support of the sector increased by 50% over the period 1982-1984, government support as a whole of the arts and culture sector declined from 53.1% to 48.8%. Self-generated earnings, admissions and fundraising, which increased 66% during the 1982-84 period, were not sufficient to offset deficits due to declining percentages of provincial and federal support.
- (4) According to estimates based on information from the Canada Council, up to 150,000 persons in Metropolitan Toronto now derive some or all of their incomes from the arts or arts-related work in other industries. Of these, it is safe to estimate that 100,000 work in Toronto. This sector of employment is growing much more rapidly than any other.
- (5) A very large imbalance in the sharing of financial responsibility for arts and culture in Metropolitan Toronto exists between the City of Toronto and the other five municipalities. During 1984, of total identified municipal arts and cultural spending in Metro Toronto of \$12.4-million, the City of Toronto, which receives about 40% of total property taxes paid

in Metro, contributed about \$7.75-million or 62% . The remaining five municipalities, which receive between them about 60% of property tax revenues, contributed \$4.65-million or 38%. Cultural facilities in the City of Toronto are attended about 42% by Torontonians, about 42% by residents of other parts of Metro and about 16% by visitors from outside of Metro.

- (6) As noted, very large numbers of visitors from outside the city attend artistic and cultural events in Toronto, receive the benefit of City and other subsidy but pay nothing towards the municipal costs involved. This report finds that other cities - New York, San Francisco, Vienna, Baltimore, St. Louis, Houston, etc. - have imposed hotel and motel room taxes in support of the arts and cultural services used by visitors and recommends that Toronto do likewise. Such a tax, paid mainly by non-residents of Toronto, will yield an amount of revenue about equal to the savings visitors experience as a result of City, Metro, Provincial and Federal subsidies which, during 1984, reduced the cost of every attendance at non-profit arts and cultural events by an average of \$11.29. Average cost of such attendance in Toronto during 1984 was about \$5.00, because of the many subsidized free and low cost events offered.
- (7) Serious imbalances exist in provincial funding of the arts and culture in Toronto. Two provincial agencies - the Royal Ontario Museum and the Arts Gallery of Ontario - experienced 1983-84 attendances of about 1.5 million persons and received a total of \$18.6-million in operating grants from the province. 150 other arts and cultural organizations experienced total attendances of 4.5 million and reported receiving in total from the province operating grants of less than \$6.2-million. Per-attendance support respectively is \$12.40 and \$1.38. The unique character of both the AGO and the ROM is not enough to account for this 9:1 disparity. Municipal support of the two institutions through tax exemptions and grants totals almost 8% of their total revenues; provincial support of other municipally-supported arts and cultural organizations in Toronto totals less than 5.7% of total revenues. Assuredly the two provincial agencies are not overfunded by the province; equally assuredly the remaining arts and cultural organizations are demonstrably underfunded by the province.
- (8) Projected on an annual growth basis of less than half that of the 1981-84 period, the non-profit arts and cultural sector will by 1989 be experiencing attendances of close to 10 million and by 1999 these will have grown to about 25 million. By 1999, the non-profit sector's local economic impact should

be about \$1-billion 1984 dollars and its national economic impact at least \$2-billion.

- (9) Even given present imbalances in funding, every resident of Toronto is experiencing savings of \$46.66 annually with respect to attendances at non-profit arts and cultural events thanks to support from the City and from other levels of government and from the private sector, which contributed \$26.33 per capita in 1984 to the arts in Toronto.
- (10) Toronto needs additional facilities for the arts if sector growth is to be sustained and the city is to enhance its reputation as an interesting place to live in or visit. This report identifies a need for a municipal lyric theatre; for two commercially viable medium-size theatres available for rental; for a museum of contemporary art focussing on Canadian expression in general and Toronto expression in particular; for a high-profile centre for community and neighbourhood arts and cultural expression and for the addition of neighbourhood performing/exhibiting spaces related to the existing network of City-sponsored community centres; for a design gallery, and for a non-commercial video production/exhibition facility closely allied with the existing Toronto video infrastructure. The City also needs an institute for contemporary visual art, and a design institute.
- (11) Despite the size of the sector and of Toronto's support for its efforts and despite the existence of a considerable number of in-house arts and culture related programmes and committees at City Hall, the City has no overall budget covering its participation in the sector and has nobody on staff in charge of City activities affecting the entire area. As a result there is no coordination at the management level of support given by way of cultural and multicultural grants, tax exemptions, rental grants, at large grants or other grants, of in-house committee and programme work, or long-term planning.
- (12) Cities everywhere know very little about the financial and other parameters of their arts and cultural sectors. No city consulted was able to supply data similar in scope to the three-year Toronto overview presented as TABLE I and TABLE II overleaf. Other tables supporting this overview in detail by disciplines and giving other relevant information may be found in the appendices. Without these data effective management of and long term-planning for the sector are almost impossible. Toronto would be well advised to spend appropriately in future to update, augment and more precisely verify and analyze this type of information.

TABLE I

Three-year Economic Overview of the Subsidized Sector
of Arts and Cultural Organizations - City of Toronto
1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84 - Sources of Revenue

	<u>1981-82</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>%</u>
	\$		\$	
REVENUES:				
<u>Self-Generated</u>				
Admissions	15,873,025	22.2	22,050,933	25.7
Other Earnings	8,212,200	11.5	9,240,981	10.8
Fundraising	<u>9,423,935</u>	<u>13.2</u>	<u>9,508,109</u>	<u>11.1</u>
	33,509,160	46.9	40,800,023	47.6
<u>Municipal</u>				
The City of Toronto	2,535,645	3.6	3,080,204	3.6
The Municipality of Metro Toronto	<u>3,749,564</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>4,489,497</u>	<u>5.2</u>
	6,285,209	8.9	7,569,701	8.8
<u>Provincial and Federal - Arts Councils</u>				
The Ontario Arts Council	4,688,274	6.5	5,571,502	6.5
The Canada Council	<u>9,663,073</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>11,334,859</u>	<u>13.3</u>
	14,351,347	20.0	16,906,361	19.8
<u>Provincial and Federal - Direct Funding</u>				
The Department of Communications & Misc. approx.	1,500,000	2.1	2,100,000	2.4
The Ministry of Citizenship and Culture approx.	<u>15,767,971</u>	<u>22.1</u>	<u>18,279,217</u>	<u>21.4</u>
	17,267,971	24.2	20,379,217	23.8
TOTAL REVENUES:	<u>71,413,687</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>85,655,302</u>	<u>100.0</u>
EXPENDITURES:				
Production, Exhibition Selling approx.	58,022,956		68,691,922	
Administrative & Financial approx.	<u>14,505,740</u>		<u>17,172,980</u>	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES:	<u>72,528,696</u>		<u>85,864,902</u>	

<u>1983-84</u>	<u>%</u>
\$	
28,144,721	26.0
11,205,227	10.4
<u>16,062,377</u>	<u>14.8</u>
55,412,325	51.2
4,025,369	3.8
<u>5,360,456</u>	<u>4.9</u>
9,385,825	8.7
6,308,746	5.9
<u>11,475,232</u>	<u>10.6</u>
17,783,978	16.5
4,200,000	3.8
<u>21,497,190</u>	<u>19.8</u>
25,697,190	23.6
<u>108,279,318</u>	<u>100.0</u>
88,890,624	
<u>22,222,665</u>	
<u>111,113,289</u>	

TABLE II

Three-year Economic Overview of the Subsidized Sector
of Arts and Cultural Organizations - City of Toronto
1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84 - Revenues by Discipline

	<u>1981-82</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>%</u>
	\$		\$	
Theatres	9,137,078	12.8	12,553,875	14.6
Music Including Opera	14,515,947	20.3	19,784,701	23.1
Visual Art Including AGO	12,965,007	18.2	13,748,648	16.1
Ballet and Other Dance	12,734,653	17.8	12,382,126	14.5
Literary	13,433	-	5,528	-
Video and Film	993,766	1.4	1,236,406	1.4
Miscellaneous- Umbrellas/Facilities, Etc.	330,225	.5	575,280	.7
St. Lawrence Centre	1,137,632	1.6	1,310,147	1.5
Toronto International Festival	-	-	-	-
Royal Ontario Museum	13,574,446	19.0	17,044,471	19.9
Toronto Arts Council	11,500	-	14,120	-
Individual Creative Artists Estimated	6,000,000	8.4	7,000,000	8.2
TOTAL	<u>71,413,687</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>85,655,302</u>	<u>100.0</u>

*Toronto International Festival can be roughly re-allocated:

Music including opera	50% + 4,443,255 = \$26,583,251 = 24.5%
Dance including Ballet	50% + 4,443,255 = 18,841,558 = 17.5%

<u>1983-84</u>	<u>%</u>
\$	
14,302,964	13.2
22,139,996	20.4*
17,431,748	16.1
14,398,303	13.3*
233,221	.2
1,505,285	1.4
854,079	.8
2,304,202	2.1
8,886,510	8.3*
18,188,990	16.8
34,020	-
8,000,000	7.4
<u>108,279,318</u>	<u>100.0</u>

NOTES TO TABLE I AND TABLE II

These comparisons highlight dramatically the increasing economic importance of the arts and culture in Toronto.

1. Self-generated revenues grew over two years from \$33.5-million to \$55.4-million, an increase of almost \$22-million or 65.4%.
2. Total revenues grew over the same two years from \$71.4-million to \$108.3-million, an increase of \$36.9-million or 51.7%.
3. Total expenditures grew over the same two years from \$72.5-million to \$111.1-million, an increase of \$38.6-million or 53.2%.
4. Municipally-provided revenues grew over the same two years from \$6.3-million to \$ 9.3-million, an increase of \$ 3.0-million or 50%.
5. Provincial funding grew from \$20.5-million to \$27.8-million an increase of \$7.3-million or 35.6%.
6. Federal funding grew from \$11.2-million to \$15.7-million, an increase of \$4.5-million or 40.2%.
7. Self-generated and municipal revenues growth rates greatly exceeded the total sector growth rate. Provincial and federal contributions lagged greatly behind the total sector growth: Provincial contribution growth percentage was only 67% of total growth percentage; federal contribution growth percentage was only 75% of total growth percentage; self-generated revenues grew by 123% of total growth percentage and municipal contributions percentage increased by ~~32%~~ 95.6%.
8. Had Canada Council, Ontario Arts Council, Department of Communications and Ministry of Citizenship and Culture participation kept pace with the sector as a whole, organizations suffering deficits of about \$4-million would have suffered no deficits whatsoever.
9. It appears that governmental pump-priming has the effect desired: Assistance from the private sector increases and amounts paid by those attending arts and cultural events also increase.
10. It appears that neither the Royal Ontario Museum nor the Art Gallery of Ontario is keeping pace with the sector as a whole in terms of growth or funding support.

MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. The City of Toronto should increase its direct spending on the arts and culture from its present level of less than \$9.00 per capita to \$15.00 per capita. This increase will:
 - (i) create 1,740 new, continuing jobs in the arts in Toronto;
 - (ii) attract up to \$18-million in additional support from other levels of government and the private sector. (This is a conservative figure arrived at by using only 25% of the normal multiplier effect.) Existing patterns have for some time indicated that total other subsidy tends to be about 17 times City subsidy. The above figure is only 4.5 times the City increase of \$4-million to \$15 per capita;
 - (iii) create an additional local economic impact of \$110-million and a national economic impact of at least \$220-million;
 - (iv) maintain and enhance the existing accessibility of arts and cultural events especially in the cases of students, senior citizens and low-wage attenders.

2. The City of Toronto should seek enabling legislation in order to impose, levy and collect a hotel and motel room tax whose revenues can be used to support the non-profit arts and cultural events attended by visitors to Toronto and tourism and convention costs.

The City should also make use of development levies authorized by section 41 of the Planning Act for recreational purposes to help support its responsibilities to the arts and culture which a recent City task force recognized as an integral element of recreation. Together, the two levies could produce about \$15-million in annual revenues.

3. A joint City Council-Toronto Board of Education task force should be appointed to find ways and means to enhance the arts and art appreciation in Toronto schools, to draw attention to the educational possibilities offered by Toronto's arts organizations and community and neighbourhood organizations, and to focus public attention on the benefits of a greatly enriched artistic and cultural experience as part of education.

4. A four-tiered grants system should be introduced: Major theatres, major arts organizations, developing arts organizations and community and neighbourhood organizations. Presently designated major theatres (CentreStage, Theatre Plus, Young People's Theatre) should not receive extraordinary increases

or decreases. Other grants budgets should be increased from less than \$400,000 (1984) to \$1.5-million. In addition, the present ad hoc system of property tax exemptions should be extended to all arts organizations which have operated continuously with City support for five years or more.

5. The City should seek legislation to set up a tough Toronto Art Commission:
 - (i) to approve or withhold approval for erection or placement of art on property owned by the City;
 - (ii) to review the aesthetics of any proposed municipal development or redevelopment;
 - (iii) to monitor a 1%-of-capital-budgets-for-artistic-enhancement programme applicable to all municipal development or redevelopment. (This programme is recommended elsewhere.)
6. The City should reaffirm its commitment to arm's-length funding of the arts and culture and to the Toronto Arts Council as the decision-making body regarding all types of cultural grant support. The City and the Arts Council should draw up jointly each year a global arts and culture budget controlling all relevant City spending.
7. The City of Toronto Economic Development Corporation should:
 - (i) house and foster a Toronto Institute of Contemporary Visual Art and a Toronto Design Institute;
 - (ii) within its "incubator industries" context offer low cost or no cost studios to bona fide visual artists and designers, and should similarly offer working space to City-supported arts organizations;
 - (iii) administer a programme of incentive capital grants to arts organizations wishing to acquire rented premises.
8. Toronto should offer generous incentives to developers willing to incorporate needed arts and cultural facilities into planned developments. Such facilities should be self-financing and emphasis should be placed on development planned for the railway lands south of Front Street. This development will relate well to much of the existing arts district and will not involve demolition of existing buildings.
9. The City of Toronto should make appropriate staffing arrangements - such as a Department of Arts and Culture - to reflect

the extent of City involvement in the sector, and its importance to the well-being of Toronto.

10. The City of Toronto should set up a standing Arts and Culture Committee to deal with all matters relating to the City's participation in the sector, and to facilitate dealings on matters of mutual interest with other levels of government.
11. (a) The St. Lawrence Centre's annual operating deficit should be eliminated by implementing a solution, similar to that used to eliminate recurring O'Keefe Centre deficits, and involving:
 - (i) a 50-cents per ticket surcharge to pay for renovations and improvements;
 - (ii) prime tenants' (CentreStage and Theatre Plus) rents raised to break-even levels and offset by Metro rental grants similar to those given to O'Keefe Centre prime tenants and by modest increases in ticket prices;
 - (iii) reduced charges by City Property Department for maintenance and upkeep.

(b) In view of the City's heavy financial commitment to activities by and in the St. Lawrence Centre, the Centre and its prime tenants should be the subject of a combined study involving all three organizations. The study should focus in particular on finding ways and means to reconcile artistic freedom with a subsidizing body's need to know that full artistic value is being received in return for resources committed.
12. The City of Toronto should begin negotiations with Metropolitan Toronto so as to arrange, as expeditiously as possible, a more equitable approach to the sharing of municipal arts and cultural financial responsibilities within Metropolitan Toronto.

A complete listing of Recommendations may be found in the Summary of Recommendations.

BACKGROUND TO THE REPORT:

In preparation for writing this report my colleagues and I interviewed a great many members of the Toronto arts and cultural community, municipal politicians and civil servants, members of arts and cultural boards of directors, and members of the public. We did our best to listen to what they had to tell us, to record the information they gave, and to make analyses, reach conclusions and form recommendations on the basis of the knowledge gained from this process rather than on pre-existing prejudice, bias and opinion.

This report has a number of intentions:

- (1) To describe, as completely as possible, Toronto's network of over 160 non-profit arts and cultural organizations and to estimate knowledgeably who comprise the approximately six million annual attendances these organizations presently experience.
- (2) To describe the goals of municipal cultural policy.
- (3) To describe the economic importance of the arts to the City of Toronto and the extent to which they have built themselves into our way of life, now that Canada Council information enables us to estimate confidently that at least 100,000 persons directly or indirectly earn some or all of their living in Toronto from the arts or arts-related activity.
- (4) To describe the Toronto arts and cultural community's own definition of the most urgent needs to be met so that the goals of cultural policy can be realized and our existing achievements retained, enhanced and augmented. The needs, not surprisingly, boil down to money, space, a climate of care and self-confidence, a demonstration that this city is prepared - out of enlightened self-interest if for no other reason - to do what needs to be done to assist an industry which has been very good and will be even better for Toronto. This report describes funding imbalances existing in the City of Toronto's support profile. There are many instances of underfunding of arts and cultural organizations by the city and other grantors but no examples of overfunding. This report in no way suggests that any organization should be advantaged by disadvantaging another organization. Those organizations reasonably supported should continue to be reasonably supported; those organizations not yet reasonably supported should be given increased budgets, on the basis of an equitable, well-understood set of criteria and financial controls. All organizations sup-

ported should be subject to regular review. Organizations no longer effective should be phased out so that promising new expressions may be supported.

- (5) To describe what the City is doing at present for the arts and culture. This turns out to be quite a lot; in Canada only Vancouver does more at a level of \$13.00 per capita compared with Toronto's \$12.92 per capita (made up of direct spending of \$8.12 and the City's share of Metro's spending of \$4.80). When our direct municipal spending has risen from the current \$8.12 to \$15.00 per capita, which this report recommends should happen as quickly as possible, Toronto will be in a position to meet its share of the cost of satisfying the most urgent needs and correcting existing imbalances in City funding. Other levels of government - Metro, provincial and federal - are not yet persuaded of the benefits flowing to them thanks to the arts in Toronto, and their inadequate funding is declining yearly as a percentage of revenue coming to the arts and cultural sector.

For a number of reasons, this report does not take into account capital grants made to arts and cultural organizations by federal, provincial or municipal governments:

- i) The assets created or acquired with the assistance of capital grants from government tend, in the event of discontinuance of designated use to revert to the ownership of governments. Capital grants in a sense, are thus interest-free loans secured by collateral. Governments in Canada have at the very least implied liens on facilities and equipment worth many billions of dollars.
- ii) The costs of maintenance and administration of facilities acquired become the responsibility of non-governmental organizations and government is relieved of a large portion of the burden of providing facilities for which it might otherwise be totally responsible.
- iii) Even when they are programme-sourced, capital grants by government tend to be more ad hoc in nature than operating grants and more frequently reflect political considerations deemed to be at least as valuable in other terms as the cash given. In general, governments get as much as they give in this area; if they do not, the grants are not given.
- iv) Because of the practicalities of capital support which tend to relate support percentages to the resources available to grantors, there appears to be a rough

equitability in the area as contrasted with the imbalances of operating support.

- (6) To describe Metropolitan Toronto as a single cultural entity whose citizens view Toronto arts and cultural facilities, groups and organizations as their theatres, orchestras, art galleries and ballet companies. They vote resoundingly for this view with their feet and their wallets: their annual attendances are more than double the population of Metropolitan Toronto. The fiscal, intergovernmental arrangements respecting the arts do not yet perfectly reflect the genuine pride and participation of the all-Metro public in arts and culture or the important economic advantages the non-profit sector confers on its users.
- (7) To describe something of the manner in which other large cities - New York, Paris, London, Amsterdam, Vancouver, Montreal - deal with the relationship between a city and its arts and cultural community. Here, strict comparisons are impossible because cultures and traditions vary enormously and the powers of cities vary even more. However, what can be learned is this: policy and practice invariably reflect a response to the unique needs of each individual city; form follows function. There is no ready-made, all-purpose solution to the problems this report considers. To solve them, our city government and its agencies will need the cooperation and participation of other levels of government and their agencies. Lacking power, our government will have to rely on skill in introducing the need for a better balanced approach to arts and cultural funding into the complicated system of trade-offs and mutual accommodations which make up the greatest part of intergovernmental relations here and everywhere else.
- (8) To describe Toronto's artistic and cultural future on the basis of projecting our present levels of activity forward. Here, one comes back to the question of municipal power because as Toronto becomes more and more a great North American centre of art and culture and a greatly strengthened magnet for tourism, present sources of City revenue spent on arts and culture will become more and more strained. New sources related to visitor-oriented activities and services will be required, such as a hotel and motel room levy similar to those in place in New York, Montreal, Houston, St. Louis and Baltimore among others. Such a levy has the great advantage of allowing visitors to contribute relatively painlessly towards the subsidized leisure activities which more and more will come to constitute a principal reason to visit Toronto, to site a convention here. Development levies, authorized for recreational purposes under the planning act offer an additional appropriate source of municipal revenue.

These were the major areas of inquiry and the results are set out in this report in order to encourage the City of Toronto to build on its very good record of sensitivity and support towards the arts and become the municipal leader in Canada.

Apart from the nitty-gritty of sensible and productive increases in and adjustments of grants budgets to correct inequities and imbalances, this report urges the City to become a conscious advocate on behalf of the arts and cultural community. Society everywhere is changing; political relationships eventually reflect social change; forces all across the country are causing cities to examine the need for change in legislated powers and relationships; the arts and cultural sector, especially in Toronto, needs to know that the new arrangements formed by new pressures will be favourable to Toronto's continued growth as a centre of art and culture.

In almost every area of society, social and economic policy goals overlap. In the non-profit arts and culture sector they overlap completely. Subsidy, as a device is unique in that it benefits the users - i.e. the concert-goers - by giving them savings in costs while giving the musicians, the conductor, and even now and then the composer, necessary income. At the same time, the multiplier effect is busy generating 2.5 to 5 times the cost of the activity in economic impact. No one has yet attempted to measure the spiritual multiplier effect, the social multiplier effect of the arts. This report is certain that Toronto's deep commitment to a civilized way of life and its demonstrated concern for the arts and culture are two sides of the same coin.

A NOTE OF ALARM:

Because Toronto contains the country's largest and most important concentration of artists, arts organizations and arts-related industries, the recent federal cuts of \$109-million to the cultural sector will have their most damaging effects here. Television, film, theatres, orchestras, dance companies will all be cutting back and our talent pool will be forced to shrink. In the process we could lose much of our artistic capital.

This note should be borne in mind in reading all sections urging the City of Toronto to begin an advocacy role with other levels of government on behalf of our Toronto arts industry. If similar cuts were made in federal oil industry participation, the City of Calgary would be already on airplanes to Ottawa. A similar urgency should inform City of Toronto actions regarding the arts and cultural sector and federal cuts at this time.

AN OVERVIEW:

In any large city in North America, the arts - the software which enables the hardware of human society to be rationalized, explained to itself, mythologized and humanized into the satisfying programme called civilization - require a sympathetic presence overseeing relations between artists and government. Thanks to the unique make-up of our population, if for no other reason, the arts in Toronto are in particular need of a friend at City Hall.

Toronto is a city of about 600,000. In the city almost one hundred derivations are represented. British accounts for almost half, Portuguese and Italian for about 10% each, Chinese for 5%, Jewish 4%, French, Polish, Ukrainian, German and Greek for about 2.5% each. The remainder is represented 87 ways. Literally dozens of languages can be heard every day on our busy streets.

To varying extents the same pattern of difference defines the background of the other 1.6 million who live in York, East York, North York, Etobicoke and Scarborough and who attend Toronto-sited drama, dance, music, painting, sculpture, video and film exhibitions, read Toronto-produced books, newspapers and magazines, listen to Toronto radio, watch Toronto television.

The melting pot has been rejected by Toronto's one hundred partners-in-ethnicity. Instead, we have chosen a more complex route to the development of identity in a new place. We are all the richer because in deciding this, our postwar arrivals achieved an exciting compromise: they changed themselves slightly to fit in but they changed Toronto even more.

Any successful cultural policy adopted and implemented by the City of Toronto will certainly affect policy consideration in the other parts of Metropolitan Toronto, and for this reason alone, although there are others, such policy must be formulated with care and great sensitivity. Its aims, diagnoses, suggestions, recommendations and ideological framework will be studied by other large Canadian cities presently feeling the need to set out their own cultural/artistic aspirations and the ways and means they see as appropriate and effective in satisfying them. The addition of the information economy in big cities to the older industrial economy has focussed the attention of planners on the key role of the arts as the hard-core research and development sector of communications. Policy considerations must take into account this importance. They must consider the potential of the arts and arts-related industries as employers, as creators of economic as well as social and aesthetic impact. These policy considerations must also be formulated in the knowledge that our present richness of artistic experience has developed in the most helter-skelter unplanned manner possible and that impositions of tidiness and or-

der, however satisfying to the fiscal mind, can harm the very activity they were meant to assist. Our cultural policy will have to be specific to the needs of Toronto, our artists and their growing public.

The efforts of the non-profit arts and culture organizations supported in some fashion by the City of Toronto have produced in 1984 a national economic impact of about \$500-million. These impact figures, by the way, do not include movies (Toronto is one of the world's biggest markets), rock and jazz concerts, libraries, commercial theatre, dinner theatre, cabaret, publishing or broadcasting. Nor do they include the millions spent by foreign producers who come to shoot films here.

This year our non-profit arts sector will spend in our community over \$111-million. Of this, two-thirds will be in wages; the arts are the most labour-intensive of all industries. Performances and exhibitions given will attract about six million attendances, about ten times the population of Toronto. Precise figures on audience composition are lacking but estimates given by knowledgeable management indicate that of these six million, about one million will be by visitors from outside Metro. Of the remaining five million, about two-and-one-half million will be made by Torontonians, about two-and-one-half million by residents of other parts of Metro.

Because of their general excellence, Toronto artistic organizations have been able to attract from Ottawa, from the Province of Ontario, from the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, from the City of Toronto and from the private and corporate sector subsidies sufficient so that the cost to the attender of every attendance this year in Toronto will be reduced on average by \$11.29; this means that the two-and-one-half million attendances by non-Toronto residents of Metro will bring the attenders total savings of more than \$28-million. Not a bad bargain when you consider that the non-Toronto areas of Metro contribute only \$3-million to the operating grants in support of Toronto's artistic organizations. Not bad at all when you consider that Etobicoke, York, East York, Scarborough and North York do not have to give up precious land to non-tax paying edifices like the O'Keefe Centre, Roy Thomson Hall, Massey Hall, the Royal Ontario Museum, Art Gallery of Ontario, the St. Lawrence Centre, and so on.

Not bad for Toronto either - despite the forgiven taxes - when you consider that during June of 1984 the Toronto International Festival of Music and Dance spent \$8.8-million mostly in Toronto, generated tourist revenues of about \$25-million mostly in Toronto, and other revenues, mostly in Toronto, of a further \$25-million. Bad, though, when you consider that if the Festival generated \$50-million in economic activity and \$25-million of that represented salaries taxed at 20%, federal and provincial governments got back

\$5-million in taxes towards the \$3-million they contributed. The other \$25-million represented goods and services taxed at 7% provincially and yielding a further \$1.75-million. TTC brought in for Metro up to \$500,000 in Festival-goer fares. The City of Toronto, however, as a level of government realized not one cent in direct tax revenue out of the entire project, even though Toronto contributed 66 cents per capita towards the Festival's costs.

As the tourist industry grows, and along with it the costs of providing the cultural and artistic services which visitors seek in any desirable destination, the City of Toronto will need additional appropriate revenues. A hotel and motel room levy - similar to those in place in many North American and European cities - set at a rate of 2% would bring in about \$10-million. This could be earmarked for payment of tourist and convention marketing costs (50%) and support of the arts (50%). This tax only requires enabling legislation from the Province.

Given the growing extent of City responsibility in the areas of the arts and culture, in addition to the recommended hotel and motel tax, Toronto should make use of development levies authorized under section 41 of the Planning Act for recreational purposes. Such levies could make \$5-million available annually.

The use of these taxes will not in itself meet long-term funding needs. It will have to be accompanied by a more equitable rationalization of the existing arts funding formula. At present, the Federal Government, through the Canada Council, pays about \$3.00 per capita towards the arts; the Government of Ontario, through the Ontario Arts Council pays about \$2.50; the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, excluding the City of Toronto's contribution of 41% to Metro's budgets, pays about \$2.00 per capita; the City of Toronto already pays in support of the arts and culture almost \$13.00 per capita. This imbalance has not been recognized in the past, nor has the contradiction between the level at which activity is generated - the municipal level - and the level at which the activity is taxed - the federal and provincial levels.

For a long time it has been assumed that cities were the net beneficiaries of arts funding formulae, that federal and provincial arts subsidies given to municipally-based arts organizations tended to be greater than federal and provincial tax revenues derived from the economic activity generated by arts activity. In the case of Toronto this has not been true for some considerable time; it is probably not true for a number of Canadian cities.

Toronto's arts community has become triply important - as a municipal resource, a provincial resource and a truly national resource. This triple responsibility has not been recognized and

properly supported by funding authorities. The small theatres of Toronto, for example, constitute a splendid research and development component for theatre across Canada. From them come many of our most interesting young actors, directors, designers, writers, technical artists. Despite this important developmental function, these theatres are still funded as though their only task was the production of dramatic material of a size appropriate to their generally small seating capacities.

In general, the artists themselves, despite the growth of their industry, still provide the largest single component of subsidy through foregone earnings. Artists still do not earn enough money as compared with other similarly trained, experienced and employable professionals. Those employed in the arts industry remain generally below the poverty line, the lowest income earners next to pensioners. Audience members tend to earn two to three times as much as the artists they watch and listen to - and applaud.

At the same time, the cost of the arts to the public is beginning to be perceived to be too high, especially in the cases of students, many senior citizens, and low wage earners.

If the arts community is to thrive and improve, and the public for the arts - visitor and resident - is to continue to grow, these contradictions will have to be bridged by the application of additional subsidy. From a fiscal point of view, the great challenge of the '80s for the arts will be to find and make the arrangements which will permit a more reasonable and fair proportion of revenue generated by arts activity to flow back to the arts in order to stimulate improvement and enlarged activity.

Because of the composition of the population of Toronto and the entire Metro region - about 70% of European derivation - the major portion of the artistic and cultural effort of Toronto and its Metro neighbours provides opportunities similar to those to be found in European countries. Western symphonic music, ballet, opera, visual art and theatre, not surprisingly, absorb most of our budgets and energies. Much of the cultural message they convey is designed to remind the majority of its western European and British roots, and to acquaint others with the majority cultural value system. A municipal cultural policy should also support the artistic endeavours of minority groups which remind them of their own roots and acquaint the majority with the vast diversity of cultural/artistic heritage in Toronto.

At the moment, neither the western European majority, nor the multi-origin minority are being sufficiently well served. We have our share of racial and generational conflict, crime, social injustice - and even outstanding success stories - in Toronto and yet how many films, plays, dance dramas, musical dramas are there

which find their subject matter here and now? The resources committed or capable of being committed to these necessary artistic expositions are slim beyond belief.

Further, we have not built upon the artistic past in Toronto which should have, by now, led to strong and deepening traditions. Thanks to the work of the Group of Seven and Painters Eleven, Toronto has the most sturdily-placed foundations in Canada in the visual arts. Sadly, the promises of the '20s and the '60s have not been kept and our painters and sculptors, and the wide public they ought to be serving, are the losers. In other fields - literature, film, video, modern dance, theatre, original creation generally - we seem determined to arrange things so that we will always remain gifted underachievers. Attitudes will have to change.

Despite all of the problems, the long-term outlook for the arts in Toronto is very good. The quality of art produced has attracted an audience which now outnumbers, and which continues to grow twice as quickly as, the audience for sports.

Further, the arts audience has traditionally been composed of persons with education levels significantly higher than those of the general population. It appears that a taste for the arts grows along with increased education. It is encouraging to note that the sector of society with some degree of post-secondary education in Canada is expanding by leaps and bounds.

The recent report of the Macaulay Committee pointed out that the most important influence shared by those with an adult interest in the arts was a childhood experience of the arts. The provision of a wide experience of all forms of art for children is now infinitely more effective and widespread than it was twenty years ago, even though the strengthening and enlargement of this vital activity is still not the priority it ought to be. Even so, if the present public for the arts was formed on the basis of the minimally available childhood experiences of art of thirty years ago, we can look for a further explosion of interest as those born ten or twenty years ago begin to exercise adult options.

Finally, one source of great encouragement comes from the Macaulay Committee survey of Ontarians who stated overwhelmingly they would be willing to pay an arts tax surcharge at income tax time, provided the revenues gained went directly to the arts. It seems that our fellow-citizens recognize their need for the arts and they are willing to pay enough in extra taxes to give every professional artist in Ontario a decent living while at the same time lowering the overall cost of the arts experience.

It is the task of governments to respond to the explicit wishes of our citizens.

C

ultural Capital

The Aims of the Cultural Policy

CHAPTER TWO

THE AIMS OF CULTURAL POLICY

Municipal cultural policy as it affects the arts is the instrument whereby a city creates the conditions within which the highest, best, and most artistic possibilities of its citizens can be realized.

Such policy governs the actions of the city towards various groups and organisms:

1. Artists.
2. Arts consumers (the general public).
3. Other levels of government.
4. The system of public education.
5. The private sector.

Briefly summarized, the goals of cultural policy include:

- 1) The creation of a productive climate where artists are enabled to practice their arts as diversely as possible to the benefit of their fellow-citizens and others.
- 2) The creation of an accessibility climate where no citizen is deprived of a continuing experience of art because of economic or social reasons.
- 3) The creation of an aesthetic climate where the city's visual representation of itself to its own citizens and to visitors reflects accurately the city's collective sense of worth, self-respect, judgment and taste.
- 4) The creation of an educational climate where the city's children, young people and others may be given the opportunity to experience, understand and participate in the artistic spectrum in all its diversity.
- 5) The creation of a climate of opportunity and welcome so that artists of excellence are drawn to the city as a place of residence and work, thus enriching the city's range of artistic experience and level of artistic quality.

The achievement of these goals requires the City of Toronto to take action in a number of areas:

- 1) Although the City itself produces great wealth which in turn produces large amounts of tax revenues for federal and provincial governments, the City's own powers of taxation are severely restricted. The total resources required to carry out a comprehensive cultural policy are simply not available to the City from its own tax sources. Therefore the City must rely on the participation of other levels of government, working in partnership with the private sector and the City itself to provide adequate operational funding for the City's arts sector, and for the development or redevelopment of arts facilities.

It follows that a primary aim of the City's cultural policy is to articulate and present forcefully to other levels of government the legitimate needs and expectations of the City's community of artists and art consumers.

- 2) In order to create a benevolent production climate where artists can create works capable, ultimately, of bringing tangible and spiritual wealth and fame to the City, policy must be applied so that the special needs of the arts industry can be accommodated. Policy in this area leads to selective modification of zoning and other regulations when necessary for the provision of subsidized work space as part of the City's job-creation efforts.
- 3) Public space in a large city is a diminishing resource. Each time a piece of sculpture, for example, is placed on city property, less public space remains. The City and its citizens have the right to expect that the remaining unoccupied public space in the City will be given over to the finest possible examples of art which compellingly represent how the City feels about itself.

From time to time special interest groups seek the use of public space in order to commemorate in perpetuity this or that special interest.

From time to time the City itself develops or redevelops public buildings; but apart from the normal review process, those buildings are not subject to a special scrutiny on aesthetic grounds which they ought to receive because of their status as a public expression and as potential examples of excellence to the private sector.

It follows that City cultural policy in this area requires the application of a firm and consistent and non-appealable process whereby an agreed-upon group of appointed trustees capable of protecting and enhancing the City's aesthetic tradition should be given the responsibility to review in this context:

- a) all public development and redevelopment;
 - b) all proposals for the siting of art on City-owned property.
- 4) The quality and content of public education greatly affects the ability of citizens to appreciate, understand and participate in artistic experience. The City, whose taxes pay much of the cost of education, has little participation in the process of deciding what its children and young people experience and learn during school hours. The artistic experience, generally agreed upon as one of the most important evidences of civilization, receives little and cursory attention in our schools. The City, which offers a wealth of artistic possibility, has its young people base their studies on curricula designed, in the main, for use in places offering little or no artistic diversity. One noted arts administrator has commented: "The single greatest obstacle to a greatly enlarged participation in the arts is our educational system itself."

It follows City cultural policy must take as an aim the modification of curricula to reflect the enormous artistic component of our way of life.

- 5) Corporations and individuals are taxed on their earnings by provincial and federal governments. They are allowed to decrease income for tax purposes by amounts given in assistance of the arts. Such assistance is usually given at the city level; thus the city receives a contribution to its arts of (1) the tax that would have been paid on the gift (2) the difference between the total amount of the gift and the amount of the tax avoided. To this extent the provision of assistance constitutes, in part, an earmarked payment of tax. In applying policy towards the private sector (corporations and individuals) Toronto should recognize the importance of the gift given at the city level:
- i) Taxes which would otherwise be delivered to other levels of government remain within the City. For example, during the year ended June 30, 1984, non-profit arts and cultural organizations in Toronto received gifts from individuals, foundations and corporations of \$16-million. Had these gifts not been made and deducted from taxable income, federal and provincial governments would have received income taxes totalling at least \$5.3-million.
 - ii) Wealth (the total of gifts committed to arts and cultural purposes) which might otherwise be spent elsewhere remains in Toronto.

iii) Organizations are enabled to expand on the basis of decisions to give gifts made at the city level, in contrast to decisions usually made at the federal or provincial levels.

It follows that city policy should be to encourage the private sector by every possible means to assist the arts in Toronto and to use its influence to persuade other levels of government to give the private sector generous incentives to increase giving.

- 6) It goes without saying that the adoption of a policy-based course of action depends upon a willingness to apply conscious, consistent, articulate choice to decisions dealt with previously on an ad hoc basis. It follows that city cultural policy should be agreed upon by City Council and that the political leadership of the city should consequently assume an advocacy role on behalf of the constituency served by the policy.
- 7) As a general rule policy, adopted to encourage the most diverse possible activity within agreed-upon parameters and practice, should be based upon a willingness to provide support for activity initiated by the arts community rather than by governments. Imposed programmes in the arts tend to be ignored or subverted by artists. Opportune support of ideas recognized as good and supportable as quickly as possible is by far the best policy for subsidy of innovation.

C

ultural Capital

What is the
Public Getting From the
Arts and Culture in Toronto?

CHAPTER THREE

WHAT IS THE PUBLIC GETTING FROM
THE ARTS AND CULTURE IN TORONTO?

Underlying the good news and the bad news, the examinations of shortcomings and the recommendations for improvements contained in this report is the belief that all Torontonians should have the most complete access possible to the entertainment, enlightenment and - in the broadest sense - education offered by the arts. Arranging things so that this may happen is the business of everyone in general and the business of City government in particular.

The belief that City government will take the necessary steps to assist the arts community - artists, supporters and public - to move upward to the next plateau of more widespread significance and presence is based on convincing evidence: the existing system of organizations and individuals supplying Toronto with art has built itself into the economic and social structure of the city. The well-being of Toronto itself is now significantly synonymous with arts and cultural activity. The relationship between the two strengthens daily.

We have moved into an age of information, communication and design. But, at the heart of communications lies art: the written word, the musical or pictorial illustration, the ability to metaphorize and package in terms of symbols.

There are now at least two hundred cultural/artistic institutions and organizations resident in the City of Toronto. The Art Gallery of Ontario was one of the few such institutions deemed capable of coping with the King Tut Exhibition; the National Ballet School is the finest of its kind in North America; the National Ballet of Canada and the Toronto Symphony are welcome everywhere; the Royal Ontario Museum Gem Collection and Chinese Collection are only two reasons for global importance. CBC Radio and Television still supply English Canada with the lion's share of Canadian arts programming; TVOntario, especially with its children's programmes, is one of the leaders in its North American field. Toronto actors, directors, managerial and technical staff still buttress both Stratford and Shaw Festivals. In the field of original Canadian drama, the energies unleashed by Tarragon, Passe Muraille, Toronto Free Theatre, Factory Theatre Lab and Toronto Workshop Productions are still defining the parameters of development across Canada.

Toronto is acknowledged to be the arts/culture capital of English Canada. Approximately forty non-profit professional theatre groups present some five thousand performances annually to an audience exceeding one million. The Toronto Symphony presents more concerts annually than any other Canadian orchestra. Our Department of Parks and Recreation offers the largest free such programme of music and drama in Canada. Toronto visual artists, as a group, still set the standard for Canada. Their efforts are noticed: the opening of the Art Gallery of Ontario's 1984 showing of new Toronto visual artists outdrew the opening of the stellar David Hockney. Providing sustaining exhibitions and exposure needed for the development of the Toronto's visual and video artists has been accepted as a responsibility by cooperative galleries and artist-run centres such as Art Metropole, A Space, Mercer Union, YYZ. These organizations, and others, have established international reputations while often having to battle for recognition and validity at home.

Toronto supplies the programming nerve centres for all three major TV networks and two major radio networks. It is the home of Canada's only national daily newspaper and most of our major magazines. Numbers of film production companies are located here.

In addition to our public art galleries and numbers of artist-administered exhibition spaces, there are dozens of private commercial galleries handling the work of Toronto, national and international artists. There are specialized museums like the George R. Gardiner Museum of Ceramic Art and the Museum for Textiles devoted to non-mainstream masterpieces. There are any number of halls where, on any given evening, one can attend poetry readings, recitals, lectures, video exhibitions, films.

The City is also host to the head offices of many local and national service organizations: the Canadian Centre of the International Theatre Institute, the Professional Association of Canadian Theatres, the Canadian Music Centre, Playwrights Union of Canada, Writers Union of Canada, Canadian Actors Equity, Toronto Theatre Alliance, the Association of Canadian TV and Radio Artists, Dance In Canada Association and many others.

In addition to the established producing and exhibiting organizations offering full seasons of works, there are hundreds of project-based experimental and developmental groups ranging across traditional disciplines and offering a forum to the new and untried. Finally, there is an entire parallel spectrum of frequently excellent "non-professional" work in music, drama, dance and the visual arts. A significant percentage comes from our minority communities and is presented in languages other than English. Many of the works presented centre around neighbourhood issues, many express the sense of a heritage virtually unknown to many other Torontonians. Some - like the annual Caribana festival

or the annual city-wide internationally-flavoured Caravan - have become Toronto institutions in a matter of years.

The audiences for these events have been astonishing. Try to drive downtown when Caribana is on; try to buy a weekend ticket to almost any theatre in town; try to get seated at the last minute at a free performance of A Midsummer Night's Dream in High Park.

A visitor to Toronto, staying at the Park Plaza, can walk across the street to the Royal Ontario Museum, can cross University to check out the Gardiner Museum, can walk two blocks to the George Ignatieff Theatre and catch a student production, proceed another two blocks and look over the Hart House Gallery, listen to a recital, perhaps see a play, walk down St. George to the Art Gallery of Ontario, stroll easily to Roy Thomson Hall, buy some half-price tickets at the Five-Star ticket booth while sizing up Michael Snow's geese defining the Galleria's space, amble over to Queen Street to take a peek at North America's most beautiful City Hall, examine the Civic Archives, walk over to old Massey Hall, head north to the Yorkville vicinity for a tour of the City's major private galleries and be back in a matter of hours, unless of course he or she stopped for a Sesqui concert in front of Queen's Park, a Jazz concert to the rear. All this, together with the charm of the adjoining Annex, contained in a matter of a couple of square miles is a source of some wonderment to our Park Plaza guest. But we Torontonians take this urban cultural convenience very much for granted.

Think a bit about what the arts meant to Toronto and Torontonians during 1984. Think of some of the highlights just as they come to mind:

Jon Vickers in Peter Grimes...The Toronto Symphony and the Massed Choirs performing the Mahler Eighth Symphony...Sabina Allemann's opening night in the National Ballet's Onegin...R.H. Thomson and Fiona Reid in Bill Glassco's fine production of Cloud 9...Oscar Peterson at Roy Thomson Hall...Trafford Tanzi's Martha Burns...Whistler and David Hockney at the AGO...Robert Desrosiers' remarkable season...Jackie Burroughs and Clare Coulter in White Biting Dog...The Canadian retrospective at the Festival of Festivals...Sankai Juku...Pina Bausch...The Hamburg Ballet...David French's latest play Salt Water Moon at the Tarragon...Everything the Montreal Symphony Orchestra played during its visit...All the authors, national and international, at Harbourfront...Josef Skvorecky's Toronto-set The Engineer of Human Souls...YPT's Twelfth Night, directed by Richard Greenblatt...Karen Kain in Cinderella...The perfect production of Delicatessen...the Opera School's The Crucible...Toronto Symphony's Chaconne commissioned from Michael Colgrass for Rivka Golani...L'incoronazione di Poppea...Evelyn Hart guesting with The National Ballet...Nureyev...Caribana...Jacob Two-Two...Denis Lee's Alligator

Pie revival at Passe Muraille...Douglas Campbell in Toad of Toad Hall and The Homecoming...The Children's Theatre Festival at Harbourfront...Placido Domingo...The Fron Male Voice Choir...Charlie Pachter's Davenport and Bay...The CJRT Celebration Concert...Chysta Commedia at St. Vladimir's with Luba Goy, Joan Karasevich, Lubomir Mykytiuk...Margie Gillis at the Music Box...Bobby Short...Death in Venice...Marilyn Horne in Rinaldo with magic sets by Mark Negin...The Dream in High Park...New City of Sculpture...Repercussion.

You have just read a list of less than 1% of what was available in Toronto during 1984.

It's always been like this. It always will be, we say. And it will. It will even get better. Provided our City Government, backed up by our voters, insures the steady financial sustenance our arts/cultural resources must have if a healthy, thriving socially dynamic artist/audience interaction is to continue.

If the arts are provided with the wherewithal they need, we will be in the happy position of strengthening Toronto's economic life while doing absolutely the right thing for our spiritual future. Toronto is getting a lot from the arts, and the arts are getting a lot from Toronto - but not enough. In order to do more, the City needs additional resources. Two appropriate sources of additional arts and culture tax revenue are a hotel and motel room levy and a development levy.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City of Toronto seek enabling legislation from the Province of Ontario so as to be able to impose a hotel and motel room levy of at least 2% designed to yield \$5-million for the arts and \$5-million for tourism and convention centre costs per annum. It is further recommended that the City use levies authorized by section 41 of the Planning Act for recreational purposes, in order to help meet its responsibilities in the area of the arts and culture.

C

ultural Capital

The Existing Community

CHAPTER FOUR

THE EXISTING COMMUNITY

Our artists have invested their ability, energy and sacrifice in a funding partnership with the City of Toronto, the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, the Ontario Arts Council, the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture, the Canada Council, the Department of Communications, the private sector - individuals, foundations and corporations - and the individuals who buy art or tickets to arts events. Of the various partners contributing to Toronto's development as a centre of artistic activity, the most important contributions have come and still come from the artists themselves and their public.

Together, the artists, the public and the funding bodies and supporters have created a community which offers Torontonians a diversity and richness of artistic experience second to none in Canada and second only to New York in North America. Together they have created an arts industry with an estimated annual economic impact of \$250-million locally and \$500-million nationally. Their audience, whose annual attendances exceed by 200% the population totals of all of Metropolitan Toronto, is growing at a rate double the audience for sports.

Toronto, like New York City and Los Angeles is now a net exporter of art and artists. More money comes into Toronto because of arts exports than goes out to pay for arts imports. Even during the recent Toronto International Festival of Music and Dance, 66% of performing positions were filled by Canadians and most of these were Torontonians. Out-of-town visitors to Festival events spent more than \$10-million, which exceeded the entire cost of the Festival and far exceeded the fees paid to artists from abroad.

Through the operations of the locally based performing arts - theatre, classical music and dance - imports from abroad have been almost completely displaced by product created in Toronto. Only the Royal Alexandra Theatre consistently offers imported productions, and these are now frequently replaced by Canadian theatrical productions generally featuring Toronto performers. The O'Keefe Centre offers only approximately twenty weeks of imports. The remainder of the year is occupied by two Toronto-based organizations - the National Ballet of Canada and the Canadian Opera Company - both of whom wish they were allowed to play longer in the Centre.

Toronto has a large and adaptable community of performing artists. During the past twenty years when local performing arts programs and their audiences were being expanded by at least

1000%, the Toronto talent pool, in addition to staffing Toronto productions, also supplied performers in all categories for performing arts organizations across Canada, for television and for films here and elsewhere. The Toronto filmmaking industry has benefited greatly from the seventy-five cent Canadian dollar, but the City's very good name as a place to make movies comes from its ability to supply a great range of first class performers and crews, designers, costumers, and set constructors. In fact, all the industry lacks at the moment is a larger supply of first class film writers.

Despite this remarkable history of development, problems exist. The cost to the consumer of art is beginning to be seen to be too high; most artists, particularly, writers, composers, painters, sculptors, choreographers - all those whose achievement lies at the very heart of any great age of artistic excellence - do not earn a decent income from their work, even when the work is accepted, used and marketed.

Non-profit artistic activity taking place in the City of Toronto has a local economic base of \$250-million made up of economic activity generated by local spending by residents of Metro and visitors to Toronto.

The non-profit arts/cultural economy itself - a complicated infrastructure of supporters, creators, performers, producers, administrators, subsidizers and suppliers - includes a number of readily identifiable elements in the subsidized sector:

Performing arts:

- 37 Producing theatre companies
- 11 Facilities for theatre and dance (not producing)
- 12 Producing dance and ballet companies
- 3 Producing opera companies
- 1 Symphony orchestra
- 12 Choirs and other vocal groups
- 15 Other musical ensembles

Visual Arts:

- 6 Public art galleries
- 3 Video facilities/Producers
- 5 Service organizations

To these must be added a long list of private galleries, book publishers, magazine publishers, suppliers of theatrical make-up, properties, costumes and settings, sound equipment suppliers, music and musical instrument suppliers, teachers, training institutions and agents.

There are many professional artists' associations in Toronto. A few, together with their estimates of numbers of Toronto members

are listed below. Some artists belong to more than one organization.

ACTRA (Association of Canadian Television and Radio Artists)	4700 members
Academy of Canadian Cinema	300 members
American Federation of Musicians	2000 members
Association of Cultural Executives	60 members
Canadian Actors Equity Association	1800 members
CARO (Canadian Artists Representation of Ontario)	125 members
CAPAC (Canadian Association of Publishers, Authors and Composers)	2000 members
Canadian Authors Association	120 members
Canadian Film Editors Guild	800 members
Directors Guild of Canada	350 members
IATSE (The International Alliance of Theatrical and Stage Employees)	200 members
League of Canadian Composers	51 members
League of Canadian Poets	100 members
National Association of Broadcast Employees and Technicians	2300 members
Periodical Writers Association of Canada	117 members
Playwrights Union of Canada	100 members
Visual Arts Ontario	2000 members
Writers Union of Canada	200 members

The entire community, including the public for the arts and the subsidizing bodies as well as the artists and other employees of arts organizations is now based on a complex set of interdependencies involving a great many elements. The loss of any of these elements would weaken the whole system to an extent out of proportion to the economic impact of each individual element. If Toronto's tradition of training at the conservatory level were interrupted or discontinued, the Canadian Opera Company, the choirs, the theatres, the cabarets, the dinner theatres, the Toronto Symphony, the makers of commercials, the television, film and radio producers would all suffer. If the small theatres were to close, a significant percentage of actors - developing and developed - would be forced to seek employment in Los Angeles and New York, or to leave the profession, as they did during the early '60s when the CBC, then almost the only employer of dramatic talent in Toronto, significantly diminished its dramatic output. If the recent federal decision to reduce CBC's already inadequate funding causes the levels of local television, radio, and film productions to lessen dramatically, numbers of performers will be forced to move elsewhere in search of the same range of employment opportunity now available in Toronto. As a result our ability to attract film productions, television and video productions and commercial productions will be gravely diminished by the weakened talent pool.

No single production element can support our performer population; together they do, and together they grow. The entire interlocked network acts as a critical mass: the employment range attracts fine performers; the performers impress producers who are mobile and tend to go where production standards are most economical and highest; the producers schedule more work to take advantage of the talent pool; the talent pool enlarges itself to take advantage of the added possibilities.

There is one major concern here: work in our non-profit theatres, orchestras and dance companies tends to be ill-paid in comparison with work in the other employment sectors. Work on the basic craft of acting in theatres becomes a luxury to be afforded on the basis of earnings in the other sectors. Fine artists in search of a decent living must spend far more time applying their craft commercially than developing their art. This leads to a talent pool possessing a great breadth of competence, but lacking the brilliance and depth which comes only from long and concentrated work on one's profession.

Continuously reliable world class standards in the performing arts in Toronto are to be found in the work of those organizations who employ their performers full-time or close to full-time. The National Ballet of Canada and the Toronto Symphony come to mind

here. Standards in theatre and modern dance vary with the ability of organizations to hold their performers and are capricious. In Toronto, theatre in particular is the "Team Canada" of the performing arts: individual productions made up of performer and production teams of great individual merit come together for short periods of time and, to the extent that they each bring professional levels of developed ability to the productions, these frequently rise to heights of ad hoc brilliance. What is missing is the sustained development which takes place in our ballet company and symphony orchestra when performers of great ability work together for extended periods of time and feed off each others' gifts.

A surprising lack in Toronto, given these rich resources of dancers, singers and actors—who-sing is a commercial lyric theatre offering the world repertoire of operettas, musical comedy and music theatre. This is commented upon more extensively in another portion of this report.

Another significant gap is in the extent of resources committed in theatre, dance and music to the development at the highest level of our important Toronto voice in the areas of playwriting, choreography and composition. The smaller organizations, who do interest themselves in these matters, are weak and underfunded by comparison with the larger, world class institutions. The performers who concern themselves with original creation are less generously remunerated than their counterparts in established organizations offering the existing world repertoire. In a city like Toronto, in search of a mythology, this is a serious lack which will be discussed more extensively elsewhere.

If the situation of the successful professional performing artist is bearable, though artistically debilitating, the plight of the successful Toronto visual artist is, by comparison, dire.

Here even the most saleable and accepted of our artists must devote high percentages of their time and energy to working at things other than their art. The Canadian Artists Representation of Ontario has stated that a painter who is fortunate enough to make sales of \$30,000 in a given year will likely, at the end of the year be faced with a net loss on his or her artistic activities. Need it be said that \$30,000 in sales in the present depressed art market is a respectable achievement indeed? The reasons for these crippling conditions are discussed extensively in another section of this report. Despite them, Toronto visual artists have done their share in helping our city to become North America's second most important art market. Whether or not Toronto is able to develop in the visual arts the same critical mass capability presently fuelling the performing arts will depend to a great extent on the City's willingness to act now to create a benevolent climate for the producers of visual art.

The importance of this next step is underlined by Planning and Development Commissioner Stephen McLaughlin's perceptive comment that "art is the cutting edge of industry." In the age of communications and information industries the importance to Toronto of a strong and healthy community of visual artists cannot be overestimated. The applied arts are just that: art that does not exist cannot be applied. Software is everything.

In the field of literature, Toronto is host to a large number of Canada's most important writers. Of all of them, perhaps a dozen or two earn a living from their writing. Much of their time must, as in the case of visual artists, be spent on work other than their art. We are all the losers and our city, composed of the most diverse collection of ethnicity in Canada and desperately in need of a collective mythology, is the greatest loser of all. The London, Dublin, New York, Paris and Berlin we all know from their literature do not really exist. The fabled images we carry in our imaginations of these cities were created by their artists who expressed and, at times, invented their mythologies. When Picasso painted the portrait of Gertrude Stein, she said "I don't look like that." Picasso replied "No, but you will." And eventually she did.

It is the same with cities.

One can endlessly cite statistics to prove employment, economic impact and tourist magnetism. What the arts - given a chance - bring to a city is something in addition to all these material rewards. They give a great city an image of its soul.

C

ultural Capital

The Arts and the Social and Economic
Fabric of Toronto

CHAPTER FIVE

THE ARTS AND THE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC FABRIC OF TORONTO

The figure of 100,000 artists or arts-related workers in Toronto seems high but isn't really, not when you take into account the Toronto concentration of industries making extensive use of artists: textiles, advertising, book, newspaper and magazine publishing, radio and television, clothing, furniture, appliances, computer software, signage, packaging.... The list is large and growing. Because Toronto has one of the continent's largest concentrations of artists and arts-related specialists, companies needing them can locate here, or - more important - originate here, succeed, expand, require an even larger supply of talent. The critical mass phenomenon which has given us an outstanding selection of performers is already operating to increase our population of visual artists, writers, designers and directors.

The artists of Toronto have conferred benefits outside of their professional lives on the City of Toronto. Artists are downtown beings; they want to live close to the action. They also don't earn a lot so they have to be careful in their spending and investment. As a result artists have been in the very forefront of the movement to revitalize rundown inner city residential districts since the '50s and '60s. For instance, Nadine and David Nowlan with The Bad Trip helped ratepayers' organizations set clear goals at the time the Spadina expressway was stopped. Result: important downtown neighbourhoods slated for demolition are now flourishing with renovation, and property values - and property tax revenues - are still soaring.

Municipalities with lower tax-rates and land costs appeal to many individuals and to commercial concerns. It is safe to say, however, that only a tiny fraction of those who leave for the suburbs are artists or arts-related professionals. These people come to stay. Similarly, arts/cultural organizations come to stay. Theatres, art galleries, concert halls, museums, planetariums become of landmark importance as the City changes around them. Try to imagine Toronto without the Art Gallery of Ontario, the Royal Ontario Museum, the O'Keefe, The Royal Alexandra, Toronto Free Theatre, Young People's Theatre, the St. Lawrence Centre, Massey Hall, Roy Thomson Hall, Tarragon Theatre, Toronto Dance Theatre, Toronto Workshop Productions; try to imagine the cost of replacing these physical facilities alone, without giving any consideration to the funds invested in bringing each to its present level of operational excellence. Arts and cultural facilities across Canada are valued in the billions now, on a replacement cost basis.

In Toronto empty downtown factories don't always get torn down - here, they frequently become theatres; disused churches become homes for dance companies, redundant warehouses blossom into artists' studios - until they attract commercial interest and are renovated out of the financial reach of the urban pioneers who first rescued them from decay.

The establishment in 1972 of two theatres, the Alumnae Theatre and Toronto Free Theatre on then-desolate Berkeley Street focussed attention on the entire south-of-Front, east-of-Jarvis area. Now the parking lots, junk yards and abandoned railway sidings are a new community, City-sponsored and surrounded by private housing development. In 1972, the City estimated there were 100 permanent residents in the square mile surrounding the Berkeley Street theatres. Today there are approximately 7,000-10,000.

To duplicate what we now have in arts and cultural resources would cost at least \$1-billion and the process would take at least as long as it did the first time. Furthermore these resources generate substantial spinoff revenues:

- * Not every play-goer, concert-goer, gallery-goer arrives by private car. The five million Metro attenders at Toronto arts/cultural events spend at least \$5-million on TTC fares. This equals Metro's cash grants to the arts.
- * At least \$2-million in provincial sales tax, \$3-million in federal sales tax is paid by non-profit producing and exhibiting organizations.
- * With an estimated local economic impact of \$250-million in taxable transactions, the non-profit arts organizations indirectly deliver at least \$30-million in income tax, at least \$6-million in provincial sales tax.
- * The producers of 34 films shot in Toronto during 1984 chose to work here largely because of our talent pool. They spent \$100-million and this resulted in up to \$15-million in income taxes and \$2.5-million in provincial sales tax. An additional reason for this activity is that the film liaison unit at City Hall has done a fine job of providing one-stop-shop police/fire/permit red tape removal and of letting the industry know about our varied locations, our pool of artists and technicians.
- * It is estimated the 100,000 persons employed in Toronto in arts and arts-related work pay property taxes in excess of \$50-million, even more in income taxes.
- * No estimates are available for taxes generated by movie theatres, dinner theatres, magazine and book publishers, televi-

sion and radio operations, cable-TV, bars and lounges featuring live performers, advertising agencies, artists' supply outlets, etcetera. Taking everything into account, at least one-half of the arts and arts-related sector's current national revenues of over \$9-billion is related to activity here in Toronto.

- * Cultural/artistic events draw visitors from outside Toronto and Metro. All subscription-based organizations report season ticket holders in Kingston, Belleville, Peterborough, Sudbury and elsewhere. During the Toronto International Festival between 75,000 and 120,000 visitors came to all parts of Metro to participate in the celebration and attend artistic events. This resulted, we are told, in previously sagging hotel occupancy rates being increased by 13% for the month of June.

The Arts Attract Companies to Locate and Remain:

Hermits enjoy deserts but most of us prefer gardens. Toronto is a cultural/artistic garden, the most abundant in Canada. The artistic product offered has already attracted a very large public who, studies show, have more education than the general average. The new information/communications industries demand a work force with significantly higher education levels than do industries based on mass-production interchangeable-worker management techniques. Companies wishing to attract highly mobile, well-educated personnel will be motivated to locate in Toronto, which already provides, in the phrase of John Naisbitt's Megatrends, the "High Touch" of the arts to complement the "High Tech" of the work. Already, Toronto is a highly desirable head office location for many reasons. Not least of these is the cosmopolitan spectrum of artistic experience available here as spectator and participant.

For particular industries, such as the making of television commercials, magazine and newspaper publishing, advertising agencies, recording, book publishing and fashion, Toronto is a logical location. Nowhere else in Canada can the same pool of artistic and technical talent be found, and without these resources these industries cannot exist.

Tourists Like the Arts and Culture:

Museums, art galleries, theatres, planetariums, science centres, zoos, concert halls - the whole artistic and cultural spectrum - are natural magnets for tourists. Governmental advertising at both the federal and provincial levels has not made much of Toronto's position as the cultural heart of English-Canada's heartland but there are encouraging signs of change here, and a new aggressiveness at the municipal level. The existence of a world class artistic community offering year-round excellence in

every area can make Toronto the most desirable destination in Canada provided marketing is targeted at those who travel and have an interest in arts and culture. Much more in the way of municipal-provincial-federal collaboration and coordination is needed to dispel the assiduously promoted image of Canada as a wilderness dotted here and there with Mounties. Much closer cooperation is required between producing bodies and those advertising their existence and excellence to convention planners and tour operators.

The Ripples of Economic Impact:

Economic impact takes many forms. It has been estimated that the 160 arts organizations supported directly and indirectly by the City of Toronto pay annually to the auditing profession in Toronto fees totalling at least \$1-million. In addition to engaging chartered accountants, these organizations pay rents, pay taxes, pay salaries, buy supplies, buy insurance, bank and borrow money, renovate and construct buildings, purchase equipment and do everything every other business does. Attendance at events causes spending on babysitting, dry cleaning, new clothing, restaurant dining, parking lot fees, souvenir books and programmes, T-shirts, buttons, and other souvenirs; a New York study showed that an event-goer tends to spend 2.5 times the cost of event tickets on goods and services relating to the attendance. These transactions occur whether the event is put on by non-profit or commercial interests.

The City of Toronto directly or indirectly supports a wide-ranging group of organizations whose audiences in total during 1984 will approach six million persons, of whom about 20% were visitors. Of the remaining five million approximately 50% live in the City of Toronto, and the other 50% live in other parts of Metropolitan Toronto. Each of these components - City and Metro - experienced subsidy-based savings on ticket prices of over \$28-million. Visitors experienced savings of approximately \$11-million.

The City of Toronto, with a population of 610,000 contributed about \$7.8-million (including the City's share of the Metro Cultural Affairs budget) to the arts. The remainder of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, with a population of 1.65 million contributed slightly over \$4-million (excluding the City's share) to the arts. Visitors to arts events contributed up to \$50-million to the Metropolitan Toronto economy with about half of this amount being spent in the City of Toronto. Residents of the City of Toronto and other areas of Metropolitan Toronto contributed over \$200-million because of their interest in the arts; of this amount approximately two-thirds was spent in the City of Toronto and the remaining one-third in other parts of Metro. These figures do not take account of spending related to commer-

cially sponsored arts events at O'Keefe Centre, the Royal Alexandra Theatre, the Canadian National Exhibition, Maple Leaf Gardens and so forth. In this regard, the local economic impact of one single event - the visit of Michael Jackson - was probably close to \$20-million.

Profit-making cultural activities add enormously to the economic impact of the sector. Ed Mirvish does not release financial information but it is safe to say his constellation of restaurants now surrounding the Royal Alexandra Theatre all make money, quite a lot of money. So do Shopsy's and the other restaurants bordering the O'Keefe Centre, the St. Lawrence Centre and Roy Thomson Hall. The theatre-restaurant connection is usual and natural, and one of the strongest arguments for a highly concentrated arts and entertainment district in a city like Toronto. Our downtown is also downtown for the rest of Metro, the place to go for the big night out. This concentration should be encouraged, and it is to be hoped that our new opera house, when and if it is built, will be sited close to an existing district, such as Front Street East or King Street West. Such a concentration would encourage a whole range of services, instrument repair shops, fine book and record stores, opera, ballet and theatre memorabilia shops, restaurants and bars, convenience and specialty stores.

The Arts Help Keep Our Downtown Alive and Lively:

It has been mentioned before in this report and will not be laboured here: artists have always been and always will be in the forefront of the struggle to preserve and enhance Toronto's unique stock of downtown dwelling houses which provide the City with one of its most attractive and important humanizing features. Further, in specific areas of need - such as our shortage of exhibition spaces - artists themselves have turned disused and potentially derelict spaces into non-profit galleries where emerging and emerged painters and sculptors can show. As usual, the principal subsidy here comes from the unpaid or ill-paid participation of the artists themselves. The result for the City is the revival of dead spaces and a significant contribution, not only to the interaction between artists and public, but to the healthy street traffic which keeps our downtown neighbourhoods safe at all hours.

Certainly, the development of the St. Lawrence Centre, the enlargement of the St. Lawrence Market, the artistic glorification of the Flatiron Building, the redevelopment of Young People's Theatre and of the Berkeley Street theatres all helped to bring about the remarkable Front Street East/Esplanade transformation. Some of the arts action went there and development followed to be where the action was. Queen Street West is another example of artist-initiated rejuvenation in Toronto.

The Social and Educational Benefits of the Arts and Culture:

Toronto is richer and more attractive thanks to the efforts of our artists. It is also a better place to live, a more understanding place, a more human place. Gone are the days when people spoke of spending a week in Toronto one Sunday. Disappearing are the days of casual racism and enforced homogeneity. Artists have played a part in many worthwhile social issues over the years. Their art - which always draws conclusions about the general from a consideration of the particular - has helped a city of ethnicities to consider its diversity an asset, not a liability. We are learning to live together and the arts are helping.

The free music and drama programmes in the parks draw hundreds of thousands each year. Children - and their parents - are introduced to the delights of music and drama in an accessible, convivial context. This is what education in art appreciation ought to be: every sector of our own population enjoying the recreation their city - and their taxes - help provide for them. The educational system in Toronto still does not reflect the reality of the arts and arts-related activity which will increasingly complement our general economic climate in the years to come. It will be the work of some years to convince educational authorities that the times they are a-changing.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that Toronto City Council and the Board of Education appoint a joint Task Force or some other appropriate Commission to inquire into:

- (1) the reasons why the arts and art appreciation are so neglected in our schools as areas of appreciation, study and participation;
- (2) ways and means of drawing attention to the educational possibilities offered by the Toronto arts and cultural community and its related organizations;
- (3) ways and means of focussing public attention on the benefits to our children from a greatly enriched programme of artistic/cultural experience given as part of education.

In providing some degree of humanization to the frequently discouraging geriatric care and housing sector of society, artists took the lead in organizing entertainment for the aged through the work of organizations like The Smile Company. As our average age increases, and more and more of our citizens become residents of senior citizens' homes, this service aspect of the performing arts will have to be expanded on the basis of present small beginnings.

Of the big cities of North America, Toronto has one of the liveliest arts/cultural communities to be found anywhere. This community includes the artists and the public whose interest makes the entire process relevant and possible. The attendances in the millions annually at thousands of arts events help to make our downtown one of the most alive - at any time of day or night - in North America. The range and diversity of arts and cultural experience offered attract the brightest and the best to come here and add to our existing achievement. No one can accurately assess the full extent of the value added to our society by the arts and cultural sector: non-profit and commercial. Try to imagine life without drama, music, dance, visual art or literature and you get an idea of what is being measured.

It is properly the business of City government to ensure that what we have we will keep, that what we do not have and need we will acquire, and that the entire arts/cultural sector of our society will be enabled to develop into a more perfect expression of our basic goal of civilization.

C

ultural Capital

The Toronto Arts and Cultural Community's
Most Urgent Needs

CHAPTER SIX

THE TORONTO ARTS AND CULTURAL COMMUNITY'S MOST URGENT NEEDS

The views expressed in this section have been developed through interviews with representatives of over 60 Toronto arts organizations, through disciplinary panel discussions and discussion with City politicians and officials.

Put briefly, the needs of the Toronto arts and cultural community are:

- 1) More working capital through appropriate arm's length funding.
- 2) More working space and support programmes.
- 3) More facilities.
- 4) Support organizations.
- 5) A staff focus at City Hall for City arts involvement.
- 6) A tough Art Commission.
- 7) A Friend at City Hall.

THE NEED FOR WORKING CAPITAL

The single most urgent need expressed by all groups is for working capital. Capital to allow organizations to pay artists a decent wage, capital to allow for purchase of much-needed equipment, capital to increase professional standards and to put into place better production values and services to the public.

This concern is expressed by groups with large operating budgets as well as the small, the new and, on a funding basis, the marginal.

Because a great many of the 96 professional organizations Toronto funds are innovative, experimental, developmental and, therefore, potentially controversial, they have far more difficulty than the more established organizations in attracting the corporate dollar. Fear of the new, the untried, the naughty, understandably affects corporate decision-makers who hesitate to

have the name of XYZ Limited connected with anything potentially risqué or controversial. The result is that the greatest amount of corporate and private assistance in Toronto and elsewhere goes to the support of the more traditional and established forms of artistic expression: symphonic music, ballet, opera and theatres offering a repertoire of material certified as acceptable by age and/or acceptance elsewhere. Ironic when one remembers the controversies once sparked by The Marriage of Figaro, The Rite of Spring, the paintings of the Fauves, the sculptures of Rodin, the novels of Joyce and Lawrence, the films of Griffith.

While the private sector is reluctant to support the untried and controversial, the Canada Council and Ontario Arts Council tend to delay ongoing operating assistance until an organization is reasonably established.

Further, both Councils are underfunded and lacking in discretionary resources to commit to new initiatives. In the case of the OAC it has not gone unnoticed that earmarked grant increases to help eliminate persistent deficits were passed directly from the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture to a number of large organizations via the Ontario Arts Council while the remainder of the Council's clientele were not similarly assisted. The developing arts organizations therefore look to municipal sources of working capital, beginning with the City of Toronto.

What they get is good news and bad news. The good news is that the City, thanks to the innovative bias of the Toronto Arts Council, is laudably sensitive to new ideas. The bad news is that City grants permitted by the present budget are at best nominal in amount. Artists express their appreciation of the City's tokens of interest and pride in the components of its arts industry but they stress that except in the cases of the major theatres and the long-established organizations whose rents and/or taxes are forgiven annually, City grants are little more than tokens.

The need for working capital is real and urgent on the part of City-funded organizations and the reasons they give for their discouraging experiences with other sectors are true. Their record, as a group, of accomplishing a great deal with a very little is acknowledged. What they say about the amount of City grants is borne out: excluding major theatres, the organization receiving the largest Toronto Arts Council-recommended grant in 1984 will get \$12,000, which works out to about 1% of that organization's annual budget.

Indeed, all 96 of these arts organizations have received, in 1984, City of Toronto cultural grants averaging only about \$3,000 each. These grants go to organizations which will spend in Toronto probably \$16-million this year. They have an average budget of about \$187,500, of which the City grant defrays, on

average, about 1.6%. City grants to 53 neighbourhood and community (multicultural) organizations are even more modest. Most of the groups funded yield more in City property taxes than they receive in grants.

By 1985, because of the documented growth of the entire sector, probably 100 groups will qualify for cultural grants, probably 60 groups will qualify for what are now called community and multicultural grants.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1) That 1985 cultural grants (apart from present major theatres) be divided into three groups:
 - (i) Major arts organizations, being mature organizations with a ten-year history of service to Toronto, complete programmes of work, and recommended as major by the Toronto Arts Council.
 - (ii) Arts organizations, being the other City-funded professional organizations.
 - (iii) Community and neighbourhood organizations.
- 2) That the budget for grants to approximately ten major arts organizations be in total.... \$400,000
but that amounts of individual grants continue to be decided by the Toronto Arts Council.
- 3) That the budget for grants to other professional arts organizations (approximately 90) be given on the advice of the Toronto Arts Council and be in total..... \$900,000
- 4) That the 1985 budget for community and neighbourhood groups (approximately 60) be given on the advice of the Toronto Arts Council and be in total..... \$200,000
\$1,500,000
- 5) That in the case of budgets for arts organizations and community and neighbourhood organizations a total of 10% be reserved for grants to be made during the year at other than customary times.
- 6) That in the case of all major arts organizations, other arts organizations and neighbourhood and community organizations applying successfully for third and subsequent times, grants be made in support of annual operations, rather than projects, if the applying organization so wishes.

- 7) That the City forgive City property taxes, including taxes paid as a portion of rent, on the recommendation of the Toronto Arts Council in the case of any groups funded for five years or more.
- 8) That, where applicable, the City forgive rents on City-owned property on the same basis as (7) above.
- 9) As a supplementary source of working capital, and in order to augment and/or replace grants given, the City of Toronto should implement as soon as possible a "Materials for the Arts" programme similar to that operated by the Department of Cultural Affairs in New York City. Under this programme, the City would act as broker between businesses and individuals wishing to donate surplus or obsolete materials and goods to the arts, and arts organizations in need of such materials and goods. At minimal cost, such a programme annually delivers about \$1-million worth of goods and materials to arts organizations in New York.
- 10) The City should adopt immediately the policy of setting aside 1% of capital budgets for all municipal development for the commissioning/purchase of works of art to enhance new public buildings. The recommended Art Commission and the Toronto Arts Council could advise in this area.

I have made suggestions elsewhere in this report regarding the future role of the Toronto Arts Council, particularly in relation to any new staff arrangements made at City Hall. Even so, I feel it is worth emphasizing here the near-unanimous opinion of artists regarding funding:

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- 1) The present arm's length approach is correct and ought to be continued.
- 2) The Toronto Arts Council, appropriately strengthened and given adequate budgets to work with, ought to continue to be the decision-making body regarding grants assistance to Toronto artists, and arts organizations.
- 3) The City of Toronto, in cooperation with the Toronto Arts Council, should draw up each year in December a global arts and cultural budget for the coming year incorporating:
 - (i) grants to major theatres
 - (ii) grants to cultural organizations
 - (iii) grants to community and neighbourhood organizations

- (iv) tax exemptions
- (v) rent grants
- (vi) other grants - at large, etc. - known at time of budget

THE NEED FOR WORKING SPACE AND SUPPORT PROGRAMMES

Next to more working capital, the requirement for more working space is the most important need of artists and arts groups in the city.

Most urgently affected here are individual artists - visual artists, designers, photographers and other individual creators - but the need for space inhibits the operations of artists and arts groups in all disciplines. Creative artists need studios. Producing and exhibiting organizations need rehearsal space, workshop space, storage space, exhibition space, production space, and they all - individuals and groups - need this space on a low cost or no cost basis.

Artists have been ingenious in finding very cheap space in unused and underused properties, but by the mere act of identifying the potential of former garages, gasworks, factories, warehouses and so forth, they have usually set in motion gentrification energies which eventually price them out of their tenancies. As urban explorers and pioneers, the artists have humanized entire areas and then, within a few years, have found themselves once again looking for a reasonably warm, dry ruin in which to work.

In New York City, whose working artists make a significant contribution to that city's \$1.5-billion annual sales in works of art, the solution to the problem of studio space has been approached in a number of ways:

1. By making unused municipally-owned premises available at low cost or at no cost to artist-run cooperatives prepared to accept the responsibility of landlordship.
2. By making low-interest and interest-free loans available to artists for conversion and renovation of suitable premises.
3. By legalizing for artists the occupancy of loft spaces for working and living spaces.

4. By assisting artists and arts organizations to contact private owners willing to make unused spaces available either at low cost or no cost.

Of these four avenues of solution, it would appear that only the legalization of loft spaces would encounter serious opposition in Toronto.

In Toronto, there are no districts containing square miles of derelict factory and warehouse space as were found in New York in SoHo/NoHo/TriBeCa. In fact, according to Toronto officials there is a shortage of appropriately-zoned space for light industry. Further, there is a disinclination on the part of the City to discriminate in favour of artists or anyone else by making regulations conferring zoning benefits on this or that professional sector of society. (This view is prevalent even though, by permitting doctors to site their offices in their homes, the City already discriminates on the basis of zoning in favor of one professional sector.)

In fact, most visual artists would prefer not to live in the studio in which they work. They find it extremely difficult to afford both living space and working space. Thus, the loft solution is seen as a last-ditch resort, not an ideal arrangement. An ideal arrangement would be low cost or no cost studio space.

In varying degrees all our city arts organizations - from Canada's most major to Toronto's most fledgling - face similar problems with regard to space. Like individual artists, these organizations are and always will be downtown creatures. They need to be where the action is, they need to be in touch with the electricity, the creative friction, the nuances of the city. They need to be close to suppliers and convenient to the city-dwelling artists whom they employ and contract. They need to be exactly where everyone pays most to be: Downtown.

They are willing to put up with dingy, unattractive, ungentrified premises, if they are cheap and reasonably convenient, as their part of the bargain. They all wish to see the city, which prides itself on being the arts and culture capital of English-speaking Canada, acknowledge its part of the bargain by accepting the fact that if you are going to have an important and influential arts presence in a city, you must make reasonable arrangements to accommodate the presence.

The arguments they make are not easily refuted. In every area, the City sets aside land and /or space for agreed-upon necessary activity: schools, fire stations, police stations, subway rights of way and exits and entrances, parks, parking lots, etcetera. Certainly, in their way, the arts contribute at least as much to the quality of life and civilization in the City and

deserve equal consideration, especially given the importance of the arts to the communications/information industry.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Within the "incubator industries" context, the City of Toronto Economic Development Corporation should be empowered to provide low cost or, ideally, no cost studio space for bona fide visual artists, designers and other creative artists resident and working in the City of Toronto.
2. This Corporation, in the same context, should be empowered to make available low cost/no cost work spaces for arts organizations funded by the City of Toronto and meeting criteria agreed upon by the City and the Toronto Arts Council. Such organizations should include community and neighbourhood groups expressing themselves artistically.
3. The City of Toronto should implement a "Space for the Arts" programme similar to the proposed "Materials for the Arts" programme. Under such a computerized programme, unused City-owned property and surplus privately-owned property could be made available on a low cost/no cost basis to arts groups and individual artists in need of working spaces.
4. The City of Toronto should encourage developers by whatever means the Department of Planning and Development considers appropriate to construct buildings containing needed arts facilities, provided such facilities are planned on a self-financing basis as far as services, maintenances and upkeep are concerned. Emphasis should be placed on potential development of the railway lands south of Front Street.

REQUIRED FACILITIES

The entire problem of needed arts facilities in the City of Toronto might well be the subject of a study in itself. In discussion with arts organizations and arts advisory committees a number of missing facilities and support programmes and organizations were identified.

1. A municipal lyric theatre would provide year-round employment to the many fine singers, dancers and musicians we train in Toronto but to whom we presently offer only intermittent employment. Through careful coordination with the Canadian Opera Company, a full-time professional chorus could be supported. The Elgin Theatre offers an ideal performing venue for such an organization, not least because of its proximity to the Convention Centre and to the hotels already existing and to be constructed to serve the thousands of conventioners who will constitute a natural market for such an organization's product.
2. A Museum of Contemporary Art is a notable lack in a city of Toronto's breadth of artistic interest and in view of its position as Canada's most important market for visual art. Montreal will soon be opening a new and impressive Musee des Arts Contemporains to augment its existing Musee des Beaux-Arts; Montreal views such facilities as vital to its importance as a destination both for tourists and conventioners. Such a museum could reasonably occupy the first two or three floors of an office development.
3. For some time, the smaller theatres of Toronto, together with many others, have stressed the need for at least one or two commercially-viable theatres of at least 900 seats into which successfully-launched productions could transfer for longer runs to a far wider audience. The Eaton Auditorium Study, which needs to be updated, identified the relationship between Toronto's lack of commercial producers of theatre and Toronto's complete lack of available commercially-viable theatre spaces. It is not unreasonable to assume that a metropolitan region of close to three million people can support more than one or two full-time commercial legitimate theatres. Given generous incentives, the private sector, through the development industry, might be willing to undertake the construction of such a theatre or theatres as part of larger downtown developments planned, in particular, for the lands south of Front Street.
4. A Centre for community and neighbourhood artistic and cultural expression is a need put forward by many of the City's community and neighbourhood arts groups. The existence of a centre dedicated to the presentation of the City's diversity would

serve to strengthen the ties of respect which have developed and are continuing to develop between the City's many ethnicities. The success of the annual Caravan has demonstrated that Torontonians are interested in the mosaic we have constructed; the existence of such a centre of community arts would serve as a high-profile reminder of our desire to find strength and texture in diversity. It would also serve as an important educational adjunct. In addition, modest neighbourhood performance/exhibition spaces related to the existing network of city-sponsored community centres should be made available to community groups.

5. A Design Gallery exhibiting the best of applied art is a crucial omission, given the importance of design to the information/communications industry and to industry in general. Such a gallery could easily be incorporated into a multi-purpose development downtown and could benefit greatly from its association with the businesses sited within the same location.
6. A Production/Exhibition Facility for non-commercial video is long overdue. The development of the cassette market, of VCRs, the breakdown of the television networks in the face of the growth of do-it-yourself programming all point to the rise of video as a popular form in need of a fine-art research and development sector. Toronto already has a group of organizations devoted to the production, exhibition and distribution of non-commercial video but, like all new expressions, they lack proper housing, equipment, working capital and the cohesion and profile a single location would bring. In the negotiations between CBC and the City regarding concessions required by CBC with respect to their new headquarters, it is recommended that the City consider carefully the possibility of trading off an extra floor or two for one of the Corporation's existing production facilities capable of conversion into a multi-purpose video facility. Could the City also use its good offices to help persuade the CBC to donate some of its hardware, thus providing important sustenance to such a centre?
7. Numbers of arts organizations in Toronto occupy rented premises which they have to some extent upgraded by carrying out tenant's leasehold improvements. They wish to own their rented premises which already add to the City's necessary stock of performance/exhibition work spaces for the arts. In the cases of such organizations, the City should offer incentive capital grants which could constitute keystone capital, attracting support from other levels of government and the private sector. Given reasonable safeguards on disposition, such a programme would help retain for the City a network of smaller facilities already attaining landmark significance,

without saddling the City with all of the burdens of ownership.

RECOMMENDATION:

The City of Toronto, the Task Force on the Theatre District and other related bodies should begin planning now to provide Toronto with the missing but necessary facilities described above. These bodies should also assist arts organizations wishing to acquire the premises they occupy by supporting a programme of incentive capital grants to be administered by the Economic Development Corporation.

REQUIRED SUPPORT ORGANIZATIONS

The progress to maturity of any industry or profession necessitates the development of industry-related institutes. These institutes serve the purpose of upgrading standards, of focussing training needs, of disseminating information of mutual benefit within the profession or industry, of lobbying on behalf of the collective, of bringing to bear on the concerns and functions of the collective a high degree of scholarship and research. Such institutes, related to the arts, are rarely found in Canada. In part this is because the arts are so diverse in nature, so spread out geographically and so unable to pass extra costs to the consumer. Where they do exist - the Canadian Music Centre is a good example - the large overall benefits to all their members has been acknowledged. There are certain areas of arts activity in Toronto which, in the opinion of many artists, would similarly benefit from the immediate establishment of sector-oriented institutes, modest in scale but large in aspiration, capable of focusing all available resources on given problem areas.

It is considered that the City of Toronto Economic Development Corporation is the appropriate vehicle to house and sponsor both of the industry-related institutes described below, and to assist them in acquiring necessary funding from the City and, where appropriate, from other levels of government and the private sector.

1. An Institute of Contemporary Visual Art:

The successful British Institute of Contemporary Art offers a model in this area of a small but effective ginger group of experts focussing their expertise. Given the general quality of Toronto visual artists in all genres, it is difficult to understand why the Toronto market for Toronto art has not developed more over the years. With the group of Seven and

Painters Eleven in our background, Toronto is one of the few Canadian cities able to point to a history of articulated artistic viewpoint. New York early developed critics of accepted stature as part of an art appreciation community which included, for example, New York-focussed curators and others associated with the Museum of Modern Art and other contemporary-minded, urban-engrossed arts organizations. Unfortunately, Toronto has never developed the organizational wherewithal to support such a grouping of art-appreciating, Toronto-oriented aficionados, nor have our Toronto publications been able or willing to give sufficient space to serious writing about our visual art and artists. Put bluntly, we have never developed the background on which, in the art world, all useful promotion is based. The New York market for New York art exists, in part, because for many years, working along with the visual arts industry, there has existed a parallel industry devoted to making certain that New York art was taken seriously as a distinctive branch of art.

An Institute for Contemporary Visual Art would work closely with existing organizations to focus public interest, to establish greater profile, to find greater resources to bring to bear on the problems they all encounter. It would act as a gadfly, stimulating the large public galleries into taking a greater, more pointed interest in the art and artists of Toronto. It would serve to attract artists from across Canada to exhibit in shows presented on a scale capable of letting everyone see what was what about Canadian work. It would reflect, explain, criticize and glorify what is unique about the Toronto visual arts experience.

Above all, such an Institute would focus the attention of patrons - collectors, foundations, governments - on the needs and possibilities of the Toronto visual artist.

2. A Toronto Institute of Design:

Related to the work of the previously described Design Gallery, the Design Institute would provide a meeting-ground for fine artists, applied artists and industry. The staff of such an organization, augmented as necessary, would do much of the research, planning and long-term organization necessary to the successful functioning of the Gallery itself.

Such an Institute would serve as a coordinating force in bringing an inventory of design talent into contact, on a knowledgeable basis, with industries with design problems. It would serve as a means of upgrading design standards to world levels of acceptability.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City of Toronto Economic Development Corporation house and foster the development of the two support institutes, The Institute of Contemporary Visual Art and the Toronto Institute of Design.

THE NEED FOR A TORONTO ART COMMISSION

In the truest sense, the single element which most shapes and expresses the aesthetic sensibility of a city is the public art - generally sculpture - placed in and on city property, for viewing by citizens and visitors; equally important is the design of public development and redevelopment and the art chosen for its enhancement. At the present time, efforts to apply some measure of acceptable process to the question of public art have not been successful. The recommendations of the Selection Committee for Public Art have been circumvented on several important occasions and it is certain that an awareness of the successful tactics employed is now common knowledge.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City of Toronto set up an Art Commission similar to the Art Commission of New York City, made up of:

The Mayor of Toronto, The Chairman of the Board of the Art Gallery of Ontario, The Chairman of the Board of the recommended Toronto Institute of Contemporary Visual Art, The Chairman of the Toronto Arts Council, and, as recommended by the Toronto Arts Council: a sculptor, a painter, an architect, a landscape architect, and three members at large (dealers, collectors, etcetera).

The mandate of this Commission, made possible by enabling legislation, would be:

- (a) to give or withhold final approval on any City permits necessary to:
 - i. The erection of any piece of art on property owned by the City of Toronto.
 - ii. The development or redevelopment of any structure carried out, by or on behalf of the City of Toronto.

- (b) To monitor a municipal "1%-of-capital-costs-for-art" programme.

In addition, the City of Toronto should make an agreement with the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, under which no work of art or memorial would be placed on Metro property within the City of Toronto, unless such work of art or memorial had received the written approval of the Toronto Art Commission. Indeed, Metro ought to consider making a similar agreement with each of its constituent elements.

THE NEED FOR STAFF FOCUS FOR CITY ARTS INVOLVEMENT

The arts are now important enough to require the City of Toronto to make appropriate staff arrangements so that those areas of the relationship between the City of Toronto and its arts community which are the responsibility of city government may be adequately administered. Elsewhere, this report sets out certain options in this regard but it is appropriate, in the light of the opinions of artists consulted, to make the following:

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City of Toronto make appropriate staffing arrangements to help meet the needs of artists and arts organizations, to acknowledge the present and potential importance of the entire arts and culture field and to coordinate interdepartmental and intergovernmental matters concerning the arts.

THE NEED FOR A FRIEND AT CITY HALL

Artists are grateful for the increasing interest the City of Toronto is taking in the arts. They are aware of the rise in City spending on the arts over the past three years, and take some pride in the results produced with the City's help.

They also take pride in the knowledge that the groundwork for the City's present arts and cultural position was put in place at a time when founding subsidy came from the artists themselves.

Next, it was from the private sector that augmenting subsidy came, then from Ottawa, later from Queen's Park, finally from municipal sources. In Toronto, the sector has grown to the point where changes in funding formulae must now be the concern not only of artists and arts administrators, but in particular of the officials they elect to represent them. It is the feeling of artists that, until now, the City of Toronto has not forcefully represented their needs to other levels of government.

Imbalances exist between City of Toronto levels of funding for Toronto organizations and those of the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto and the Province of Ontario through the Ontario Arts Council and of the Government of Canada through the Canada Council. The City must, naturally, act first to put its own house in order with regard to balanced funding, but even while that is being done, artists hope that City Council will consider ways and means of drawing the attention of the other members of the funding partnership to the damage caused and the progress impeded as the result of the withholding of the relatively small amounts required to bring partnership contributions into reasonable relationship.

In Toronto, the arts have developed an asset of municipal, metropolitan, provincial and national importance: the Toronto pool of talent. Such an asset requires careful attention if it is not to depreciate. If we neglect to offer a comprehensive range of opportunity there are others elsewhere aware of the value of talent who will be more than happy to take advantage of the unique background a Toronto artist develops. Not the least important component of this asset is the sector made up of the smaller organizations who receive City of Toronto cash grants and who provide many of our most important artists with the crucial developmental stages of their careers as well as the opportunity to exercise their artistic maturity in adventurous ways. It is exactly this sector, for all of the reasons set out herein, whose growth and contribution is most threatened by governmental underfunding.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is therefore recommended that City Council at its earliest opportunity, decide on ways and means:

1. of implementing the recommendations of this report with regard to grants policy and budgets, and
2. of drawing the attention of other levels of government to the necessity of bringing their funding to more appropriate levels.

In summary, these are the most pressing needs of Toronto's arts and cultural community:

- * Working capital
- * Working space and support programs
- * Support and research organizations
- * A tough Art Commission
- * A staff focus for City arts involvement
- * A friend at City Hall

C

ultural Capital

Support

Relationships between the City of
Toronto and the Toronto Arts
and Cultural Community

CHAPTER SEVEN

SUPPORT RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE CITY OF TORONTO
AND THE TORONTO ARTS AND CULTURAL COMMUNITY

Now that the City-supported non-profit arts and cultural sector has passed \$100-million per annum in total spending and has acquired a public making about six million attendances annually at events presented, the time has come to implement a more complete professionalization of City and City-sponsored committees and agencies dealing with artistic and cultural matters. Decisions must be made in two areas:

1. The future role of the Toronto Arts Council.
2. The future role of City Hall.

THE TORONTO ARTS COUNCIL (TAC)

Launched in 1974 with a mandate to advise the City of Toronto on its cultural grants policies and practices, the Council was a largely volunteer endeavour until 1982, when the City recognized the need for greater staff involvement and provided Council with the funds to engage a part-time professional executive director. City willingness in this regard came in part from City Council's 1981 decision to ask the Arts Council to advise on the City's community and multicultural grants in addition to regular cultural grants.

During 1983 City Council requested TAC to advise on City grants to the major theatres - Young People's Theatre, CentreStage and Theatre Plus. At the same time, City Council raised TAC budget to enable it to increase the executive director to a full-time level of employment, and to fund one-third of the cost of this study and report. Recently the City arranged for TAC to move from the quarters it had for some time borrowed from a Council board member to a modest office of its own.

Made up largely of professional artists plus one alderman, the Council has nine directors and three officers (Secretary, Treasurer and Past Chairman). The members are chosen for their knowledgeability in the different disciplines the City funds: music, literature, video, visual arts, theatre, dance. The Council has sub-committees, either in being or planned, made up in part of non-members of the Council. The task of the sub-

committees, made up of practicing artists, is to assess Council's response and advice to City Council on funding applications from arts and cultural organizations. All members of Council, officers and sub-committee members are on a volunteer basis. There is, at present, no one on the Council representing the neighbourhood and community sector.

In discussion, artists have expressed approval for the manner in which the TAC has allocated the modest grants budgets given annually by the City. They feel, however, that the Council has never been forceful enough in pointing out to City Council the inadequacy of the City's grants budgets, and the imbalances existing between, for example, the reasonably-funded major theatres and the severely-underfunded remainder of City-supported organizations. It is a measure of their respect for the artist-members of the Toronto Arts Council that they have not, until now, aired this particular area of dissatisfaction. It is equally true that, having stated their needs and aspirations so frankly at this time, they expect some form of perceivably-positive shift in the City's granting policies and levels of grants budgets to occur as a result of Toronto Arts Council endorsement of this report.

The Toronto Arts Council, which has had as many as fourteen members, currently consists of nine, seven of whom are primarily representative of arts disciplines funded. The Council might usefully be increased to as many as fifteen members.

Of those to be added, it is recommended that at least one be chosen on the basis of knowledgeability in the area of neighbourhood and community organizations. The remainder might be selected on the basis of expertise in various problem areas affecting the arts. These additional members need not necessarily all be artists.

The Toronto Arts Council is a non-profit corporation and functions as an advisory regranting body at the request of City Council. At present, TAC lacks an identifiable, formal constituency to be relied upon for defence and explanation at any time of crisis. TAC could therefore be in a precarious position should any conflict arise between it and City Council.

Artists have expressed guarded approval for the launching of a Foundation, linked to the Toronto Arts Council, whose membership would have the right to nominate some certain percentage of the members of the Council. Such a foundation could have as members:

1. One representative of each of the groups funded by the City of Toronto.
2. Supporters of the arts in Toronto.

3. Persons making their living as professional artists and in other areas of the professional arts community.

Such a foundation, like the Winnipeg Foundation or the Vancouver Foundation, would be empowered to receive gifts and bequests on behalf of the arts in general in Toronto, to give grants, to conduct research projects, and to in all appropriate ways complement the work of the Toronto Arts Council by publishing relevant documents, conducting programmes of education and study as well as other activities.

Finally, the question of cost to the City of supporting the activities of the Toronto Arts Council, must be addressed. At the moment, TAC oversees budgets totalling approximately \$1.2-million and does so on a budget of \$50,000 per annum.

This budget - a little over 4% - is inadequate and, as a result, Council's professional staff is overworked. Such a situation, if allowed to persist, will lead to inefficiency and inertia. As a working rule, 12% of funds administered is considered to be a good general guideline for such budgets. It will be up to Toronto Arts Council to say how much is required, but it is suggested that 10% of funds administered should serve as a general guideline during Council's growth to full usefulness.

One reason why a provision of 10% is a basic and necessary amount is this: in practice a municipal arts council, unlike its provincial and federal counterparts, has responsibilities over and above its primary obligation to provide government with the best possible advice on the spending of the City's arts dollar.

These include:

1. The maintenance of ongoing research and statistical studies designed to provide TAC with accurate guides to future trends affecting the City and the arts.
2. A catalytic role designed to bring forward missing but necessary programmes which might be launched by TAC and then turned over to existing organizations once terms of reference and required funding have been put in place.
3. A conscience, critic, ombudsman type of role which requires TAC to take positions which would be inappropriate except for an independent body on such issues as censorship, actions by other levels of government perceived as inequitable or damaging to the arts and culture community, etcetera.

4. An informational role requiring TAC to provide elected and appointed officials at City Hall and others with background information prepared from the viewpoint of the arts and cultural community on important issues.
5. A role as a "promoter of first resort" of tours by Toronto arts groups to other areas of Metro, to Mississauga and other nearby communities, when appropriate.
6. An organizing role regarding necessary informational and discussion seminars such as this year's Intergovernmental Forum (April) and Future Focus Forum (October).
7. A promotional role in drawing the attention of the media to the activities of Toronto artists here and abroad.
8. An eventual administrative role with relation to the activities of the Albert Franck Committee, the Toronto Book Awards, the Toronto Awards of Merit, the Toronto National Ballet School scholarship, etcetera.
9. Other activities of a programme nature.
10. Other activities of a "requested task" nature asked of TAC by City Council.

It is noted that City processing of approval of grants recommended by TAC occurs in a cumbersome way. After making its budget request, TAC receives notification from the City of total grants budgets in January. Grants are considered in detail during February and March and grant applicants notified. Those wishing to appeal do so through a series of personal interviews with TAC members. In May a final modified list of grant amounts goes to Neighbourhoods Committee, who approve it and send it on to the Budget Review Group, Executive and City Council who all approve it in principle. In June the list goes back to Neighbourhoods Committee for line-by-line approval and then goes once again to Budget Review, Executive and City Council for final approval. Since the TAC's detailed proposals are unchanged after their submission for May approval in principle, it would be helpful to arts groups if at that time the City funded the Toronto Arts Council for the total amount of approved arts budgets. Payment should be made directly by TAC to approved grantees, with TAC required to report in detail to Council on disposition of budgets.

Finally, because of the nature of the relationship between the St. Lawrence Centre, CentreStage and Theatre Plus, it seems incongruous that Toronto Arts Council, which advises City Council on grants to the major theatres, does not advise the City on grants policy regarding the Centre itself. These operating grants to the St. Lawrence Centre facility are higher than the total of City

grants to the Centre's main tenants and all other Toronto theatre companies combined. They represent almost 20% of Toronto's direct spending on the arts. It would seem sensible to include grants to the St. Lawrence Centre in the list of those reviewed by Toronto Arts Council.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the City of Toronto affirm its commitment to the Toronto Arts Council as the organization whose advice the City will officially seek on all matters affecting grants to professional cultural and neighbourhood arts organizations.
2. That the Toronto Arts Council increase Council membership from nine to fifteen with representatives to be chosen along the lines suggested herein.
3. That the Toronto Arts Council be asked to report to City Council on the costs and benefits to be encountered in forming a related Toronto Arts Foundation having in general the structure and the aims suggested herein, and designed to provide a basis of constituency support and wider communication for TAC.
4. That City Council contemplate for the Toronto Arts Council an operating budget set at 10% of funds administered, provided the TAC itself agrees with this recommendation.
5. That following appropriate annual approvals the City pay to TAC a cheque for the total of approved budgets, and that TAC issue grants cheques directly, subject to providing City Council with a complete report of disposition of approved funds.
6. That the St. Lawrence Centre be included among the organizations whose grants are subject to review by Toronto Arts Council.

AN ARTS FOCUS AT CITY HALL

There are some things an independent arm's length arts council does supremely well, and those things the Toronto Arts Council should continue to do.

There are other things necessary for the continued growth of the arts best handled by a professional staff employed by the City of Toronto.

1. Coordination and cost-saving relative to the ten areas of in-house arts and cultural activity funded by the City.
2. Ongoing relationships at staff level with other areas of government in matters respecting the arts and culture in Toronto.
3. Ongoing relationships at staff level with other departments of City government whose policies and practices affect the arts conducted so as to maximize effectiveness and minimize costs while maintaining a high profile for arts and cultural priorities.
4. Ongoing informational programmes designed to inform elected representatives of all matters affecting the 100,000-member arts and cultural working community in Toronto.
5. Ongoing research and background work designed to produce effectiveness in political initiatives launched by City Council on behalf of the arts and cultural community.
6. Ongoing programmes such as the recommended "Materials for the Arts" and "Space for the Arts."
7. Ongoing relationships at the staff level with education officials with regard to matters affecting both sectors.
8. Administrative support and liaison for the recommended Toronto Art Commission.
9. Backup for City initiatives to encourage assistance from the Toronto business community via a "Business for the Arts" programme similar to that operating in Vancouver.
10. Backup for a possible "Toronto 5% Club" similar to the successful Minneapolis "Mayor's 5% Club" made up of Presidents and/or CEOs of corporations donating 5% of before-tax profits to the arts.
11. Organizational and informational backup regarding arts/cultural matters likely to be the subject of discussion at organizations such as the Canadian Association of Big City Mayors and the Ontario Municipal Association.
12. Organizational and informational backup regarding municipal-provincial-federal consultative channels on matters of mutual concern respecting the arts and culture.
13. Long-term planning in relation to budgetary priorities.
14. To set up and staff a City Hall Arts Hotline and information service.

15. To oversee liaison at the staff level between the City of Toronto and Toronto Arts Council, City of Toronto Economic Development Corporation and other organizations and agencies whose operations affect or might affect the Toronto arts and cultural community.
16. Other appropriate matters involving City government and the arts and cultural community.

There are four major options open to the City in addressing these matters:

1. To do nothing and deal with problems ad hoc when they arise.
2. To adopt the "New York" (Department of Cultural Affairs) model which centralizes all power within the bureaucracy (see appendix).
3. To adopt an adapted "Amsterdam" model, which features a City Hall-employed professional staff responsible by agreement to an independent arts council which reports its findings - since Amsterdam municipal politics is run on the party system - through the majority party's Alderman designated as responsible for the arts and culture (see appendix).
4. To take something from each and recognize:
 - i) the need for a responsive, independent Arts Council,
 - ii) the need for a responsible staff seen to be looking after the arts and culture at City Hall.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that option (4) form the basis for the creation at City Hall of a Department to be responsible for all City-level governmental aspects of arts and cultural activity.

An Overall Strategy for the Arts and Culture:

City policy and practice towards the arts and culture has developed piecemeal over the years largely in response to requests for assistance and coordination from various interest groups.

At the moment, the various financial and other instruments of City policy are operating in isolation from each other and the entire sector is so fragmented that there is, for example, no

overall City budget grouping all forms of arts and cultural expenditure and relating all forms of benefits received. The recommended partnership between the Toronto Arts Council and a Department responsible for the City's activities in arts and culture, apart from grants recommendations, will eliminate existing fragmentation of effort and enable opportune, appropriate support and encouragement to be given within a framework of careful, progressive management.

C

ultural Capital

Working for a Better Deal

CHAPTER EIGHT

WORKING FOR A BETTER DEAL

WHAT TORONTO DOES NOW FOR THE ARTS AND CULTURE:

The City of Toronto, in addition to giving grants to arts organizations, operates a fairly extensive in-house arts/culture network whose aims are to display the City's past in interesting ways, to conserve and display the works of art the City owns, to advise the City on art to be placed on City property both within and without City Hall, to assist film producers to make movies in Toronto, to put on an extensive programme of music in our parks (the largest such programme in Canada) and a modest but growing Parks drama programme, and to give awards to authors and others the City wishes to honour.

There are in fact ten distinct areas of arts/culture activity within City Hall, with seven of them reporting through the City Clerk's Department, two through the Department of Planning and Development and one through the Department of Parks and Recreation.

UNDER THE CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT ARE:

1. THE MARKET GALLERY of the City of Toronto Archives: established in 1979 and with a 1984 budget of \$142,395 and \$60,000 for acquisitions, the Gallery is run by Heather Hatch. Located on the second floor of the South St. Lawrence Market building, it is designed to showcase the City's extensive archival and artistic collections. Since 1975, when City Archives was granted custody of the City's collection of fine art, some \$400,000 has been spent to build up the 702-piece collection. Since opening, over fifty exhibitions have been held, hundreds of tours of school children and others have been hosted, and attendance now averages over two thousand monthly.
2. THE FINE ART COLLECTION: Mentioned above, the Fine Art Collection was begun in 1851. A large percentage of the collection is always on display in the public and office areas of Toronto City Hall and is rotated regularly for maximum visibility.
3. CITY HALL ART ADVISORY COMMITTEE: This committee is made up of the the City Clerk, the Commissioner of Planning and Development, the Commissioner of Property and the Secretary of the City Council Executive Committee, as advised by the

Director of Public Information and Communications Department (who chairs the art advisory sub-committee). This group has no budget. Its purpose is to preserve and enhance the architectural and design integrity of City Hall and Nathan Phillips Square, and to advise on the appropriateness and siting of temporary exhibitions both within and without the Hall. An independent advisory group might be more appropriate to undertake these responsibilities.

4. THE ALBERT FRANCK COMMITTEE/TORONTO-AMSTERDAM ARTISTS EXCHANGE: Organized in 1974 and with a present budget of \$8,951, the committee administers a modest exchange programme which sends professional Toronto performing or visual artists for two-month residencies in our twin city of Amsterdam. A similar committee in Amsterdam sends Dutch artists to Toronto each year for the same periods.
5. CITY OF TORONTO BOOK AWARDS: Begun in 1973 and with a 1984 budget of \$12,015, the committee selects on the basis of excellence a number of books touching upon life in Toronto, and awards the author of each a prize of \$1,600.
6. CITY OF TORONTO SCHOLARSHIP IN THE NATIONAL BALLET SCHOOL: This scholarship of \$2,000 is presented to a National Ballet School student selected by the school's principal. The award commemorates the 1982 visit of Queen Elizabeth, the Queen Mother.
7. AWARDS OF MERIT: A committee chaired by Dr. Claude Bissell selects Torontonians "who have attained distinction and renown in various fields of endeavour." Those chosen receive inscribed medallions. The awards were instituted in 1956 and some of the arts/cultural winners include Margaret Atwood, A.J. Casson, Maureen Forrester, Oscar Peterson, Marshal McLuhan, Don Shebib, Raymond Moriyama and Barbara Hamilton. The awards have a 1984 budget of \$28,520.

UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ARE:

8. THE SELECTION COMMITTEE FOR PUBLIC ART: With no specific budget, despite its potential importance, this committee deserves better treatment than it has received frequently at the hands of City Council. Coordinated by Mary Lynn Reimer of the Urban Design Group, the committee is made up of a knowledgeable group of artists, curators, dealers and collectors. Its mandate is to advise City Council on the artistic merit of sculptural or other artistic gifts or commissions to be sited for display on City-owned open spaces. Unfortunately, despite the expertise of the Committee, City Council is not obliged to take its advice. As a result a number of unfortunate pieces of sculpture are with us in

perpetuity. Equally disturbing is the fact that the City has no reciprocal arrangements with Metro Council which would permit regulation of sculpture placement on Metro property (such as major streets like University Avenue) which lies within the City of Toronto.

The Committee has done good work at times but its recommendations are too easily circumvented. I have commented further on this problem in another part of this report.

9. TORONTO FILM LIAISON UNIT: Under the direction of Naish McHugh and with a 1984 budget of \$150,000 this unit facilitated the shooting of thirty-four films in Toronto during 1984. The unit arranges for all the permits and City personnel needed to fulfill legal requirements affecting filmmaking and assists producers in a hundred useful ways. The programme under which the unit operates is also associated with and assists the Festival of Festivals and the Academy of Canadian Cinema. To mark the Sesquicentennial, an annual "City of Toronto Screen Award" will be given to a student of film or television.

UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION:

10. SUMMER MUSIC FESTIVAL: Established in 1959 and with a 1984 budget allocation of \$76,740, Toronto's Summer Music Festival is probably the largest of its kind in Canada. In seventeen different locations everything musical from the Honolulu Heartbreakers to the Band of the Queen's Own Rifles, from the Toronto Opera Society and the Toronto Symphony to Manteca and the Good Brothers are presented through a partnership involving the City, the Toronto Star and CBC, which carries a portion of the programme to a wider audience. Altogether the music programme, together with a smaller programme of children's theatre and Dream in High Park, plays in parks to about 250,000 persons. Of these, it is estimated fifty percent come from Toronto, fifty percent from other parts of Metro and elsewhere.

CITY OF TORONTO SPENDING ON THE ARTS AND CULTURE:

The City of Toronto has more than doubled its participation in the arts and culture field during the past five years. In 1980, total spending, including tax and rental remissions, was \$2,116,007. By 1984, this had reached \$4,872,031. Neither of these figures includes arts and culture related spending included

regularly in departmental estimates. During 1984, identified spending can be summarized as follows:

<u>In-House Budgets</u>		
Market Gallery-operations	\$ 142,395	
Market Gallery-acquisitions	<u>\$ 60,000</u>	\$ 202,395
Albert Franck Committee		\$ 8,951
Toronto Film Liaison		\$ 150,000
City Book Awards		\$ 12,015
Awards of Merit		\$ 28,520
National Ballet Scholarship		\$ 2,000
Summer Music Festival		<u>\$ 76,740</u>
		\$ 480,621

Tax and Rental Forgivenesses

Taxes	\$ 1,239,565	
Rentals	<u>223,405</u>	\$ 1,462,970
St. Lawrence Centre:		
Operational Grants	\$ 964,752	
Debt Charges	<u>558,288</u>	\$ 1,523,040
As advised by Toronto Arts Council:		
Grants to Major Theatres	\$ 743,400	
Other Grants	<u>442,000</u>	\$ 1,185,400
<u>Payments from At Large Account:</u>		
Toronto International Festival	\$ 200,000	
Dream In High Park	<u>20,000</u>	\$ 220,000
		\$ 4,872,031

To this amount can be added the City of Toronto's share of Metro's support to arts and cultural organizations:

Metro 1984 Support	\$7,033,441 @ 41%	<u>\$ 2,883,710</u>
Total City of Toronto Commitment		\$ 7,755,791

WHAT DOES TORONTO GET IN RETURN?

During the year ended 30th June 1984 approximately 130 organizations received direct and indirect support from the City of

Toronto. In this context, direct support means a cash grant of some sort, indirect support means rental forgiveness or tax exemption. During the present year 160 organizations will be assisted. The organizations include:

- * Theatrical producing bodies
- * Theatrical facilities
- * Musical and operatic producing bodies
- * Art Galleries
- * Ballet and Dance producing bodies (including schools)
- * Literary publishing and producing bodies
- * The Royal Ontario Museum
- * Video and film coordinating and exhibiting bodies
- * Miscellaneous bodies including the Toronto Arts Council
- * The Toronto International Festival of Music and Dance

These organizations, during this period reported receiving from the City of Toronto a total of \$4,025,369 in cash grants, tax exemptions and rental forgivenesses. (Because of varying year-ends which mean in practice that groups receive money in one City fiscal year but report its receipt in another, amounts granted will not agree with amounts reported as received.) During the year, all of these groups received a total, from all sources, of \$108,279,318 and spent a total of \$111,113,289. All of the groups in question are sited within the City of Toronto. Their total attendances, in Toronto, amount to six million.

(Note: The figures quoted above also include estimates of \$1.8-million in grants to individual artists from provincial sources, \$2.2-million from federal and other sources and a matching \$4-million deemed to come from artists' savings and/or sales of art objects. No attempt has been made to ascertain the actual total of sales by authors, composers or by Toronto visual artists through Toronto art dealers or privately. A fair estimate is probably in the range of \$15-million to \$20-million with most of this amount being reinvested in space and materials, paid out in dealers' fees, exhibition costs, framing costs, typists' fees, research fees, etcetera. The lesser matching amount of \$4-million has been used for convenience.)

During the year Toronto artistic organizations and artists included in their income:

<u>Receipts:</u>	
From admissions	\$ 28,144,721
From other income	11,205,227
From fundraising	<u>16,062,377</u> \$ 55,412,325

From the City of Toronto	4,025,369	
From the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto	5,360,456	
Ontario Arts Council (organizations \$4,508,746 individuals \$1,800,000)	6,308,746	
Canada Council	<u>11,475,232</u>	27,169,803
From Department of Communications and other federal sources approximately	4,200,000	
From the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture (over 85% to ROM and AGO)-approximately	<u>21,497,190</u>	<u>25,697,190</u>
		<u>\$ 108,279,318</u>

These groups included in their expenditures:

Amounts spent on artists, materials,
presentation and exhibition costs \$ 84,578,732

Amounts spent on administrative costs
(including forgiven taxes and rents of \$2,575,840
not recorded by receiving organizations) 26,534,557
\$ 111,113,289

The groups attracted attendances of about six million. Total subsidy applied to these attendances was \$67,673,341. If this subsidy is divided by total attendances of 6,000,000, one determines that the average subsidy experienced as a saving by each attender at the time of attendance was \$11.29.

Subsidy savings to visitors (tourists)	\$11,293,941
Subsidy savings to Torontonians	\$28,189,700
Subsidy savings to residents of other parts of Metro	<u>\$28,189,700</u>
	\$ 67,673,341

WHERE DOES SUBSIDY SPENDING GO FROM HERE?

The arts in Toronto, as we have seen, spend about \$111-million annually, and give to Torontonians, in return for \$7.8-million in subsidy, a total of \$28-million in savings.

Toronto's per capita direct spending amounts to \$8.12. Vancouver spends \$13.00 per capita. Toronto, as the cultural

capital of English-speaking Canada, ought to be spending \$15.00 per capita directly.

This increase of \$4-million would bring the City's participation to approximately \$9-million or 12.5% of total non-profit arts and culture spending. Applying conservative economic multipliers, such a move would tend to generate up to \$10-million in local economic impact. This would mean about 1700 new jobs in Toronto. This increase would not be inconsistent with average increases over the past four years, which have been made prudently in recognition of the arts and cultural sector's increasing contribution to Toronto's economy.

The investment of \$15.00 per capita does not seem to be a bad one when it is considered that, as will be shown later in this section, the excellence of Toronto's arts/cultural sector is such that it attracts total subsidies from other levels of governments and the private sector of almost eight times the amount of suggested City subsidy. As things stand:

1. Each attendance is subsidized by various funding bodies on average by \$11.29 - for a total of \$28,189,700.
2. Subsidy presently received by Torontonians in the form of savings on ticket prices amounts on a per capita basis to \$46.66 every year.
3. The difference of \$38.54 (\$46.66 - \$8.12) per capita paid for by federal, provincial and metro governments, together with the private sector would not exist if the arts and culture sector did not exist.
4. The savings experienced by attenders as a result of subsidy application are not taxable, resulting in a further saving of \$10-\$15-million.
5. Increased levels of excellence and diversity made possible by commitment of increased resources will attract further subsidy from other sectors of government and the private sector.
6. Taking a position now will place Toronto in a favourable position in negotiations with other levels of government, in order:
 - a) To highlight our City's perception of the importance of the arts and culture to our municipal economy;
 - b) To enable the City to argue from a secure moral basis against cuts to the chronically underfunded arts and culture sector, CBC-TV and Radio;

7. Taking a position now will mean that Toronto has decided to find ways and means to assure:
- a) artists of a decent living;
 - b) the public of affordable prices;
 - c) potential employers of artists and technicians for the performing arts, film, video, television and commercials of a growing, improving talent pool;
 - d) visual arts enthusiasts and artists of the creation of the foundation for a new market for art.
8. Taking this particular position now - of being the Canadian leader in municipal arts investment - will be of great benefit in publicizing Toronto as a city of diversity, of culture, of thriving optimism.

RECOMMENDATION:

For reasons given, the City of Toronto's total direct contribution to the arts - grants, tax exemptions and rent grants - should rise to \$15.00 per capita yearly.

WHAT ABOUT OTHER LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT?

Federal Spending:

The Canada Council's national operating grant resources have declined in real terms over the past ten years. Present spending of \$3.00 per capita in this area by a country of Canada's wealth, prospects and aspirations is pathetic. The recent federal cuts further weaken an already underfunded agency.

Metropolitan Toronto, which, every year delivers billions of dollars in income tax to Ottawa, supports an arts and cultural sector which received grants from The Canada Council of \$4.98 per capita. This is less than the \$5.40 per capita paid by all Metro residents during 1984.

If the management of sector growth from a municipal point of view is to be effective, and if continuing growth itself in the arts and culture as an industry is to be sustained, the Canada Council's operating budget will have to be increased to at least \$6.00 per capita nationally. The City of Toronto and the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto should accept the responsi-

bility of providing leadership for a national campaign to persuade the federal government of the urgent necessity of - and the positive economic and employment benefits flowing from - this long overdue improvement.

Provincial Spending:

The Macaulay Committee drew attention to the fact that the Province of Ontario's support of the arts at a level of \$2.50 per capita through the Ontario Arts Council was among the lowest, if not the lowest, of per capita provincial contributions.

It is interesting to note that, of total attendances of six million, almost 22% are to two large agencies, the Royal Ontario Museum and the Art Gallery of Ontario. The ROM and the AGO together absorb more than 85% of Ministry of Citizenship and Culture funding reported herein and about 36% of all Toronto arts and culture support - private and public. The remaining 64% of subsidy underpins over 150 organizations serving approximately 78% of those attending arts and cultural events. This comment is not made to suggest that either the ROM or the AGO is overfunded; rather it is made to point up that the remainder of the constituency is, by comparison and in real terms, severely underfunded. The disparity between the \$4.5 -million given by the Province via the Ontario Arts Council to some 150 organizations serving 4.6 million attenders and the over \$18-million given by the Ministry to two agencies serving 1.4 million attenders is too great not to give credence to the view that the Ontario Arts Council's funds are simply not adequate to the task of properly carrying the Province's share of costs and of sustaining the growth of the Toronto arts community.

It will be noted that 1983-84 spending outpaced receipts by some \$3-million. A number of the City's larger organizations, on the advice of the Macaulay Committee, have recently received increases of more than 100% in provincial funding. No announcement has been made regarding the other 150 City-supported Toronto arts organizations which are also underfunded by the province. A province-wide 100% increase in OAC grants funding would mean:

1. Ontario Arts Council funding of Toronto-based arts organizations would approximate Canada Council funding.
2. Ontario Arts Council funding of these groups would approximate total municipal (Metro and Toronto) funding.
3. Ontario Arts Council funding of these groups would approximate 65% of private sector fundraising.

Such a move would constitute a vote of confidence in the ability of the Ontario arts community - of which Toronto is the

leader - to continue to develop local revenues (admissions, other income and fundraising) which already account in Toronto for over 50% of total revenues. It would also provide a fund to be imaginatively administered to limit costs to the public while increasing earnings to artists.

Metro Spending:

Such a move by the government of Ontario would also serve as leadership to other government levels - in particular that of Metro - whose contribution to the funding partnership is not in line with benefits derived. During 1984, apart from tax forgivenesses matching those of the City of Toronto, Metro will contribute to the arts and culture operating funds of \$4,478,300 and capital grants of \$1.1-million, a total of \$5,578,300. Of this, the City of Toronto will contribute \$2,287,000 and the rest of Metro \$3,291,300. Given that residents of Metro municipalities other than the City of Toronto receive savings on arts/culture attendances of over \$28-million, and given the willingness of taxpayers (as recorded by the Macaulay Committee) to commit more to the arts, it would seem reasonable to suggest that Metro move from its present level in operating grants of \$2.00 per capita to a more realistic and functional level of \$4.00 per capita - \$9-million. A further section of this report will detail the improvements and augmentations to our arts and culture spectrum possible given these modest increases in provincial, Metro and City resources.

Without these changes, most artists will remain where the Canada Council tells us they are now: disgracefully below the poverty line. Further, an industry presently enriching our economy, will not be able to continue its remarkable growth.

What is obvious from this entire discussion is that present levels of governmental investment constitute a good beginning, but nothing more, towards raising earnings from the arts to decent levels.

WHAT ABOUT ACCESS TO THE ARTS?

Despite the generally miserable average income offered to trained professional artists, there is the problem of access: for many people the cost of art is simply too high. Something which ought to be their right is in many cases a luxury.

Very fundamental decisions have to be made because, at the moment, the arts stand where education once stood - somewhere between a right and a privilege. Nowadays, few would suggest that a teacher's salary ought to depend on the effectiveness of a fund-

raising committee, or a student's right to advance ought to depend on a family's ability to pay the going rate. And yet, in earlier times, these were the norms, not the exceptions. They became the exceptions on the day when it was decided that it is the duty of society to provide an education to everyone. In many other countries similar decisions have been made with regard to society's obligation to make the arts available to all sectors of the population. The decisions have been made, policies put in place, practices worked out. As a result, the arts are generally available as part of the bounty of civilization in which every citizen has the right to share; artists have been enabled to devote themselves more wholeheartedly to their art to the general enrichment of society. Best of all, the sky has not fallen and no one has gone bankrupt because of the costs of providing this indispensable dimension of civilization.

Why? Because by comparison with the costs of other necessary components of civilized life, the arts are not only incredibly inexpensive, but in addition have the capability of largely paying for themselves. They create in a city the kind of atmosphere which attracts visitors. Think for a moment about the success of the "I Love New York" campaign. It worked because it's true: most of us do love New York. But do we love the rudeness, the danger, the dirt, the overcrowding, the smog? No. What we love and remember are Carnegie Hall and the Carnegie Tavern and the Carnegie Deli where we once sat next to Woody Allen...The Statue of Liberty...Lincoln Centre and the Theatre Pub... Broadway... Off-Broadway...The Museum of Modern Art...The Public Library...Radio City Music Hall...SoHo...Shakespeare in Central Park...Dinty Moore's...The Metropolitan Museum...The Met. All the artistic/cultural things.

That's what we love about New York. Matter of fact, that's what we love about Toronto. All the expressions of soul.

The beginnings have been made. Now it's time to move on. It is a legitimate aim of municipal cultural policy to work for an even-handed, equitable funding partnership between city government and other levels of government.

Toronto's present level of spending on the arts and culture, together with the recommended immediate increase in cash grants will place the City in an excellent position to begin working for a better deal from its funding partners.

C

ultural Capital

Metro and Toronto

CHAPTER NINE

METRO AND TORONTO

Of the senior levels of government who share the funding partnership with the City of Toronto, the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto is the closest in terms of common concerns and responsibilities and community of interests. Despite this, there is confusion about the relationship between Metro and the City.

In part, this confusion exists because in certain areas - like policing - Metro has total responsibility, while in others, the constituent municipalities have total responsibility while in still others the responsibility is shared between the two governments. In this latter category is found the area of the arts and culture.

Put briefly, the relationship between Metro and its constituent municipalities - Toronto, North York, East York, York, Etobicoke and Scarborough - is that of a partnership. The partners have agreed that for the good of all they will pool a percentage of tax revenues in order to pay for certain services which will be most effective when organized and administered on the basis of being paid for by and serving the entire Metro region. At the moment, out of every dollar in property taxes collected by the City of Toronto, 23 cents goes to the City, 27 cents goes to Metro and 50 cents goes to an education pool which is portioned out according to the education needs of Metro's constituent municipalities.

In areas which receive both Metro and City support - like the arts and culture - imbalances happen because practice has developed rapidly over the past ten years in both Metro and City areas in the absence of an arts and culture-oriented forum where points of view could be advanced regarding cost-sharing and decisions could be made about sensible apportioning of responsibilities.

Just as the needs of Metro in the area of zoology are best served by Metro's support and continuing development of a major facility located in Scarborough, so Metro's arts and cultural needs will, in the main, be best served by continuing to support and develop the organizations and facilities presently existing in the City of Toronto.

Such a recognition does not preclude the possibility of artistic and cultural development in parts of Metro other than the

City of Toronto. On the contrary, policy based on this acceptance of reality would stress the importance of creating and enhancing a pan-Metro approach to solving the problems of accessibility, of the arts in education, of stimulating community expression in the arts. In these areas, Toronto's arts community has expertise and experience to offer and a demonstrated willingness to share its know-how. Underlying a creative programme of arts/cultural interchange between the City of Toronto and the other constituents of Metro should be the basic understanding that Metro is a single cultural entity, and that thanks to the existence and continued development of the major arts/cultural pool of facilities and personnel presently existing in one part of Metro, the other parts do not have to spend the money and energy necessary to duplicate what already exists.

HOW METRO AND THE CITY OUGHT TO DEAL WITH THE SHARED ARTS AND CULTURE RESPONSIBILITY

At present, where arts policy exists among the constituent municipalities of Metro, it tends to deal with local and immediate concerns existing within the boundaries of each municipality. Direct spending on the arts by North York tends to be in support of organizations and projects sited in North York; Scarborough direct spending focuses on the needs of Scarborough; Etobicoke direct spending is related to Etobicoke initiatives; Toronto direct spending goes in support of what is happening in Toronto. This is as it should be since arts and culture, like charity, begin at home.

Apart from this municipally-oriented pattern of support of local expression, however, there is the reality that the artistic and cultural expression of Metropolitan Toronto is greater than the sum of its parts, and it is in response to this fact of life that Metro government itself, as opposed to the governments of the various constituents making up Metro, bases the logic of its arts and culture policy. So far, in dealing with the allocation of scarce resources, Metro has shown a laudable inclination to deal with reality. Metro has acknowledged that just as zoology funding ought to go to the pan-Metro Zoo situated in Scarborough, so arts funding ought to go to the professional arts community situated in Toronto. As a result, there is an almost complete overlap between the list of arts and cultural organizations supported by Metro and the list of such organizations supported by the City of Toronto. What there is not is an equitable sharing of the costs of an all-Metro service for which an all-Metro public is already voting

resoundingly with both its feet and its wallet. A possible basis for support would be the municipal property tax. This would mean that Metro government spending on the arts and culture should rise to 150 percent of City of Toronto spending so that the total costs are shared:

City of Toronto, approximately	40%
Remainder of Metro Toronto, approximately	60%

At the moment this is not the case. During 1984, total municipal benefits conferred on the arts and culture by the City of Toronto and Metro will equal: \$12,405,472.

This amount is made up of:

Paid directly by City of Toronto	\$4,872,031
Paid directly by other Metro constituents (estimated)	500,000
Paid directly by Metro	<u>7,033,441</u>
	\$12,405,472

Of the amount of all-Metro costs paid directly by Metro:

41% is contributed towards all-Metro costs by the City of Toronto, and this equals	\$2,883,710
---	-------------

59% is contributed towards all-Metro costs by the remainder of Metro and this equals	<u>4,149,731</u>
--	------------------

\$7,033,441

Thus, towards total costs of: The City pays:	\$12,405,472
---	--------------

Directly	\$4,872,031	
Through Metro as 41% City contribution to all-Metro costs	<u>2,883,710</u>	7,755,741

The remainder of Metro pays: As 59% contribution to all-Metro costs	\$4,149,731	
Directly (estimated)	<u>500,000</u>	4,649,731

\$12,405,472

If the City pays directly or indirectly a total of \$7,755,741 or 62% of arts and culture spending in Metro, and the remaining constituents spend directly or indirectly \$4,649,731 or 38% of arts and culture spending, then the spending ratio is almost exactly the reverse of what it should be - 40% for the City of Toronto and 60% for the remaining five constituent municipalities (at an average of 12% each).

This report recommends that total City of Toronto direct spending should rise to \$15.00 per capita, or \$9,000,000.

As a first step towards an equitable municipal cost-sharing formula, reflecting accurately the costs and benefits of the arts and cultural sector, Metro's level of funding should increase to \$11,000,000.

This would bring the all-Metro per capita contribution to \$8.70 per capita, the non-Toronto contribution to \$4.12.

In the light of the Macaulay Committee survey which found Ontarians were willing to pay up to \$25.00 per capita in extra taxes in support of the arts, the suggested per capita increases do not seem excessive.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City of Toronto begin negotiations with Metropolitan Toronto in order to secure a more equitable formula for sharing the financial responsibility for encouraging and supporting the professional arts and cultural sector in Metro.

HOW THE CITY AND METRO ARE PRESENTLY ADMINISTERING FUNDING FOR THE ARTS AND CULTURE

The two governments operate in different ways to give assistance to the arts:

Cash Grants:

The City of Toronto gives grants to professional cultural, to community and neighbourhood organizations and to major theatres on the basis of advice given to City Council by the Toronto Arts

Council, an independent arm's length body composed mainly of artists.

Metro gives grants to professional cultural organizations on the basis of advice given by the Metro Director of Cultural Affairs who reports to Metro's chief administrative officer. Metro also gives grants to support cultural activities of community and neighbourhood organizations on the advice of the Director of Multicultural Affairs. During 1984, Metro instituted a system of peer-panel review of grant applications and decisions affecting arts groups.

Tax Exemptions:

The City of Toronto exempts a total of eleven arts and cultural institutions from the payment of City taxes. Such exemptions have in general been in place for some time and affect mostly well-established organizations such as the AGO, the ROM, the National Ballet School, Massey Hall, the O'Keefe Centre, and Roy Thomson Hall. Exemptions are decided by City Council without the advice of the Toronto Arts Council.

By agreement, Metro exempts the same organizations from payment of Metro's portion of property taxes.

Rent Grants:

The City assists three organizations - the National Ballet of Canada, the Alumnae Theatre and Young People's Theatre - by charging no rent or reduced rent on City-owned premises. Toronto Arts Council does not advise on rental grants.

Metro gives leases at \$1.00 per year to two Metro-owned facilities - Pauline McGibbon Centre and Adelaide Court. Savings to the two organizations are estimated to be \$50,000 in total.

Facilities Operating Grants:

The City of Toronto provides operating grants to the Board of the St. Lawrence Centre. The Toronto Arts Council does not advise on these grants. Metro provides no facilities operating grants. (See discussion of major facilities beginning on page 87).

Capital Grants:

The City provides no capital grants as such to arts organizations but from time to time makes grants in aid of capital projects from its At Large account. The City also pays for the net capital cost of renovations and equipment needed by the St. Lawrence Centre, after deducting private sector donations towards such renovations.

Metro presently gives capital grants to Roy Thomson Hall and the Royal Ontario Museum.

Debt Charges:

The City of Toronto pays interest charges on debt incurred to finance the City's portion of construction and renovation costs applicable to the St. Lawrence Centre.

In-house Programmes:

The City of Toronto operates a total of ten arts/cultural in-house programmes (e.g. the Market Gallery, Summer Music Festival, Albert Franck Committee, Awards of Merit, Film Liaison Unit).

Grants Administration/Arts Councils:

In 1984 the City of Toronto provided the Toronto Arts Council with \$50,000 for administration and \$10,000 towards the cost of this report.

Metro absorbs all grants administration costs of its Department of Cultural Affairs as part of general administrative costs. Metro gives operating grants through its Department of Cultural Affairs to Arts Councils in the cities of Etobicoke, North York, and Scarborough but does not similarly fund the operations of the Toronto Arts Council.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City of Toronto use its good offices to encourage the Department of Cultural Affairs of Metropolitan Toronto to respond favourably to Toronto Arts Council's request for operational funding as the Department does with other municipally-based arts councils in Metro.

BENEFITS CONFERRED:

Analyzed in terms of the above area breakdown, the expenditures of the two governments can be compared:

	City of <u>Toronto</u>	Metro <u>Toronto</u>
Operating grants to arts organizations	\$1,037,070	\$4,415,800
Community and neighbourhood grants	88,250	70,100
Operating - Facilities	955,960	-

Debt Charges - Facilities	567,080	-
Rent Grants	223,405	50,000
At Large Grants	220,000	-
In-House Programs	480,621	-
Arts Councils	60,000	62,500
Capital Grants to organizations	-	1,100,000
Tax Exemptions	<u>1,239,565</u>	<u>1,455,141</u>
	4,871,951	7,153,541
Portion of Metro costs paid by City contribution of 41% of total	<u>2,883,710</u>	<u>(2,883,710)</u>
Cost/Shares	\$7,755,661	\$4,269,831

It is interesting to note that of the funds the City of Toronto ultimately contributes to the arts and culture totalling \$7,755,661:

Through the Toronto Arts Council the City spent in 1984	\$1,185,320	(15.3%)
City Council itself supervised the spending of	3,686,631	(47.5%)
City Council delegated to Metro's Department of Cultural Affairs the spending of	<u>2,883,710</u>	(37.2%)
	\$7,775,661	(100.0%)

By amalgamating this latter amount with contributions from the other constituents of Metro, the Metro region, through the medium of Metro government, is able to give grants whose very size guarantees that greater benefits will be received than would be the case if grants were given pro-rata by each separate municipality. The saving in paperwork alone is impossible to estimate.

Analyzed according to area of benefit these amounts could be restated as follows:

	City of <u>Toronto</u>	Metro <u>Toronto</u>
Dance(excluding National Ballet)	\$ 55,250	\$ 250,500
Music (excluding TS)	51,700	385,050
Theatre - General	142,250	597,950
Theatre - Major	743,400	335,000
St. Lawrence Centre	1,523,040	-
Visual and Media (excluding AGO)	34,900	203,200
Miscellaneous/At Large	229,520	266,300

Communities/neighbourhoods	88,300	70,100
Arts Council(s)	60,000	62,500
Rent Grants*	223,405	50,000
In-House Programmes	480,621	-
Tax Exemptions*	1,239,565	1,455,141
Capital Grants	-	1,100,000
AGO, COC, National Ballet, TS	-	2,377,800
	<u>4,871,951</u>	<u>7,153,541</u>
City of Toronto 41% portion of Metro budget	<u>2,883,710</u>	<u>(2,883,710)</u>
Benefits/Shares	\$7,755,661	\$4,269,831

* See appendices. Tax exemptions and rent grants have been given on an ad hoc basis. In general tax exemptions and rent grants benefit major theatre companies, ROM, AGO, National Ballet, Canadian Opera Company and the Toronto Symphony by reducing facilities costs. The savings are generally passed to users in the form of lowered admission costs.

Neither the City of Toronto nor Metro gives grants to individuals, in part because both Canada Council and Ontario Arts Council do. Further, the lists of organizations funded by the City of Toronto and Metro overlap almost completely and more than 95% of Metro spending on the arts and culture goes to organizations sited in the City of Toronto. Even so, there are some differences:

- (1) The City of Toronto, unlike Metro, funds non-professional organizations, generally to assist them in acquiring professional guidance and participation.
- (2) The City of Toronto is frequently the first government to fund emerging arts groups.
- (3) The City of Toronto does not fund the Royal Ontario Museum or Roy Thomson Hall by way of capital grants, but exempts both from taxes, as does Metro.
- (4) The City of Toronto does not give operating grants to the Art Gallery of Ontario, the Canadian Opera Company, the National Ballet School, or the Toronto Symphony but exempts the O'Keefe Centre, Roy Thomson Hall and the AGO from taxes, as does Metro. Further, the City gives the National Ballet of Canada a sizable rent grant towards its St. Lawrence Hall tenancy. All of these reduce organizational costs in lieu of operating grants.

OTHER AREAS - MAJOR FACILITIES:

Metro operates the O'Keefe Centre. The City of Toronto operates the St. Lawrence Centre. Until 1980 both facilities operated at a deficit. At that time, the relations between the O'Keefe Centre and its prime tenants were rearranged so that rents charged to the National Ballet of Canada and the Canadian Opera Company were increased to break-even levels. So as not to disadvantage the two prime tenants, Metro grants were increased to amounts equalling the new increased rents. At the same time, the O'Keefe Centre was exempted from taxes by both the City of Toronto and Metro, and a per-admission renovations surcharge was introduced. As a result, the O'Keefe Centre has over the past two years generated a considerable surplus, despite declining usage, instead of the \$1-million deficits it formerly produced.

Despite regular deficits, no such rationalization of the affairs of the St. Lawrence Centre has been put in place, and as a result the Centre, which although owned by the City of Toronto is, in terms of usage, as much a Metro facility as is the O'Keefe Centre, has always required from the City annual operating grants which in 1984 will total almost \$1-million.

It is noted that this deficit is caused mainly by the artificially low rents paid by CentreStage and Theatre Plus, the very high charges for cleaning and services by City Property Department, and the generally high charges for upkeep and replacement of equipment.

It would appear appropriate to apply to the problem of the St. Lawrence Centre operating deficit a solution modelled on the O'Keefe solution in part and also on the arrangement made to assist the Toronto Symphony's prime tenancy at Roy Thomson Hall.

In the latter case, the increase in costs occasioned by the move was, in part, absorbed by an increased Metro grant to the Toronto Symphony with the remainder passed ultimately to the patrons of Roy Thomson Hall in the form of unsubsidized costs.

Rents paid to the St. Lawrence Centre by its prime tenants are unusually low, given the extent of services provided by the Centre, whose ushers alone are paid more than half the total of rents paid by the two organizations. Metro grants paid to Theatre Plus and CentreStage are unusually low in comparison to the pattern of Metro grants to other Toronto theatres; in the latter case, Metro tends to give grants averaging four to five times City grants; in the cases of the St. Lawrence Centre companies Metro grants are a bare third of City grants. Further, ticket prices paid by St. Lawrence Centre patrons are unusually low and amounts of City subsidy are unusually high. (See appendix).

RECOMMENDATION:

With all of the foregoing in mind it is recommended that an equitable method of disposing of the St. Lawrence Centre deficit of approximately \$1-million would be to:

- | | |
|---|------------|
| (1) Implement a renovations surcharge of fifty cents per ticket which on annual admissions of 300,000 persons would yield | \$ 150,000 |
| (2) Raise rents to prime tenants pro rata to present amounts by | 600,000 |

This would be met by:
 negotiating increases in Metro grants to prime tenants \$ 350,000
 Increasing ticket prices by an average of one dollar per ticket

250,000
\$ 600,000

- | | | | |
|---|---|------------|-------------|
| (3) Limit Property Department charge to \$6,000 per week and charge the remainder, as is the case with other City-owned premises to general property upkeep costs. This would eliminate | <table border="0"> <tr> <td style="text-align: right;">\$ 250,000</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: right; border-top: 1px solid black;">\$1,000,000</td> </tr> </table> | \$ 250,000 | \$1,000,000 |
| \$ 250,000 | | | |
| \$1,000,000 | | | |

This saving of \$1-million ought not to be returned to general revenues but used to increase the inadequate cultural grants and community and neighbourhood grants budgets.

POLICY ON FACILITIES -- IN GENERAL

Both the O'Keefe Centre and the St. Lawrence Centre have been the source of ongoing problems to the governments which are their respective owners. It is noted that, in general, facilities which are not operated by prime tenants - whether they are located in Toronto, Montreal or Vancouver - tend to generate concern, conflict, inefficiency and high costs. It is further noted that the St. Lawrence Centre and its two prime tenants spend annually about \$7-million (of which much more than half is subsidy) in order to entertain patrons making about 260,000 attendances.

In the arts, as in everything else, justice must not only be done, but be seen to be done. This is particularly important where intergovernmental arrangements must be made. At the present time at CentreStage a new Artistic Producer has begun his tenure. At Theatre Plus, a new Artistic Director will take up his duties in 1985; at the St. Lawrence Centre a new General Manager will shortly be appointed. Perhaps now is a good moment not only to include the Centre itself on the list of organizations on whose affairs the City will request advice of the Toronto Arts Council, but to consider the presentation of art at the Centre on a more amalgamated administrative basis.

Recently there have been encouraging signs of a willingness to cooperate on the part of the Centre's prime tenants, with the object of the collaboration being a saving of costs which could be translated into upgraded production values. This type of joint venturing should be encouraged as should be any movement towards integrated operations on the part of the Centre itself and its two prime tenants. Between them they now spend almost half as much as does the Stratford Festival, considerably more than does the Shaw Festival. A fundamental question here is this: how does the City of Toronto, in view of its unusually heavy commitment to operations by and in the St. Lawrence Centre, assure itself that it is getting the greatest amount of artistic value for money expended? Without some means of obtaining that assurance, how does the City negotiate in good faith with other levels of government on behalf of the Centre's artists? The questions are real ones and they will not go away merely by being ignored.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is recommended that the City of Toronto request the Toronto Arts Council to consider ways and means of rationalizing this question: how should a major subsidizing body such as the City of Toronto reconcile the question of artistic freedom with the subsidizing body's need to know that full value is being received in return for resources provided? The Council should be asked to consider the question generally and in terms of the specific operations by and in the St. Lawrence Centre.

This recommendation may seem to be a digression from the general thrust of this chapter but, in fact, a considered response to such an inquiry would be of great benefit in the City's relations, not only with Metro but other levels of governments as well. The pattern of funding of the Centre's two prime tenants is most unusual when compared with that of similar theatres across the country, where Canada Council and provincial grants are generally a multiple of municipal aid and not the reverse. If theatre as an expression in Toronto is to acquire resources similar to those committed to opera, ballet and symphonic music, the good offices of the City will certainly be required in the task of persuading

Canada Council, Ontario Arts Council and the private sector to scale up their participations. To function effectively in such negotiations the City will have to be very certain it knows whereof it speaks.

OTHER AREAS OF COOPERATION - PROGRAMMES

A number of areas which would benefit from cooperation among all Metro area municipalities are:

- (1) The proposed "Materials for the Arts" programme.
- (2) The proposed "Space for the Arts" programme.
- (3) The proposed Art Commission.
- (4) A programme of tours by Metro organizations to other areas of Metro, supported by a matching Metro touring fund.
- (5) A programme of enriched interchange between professional artists and community-based groups.
- (6) A programme to bring the arts to the elderly, particularly those in nursing and senior citizens homes.
- (7) Joint action by municipal arts councils.

A Legislative Focus at City Hall

In order to acknowledge the importance of the arts and cultural sector to Toronto, City Council should set up an Arts and Culture Committee to deal with all matters affecting the sector. Such a Committee would facilitate long-term planning and could focus the City's relations with other levels of government.

RECOMMENDATION:

City Council should set up an Arts and Culture Standing Committee.

LOOKING BACKWARDS - LOOKING AHEAD

Ten years ago, David Silcox's successful report "Metropolitan Toronto's Support of the Arts - A Study of the Problems" put Metro into the arts support business in a major way. The projected levels - \$1.00 per capita - of funding were visionary at the time while being simple to understand and easy to explain. One dollar per capita was a beginning goal.

Thanks to inflation, one 1974 dollar gets you \$2.40 in 1984 dollars. As a result, Metro's increases in budget amount to only thirty 1974 cents per capita, even though the Metro appetite for art grew more rapidly and extensively during the past ten years than anyone ever imagined it would.

One of the major tasks facing an Arts and Culture Committee will be to consider carefully how costs and benefits can be broadly related so that Metro as an entity and Toronto as an entity can reach agreements on budgetary targets needed to provide our citizens and visitors with the level and diversity of artistic experience they have a right to expect in a centre as important as Metropolitan Toronto.

Cultural Capital

Toronto — a Great Centre of Arts and Culture

CHAPTER TEN

BUILDING A GREAT CENTRE OF ARTS AND CULTURE

By 1989, our arts and cultural community will be much bigger than it is now, if present trends of development continue at an annual rate of 10% per annum. This is about half the growth rate of the past two years.

In fact, during the three-year recessionary period between mid-1981 and mid-1984 the revenues of the non-profit arts and cultural sector in Toronto grew by 52% and attendances by about 50%. (See Appendix). Even excluding the Toronto International Festival, both revenues and attendances grew by 40% over the three-year period. Assuming no improvements whatsoever in the current funding profile, and no dramatic rises in the currently underfunded Metro, provincial and federal sectors, it seems safe to predict on the basis of a 47% growth in private and public subsidy during a recession-ridden two-year period that a 10% annual growth in the total area will be achieved.

This growth, which conservatively estimated will bring the sector by 1989 to \$175-million in total revenues and direct spending, and increase its annual local economic impact to over \$400-million and its national economic impact to between \$800- and \$900-million. By 1999, local impact will be slightly in excess of \$1-billion, national economic impact about \$2.1-billion. All amounts are expressed in 1984 dollars.

	1983-84	1988-89	1998-99
ADMISSIONS	\$ 28,144,721	\$ 45,327,353	\$117,567,460
OTHER EARNINGS	11,205,227	18,046,129	46,806,999
FUNDRAISING	16,062,377	25,868,616	67,096,518
CITY OF TORONTO	4,025,369	6,482,897	16,814,955
METRO TORONTO	5,360,456	8,633,068	22,391,949
ONTARIO ARTS COUNCIL	5,708,746	9,193,992	23,846,842
CANADA COUNCIL	12,275,232	19,769,382	51,276,681
D.O.C.	4,000,000	6,442,040	16,708,989
M.C.C.	<u>21,497,190</u>	<u>34,621,436</u>	<u>89,799,079</u>
TOTAL REVENUES	\$108,279,318	\$174,384,911	\$452,309,472
ATTENDANCES	6,000,000	9,663,060	25,063,483

Attendances now number about one million visitors from outside Metro, about two-and-a-half million from the City of Toronto (about four times the population) and two-and-a-half million from other parts of Metro (about one-and-a-half times the population).

If we make the assumptions that Metro population will not increase significantly, and

- (1) attendances made by visitors will rise disproportionately because of the existence of the Convention Centre, the improved tourism and marketing strategy promised at federal and provincial levels, and the growing awareness everywhere of Toronto as a centre of art and culture and,
- (2) attendances from residents of Metro living outside of Toronto will rise to one-half of Toronto's present level of about four attendances per capita, and
- (3) attendances by Torontonians will rise to a level of six times per capita, then our predictable audience profile in 1989 may be summarized as follows:

Attendances by visitors from outside Metro	3.0 million
Attendances by Torontonians	3.75 million
Attendances by non-Toronto Metro residents	<u>3.25 million</u>
	10 million

By 1999 visitors should have again increased disproportionately, thanks to more vigorous operations by the Convention Centre, growing tourism and Toronto's even greater fame as a great centre of art and culture; Metro attendances should have increased to an equivalent of 1989 Toronto attendances and Toronto attendances should have stabilized at a level of ten times the present population. Thus, our audience profile will then be:

Attendances by visitors from outside of Metro	9 million
Attendances by Torontonians	6 million
Attendances by Metro residents not living in Toronto	<u>10 million</u>
	25 million

IN 1999, WHERE WILL ALL THESE ESTIMATED TWENTY-FIVE
MILLION ATTENDANCES BE MADE?

Our eight major resident theatres	4.0 million
AGO	1.5 million
ROM	2.0 million
The Annual Summer Arts Festivals	1.5 million
Symphony Orchestras (2)	2.0 million
Our Summer Parks Programme of Drama, Visual Arts, Music and Dance	1.0 million
Our Major Dance Companies and Festival	2.0 million
Our Civic Music Theatres (2)	1.0 million
Our Chamber Orchestras and smaller musical ensembles	.5 million
Our Fifty Smaller Theatres	1.0 million
Our Parallel Galleries and Video Libraries	1.0 million
Community and Neighbourhood presentations	1.0 million
Harbourfront Arts Activities	1.5 million
Our Smaller Dance and Dance Theatre Groups	.5 million
Our Toronto Civic Cinemas	.5 million
Our Choral Groups	.5 million
Our Contemporary Art Museum	1.0 million
Our Toronto Gallery of Photographic Art	.5 million
Canadian Opera Company and other Opera Companies	1.5 million
Other activities not yet imagined	<u>.5 million</u>
	25.0 million

To this will be added performances in schools, street performances and other unmeasured attendances.

However the profile is spread, one thing is certain: the arts activity that is now ten times greater than it was in 1969 will certainly be at least four times greater in 1999 than it is today.

THE AIMS OF CULTURAL POLICY

At the beginning of this report the aims of cultural policy were set out:

- (1) The creation of a productive climate for artists.
- (2) The facilitation of accessibility for the public for the arts.
- (3) The creation of an aesthetic climate wherein public art might express the best of collective aspirations.
- (4) The creation of an educational climate wherein our young people might come naturally, easily and as early in their lives as possible, into contact with a living expression of their artistic and cultural heritage.
- (5) The creation of a climate of welcome for artists and others connected with the arts.

The recommendations in this report can be supplemented and added to, modified and strengthened, but the fact will remain that Toronto is already a long way down a path. If we take decisions and commit resources now, the progress to our perceivable destiny as a great North American centre of art and culture will be that much more rapid. Even if we all agree now on what is to be done and why, it will take many years of hard and exciting work to put everything in place.

It is part of the mystique of art to suggest that somehow its occurrence is accidental, capricious, unpredictable and not capable of being planned. In a society without the means to nourish art or the time or energy to assimilate its expression, this is probably a comforting notion. In a mature society of great wealth - resources, energies and leisure - such thinking is simplistic and retrogressive. The great composers, painters and writers of the past flourished because great patrons sustained them, provided them with the instruments and the climate they required, and appreciated knowledgeably what they were able to accomplish. It is significant that many of the great periods of artistic achievement were periods of turbulence, of insecurity, of transition, of graduation from collective immaturity to maturity, of self-conscious

grasping after clues to identity: times very like the present in North America, in Canada, in Ontario, in Toronto.

The very large, and rapidly growing public interest in the arts has not happened accidentally. It has happened because we have reached that stage in our development as a society where, along with the awareness of our need for the things the arts can provide, we have developed the self-confidence to search consciously for ways to satisfy the need. The concern of artists is that just as generals tend to prepare always for the last war they fought, so it is that political and economic leaders tend to mobilize resources to meet crises already surmounted. Artists wonder why it is that so much in the way of energy and cash is being committed to meet potential recreational needs centring on sport when voters are so clearly demonstrating their galloping appetite for art. It is not an either/or question; obviously there should be facilities for sports and there should be facilities for the arts. The matter is one of balance. Artists wonder when the governmental bias towards spending on sports-centred recreation, which has increased in the face of a surging interest in the arts, will be modified so as to reflect the wishes of the electorate.

As a group, artists are enthusiastic about Toronto. Asked why they want to work here, they reply:

"Toronto is the artistic focus of Canada."

"I like Toronto's diversity and sense of potential."

"As a visual artist, it makes sense to be in the visual arts centre of the province and the country."

"One can start in isolation here and that enables an artist to have more freedom."

"It's an international city with a cultural community which is very innovative."

"I like its optimistic energy as it continues to develop and grow."

"Toronto is really coming alive. It's good to be here right now."

"Toronto is the centre of communications for the country and represents one of the most diversified concentrations of people on the planet. This is Canada's gift to the rest of the world - an example of how people can live and work side by side in harmony."

Traditionally, artists are the early warning indicators as to where a total society is going. It appears that Toronto has a strong sense of identity and purpose and a bubbling enthusiasm for the future. Whatever became of prim old Toronto the Good? Drowned in dreams fast becoming reality, it would appear.

The dreams of artists here are altruistic and healthy. No one wants to simply get famous and rich, or if they do, they aren't saying so. They dream of paying their colleagues adequate fees, of owning and properly developing their premises, of finding risk capital in a society which built a large part of its past 150 years of existence on a basic creed of avoiding risk at all costs.

"We want to gain access to television broadcasting. All we need is enabling legislation and a transmitter."

"To see the arts exempted from censorship, as they are in most countries."

"A living wage for working artists is our dream and our continued existence - already a dream come true."

"A network of institutes of contemporary art - living museums, well-equipped, run by artists across the country, showing the best and challenging the rest."

"A five hundred to one thousand-seat dance theatre on Yonge Street. An improvisational composing orchestra. An integrated, multi-disciplinary performance ensemble."

"An annual two-week literary festival all over the City."

"Greater links with all of society, especially science."

"An entirely sold-out season of Canadian plays."

"A lobby art gallery for Third World artists...a bookshop."

"The opportunity to refine, modify and cultivate the creative roots planted during the last decade."

These are a few of the dreams of our artists. What we have in Toronto now represents the dreams of fifteen years ago, thirty years ago, fifty years ago.

TO SUM UP

The days of benign neglect of the arts at the municipal level have been over for some time. The arts are too important to the City's economy, too built into its fabric to be neglected or ignored or patted on the head and given their inadequate allowance. Mayor Eggleton at the Future Focus Forum, defined the arts as "not a cost to the community, but an investment, not a luxury, but a necessity, not something for the narrow elite but vitally important for the mainstream of life here." He stressed that the City was looking for a cogent and sensible approach to support of the arts through a fully developed arts policy.

In this report are numbers of recommendations based upon the shared experience of artists, business people, and civic officials. Policy, however, is not a question of merely putting good ideas into practice. Rather, it is something integrated and cohesive which develops gradually as an expression of will, of responsibility as opposed to often grudging response. To have no policy is, in itself, a complete statement of policy.

When Toronto moves as recommended, it will be interesting to look back on some of the other things said at the Future Focus Forum.

Geraldine Sherman: "Governments at all levels should be pushed to make more inspired appointments to Boards and Councils, to fund arts councils adequately, to let them get on with the job."

Guy Sprung: "Education in art is inadequate. There should be one free event for school children each week: music, theatre, dance, an art gallery, a film. There should be writers, painters, composers, sculptors in residence in every school. Each neighbourhood should have a small theatre and the City should sponsor an annual festival of community and neighbourhood plays."

Diane Pugen: "Artists need comprehensive income-supplementing programs, access to inexpensive or free work space, assistance in liaison with educational authorities, a program of municipal purchasing of art."

Susan Crean: "The smaller, innovative arts groups in Toronto are an irreplaceable research and development sector for the arts and applied arts, but unlikely to find private support. The City must see them and fund them as the integral part of the entire arts spectrum. Without art, life is simply all trees falling in a desert, unseen, unnoticed."

Harry Chartrand: "The arts industry is the largest Canadian industry in terms of employment (237,000 Canadians are directly employed in arts industries and an additional 177,000 Canadians work using arts-related skills in other industries), the sixth largest in terms of wages and salaries (\$2.5-billion), the eleventh largest in terms of revenues (\$8-billion). These figures are for 1981. By now these are larger since the arts audience is growing so quickly."

Alderman Michael Gee: "The arts and other sectors of society have to develop ways of talking to each other in a language they all understand. City Hall can help in this."

William Kilbourn: "You can fight City Hall - even if you have to join it to do so. Keep lobbying. Identify your friends and your enemies. Don't attack your friends. Don't lobby the converted. Neutralize the opposition. Organize your allies."

This report is based on a firm belief that the arts do have a friend at City Hall, that elected and appointed officials do want to help, to see the arts continue to grow, and are looking positively for ways to become the catalytic element in Toronto's move to the next higher plateau of achievement.

It is my hope they will listen to all the good advice which I have been given and which forms the substance of this report.

IN CONCLUSION

The preparation of this report has been a considerable education. I thought I knew a lot about the arts in Toronto but as research proceeded I became aware that my own appreciation of the size, impact and importance of the field I had been working in for twenty years here in Toronto was misinformed.

The public for the arts turned out to be twice as big as I had ever imagined; spending by non-profit arts organizations turned out to be almost double my best educated guess; the City of Toronto's involvement in the arts, on examination, was infinitely more extensive than everyone thought and the City's actual spending is within sight of the respectable \$15.00 per capita which will confirm our position as Canada's leader in the field of municipal arts investment. I was frankly appalled by the willingness of other levels of government to allow cities like Toronto and Vancouver to do the lion's share of what should be an equitably divided task. I hope something of my dismay came through, and my own feeling of resolution regarding the negotiations which will be necessary to redress an entire catalogue of imbalances.

I was cheered by the helpfulness of artists, the availability of government officials and by the cooperation of the Ontario Arts Council and the Canada Council. I was most heartened by the artists themselves who, despite being researched and surveyed within an inch of their lives, waded in and provided me with questionnaires, figures, opinions, dreams. My favorite response to a question about the extent of government support here was made by a former Southerner: "What government is doing is only a little tiny whisper of what it should be doing." This said everything that needed saying on the subject.

Recently I have begun to reflect that perhaps the imbalances in funding from different governments result from the same lack of knowledge with which I began this assignment. Perhaps they just don't know enough - almost nobody does - about this fantastic area of Canadian economic, intellectual and spiritual growth. If that's the case, I recommend others do what we did. Go and ask people involved what they think should be done. You'll be surprised to learn how many good ideas can come out in the course of a two-hour discussion with ten artists. Once you've shared their experience and advice, you must be willing, of course, to pass it on.

Which is what I have done. I sincerely hope the consultative process which has begun will be continued and expanded. It's amazing what you can learn from people who know what they're talking about.

C

ultural Capital

Summary of Recommendations

CHAPTER ELEVEN

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. It is recommended that the City of Toronto seek enabling legislation from the Province of Ontario so as to be able to impose a hotel and motel room levy of at least 2% designed to yield \$5-million for the arts and \$5-million for tourism and convention centre costs per annum. It is further recommended that the City use levies authorized by section 41 of the Planning Act.

(Chapter Three - p. 28).

2. It is recommended that Toronto City Council and the Board of Education appoint a joint Task Force or some other appropriate Commission to inquire into:
 - (i) the reasons why the arts and art appreciation are so neglected in our schools as areas of appreciation, study and participation;
 - (ii) ways and means of drawing attention to the educational possibilities offered by the Toronto arts and cultural community and its related organizations;
 - (iii) ways and means of focussing public attention on the benefits to our children from a greatly enriched programme of artistic/cultural experience given as part of education.

(Chapter Five - p. 40).

3. 1985 cultural grants (apart from present major theatres) should be divided into three groups:
 - (i) Major arts organizations, being mature organizations with a ten-year history of service to Toronto, complete programmes of work, and recommended as major by the Toronto Arts Council.
 - (ii) Arts organizations, being the other City-funded professional organizations.
 - (iii) Community and neighbourhood organizations.

* The budget for grants to the approximately ten major arts organizations should be in total.... \$400,000

but amounts of individual grants should continue to be decided by the Toronto Arts Council.

- * The budget for grants to other professional arts organizations (approximately 90) should be given on the advice of the Toronto Arts Council and be in total....\$900,000
- * The 1985 budget for community and neighbourhood groups (approximately 60) should be given on the advice of the Toronto Arts Council and be in total.... \$200,000
\$1,500,000
- * In the case of budgets for arts organizations and community and neighbourhood organizations a total of 10% should be reserved for grants to be made during the year at other than customary times.
- * In the case of all major organizations, and arts organizations and neighbourhood and community organizations applying successfully for third and subsequent times, grants be made in support of annual operations, rather than projects, if the applying organization so wishes.
- * The City should forgive City taxes, including taxes paid as a portion of rent, on the recommendation of the Toronto Arts Council in the case of any groups funded for five years or more.
- * Where applicable, the City should forgive rents on City-owned property on the same basis as above.
- * As a supplementary source of working capital, and in order to augment and/or replace grants given, the City of Toronto should implement as soon as possible a "Materials for the Arts" programme similar to that operated by the Department of Cultural Affairs in New York City.
- * The City should adopt immediately the policy of setting aside 1% of capital budgets for all municipal development for the commissioning/purchase of works of art to enhance new public buildings. The recommended Art Commission and the Toronto Arts Council could advise in this area.

(Chapter Six - pp. 45-46).

4. (i) The present arm's length approach to arts funding in the City of Toronto is correct and ought to be continued.
- (ii) The Toronto Arts Council ought to continue to be the decision-making body regarding grants assistance to

Toronto artists, and arts organizations.

- (iii) The City of Toronto, in cooperation with the Toronto Arts Council, should draw up each year in December, a global arts and cultural budget for the coming year incorporating:

- grants to major theatres
- grants to cultural organizations
- grants to community and neighbourhood organizations
- tax exemptions
- rent grants
- other grants - at large, etc. - known at time of budget

This should be dealt with by City Council in total.

(Chapter Six - p. 46).

5. Within the "incubator industries" context, the City of Toronto Economic Development Corporation should be empowered to provide low cost or ideally, no cost studio space for bona fide visual artists, designers and other creative artists resident and working in the City of Toronto.

This Corporation, in the same context, should be empowered to make available low cost/no cost work spaces for arts organizations funded by the City of Toronto and meeting criteria agreed upon by the City and the Toronto Arts Council. Such organizations should include community and neighbourhood groups expressing themselves artistically.

6. The City of Toronto should implement a "Space for the Arts" programme similar to the proposed "Materials for the Arts" programme. Under such a computerized programme, unused City-owned property and surplus privately-owned property could be made available on a low cost/no cost basis to arts groups and individual artists in need of working spaces.
7. The City of Toronto should encourage developers by whatever means the Department of Planning and Development considers appropriate to construct buildings containing needed arts facilities, provided such facilities are planned on a self-financing basis as far as services, maintenances and upkeep are concerned. Emphasis should be placed on potential development of the railway lands south of Front Street.

(Chapter Six - p. 49).

8. The City of Toronto, the Task Force on the Theatre District and other related bodies should begin planning now to provide the following facilities:

- A Municipal Lyric Theatre
- A Museum of Contemporary Art
- One or two commercially-viable theatre(s) of at least 900 seats
- A Centre for Community and Neighbourhood Arts
- A Design Gallery which would exhibit the best of applied art
- A Production/Exhibition Facility for non-commercial video

In addition, the Toronto Economic Development Corporation should offer incentive capital grants to arts organizations wishing to acquire their rented premises.

(Chapter Six - p. 52).

9. The City of Toronto Economic Development Corporation should house and foster (i) An Institute of Contemporary Visual Art and (ii) A Toronto Institute of Design.

(Chapter Six - p. 54).

10. It is recommended that the City of Toronto set up an Art Commission similar to the Art Commission of New York City, made up of:

The Mayor of Toronto, The Chairman of the Board of the Art Gallery of Ontario, The Chairman of the Board of the recommended Toronto Institute of Contemporary Visual Art, The Chairman of the Toronto Arts Council, and, as recommended by the Toronto Arts Council: a sculptor, a painter, an architect, a landscape architect, and three members at large (dealers, collectors, etcetera).

The mandate of this Commission, made possible by enabling legislation, would be:

- (a) to give or withhold final approval on any City permits necessary to:
 - i. The erection of any piece of art on property owned by the City of Toronto.
 - ii. The development or redevelopment of any structure carried out by or on behalf of the City of Toronto.
- (b) To monitor a municipal "1% of capital costs for art" programme.

In addition, the City of Toronto should make an agreement with the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, under which no work

of art or memorial would be placed on Metro property within the City of Toronto, unless such work of art or memorial had received the written approval of the Toronto Art Commission. Indeed, Metro ought to consider making a similar agreement with each of its constituent elements.

(Chapter Six - pp. 54-55).

11. The City of Toronto should make appropriate City Hall staffing arrangements to help meet the needs of artists and arts organizations, to acknowledge the present and potential importance of the entire arts and culture field and to coordinate inter-departmental and intergovernmental matters concerning the arts.

(Chapter Six - p. 55).

12. City Council should at its earliest opportunity, decide on ways and means:
 1. of implementing recommendations of this report with regard to grants policy and budgets, and
 2. of drawing the attention of other levels of government to the necessity of bringing their funding to more appropriate levels.

(Chapter Six - pp. 56-57).

13. The City of Toronto should affirm its commitment to the Toronto Arts Council as the organization whose advice the City will officially seek on all matters affecting grants to cultural and neighbourhood arts organizations.
14. The Toronto Arts Council should increase its membership from nine to fifteen.
15. The Toronto Arts Council should be asked to report to City Council on the benefits and costs of forming a related Toronto Arts Foundation.
16. Toronto City Council should contemplate an operating budget for the Arts Council of 10% of funds administered.
17. Following appropriate annual approvals the City should pay to the Toronto Arts Council a cheque for the total of approved budgets and the Toronto Arts Council should issue grants cheques directly subject to providing City Council with a complete report of disposition of approved funds.

18. The St. Lawrence Centre should be included among the organizations whose grants are subject to review by the Toronto Arts Council.

(Chapter Seven - p. 63).

19. It is recommended that, in formulating plans for a department to be responsible for all governmental aspects of arts and cultural activity, the City bear in mind the ongoing responsibilities - particularly with reference to grants policy and practice - of the Toronto Arts Council.

(Chapter Seven - p. 65).

20. The City of Toronto's total direct contribution to the arts - grants, tax exemptions and rent grants - should rise to \$15.00 per capita yearly.

(Chapter Eight - p. 74).

21. The City of Toronto should begin negotiations with Metropolitan Toronto in order to secure a more equitable formula for sharing the financial responsibility for encouraging and supporting the professional arts and cultural sector in Metro.

(Chapter Nine - p. 81).

22. The City of Toronto should use its good offices to encourage the Department of Cultural Affairs of Metropolitan Toronto to respond favourably to Toronto Arts Council's request for operational funding as the Department does with other municipally-based arts councils in Metro.

(Chapter Nine - p. 83).

23. The St. Lawrence Centre deficit of approximately \$1-million should be disposed of by:

(i) implementing a renovations surcharge of fifty cents per ticket to yield, on annual admissions of 300,000, a total of \$150,000;

(ii) raising rents to prime tenants pro rata to present amounts by \$600,000; and to meet these increases to operating costs of prime tenants by:

(iii) negotiating increases in Metro grants to prime tenants of \$350,000 and

- (iv) increasing ticket prices by an average of \$1.00 per ticket to yield \$250,000;
- (v) limiting Property Department charges to \$6,000 per week and charging the remainder, as is the case with other City-owned premises to general property upkeep costs to eliminate a further \$250,000.

This saving of \$1-million ought not to be returned to general revenues but used to increase the inadequate cultural grants and community and neighbourhood grants budgets.

(Chapter Nine - p. 87).

24. It is recommended that the City of Toronto request the Toronto Arts Council to consider ways and means of rationalizing this question: how should a major subsidizing body such as the City of Toronto reconcile the question of artistic freedom with the subsidizing body's need to know that full value is being received in return for resources provided? The Council should be asked to consider the question generally and in terms of the specific operations by and in the St. Lawrence Centre.

(Chapter Nine - p. 88).

25. City Council should set up an Arts and Culture Standing Committee.

(Chapter Nine - p. 89).

C

ultural Capital

Appendices

APPENDIX i

WHY SHOULD A CITY LIKE TORONTO SUBSIDIZE
ITS RESIDENT ARTISTIC ORGANIZATIONS?

Before deciding why Toronto ought to provide arts subsidy, it is necessary to define the nature of arts subsidy.

Tax-supported subsidy, in general, is a form of transfer payment from those well off to those less well off. Private subsidy comes in the form of donations from an allocation of profit or savings, or it is built into product costs and given as sponsorship.

Subsidy, as experienced by the user, constitutes the difference between the actual cost of a socially desirable good and/or service, and the price paid by the user. Subsidy is used by society to lower the latter - the user fee - so that public access to the good or service becomes more nearly universal. Examples are:

- (i) Medical and hospital expenses: the user pays the difference between what OHIP pays and the charge made.
- (ii) University tuition fees: the user pays the difference between the costs of running the University and the government grants given to the University to pay a portion of costs.
- (iii) Performing arts ticket prices: the user pays the difference between the actual cost - pro rata - of producing a performance and the government grants and other support given to the performance.

Arts subsidy invariably constitutes a saving to the user, whether the good acquired is a subsidized theatre ticket, a subsidized book, a subsidized print or a subsidized sculpture. The subsidy is given initially to the producer of the good; the producer of the good regrants the subsidy to the user in the form of a reduced user fee, on the basis of a decision made in each case by the user. The amount of the subsidy is frequently a function of the lobbying power of the producer of the good subsidized.

User fees encountered by those seeking medical services tend to be a very low percentage of actual costs; user fees encountered by those seeking higher education or artistic goods and services tend to be a much higher percentage of cost. This happens, al-

though health care costs are very high, because our society and its government accord a much higher priority to universal access to health care than to higher education or artistic experience. According to the Macaulay Committee and the Interprovincial Comparisons of University Expenditures (Ontario Council of Universities) user fees paid by Ontario residents who are users of higher education and the arts tend to be greater than similar fees paid, on the average, by residents of the other provinces of Canada. This is because our provincial government accords a relatively lower priority to access to higher education and to the arts.

Subsidy paid by City government to producing arts organizations, before it is passed to the user as a saving, constitutes working capital enabling an organization to exist and attract other amounts of subsidy - Federal, Provincial, Metro - which are also passed eventually to the user.

Although the City of Toronto pays subsidy - in the case of the arts - of less than \$1.35 per spectator, an average total subsidy per spectator of \$11.29 is received by users. By paying out approximately \$7-million, the City, acting on behalf of its residents and other attenders, attracts a further subsidy of at least \$60-million, all of which is passed to users.

At present very little City support goes to the more innovative, developing groups whose existence adds to the diversity of artistic experience available in Toronto. Such groups tend to attract little in the way of private subsidy. Subsidy coming from other levels of government tends to be delayed. If City support, small as it is, were not given to such groups, their general development would suffer and many would not develop at all. Decisions as to what was available in the City of Toronto would be left to other levels of government - Federal, Provincial and Metro. Such a situation would be intolerable to a city like Toronto which, to some extent, defines itself in terms of civilized values - safety, cleanliness, quality of life - which include access to a wide range of diverse artistic experience. Further, users of the broad spectrum of artistic experience offered would be deprived of the savings flowing from Federal, Provincial, Metro and private-sector subsidy paid to City-based, City-supported arts organizations and passed to users.

Not only residents of Toronto would be deprived. In general, half of Toronto arts users live in other parts of Metro and come to Toronto to enjoy their arts experiences. Most recent figures suggest that, because of the existence of Toronto arts and cultural organizations:

- (i) Six million users experience total savings of \$67,000,000 annually (1983-84);

- (ii) of these savings about \$28-million goes to residents of Toronto;
- (iii) about \$28-million goes to residents of other parts of Metro;
- (iv) about \$11-million goes to visitors from outside Metro;
- (v) savings are non-taxable, giving a further saving of at least \$10-\$15-million.

In return for these benefits:

- (i) The City of Toronto pays out approximately (including its portion of the Metro arts budget) - \$7.8-million
- (ii) Metro pays out approximately (excluding the City of Toronto's portion of its budget) - \$4.5-million

The City of Toronto thus attracts savings for its residents, as a percentage of amounts expended - approximately 360%

The remainder of Metro thus attracts savings for its residents, as a percentage of amounts expended - approximately 620%

Conclusions:

- (i) The elimination of City subsidy would severely curtail the present healthy diversity of artistic experience available to Toronto/Metro residents and would severely inhibit innovation and development.
- (ii) The elimination of Metro subsidy would exacerbate the process and curtail severely the operations of even established groups.
- (iii) The elimination of City, Metro, Federal and Provincial subsidy would mean that user fees would rise - per spectator - by at least \$9.00, which would limit arts experience to a small affluent percentage of the population and effectively return Toronto to the 1940's and 1950's in terms of arts access. It is doubtful if such a return is politically possible.

APPENDIX ii

BASIS OF SECTOR POPULATION ESTIMATE

How did we arrive at the figure of 100,000 Torontonians earning some or all of their living from the arts or arts-related work in industry?

1. Canada Council reported that in 1981, 414,000 Canadians worked in these sectors and that they were the fastest-growing in Canada.
2. Assuming sector growth of only 5% per year, 414,000 grew by 1984 to about 480,000.
3. Council informs us 42% of the sector resides in Ontario. Total Ontario sector population in 1984 is therefore 42% of 480,000 or 202,000.
4. If artists were spread evenly through the population then the sector population in Metro would be about 50,000.
5. Because of the occupational clustering effect, however the Metro sector population can be deemed to be three times average or 150,000.
6. Because of the known preference of artists and arts-related workers for downtown, the within-Metro clustering effect can be stated:

Working or living in Toronto, 66.67%	100,000
Working or living in Metro but not in Toronto, 33.33%	<u>50,000</u>
Total Metro sector population, 100%	150,000

It is to be hoped that 1986 census information will provide an accurate basis for sector evaluation.

APPENDIX iii

AN OVERVIEW OF ARTS AND CULTURAL SUPPORT
IN OTHER CITIES IN CANADA AND ELSEWHERENEW YORK CITY:

New York City during 1983 spent about \$46-million on the arts and culture. A detailed breakdown for 1983 is not available, but such an analysis exists for 1982. During that year, under Commissioner Bess Myerson, the Department of Cultural Affairs spent about \$40-million. No estimates exist for tax exemptions given to arts and cultural institutions but a conservative estimate would place this at a minimum of \$40-million annually. Operating benefits conferred by New York City annually total \$80-million U.S., (\$106.4-million Canadian). Municipal benefits conferred in Metropolitan Toronto during 1982 total about \$9-million. New York is approximately three times as large as Metropolitan Toronto. If New York's level of spending - considered far too low by New York arts authorities and others - is taken as a reasonable level for a large City, then spending by all of Metropolitan Toronto is presently less than one-third of what it should be.

Of the approximately \$56-million given out by way of grants and other direct spending during 1982 in New York City:

\$16.5-million went to capital budgets of arts institutions in need of renovations, repairs, enlargement;

\$36.3-million went to twenty-nine cultural institutions to provide them with janitorial, security and similar services, utilities and so forth;

\$1.5-million went to the facilities service which coordinated and assisted capital improvements for thirty-nine institutions;

\$1.6-million went to program services to facilitate delivery of a varied arts menu to the public.

The Department of Cultural Affairs of New York also administers a number of programmes of benefit to the arts, such as the Arts Apprenticeship Programme and the Materials For the Arts Programme. In addition, it provides administrative back-up for the City's Art Commission and the 1%-for-the-arts Programme. The Department does not make grants per se, and is not viewed as a potential granting agency. Because of American funding tradition

grants come from the very large contributions of the private sector, the state government and the federal National Endowment for the Arts. The Department of Cultural Affairs is viewed most importantly as New York's instrument of support for very large, very old cultural institutions sited on city-owned, tax-free property.

Although a volunteer commission advises on the policies of the Department of Cultural Affairs, the power in the Department resides entirely with the professional bureaucrats. The top jobs in the Department are acknowledged to be political appointments made by the Mayor of New York. The arts community feels little relationship with the D.C.A. and private-sector input into its policy and practice decisions is not strong.

AMSTERDAM:

Amsterdam's relationships with the arts are conducted on a basis very different from New York's. This stems not only from history and tradition but from the fact that in Amsterdam, municipal politics function on the party basis and, as a result, a sort of aldermanic cabinet is responsible for various portfolios. Several portfolios affect the arts:

- (1) Education - since education in Amsterdam includes training in the arts and art appreciation;
- (2) Social Affairs - this department operates an income-supplement plan - "BKR" - which basically enables artists to work in return for a share of their output;
- (3) Art Affairs - this department deals directly with the arts and spends about 93-million guilders (\$36-million Canadian) which equals about 4.5% of the City's total budget.

Amsterdam Art Affairs

The 1983 budget for this area of municipal spending may be analyzed as follows:

	Guilders Millions	% of Budget	\$ Canadian Millions
Municipal Art Museums and Galleries Including costs of Artists' income Supplement programme (BKR)	30.0	32.2	11.4
Private and Alternate Museums And Galleries	1.9	2.	.72
Visual Art (To this must be added additional funds from the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Culture to be administered by the City; amount is estimated to be equal to amount shown.)	3.7	4.	1.41
Theatres and Concert Halls Facilities Costs	14.8	15.9	5.62
Theatre Companies	11.2	12.0	4.26
Opera—Mainly Dutch Opera Foundation	2.5	2.7	.95
Ballet and Mime	4.6	4.9	1.75
Music - Orchestras	14.0	15.0	5.32
Music - Projects & Smaller Groups	1.0	1.1	.38
Festivals	1.4	1.5	.53
Non-Professional Arts	2.3	2.5	.87
Arts Promotion, Publicity, etc.	2.7	2.9	1.03
Amsterdam Arts Council Administration	<u>3.0</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>1.14</u>
	G93.1	100.0	\$ 35.58

In general, operating costs of facilities consume about 50% of Amsterdam's annual arts budget, and the remaining 50%, plus

payments from BKR and from the Federal Ministry of Health, Welfare and Culture, goes to individual artists, producing organizations, amateur organizations, festivals promotion and the operation of the Amsterdam Arts Council. No accounting of tax exemptions is maintained.

A separate foundation, related to the City, coordinates supplying inexpensive living and working spaces for artists.

The Amsterdam Arts Council consists of seventy-five members grouped into fourteen disciplinary and sub-disciplinary committees. These committees advise City government on general policy areas and on the balance between:

- * facilities costs and production costs.
- * established work and new work.
- * small arts organizations and large arts organizations.

Every three years, the Arts Council rates every producing body and advises:

- * whether the organization deserves to continue receiving City Subsidy.
- * whether subsidy would be increased and by how much.
- * whether subsidy should be decreased and by how much.

The Arts Council also advises in detail on:

1. funds for projects, festivals, etc.
2. the needs and well-being of the arts and cultural community in whole and in part.
3. long-run and short-run policy especially with regard to finances and relations with other levels of government.

In addition, the Council supplies advice and expertise, on request, to subsidized organizations, conducts an extensive informational programme and uses its good offices and resources to bring together experts and those in need of their advice.

The government of Amsterdam is under no legal obligation to take the advice of their Arts Council; over the years, however, relations have been such that there has not been a single public disagreement on any article of policy or practice between the two bodies. There have been private disagreements many times but each has been settled to the satisfaction of both parties.

On advice, BKR - a form of Art Bank which must make purchases from designated artists - is being phased out in favour of more flexible programmes of income supplement. Of funds paid out under BKR, 90% are refunded by the national government; these are being replaced, as noted, by funds coming from the National Ministry of Health Welfare and Culture.

Amsterdam is a city of about 688,000. The amounts given do not include the cost of training facilities, music conservatories, drama and art schools, etc.

PARIS:

The Municipal participation in the arts in Paris resembles that of New York much more than that of Amsterdam. All matters affecting the arts and cultural institutions and facilities come under a Director, Michel Boutinard-Rouelle, who is responsible to the Mayor.

During 1983, Paris spent on this area of the arts and culture:

	Millions Francs	%	Millions \$ CDN
Artistic Training	42.3	10.3	6.4
Historical Monuments	2.8	.6	.4
Cultural Premises	4.6	1.1	.7
Libraries	104.9	25.3	15.7
Museums	67.5	16.2	10.1
Theatres	88.1	21.1	15.7
Fine Arts and Cultural Organizations	1 04.7	25.1	15.7
Photography/Audio Visual	<u>2.0</u>	<u>.2</u>	<u>.3</u>
	416.9	100.0	62.5

Of this amount, subsidy amounted to 222.5- million francs (\$33.4-million Canadian.) Complete figures are not available but for theatre the 1983 analysis for operating grants going to 110 organizations, is:

	Millions Francs	%	Millions SCDN
Municipal Theatres	36.4	54.5	5.5
Privately-owned Theatres	7.7	11.5	1.2
Production costs	11.6	17.3	1.7
Festivals	3.8	5.7	.6
Training	3.4	5.0	.5
Verse Theatre	<u>4.0</u>	<u>6.0</u>	<u>.6</u>
	66.9	100.0	10.1

In addition to operating budgets, the Department of Cultural Affairs has a separate capital budget which in 1983 totalled 90.8-million francs (\$13.62-million Canadian). Of this budget, 2-million francs (\$300,000 Canadian) was spent in 1983 on renovations to artists' studios. A further 35-million francs (\$5.25-million Canadian) is spent on repairs, renovations, art restoration. Total spending was \$81.37-million Canadian in order to benefit approximately three hundred arts and cultural institutions. These figures do not take into account automatic exemptions from tax which would at least equal the amount of subsidy given.

Paris is a city of 2,000,000 - approximately the same size as Metropolitan Toronto. Paris confers benefits on the arts and culture totalling twelve times those of all of Metropolitan Toronto, and approximately one-and-a-half-times New York's total spending.

LONDON:

With its vast diversity of ethnicities and its neighbourhood orientation, London is a much larger version of Toronto and its granting policies mirror its needs. Where else (except Toronto) are subsidized breakdancing classes offered?

Structurally, greater London bears a superficial resemblance to Metropolitan Toronto in that, although it is composed of many semi-self-governing constituent elements, a separate level of government - the Greater London Council - receives tax revenues and administers many services of benefit to all of greater London. The Greater London Council is presently under attack by the central government as an unnecessary and artificial level of municipal government, but for the present the Council is still exercising its prerogatives and responsibilities which include a considerable role in arts funding. During fiscal 1983-84 the Council approved operating grants to arts and cultural organizations of 8,885,797 pounds (\$14,217,275 Canadian) plus capital grants of 447,829 pounds (\$716,526 Canadian).

Organizations benefiting operationally totalled 369. Total expenditures in this area for the year may be analyzed as follows:

	Pounds	%	Dollars
Operating Expenses:			
Traditional arts- 98 Groups	2,866,488	32.5	4,586,381
Equipment, Renovations:			
Traditional arts - 15 Groups	162,636	2.0	260,218
Visual Arts - 11 Groups	46,872	.5	74,995
Four Major Arts Organizations: (National Theatre, English National Opera Company, London Festival Ballet, London Orchestral Concert Board) - 4 Groups	3,500,000	39.0	5,600,000
Community Arts - 154 Groups	1,592,935	18.0	2,548,696
Ethnic Arts - 87 Groups	<u>716,866</u>	<u>8.0</u>	<u>1,146,985</u>
369 Groups	8,885,797	100.0	14,217,275

Capital grants were approved for a total of twenty arts organizations. The four major arts organizations received from the Arts Council of Great Britain an additional 13,666,000 pounds (\$21,865,600 Canadian). One of the GLC's grants (50,000 pounds) went to a re-granting agency, the Greater London Arts Association, which receives grants from the Arts Council of Great Britain and other public and private sources. The GLAA in 1983 gave arts grants totalling 1,382,385 pounds (\$2,211,816 Canadian). The GLAA gives individual as well as organizational grants, which may account in part for its very high administrative costs of 385,000 pounds (22% of total expenditure).

In addition, the various London boroughs - which make modest contributions to the GLAA - also spend small amounts on the arts. Total municipal grants spending is estimated to be about \$20-million Canadian, to which can be added GLC share of upkeep of museums and historic houses of 4,031,000 pounds (\$6,500,000 Canadian) and of the South Bank facilities, including concert halls of 6,105,000 pounds (\$9,768,000 Canadian). Total spending is thus \$36,268,000 Canadian, to which at least the same amount in benefits like tax exemptions can be added, making a grand total of \$72.5-million. Greater London is about three times as large as Metro Toronto and committed last year six times as much to the arts and culture. All revenues discussed here came from municipal taxes except about \$2-million from the central government to be re-granted by the Greater London Arts Association.

If plans to dismantle the Greater London Council are ever realized its total budget of \$30,000,000 making up 80% of all London spending for the arts and culture would be largely lost. Realizing this, the central government has plans to allocate replacement funds of up to about 80% of funds lost, but the fear is that replacement funds will tend to go to the large, tourist-oriented arts organizations, and not to the very broad spectrum of large to small arts organizations - traditional, community and ethnic - presently supported by the GLC. These fears were reinforced by a 1982 parliamentary report which recommended having arts and tourism administered by one ministry.

Funds granted by the GLC are approved by the Arts and Recreation Committee. The Committee makes use of professional staff and peer review panels. No figures are available on administrative costs; it is assumed that Greater London Council, like Metro Toronto, absorbs administrative costs within general overall budgets.

By comparison with Paris, London seems vastly underbudgeted in the area of arts and culture; given the limitations of budgets however, the GLC's Arts and Recreation Committee appears to exhibit an unusual degree of sensitivity towards community artistic and cultural needs. A healthily non-elitist, something-for-everyone attitude characterizes their granting patterns.

MONTREAL:

Founded in 1956 and Canada's oldest such municipal body, Montreal's Arts Council operates on behalf of the Urban Community of Montreal, which corresponds to Toronto's Metropolitan level of government, with a 1984 budget of \$2,105,750, a 1983 budget of \$1,815,800.

Like the Vancouver Social Planning Department, the Montreal Arts Council takes an active role in seeking to present its point

of view forcefully to other levels of government and their agencies. The Council meets regularly with the Quebec Minister of Cultural Affairs and meets on a tri-level basis with officials of the Ministry of Cultural Affairs and of The Canada Council. Like the Vancouver Social Planning Department, the Montreal Arts Council does programming. It prepares fundraising studies, promotes tours of performing arts groups throughout the entire urban community, holds an annual dinner (during 1983 with the Chamber of Commerce) to draw attention to the arts and to the Arts Council, and advises extensively on problems besetting its varied clientele.

The Council has twenty volunteer members, including six officers. These are divided into four committees - Music, Theatre, Dance and Visual Arts.

During 1984, the Council employed a paid secretariat of six. Since 1980, it has assumed responsibility for the arts in greater Montreal (the urban community). As a further activity, the Council works actively to help organize events such as World Music Days, the International Mime Festival in Montreal, and the 1985 World Congress of the International Theatre Institute, to be held partly in Montreal, partly in Toronto. In addition, the council prepares studies such as an examination of Montreal's (like Toronto's) need for medium sized theatres. The Council is also acting jointly with the Ministry of Cultural Affairs and the Canada Council to assist four prominent Montreal musical organizations to put in place an integrated administrative, marketing and audience development plan. The Council administers the selection process for the Montreal annual Grand Prix Artistique. Finally, the Council works actively to bring to Montreal provincial, national and international events such as The World Congress of Jeunesses Musicales (1986), the Festival of Theatre of the Americas (1985), the Bible and the Arts (1986) in order to focus outside attention on the City.

During 1983, the Council, out of a total budget of \$1,815,800 gave grants of \$1,635,075 as follows:

Visual Arts	22 Groups	\$ 312,750	19.13%
Dance	5 Groups	\$ 186,000	11.37%
Music	25 Groups	\$ 537,325	32.86%
Theatre	35 Groups	515,000	31.50%
Special Projects	<u>10 Groups</u>	<u>84,000</u>	<u>5.14%</u>
	97 Groups	\$1,635,075	100 %

In general, slightly more than fifty percent of requests for assistance are met. The number of organizations funded has grown from fifty in 1979 to eighty-seven, and during the five years

1979-1984 the percentage of positive responses has declined from 88.9% to 50.6%. Of those receiving grants, the big winners are:

Musee des Beaux-Arts	\$ 160,000
Les Grands Ballets Canadiens	147,000
Orchestre Symphonique de Montreal	265,650
Centaur Theatre	75,000
Theatre du Rideau Vert	60,000
Theatre Du Nouveau Monde	50,000
International Music Meeting	47,250
McGill Chamber Orchestra	45,000
Theatre D'aujourd'hui	35,000
Nouvelle Compagnie Theatrale	<u>35,000</u>
	\$ 919,900

The remaining eighty-seven organizations and projects share grants totalling \$ 717,175. In response to this, and to the low percentage of requests which can be met, the Montreal Arts Council has asked that its budget be doubled for the coming year.

The secretariat of the Montreal Arts Council operates on a budget of less than \$ 200,000, about 11% of funds administered. All funds - grants and administration - come directly from city taxes.

In addition to the grants given by the Montreal Arts Council, the City's Department of Cultural Events contracts with arts organizations, as does the Department of Cultural Affairs (N.Y.C.) to present performances and exhibitions at the request of the city. In addition to these activities, the city participates heavily in the support of La Place des Arts and other cultural facilities and in the support of festivals of various types. Figures here are not available at this time.

The population of the metropolitan community of Montreal is about 2,862,300. The City of Montreal has a population of 1,005,000 and its suburbs a population of 1,857,300. The population relationships are thus very similar to Metropolitan Toronto's.

VANCOUVER:

Vancouver, a city of less than half a million, presently leads Canadian cities in demonstrated per capita support at \$13.00 annually and in demonstrated public interest. During 1982 there were 2,557,263 attendances (about 6.3 per capita) at cultural events compared with probably 4.5 million the same year in Toronto (about 7.5 per capita). Vancouver's catchment area - radius of easy transportation - is much less than half of Toronto's.

Like Toronto, Vancouver is in the process of examining municipal relations with the arts and culture. A 1983-initiated Mayor's Task Force on Business and the Arts, similar to Toronto's Mayor's Task Force on Tourism and the Arts was formed. In November of that year the Vancouver Mayor's Task Force put out a working paper called "Framework for Action" which pinpointed a number of familiar issues:

1. A "percentage of capital cost for art" programme at the municipal level.
2. The need for better promotion of the arts as an industry, especially by existing tourism authorities.
3. A programme of Municipal recognition of business participation in the Arts.
4. Funding Suggestions:
 - (i) Encouragement from other levels of government of tax concessions on contributions.
 - (ii) An idea book suggesting innovative ways of assisting the arts.
 - (iii) Business sponsorship through commissions and residencies given to individual artists.
 - (iv) Special bank interest rates for non-profit arts organizations because of their good non-default records.
5. A United Arts Fund for Vancouver.
6. The arts and education problem of mutual alienation, especially in the light of provincial cutbacks on education.

Much of the Task Force's thinking went into the launching in January, 1984 of a new organization called the Vancouver Partnership, designed to provide a focus for joint action by arts and business activists.

The mandate of the Vancouver Partnership is to learn the arts and cultural community's needs and to assist in marshalling the supplies of financial and people resources the arts require in order to solve problems.

The City of Vancouver's Social Planning Department, under Max Beck, directly handles all aspects of Vancouver's relations with the arts and culture - including decisions on the giving of all

grants and other municipal benefits. The Social Planning Department assisted with the work leading to the Partnership by:

1. Preparing an inventory of Vancouver's cultural organizations and activities.
2. Surveying members of Vancouver's arts community about their needs.
3. Researching effective strategies used in other cities to generate business support for the arts.

Specifically, the Partnership is designed to:

1. promote the concept of business/arts interrelationship through media campaigns, annual awards programmes and other means;
2. advise arts organizations, on a research and resource basis, on fundraising methodology and advise businesses on opportunities for innovative support;
3. act as a placement service for business people wishing to volunteer to assist the arts as board members and in other ways;
4. initiate or support missing elements, such as an arts-in-education programme.

It is still too early to judge the effectiveness of the Vancouver Partnership. Those associated with its inception are certain it will have a great impact although artists in Vancouver fear the organization is business-dominated, one-sided and lacking in arts input. By the end of 1985, it will be possible to assess the Partnership's contribution; for the moment its achievement is to exist at all, and to serve as an encouraging signal to other cities whose municipal, arts and cultural, and business sectors have too long operated in isolation from each other.

The income profile of Vancouver's arts organizations in 1982-83 is considerably different from Toronto's and reflects the smaller range of artistic diversity and the absence of highly-subsidized groups like the National Ballet. It also reflects an acceptance of reduced accessibility since that year attenders in Vancouver spent about \$10.00 on average for each attendance, while in Toronto, they spent about \$6.00 on average per attendance.

That year Vancouver organizations revenues were \$22,263,893 made up of:

Earned Income	\$ 11,131,946
Donations	\$ 3,228,264
Government Grants	\$ <u>7,903,863</u>
	\$ 22,263,893

By disciplines, this amount may be analyzed and compared with Toronto's as follows:

	Vancouver	Toronto
Dance	\$ 1,337,493	\$12,382,126
Theatre	5,970,132	13,864,022
Music	10,305,833	19,784,701
Literature/Visual	2,316,850	13,754,176
Multi Media/Festivals, etc.	2,333,585	1,825,806
Museums (Vancouver is estimated)	<u>8,000,000</u>	<u>17,044,471</u>
	\$30,263,893	\$78,655,302

INCOME FOR THE SECTOR MAY BE ANALYZED:

Earned	50.0%	35 %
Donations	10.6%	12 %
Government Grants	<u>39.5%</u>	<u>53 %</u>
	100 %	100 %

Canada Council sector assistance is about 10.5% in Vancouver, compared with about 12% in Toronto. Provincial arts grants contributions stand at 8% in Vancouver, at 5% in Toronto. Municipal sources in Vancouver equal 18%, while the same sources in Toronto equal 10%. In the Vancouver figures there is no equivalent for the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture's grants to its agencies, the AGO and the ROM, totalling more than \$18-million and making up 23% of Toronto revenues. Other income from government (Department of Communications) compares at about 3.1% in each City.

During 1982-83, the City of Vancouver gave general cultural grants totalling \$ 1,587,705 made up of grants to:

Music	\$ 586,454
VisualArts/Literature	493,698
Theatre	279,848
Multi-Media and Fesitvals	191,125
Dance	<u>36,580</u>
	\$ 1,587,705

In addition the City provides institutional funding to older, established cultural organizations such as museums and galleries and absorbs any net cost resulting from the City's operation of three major municipally-owned theatres. Total expenditure in this area is estimated to have been slightly less than \$4-million during fiscal 1982-83.

The Vancouver Social Planning Department has a significant and positive input into all questions of public art sited on municipal property and on aesthetic aspects of Vancouver's general development review process. The Department actively represents Vancouver interests to other levels of government and the City pioneered the holding of regular tri-level consultations (municipal-provincial-federal) to discuss artistic and cultural matters of common concern. In part this initiative was undertaken because Vancouver, like Toronto, is faced with the problem of inadequate contributions to funding formulae by other levels of government.

Discussions with Vancouver artists indicate that, although they would prefer arm's length grant-giving, they feel the Vancouver solution works reasonably well and fairly. There is, however, a general impression of historic municipal mishandling of city-owned theatres. Here, the City has promised better management and has effected some useful reforms.

Except for its discretionary 25% of budget given in operating grants, the Social Planning Department's modus operandi and functions resemble those of the Department of Cultural Affairs of New York City, which also serves as a conduit for City funds to landmark cultural institutions, also is active in the intergovernmental political process and also actively pursues programming objectives.

APPENDIX iv

MISSING ELEMENTS

Even when all of the recommendations made in this report have been implemented, there will remain a number of important initiatives for the City of Toronto to put in place. These will be made possible by securing additional sources of revenue - such as the recommended hotel and motel room levy - and by the assumption of more equitable shares of costs by other levels of government:

(1) Aid to the Individual Creative Artist:

At present, neither the City of Toronto nor the Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto make grants to individual creative artists. It is those individual creators who provide the healthy spine of originality and immediate identification with place and time for a mature society's growing body of artistic expression. For the purpose of this discussion creative artists are deemed to be composers, writers, poets, choreographers, playwrights, painters, sculptors, film and video-makers. The Canada Council and the Ontario Arts Council provide individual grants to these "creators" and as a result each year eight to nine hundred artists in Toronto receive a variety of grants ranging from modest short-term assistance to relatively generous senior arts awards. Thus, less than 10% of Toronto's resident "creators" who as a group are the least well rewarded of a generally disadvantaged artistic totality, receive in any given year assistance designed to enable them to devote themselves wholeheartedly and full-time to their creative labours.

It follows that Toronto's creative "plant" must work at about 10% of capacity and this is not good enough. It has been established, in this report and elsewhere, that arts organizations interesting themselves in creativity as a priority tend to be small, economically weak and underfunded by government and its agencies and by the private sector. In general, it is the artistic sector with the least total resources which makes most of the decisions - and most of the payments - relating to the work of composers, playwrights, choreographers.

Because of the long-standing lack of a strong parallel support infrastructure - critics, museums, institutes, publicizers, merchandisers - the market for Toronto painters, photographers, sculptors is not even a glimmer of what it should be. As a result, they too are in the position of depending upon a small share of the smallest overall market.

The conditions which produce this 10% syndrome condemning our creators to underachievement will disappear gradually as suggested recommendations are implemented. In the meantime and until at least 1999, we should be thinking about income supplement plans designed to strengthen the research and development creative sector of the arts. These might include:

(i) For new and emerging artists:

A first-flight fund should be established designed to reduce the risk of introducing/developing new work. This fund should be administered by the Toronto Arts Council and be made available to galleries for exhibition costs, to theatres, orchestras, ensembles and dance companies for workshops, to publishers to help with editing and publication costs.

(ii) For more established artists:

An income-supplement fund should be established, administered by Toronto Arts Council and designed to pay to Toronto creators:

12.5% of royalties received from book publishers, record publishers, theatres, ballet and dance companies, orchestras, choirs and other users of music;

12.5% of sales of visual art made through approved dealers.

The City should use its good offices to persuade Metro, the Province of Ontario and the Canada Council to each contribute a further 12.5% so that creators automatically receive an additional 50% of earnings (exclusive of commissions) during a given year, up to some agreed-upon maximum of perhaps \$15,000. Similar plans, designed to benefit artists whose work is necessary to the entire spectrum but unlikely to attract reasonable remuneration, are operated successfully by the Arts Council of Great Britain. They have the virtue of rewarding the successful but underpaid.

(2) A City of Toronto Artistic Initiatives Programme:

The City of Toronto for many reasons could benefit from some sort of month-long summer annual arts event like the 1984 Toronto International Festival. From the point of view of attracting tourists such events make sense and can work towards feeding the local appetite for art while building audiences for the future.

The 1984 Toronto International Festival has been discussed. Other examples of successful summer festivals may be cited: the 1971 Festival of Underground Theatre provided a good deal of the

powering energy for Toronto's theatrical achievements of the '70s and conferred a needed sense of community. The 1981 Toronto Theatre Festival's artistic successes have been forgotten because the underfunded festival lost money. In every other sense, it succeeded marvellously. The annual Festival of Festivals is still another example of Toronto's ability to host major festival-type enterprises. For all of these and similar events, public response has been good to excellent and the City's reputation has been enhanced.

These various events - some annual, some one-time - have taken place as the result of someone other than the City deciding something should happen here at some given time. Now, the City should be giving thought to arranging things so that something major in the arts is happening every summer in Toronto in a large-scale festival context. Such festivals could be:

- * Visual Arts - painting, sculpture, performance
- * Literary arts - prose, poetry, non-fiction
- * Dance - especially new dance
- * Music - especially new music
- * Theatre - especially new theatre
- * Video arts

Others will have more and better ideas but the point is made: there is no lack of subject matter, no lack of interest on the part of the public. What is lacking is a mandate from the City of Toronto to begin the work which must begin now if large-scale events are to happen in 1988, '89, '90, '91.....

Such a programme would require professional guidance, seed money, a modest staff and the City's good offices in convincing other levels of government to commit resources on the basis that, in the arts, what is good for Toronto is ultimately good for Metro, for Ontario, for all of Canada.

(3) A City of Toronto Facilities Initiatives Programme:

A rapidly growing arts sector needs expanded and improved facilities in which to accommodate a similarly growing public for the arts.

At the moment the city offers no resources to those wishing to develop or redevelop arts facilities but needing assistance towards the costs of the feasibility studies, architectural studies, engineering studies, marketing studies which must be done before financing can be arranged.

Such a programme, properly funded and carefully coordinated with the work of the City of Toronto Economic Development Corporation and of the Planning and Development Department, could

serve as a powerful arm of city policy towards the arts and development generally. It would have the advantage of acquiring the high profile that anything associated with the arts automatically receives while being relatively inexpensive to operate in relation to benefits derived. It would in this area at least, restore to the City the basic right of acting as the prime initiator of important change.

(4) A Weekly Arts Broadsheet:

In many European cities, the municipal government publishes a weekly newsprint arts calendar listing all events for a given week - theatres, dance companies, concerts, opera, performances, visual arts exhibitions, museum exhibitions, films of consequence, video showings, readings by poets and novelists. Assembly of these two or four-page broadsheets is frequently the responsibility of the City's arts council or arts and cultural department. They are placed in hotel rooms, hotel lobbies, theatres, galleries, concert halls, airports, railway and bus stations, filling stations and many stores. They are free of charge, comprehensive and accurate and serve as a major stimulus to visitor and resident participation in arts events.

Such a Toronto Arts Bulletin similarly distributed would be a boon to visitors and a source of great assistance to our arts and cultural organizations.

(5) A Mayor's 5% Club:

In other cities of North America, municipal political leadership had proven effective in mobilizing the private - particularly the corporate - sector in support of arts organizations and artists. The Mayor of Minneapolis played a large role in helping the founders of the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce's "5% Club" and "2% Club" get started. In the U.S.A. the national average of corporate giving to community causes is about 1% of pre-tax profits - somewhat higher than the Canadian average. In Minneapolis, forty-five corporations belong to the prestigious "5% Club" - indicating they give at least 5% - five times the national average - to a broad range of Minneapolis causes including, importantly, the arts. The "2% Club" recognizes the contribution of the twenty-odd corporations who now more than double the national average in giving.

This Minneapolis initiative has spawned state-wide activity such as the Minnesota Keystone Awards which recognize the efforts of companies throughout the state who get behind socially useful activity.

With leadership from City Hall and the Toronto business community a similarly influential Toronto group could provide the focus

for a more productive partnership between the City and its corporate citizenry to the vast benefit of the arts. The City needs more investment in operating funds, more facilities, more outlets for creative interaction by artists and audiences.

Meeting these needs calls for the planning, coordination and carefully channelled action such suggested leadership forums can provide.

(6) The City of Toronto Artistic Exports Programme:

The City of Toronto should become more aware of the value of artistic exports and should earmark an annual budget to be used to encourage Toronto groups to tour both in Canada and abroad. Toronto Arts Council should be asked to develop:

- (1) criteria for eligibility of artists and groups and
- (2) guidelines reflecting limits on City participation and requirements for other governmental or private sponsorship.

(7) Training for the Arts:

Arts training programmes offered by educational institutions in and near Toronto are varied and the quality of training offered ranges from good to not good at all. Toronto Arts Council should be asked to report to City Council on:

- (1) the inventory of training available, together with professional assessment of its effectiveness;
- (2) recommendations as to the best method of upgrading existing training and of causing omitted areas of training to be offered;
- (3) recommendations as to the best method of effecting ongoing coordination of this important area of the arts, including their consideration of the usefulness of an institute of arts training capable of working with established organizations in this context.

(8) The Toronto Film Writing Programme:

The film industry in Toronto desperately needs more good film writers. The particular popularity of films in Toronto, in conjunction with an indigenous industry having good directors, fine actors, highly professional technical crews, a potentially adequate supply of working capital and a number of serious and capable producers point to the one missing element - an adequate supply of good scripts. The two - a public in search of stories, an

industry in search of stories - produce a feeling of lost opportunity.

In recognition of the very great potential importance of a Toronto film industry, and of the importance to the industry of film writers, it is suggested:

- (1) That for three years the City set aside \$100,000 yearly to be made available to Toronto film producers, on a matching basis, to commission stories about Toronto for film.
- (2) That City Council request the Toronto Arts Council to meet with the City Film Unit and interested film producers in order to decide on criteria, levels of awards to writers included in the programme, time frames and questions of administrative arrangements, returnability of awards to the fund in the event of profits, etcetera.
- (3) That at the end of two years the programme be evaluated on the basis of results produced, and if consideration indicates benefits outweigh costs, the programme be extended for a further three years.

The Australians have become an important film presence in the world by resolutely being themselves. The suggested programme would help our filmmakers move in the same productive direction.

(9) A City of Toronto Arts Apprenticeship/Internship Programme:

Numbers of subsidized arts organizations would be willing to train young people as technicians, directors, administrators, designers, managers, front-of-house staff, settings, costumes and props workers but they lack funding to employ apprentices and to pay extra staff to supervise training programmes.

The City of Toronto ought, as part of its job strategy programming, to include the arts organizations as a training sector for Canada's fastest-growing industry. The City should sponsor numbers of placements through internships and apprenticeships. The City should use its good offices with other governments to effect adaptation of job-creation programmes to meet the particular needs of the arts in general and organizations wishing to serve in a training capacity in particular.

The foregoing represents a few missing elements whose presence would greatly strengthen the entire arts and cultural community while helping to satisfy the needs of the public for the work of artists. They should not be put off too long.

TABLES

Notes to Tables

1. Amounts are taken from financial statements of organizations receiving assistance from the City of Toronto. Amounts relating to individual artists are estimated on the basis of advice from artists' organizations, granting bodies and other expert sources.
2. Figures in every case are for the period ended June 30, 1984.
3. Subsidies from the City of Toronto and Metro include tax exemptions and rental forgiveness.

NOTES TO TABLE I and TABLE II:

1. Amounts reported as grants will not agree with grantor figures because of varying fiscal years.
2. Although the sector grew in 2 years by 53% only self-generated and municipal revenues equalled or bettered general growth.
3. Had Canada Council and Ontario Arts Council participation kept pace with the sector, organizations suffering deficits of about \$4-million would have suffered no deficits whatsoever.

TABLE I

Three-year Economic Overview of the Subsidized Sector
of Arts and Cultural Organizations - City of Toronto
1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84 - Sources of Revenue

	<u>1981-82</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>%</u>
	\$		\$	
REVENUES:				
<u>Self-Generated</u>				
Admissions	15,873,025	22.2	22,050,933	25.7
Other Earnings	8,212,200	11.5	9,240,981	10.8
Fundraising	<u>9,423,935</u>	<u>13.2</u>	<u>9,508,109</u>	<u>11.1</u>
	33,509,160	46.9	40,800,023	47.6
<u>Municipal</u>				
The City of Toronto	2,535,645	3.6	3,080,204	3.6
The Municipality of Metro Toronto	<u>3,749,564</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>4,489,497</u>	<u>5.2</u>
	6,285,209	8.9	7,569,701	8.8
<u>Provincial and Federal - Arts Councils</u>				
The Ontario Arts Council	4,688,274	6.5	5,571,502	6.5
The Canada Council	<u>9,663,073</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>11,334,859</u>	<u>13.3</u>
	14,351,347	20.0	16,906,361	19.8
<u>Provincial and Federal - Direct Funding</u>				
The Department of Communications & Misc. approx.	1,500,000	2.1	2,100,000	2.4
The Ministry of Citizenship and Culture approx.	<u>15,767,971</u>	<u>22.1</u>	<u>18,279,217</u>	<u>21.4</u>
	17,267,971	24.2	20,379,217	23.8
TOTAL REVENUES:	<u>71,413,687</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>85,655,302</u>	<u>100.0</u>
EXPENDITURES:				
Production, Exhibition Selling approx.	58,022,956		68,691,922	
Administrative & Financial approx.	<u>14,505,740</u>		<u>17,172,980</u>	
TOTAL EXPENDITURES:	<u>72,528,696</u>		<u>85,864,902</u>	

<u>1983-84</u> \$	<u>%</u>
28,144,721	26.0
11,205,227	10.4
<u>16,062,377</u>	<u>14.8</u>
55,412,325	51.2
4,025,369	3.8
<u>5,360,456</u>	<u>4.9</u>
9,385,825	8.7
6,308,746	5.9
<u>11,475,232</u>	<u>10.6</u>
17,783,978	16.5
4,200,000	3.8
<u>21,497,190</u>	<u>19.8</u>
25,697,190	23.6
<u>108,279,318</u>	<u>100.0</u>
88,890,624	
<u>22,222,665</u>	
<u>111,113,289</u>	

TABLE II

Three-year Economic Overview of the Subsidized Sector
of Arts and Cultural Organizations - City of Toronto
1981-82, 1982-83, 1983-84 - Revenues by Discipline

	<u>1981-82</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>1982-83</u>	<u>%</u>
	\$		\$	
Theatres	9,137,078	12.8	12,553,875	14.6
Music Including Opera	14,515,947	20.3	19,784,701	23.1
Visual Art Including AGO	12,965,007	18.2	13,748,648	16.1
Ballet and Other Dance	12,734,653	17.8	12,382,126	14.5
Literary	13,433	-	5,528	-
Video and Film	993,766	1.4	1,236,406	1.4
Miscellaneous- Umbrellas/Facilities, Etc.	330,225	.5	575,280	.7
St. Lawrence Centre	1,137,632	1.6	1,310,147	1.5
Toronto International Festival	-	-	-	-
Royal Ontario Museum	13,574,446	19.0	17,044,471	19.9
Toronto Arts Council	11,500	-	14,120	-
Individual Creative Artists Estimated	6,000,000	8.4	7,000,000	8.2
TOTAL	<u>71,413,687</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>85,655,302</u>	<u>100.0</u>

*Toronto International Festival can be roughly re-allocated:

Music including opera	50% + 4,443,255 = \$26,583,251 = 24.5%
Dance including Ballet	50% + 4,443,255 = 18,841,558 = 17.5%

<u>1983-84</u>	<u>%</u>
\$	
14,302,964	13.2
22,139,996	20.4*
17,431,748	16.1
14,398,303	13.3*
233,221	.2
1,505,285	1.4
854,079	.8
2,304,202	2.1
8,886,510	8.3*
18,188,990	16.8
34,020	-
8,000,000	7.4
<u>108,279,318</u>	<u>100.0</u>

TABLE III

1981-82 Economic Overview of the Subsidized Arts/Cultural Sector
Sources of Revenue of 72 Organizations Assisted by the City of Toronto
and of Individual Creative Artists Not Assisted by the City

	<u>Admissions</u> \$	<u>Other Income</u> \$	<u>Fund- Raising</u> \$	<u>City of Toronto</u> \$
Theatres	2,630,354	652,357	924,397	656,369
Music Including Opera	5,368,452	1,232,419	2,714,775	164,102
Visual Art Including AGO	2,864,871	1,066,653	2,375,926	170,464
Ballet and Other Dance	4,283,954	707,872	2,092,584	271,176
Literary	---	433	11,000	2,000
Video and Film	220,530	110,271	204,676	177,300
Miscellaneous- Umbrellas/Facilities, etc.	25,000	70,689	42,229	104,379
St. Lawrence Centre	44,782	161,929	---	795,763
Royal Ontario Museum	435,082	1,209,577	1,058,348	182,592
Toronto Arts Council	---	---	---	11,500
Individual Creative Artists estimated	---	3,000,000	---	---
TOTAL:	<u>15,873,025</u>	<u>8,212,200</u>	<u>9,423,935</u>	<u>2,535,645</u>

Note: Of DOC/MCC and Other total of \$17,267,971 a total of \$15,545,200 went directly from the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture to the two provincial agencies assisted by the City of Toronto - The Royal Ontario Museum and the Art Gallery of Ontario. The remaining \$1,722,771 went to a variety of organizations in Toronto and came mostly from DOC and Secretary of State Department.

<u>Metro Toronto</u> \$	<u>Ont. Arts Council</u> \$	<u>Canada Council</u> \$	<u>DOC/MCC and other</u> \$	<u>TOTAL REVENUES</u> \$
864,594	1,473,094	1,492,079	443,834	9,137,078
1,098,341	1,145,627	2,233,808	558,423	14,515,947
550,793	112,900	743,400	5,080,000	12,965,007
798,657	656,713	3,298,737	624,960	12,734,653
---	---	---	---	13,433
56,000	44,440	95,049	85,500	993,766
32,428	55,500	---	---	330,225
134,404	---	---	754	1,137,632
214,347	---	---	10,474,500	13,574,446
---	---	---	---	11,500
---	1,200,000	1,800,000	---	6,000,000
<u>3,749,564</u>	<u>4,688,274</u>	<u>9,663,073</u>	<u>17,267,971</u>	<u>71,413,687</u>

TABLE IV

1982-83 Economic Overview of the Subsidized Arts/Cultural Sector
Sources of Revenue of 112 Organizations Assisted by the City of Toronto
and of Individual Creative Artists Not Assisted by the City

	<u>Admissions</u>	<u>Other</u> <u>Income</u>	<u>Fund-</u> <u>Raising</u>	<u>City of</u> <u>Toronto</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Theatres	3,979,427	1,057,882	1,478,921	877,591
Music Including Opera	8,217,124	1,469,248	3,647,051	491,474
Visual Art Including AGO	4,002,598	635,428	1,828,733	184,971
Ballet and Other Dance	3,541,903	786,907	1,477,872	311,363
Literary	---	178	600	4,750
Video and Film	219,153	120,910	268,151	17,250
Miscellaneous- Umbrellas/Facilities, Etc.	92,496	88,395	158,909	22,327
St. Lawrence Centre	---	206,711	---	955,685
Royal Ontario Museum	1,998,232	1,375,322	647,872	200,673
Toronto Arts Council	---	---	---	14,120
Individual Creative Artists Estimated	---	3,500,000	---	---
TOTAL:	<u>22,050,933</u>	<u>9,240,981</u>	<u>9,508,109</u>	<u>3,080,204</u>

Note: Of DOC/MCC and Other total of \$20,379,217 a total of \$18,043,799 went directly from the Ministry of Citizenship and Culture to the two provincial agencies assisted by the City of Toronto - The Royal Ontario Museum and the Art Gallery of Ontario. The remaining \$2,335,418 went to a variety of organizations in Toronto and came mostly from DOC and Secretary of State Department.

<u>Metro Toronto</u> \$	<u>Ont. Arts Council</u> \$	<u>Canada Council</u> \$	<u>DOC/MCC and other</u> \$	<u>TOTAL REVENUES</u> \$
970,364	1,676,949	1,880,358	632,383	12,553,875
1,583,016	1,368,951	2,736,685	271,152	19,784,701
592,991	190,690	749,034	5,564,203	13,748,648
863,440	723,100	3,941,099	736,442	12,382,126
---	---	---	---	5,528
61,000	71,712	127,683	350,547	1,236,406
35,362	40,100	---	137,691	575,280
147,751	---	---	---	1,310,147
235,573	---	---	12,586,799	17,044,471
---	---	---	---	14,120
---	1,500,000	1,900,000	100,000	7,000,000
<u>4,489,497</u>	<u>5,571,502</u>	<u>11,334,859</u>	<u>20,379,217</u>	<u>85,655,302</u>

TABLE V

1983-84 Economic Overview of the Subsidized Arts/Culture Sector
Sources of Revenue of 132 Organizations Assisted by the City of Toronto
and of Individual Creative Artists Not Assisted by the City

	Admissions	Other	Fund-	City of
	<u> </u>	<u>Income</u>	<u>Raising</u>	<u>Toronto</u>
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Theatres	5,364,129	964,176	1,472,993	818,851
Music Including Opera	9,017,296	2,426,475	3,635,465	549,360
Visual Art Including AGO	4,436,214	234,923	5,139,959	202,329
Ballet and Other Dance	4,220,506	1,334,436	1,939,305	328,136
Literary	10,605	33,803	34,350	11,000
Video and Film	234,069	104,919	288,111	17,250
Miscellaneous- Umbrellas/Facilities, Etc.	265,570	76,574	148,393	49,779
St. Lawrence Centre	---	559,213	---	1,378,753
Toronto International Festival	2,932,428	315,018	1,629,064	425,000
Royal Ontario Museum	1,663,904	1,155,690	1,774,737	210,891
Toronto Arts Council	---	---	---	34,020
Individual Creative Artists Estimated	---	4,000,000	---	---
TOTAL:	<u>28,144,721</u>	<u>11,205,227</u>	<u>16,062,377</u>	<u>4,025,369</u>

Note: Of DOC/MCC and Other total of \$25,697,190 a total of \$18,607,200 went directly from MCC to the two provincial agencies assisted by the City of Toronto - the ROM and the AGO. A further \$3,160,000 split evenly between the Ministry and the DOC went to the Toronto International Festival. The remaining \$3,929,990 came mostly from DOC and Secretary of State Department and went to a variety of organizations and individuals in Toronto.

<u>Metro Toronto</u>	<u>Ont. Arts Council</u>	<u>Canada Council</u>	<u>DOC/MCC and other</u>	<u>TOTAL REVENUES</u>
\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
924,150	1,691,854	1,978,276	1,088,535	14,302,964
1,893,475	1,593,869	2,781,072	242,984	22,139,996
666,497	296,857	276,319	6,178,650	17,431,748
906,483	781,250	4,263,237	624,950	14,398,303
5,750	11,100	22,450	104,163	233,221
81,000	73,316	142,608	564,012	1,505,285
55,297	60,500	11,270	186,696	854,079
155,236	---	---	211,000	2,304,202
425,000	---	---	3,160,000	8,886,510
247,568	---	---	13,136,200	18,188,990
---	---	---	---	34,020
---	1,800,000	2,000,000	200,000	8,000,000
<u>5,360,456</u>	<u>6,308,746</u>	<u>11,475,232</u>	<u>25,697,190</u>	<u>108,279,318</u>

TABLE VI

The St. Lawrence Centre and its Prime Tenants Summary
of Benefits Conferred on Patrons By Way of Subsidy
and Other Expenditure By Governments and their Agencies
During the Year Ended June 30, 1984

*By the City of Toronto:		\$	598,400	
Prime Tenants - Operating Grants				
St. Lawrence Centre - Grant and loss assumption	\$ 1,003,536			
Tax Exemption	132,238			
Debt Charges - Construction and renovation costs	<u>290,255</u>	\$	<u>1,426,029</u>	\$ <u>2,024,429*</u>
By Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto:				
Prime Tenants - Grants		\$	224,000	
St. Lawrence Centre - Tax Exemption			<u>155,000</u>	\$ 379,000
By Ontario Arts Council and other Provincial:				
Prime Tenants - Grants		\$	514,300	
St. Lawrence Centre - Grants			<u>156,000</u>	\$ 670,300
By Canada Council and other Federal:				
St. Lawrence Centre Prime Tenants - Grants			55,000 <u>517,081</u>	<u>572,081</u>
TOTAL BENEFITS CONFERRED:				\$ 3,645,810
TOTAL ATTENDANCE: (Prime tenants 220,000)				260,000
Average Benefits Per Seat Occupied:	\$ 14.02			
Which may be compared with average similar benefits conferred on patrons of other prime tenants of municipally- owned performance spaces:				
Young People's Theatre	\$ 6.09			
National Ballet of Canada	13.66			
Canadian Opera Company	18.83			

*Note: City of Toronto 1983-84 contribution to renovation costs of
\$1.2-million is not included.

TABLE VII

Municipal Benefits Conferred on Toronto Arts and Cultural Organizations
Other Than By Way of Cash Grants

	1981		1982	
	<u>City</u> \$	<u>Metro</u> \$	<u>City</u> \$	<u>Metro</u> \$
<u>Tax Exemptions</u>				
Roy Thomson Hall	22,336	26,221	315,523	370,397
Massey Hall	12,799	15,025	14,066	16,512
O'Keefe Centre	170,534	200,192	187,421	220,016
St. Lawrence Centre	114,493	134,405	125,831	147,715
Art Gallery of Ontario	156,151	183,308	171,613	201,459
Ontario College of Art	413	484	453	532
Royal Ontario Museum	182,592	214,347	200,673	235,573
Ontario Heritage Foundation	1,936	2,273	2,128	2,498
Eaton Auditorium	6,095	7,155	6,699	7,864
National Ballet School	26,459	31,060	34,442	40,432
Alumnae Theatre	3,526	4,139	3,875	4,548
	<u>697,334</u>	<u>818,609</u>	<u>1,062,724</u>	<u>1,247,546</u>
<u>Rent Grants:</u>				
Alumnae theatre	18,000	---	19,260	---
National Ballet of Canada -				
St. Lawrence Hall	128,000	---	136,960	---
Young People's Theatre	---	---	14,625	---
	<u>146,000</u>		<u>170,845</u>	
<u>St. Lawrence Centre</u>				
Debt Charges - Building and Renovations	187,403	---	176,264	---
Operating Grants to Centre	489,240	---	656,440	---
	<u>676,643</u>		<u>832,704</u>	

1983		1984		Primary Benefits to:
<u>City</u>	<u>Metro</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>Metro</u>	
\$	\$	\$	\$	
364,746	428,180	393,062	461,421	Toronto Symphony
14,782	17,353	15,930	18,701	Sundry
196,764	230,984	212,254	249,168	COC/National Ballet
132,238	155,236	142,503	167,286	Theatre Plus/CentreStage
180,352	211,716	194,351	228,151	AGO
477	560	514	603	OCA
210,891	247,568	227,261	266,785	ROM
2,237	2,626	2,410	2,829	Ont. Heritage Fdn.
7,812	9,171	8,419	9,883	Eaton Auditorium
36,196	42,491	38,473	45,164	National Ballet School
4,072	4,781	4,388	5,151	Alumnae Theatre
<u>1,150,567</u>	<u>1,350,666</u>	<u>1,239,565</u>	<u>1,455,142</u>	
20,223	---	22,244	---	Alumnae Theatre
143,808	---	184,269	---	National Ballet
15,356	---	16,892	---	Young People's Theatre
<u>179,387</u>		<u>223,405</u>		
290,255		558,288		
<u>955,960</u>		<u>964,752</u>		
<u>1,246,215</u>		<u>1,523,040</u>		

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my gratitude to everyone who participated in my work on Cultural Capital: The Care and Feeding of Toronto's Artistic Assets. To all the individuals who spent many hours thinking about, talking about and writing down their views, my thanks for the frank and generous sharing of your expertise and experience.

I also wish to acknowledge a particular debt of gratitude to the Toronto Arts Council and its Executive Director, Rita Davies, without whose assistance Cultural Capital would never have been completed. Their willingness to help without attempting to influence came to epitomize for me the kind of basic attitude an arts funding body ought to have.

T.H.

Individuals are referred to by the titles they held and organizations they belonged to at the time they were interviewed. Our apologies if there are any errors or omissions in the following:

GROUPS:

A Space - Michael Banger, Coordinator
- Doug Sigurdson, Coordinator

A.K.A. -Richard Shoichet, Artistic Manager

Adelaide Court Theatre - Ronald Taylor, Managing Director

Annpac - Ric Amis, Managing Director

Art Gallery at Harbourfront - William Boyle, Director

Art Gallery of Ontario - Roald Nasgaard, Chief Curator
- Glenda Milrod, Head of Extension Services
- William Withrow, Director

- Art Metropole - John Goodwin, Director
- Christina Ritchie, Video Curator
- Arts Television Centre - Lawrence Adams, Director
- Arraymusic - David Duclos, Administrative Director
- A.R.C. - Derek Dowden
- B.A.A.N.N. Theatre Centre - Wendy Dawson, Administrator
- Svetlana Zylina, Director
- Black Theatre Canada - Vera Cudjoe, Executive Director
- Robin Breon, Administrative Director
- Buddies in Bad Times - Sky Gilbert, Artistic Director
- Canadian Artists Representation Ontario - Hamish Buchanan,
Acting Executive Director
- Canadian Children's Opera Chorus - Suzanne Bradshaw, Manager
- Derek Holman, Musical Director
- Canadian Electronic Ensemble - Jon Siddall, Administrative Director
- Canadian Music Centre - John Miller, Executive Director
- Canadian Opera Company - Lotfi Mansouri, General Director
- Dory Vanderhoof, Director of Development
- Canadian Ukrainian Opera Association - Irene Lukasevich-Dziki,
President
- Valentina Kuryliw,
Financial Chairman
- CentreStage - Duggan Melhuish, President
- William Buchanan, Past President
- Richard Ouzounian, Artistic Producer
- Gordon Hinch, General Manager
- Thomas Bohdanetzky, Executive Manager
- C.C.M.C. Music Gallery - Al Mattes, Artistic and Administrative Director
- Changing Places Theatre - Debora Bojman, Artistic Director/General Manager
- Comus Music Theatre - Paul Schafer, President
- Susan Wright, Assistant to the General Manager
- Dance Ontario - Lynn McGuigan, Chairman
- Dancemakers - Danyele Fortin, General Manager

Danceworks - Kim Gaynor, General Manager

Deer Park Concerts - William Wright, Artistic Director

Desrosiers Dance Theatre - Paul Douglas, General Manager

Dixon Hall Music School - Douglas Jamieson, Music School Director

Equity Showcase Theatre - Timothy Leary, General Director

Factory Theatre Lab - Dian English, Managing Director

Festival of Festivals - Wayne Clarkson, Director

Funnel Experimental Theatre - David MacIntosh, Artistic Director
and General Manager

Ground Zero - Don Bouzek, Artistic Director

Harbourfront Reading Series - Greg Gatenby, Executive Director

Harbourfront Corporation - Howard Cohen, General Manager
- Anne Tindale, Director of Programming
- Tom Scurfield - Manager Performing Arts
Department
- Marilyn Brewer, Manager of Community
and Special Events

International Children's Theatre Festival - Anne-Marie Knudsen, Manager
Harbourfront Community
and Corporate Development

International Festival of Authors - Greg Gatenby, Literary Coordinator

Inner City Angels - Louis Morantz, Executive Director

Las Flores Charitable Foundation - Fernando Valladares, Coordinator

Le Theatre du P'tit Bonheur - John Van Burek, Artistic Director

Mariposa Folk Foundation - Rob Sinclair, Executive Director

Mercer Union - Steve Pozol, Administrator

Mime Company Unlimited - Ron East, Artistic Director

Mixed Company - Simon Malbogot, Director

Moebius - Douglas Brown, Administrative Consultant

National Ballet of Canada - Robert Johnston, Administrative Director

National Shevchenko Musical Ensemble Guild of Canada - Ginger Kautto,
Vice President

National Tap Dance Co. of Canada - Renee Addison, Director

National Youth Orchestra - Chris Deacon, Coordinator of Grants and Artists

Necessary Angel/Theatre Autumn Leaf - Brenda O'Donnell, General Manager

New Music Concerts - Norma Beecroft, President

Nightwood Theatre - Cynthia Grant, Artistic Director

Ontario Multicultural Theatre Association - Jerry Polivka,
Executive Director
- Lawrence Laffan,
Assistant Executive Director

Open Studio - Judith Stephens-Wells, Studio Director

Opera in Concert - Kathryn Brown, Assistant to Producer

Pauline McGibbon Cultural Centre - Jennifer Stewart-Gottfried,
Administrative Director

Pavlychenko Studio - Kathryn Brown, Artistic Director

Performing Arts Development Fund - Susan Feldman, Executive Director

Photo/Electric Arts Foundation - Richard Hill, Chairman

Playwrights Union of Canada - Larry Fineberg, Chairman
- Jane Buss, Administrative Director
- Ken Gass, Treasurer

Regent Park Teen Association - Bob Macdonald, Coordinator

Second Look Community Resource Centre - Julie Salverson, Director

Smile Company - Brian Robinson, Director

Solar Stage Theatre - Dilys Hankins, Administrator and Promotion Director

Spruce Street Cabbagetown Community Band - David Blackmore, President

St. Christopher's House Music - Mary Leggatt, Music School Director

- St. Christopher's House Drama - Dawn Elliot, Director of Special Projects
- Heather Marshall, Director of Resource
and Development
- St. Lawrence Centre - Ernest Balmer, Chairman
- Susan Rubes, Vice-Chairman
- Bruce Swerdfager, General Manager
- St. Vladimir Ukrainian Institute - Mariana Zaparyniuk, Chairman
- Storytellers School of Toronto - Dan Yashinsky, Director
- Tafelmusik Baroque Orchestra - Ottie Lockey, General Manager
- Tapestry Singers - Wayne Strongman, Artistic Director
- Tarragon Theatre - Mallory Gilbert, General Manager
- Theatre Direct Canada - John Glossop, Artistic Director
- Susan Serran, Producer
- Theatre Fountainhead - Jeff Henry, Artistic Director
- William Wright, General Manager
- Theatre Ontario - Catherine Smalley, Executive Director
- Theatre Passe Muraille - Clarke Rogers, Artistic Director
- Jerry Doiron, Assistant Business Manager
- Theatre Plus - Robert Foster, President
- Marion Andre, Artistic Director
- Ira Levine, Administrator
- Theatre Resource Centre - Ian Wallace, President, Artistic Director
- Mar Connors, Vice President, Artistic Director
- Toronto Chamber Society - David Anderson
- Toronto Chinese Chamber Orchestra - Danny C.K. Ngo, President
- Toronto Consort - David Clauzner
- Toronto Dance Theatre - Kenny Pearl, Artistic Director
- Ellen Busby, General Manager
- Toronto Free Theatre - Guy Sprung, Artistic Director
(Future Focus Forum Panelist)
- Leyton Morris, General Manager
- Toronto Independent Dance Enterprise - Allan Risdill, Co-artistic Director

Toronto Theatre Alliance - Anne Billings, Executive Director

Toronto Symphony Orchestra - Walter Homburger, Managing Director
 - Loie Fallis, Manager of Educational
 Activities, Assistant Music Administrator

Toronto Workshop Productions - George Luscombe, Artistic Director
 - Catherine McKeehan, General Manager

Trinity Square Video - Pat Wilson, General Manager

University Settlement Music School - George White, Music Director

Ukrainian Music Festival - Martha Barabash, President

V/Tape - Kim Tomczak, Coordinator

Video Culture Canada - Sally Hennessy, Executive Director

Videocabaret International - Michael Hollingsworth, Co-Artistic Director
 - Deanne Taylor, Co-Artistic Director
 - Shain Jaffe, Producer
 - Alan Bridel, Producer

Young People's Theatre - Peter Moss, Artistic Director
 - June Faulkner, General Manager

Youth and Music Canada - Albert Brule, Administrative Director

YYZ Artists' Outlet - Jennifer Rudder, Coordinator

INDIVIDUALS

David Anido - Manager Marketing Communications,
 (Overseas), Tourism Canada

Nini Baird - Director of Outreach Program, Emily Carr College of
 Art and Design - Vancouver

Stuart Backerman - Senior Cultural Planner, Social Planning
 Department - City of Vancouver

Edna Bampton - Budget Administration Assistant, Secretary of the
 Grant Review Board - City of Toronto

Curtis Barlow - Executive Director, Professional Association of Canadian Theatre; President, Canadian Conference of the Arts (Chairman: Future Focus Forum)

David Bartlett - Secretary to the Council; Assistant Director, Canada Council

Max Beck - Director, Social Planning Department - City of Vancouver

Roberta L. Beiser - Executive Director, The Vancouver Partnership for Business and the Arts - Vancouver

Ted Berger - Executive Director, New York Foundation for the Arts - New York City

Bertrand Bergeron - Conseiller en recherches économiques - ville de Montreal

Randall Bourscheidt - Deputy Commissioner, Department of Cultural Affairs -City of New York

Morley Bregman - Director of Planning and Budgeting Division, Management Services Department- City of Toronto

Marek Brodzki - Regional Consultant, Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture

Alderman William Boytchuk - City of Toronto

Alderman Joanne Campbell - City of Toronto

Barbara Caplan - Deputy City Clerk - City of Toronto

Harry Chartrand - Research Director, Canada Council

Robert Cousins - Communications Development Officer, Department of Communications

Susan Crean - Arts Critic (Future Focus Forum Panelist)

Dr. David Cwi - President of David Cwi and Associates - Baltimore, Maryland

Jenny Dixon - Director, Public Arts Fund - New York City

John Dunn - Planner, Department of Planning and Development -City of Toronto

William Duron - President, Metropolitan Toronto Convention and Visitors Association

Alex Ebel - Manager of Systems Development and Support
Computer Division, Management Services Department - City of Toronto

Mayor Art Eggleton - City of Toronto

Ron Evans - Director of Policy and Planning, Ontario Arts Council

Sara Garretson - Director, Office of the Not-For-Profit Sector,
New York City Economic Development Administration - New York City

Alderman Michael Gee - City of Toronto (Future Focus Forum Panelist)

Arthur Gelber - O.C., LL.D. - Toronto

Alderman Richard Gilbert - City of Toronto

Lin Grist - Director, Community Centre 55 - Toronto

Carol Grossman - Partner, Odyssey Partners - New York City

Henry Guettel - Director, Theatre Development Fund -
New York City

Diana Jervis-Read - Cultural Affairs Representative, Ontario House
Ministry of Citizenship and Culture - London, England

Moria Johnson - Cultural Consultant, Ontario House,
Ministry of Industry and Tourism - Paris, France

Alderman Anne Johnston - City of Toronto

Pat Jones - Executive Director, Cultural Assistance Centre -
New York City

Alderman Ron Kanter - City of Toronto

William Kilbourn - Writer and Historian (Future Focus Forum Panelist)

Bert Kingsley - Manager, Budget Analysis, Management Services
Department - City of Toronto

Ian Kramer - Program Director, Cultural Council Foundation -
New York City

John Kruger - Chief Administrative Officer, Municipality of
Metropolitan Toronto

Janet Langson - Director, N.Y.C. Office of Housing - New York City

Mark Larret-Smith - Deputy Minister of Culture, Ontario Ministry
of Citizenship and Culture

William Lord - Theatre Officer, Ontario Arts Council

Frank Lubbers - Deputy Curator, Fodor Museum, Amsterdam

D'Arcy Martin - Educational Director, United Steelworkers of America

Alderman Dale Martin - City of Toronto

Cyndra McDowell - Freelance Artist, Former Executive Director of CARO

Naish McHugh - Film Liaison, Department of Planning and Development - City of Toronto

Catherine McLeod - Labour, Arts & Media Working Group

Edward Negridge - Assistant to Alderman Boytchuk - City of Toronto

Michael Noon - Executive Director of Culture, Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Culture

Patricia O'Connell - Director of Recreation, Department of Parks & Recreation - City of Toronto

Carol Off - Producer, CBC Stereo Morning, Toronto

Alderman Joe Pantalone - City of Toronto

Walter Pitman - Executive Director, Ontario Arts Council

Virginia Reh, Independent Director - Toronto

Lyse Richer - Secretaire Generale, Conseil des Arts de la Communaute Urbaine de Montreal

Alderman June Rowlands - Budget Chief, City of Toronto

Isaiah Sheffer - Artistic Director, Symphony Space - New York City

Geraldine Sherman - Executive Producer, Literary Programming, CBC - (Future Focus Forum Panelist)

Arlene Shuler - Executive Director, Volunteer Lawyers for the Arts - New York City

David Silcox - Assistant Deputy Minister, Department of Communications

Jerry Smith - Senior Vice President, Theatre Ontario

Ron Soskolne - Vice President of Planning and Development
Olympia and York Ltd.

Tim Sullivan - Composer

Alderman Dorothy Thomas - City of Toronto

Peter Tomlinson - Programme Manager, Department of Planning
and Development - City of Toronto

Irene Turrin - Cultural Affairs Director, Municipality
of Metropolitan Toronto

Robert Vanney - Legal Counsel, Department of Cultural
Affairs - New York City

David White - Director, Dance Theatre Workshop
- New York City

Karen Wilkin - Independent Curator - Toronto

Hennie Wolff - Executive Director, Visual Arts Ontario

Tom Hendry, consultant for CULTURAL CAPITAL is a Toronto writer who was trained as a chartered accountant. He is a co-founder of Rainbow Stage and the Manitoba Theatre Centre, Toronto Free Theatre, Playwrights Canada, Banff Playwrights Colony and Playwrighting Department. He has served as Secretary General of the Canadian Theatre Centre and as Literary Manager of the Stratford Festival. His plays have been produced on stage, radio and television in Canada and elsewhere.

