

ALBERTA PERFORMING ARTS POLICY

**Marda Schindeler
B.A. (Distinction), University of Lethbridge, 1993**

**A Thesis
Submitted to the Council on Graduate Studies
of the University of Lethbridge
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree**

Master of Arts

Lethbridge, Alberta

April 23, 1998

© Marda Schindeler, 1998

ABSTRACT

Alberta's first arts legislation, the *Cultural Development Act*, was passed in 1946. It was followed by numerous policy initiatives to support the arts, including creation of facilities for training of artists, development of agencies and agreements to deal with arts funding, enactment of regulations to guide arts institutions, and creation of various Departmental structures depending on organizational location of this policy sector. The thesis examines the historical evolution of performing arts policy in Alberta from 1905 to 1997 to identify government activities, shifts in policy-making, and methods of implementation. The study utilizes Paul Sabatier's advocacy coalition approach, which treats public policy as determined by the dynamics of the advocacy coalition within a policy sector and the manner in which external factors and system parameters steer policy development. This study concludes that Alberta performing arts policy has largely developed within the context of meta public policies emphasizing economic development and provincial statebuilding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	2
Chapter 1	
The Period of Non-Government Involvement in Arts Policy: 1905 to 1946	12
Chapter 2:	
The Entry of the Alberta Government into Performing Arts Policy: 1946-1970	25
Chapter 3:	
Policy Implementation through Alternative Policy Instruments: 1970-1991:	36
Chapter 4:	
Government Downsizing and the Increased Importance of the Private Sector in Arts Policy	50
Conclusion	66
Appendices	78
Cumulative References	91

INTRODUCTION

In 1946, the Alberta government passed the first arts legislation in Canada, *An Act to Promote the Cultural Development of Alberta*. Numerous policy initiatives to support the arts followed including the creation of facilities for the training of artists, the development of agencies to deal with arts funding, and the enactment of regulations to guide arts institutions. In addition, advisory groups were created to provide government departments with specialized knowledge about the arts. These initiatives reflect the government's experimentation with a variety of administrative structures in response to changing attitudes among both the public and political elites toward the role that government should play in arts development and support. The recent government emphasis on fiscal restraint and downsizing has meant a reconsideration of the role for government, resulting in a time of uncertainty for the arts.

Despite over 50 years of government activity in the arts area, the study of performing arts policy-making in Alberta remains relatively unexplored. Studies of arts policy have been largely focused at the national level. In the United States for example, see the research of Cummings and Katz's (1987) *The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America, and Japan* and the many contributors to the *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*. In Canada, federal government task forces and legislative committee reports have been supplemented by studies such as Schafer and Fortier's (1989) *Review of Federal Policies for the Arts in Canada* as well as Globerman's (1987) *Culture, Governments and Markets: Public Policy and the Culture Industries*. No comparable studies of Alberta performing arts policy exist.

This thesis addresses the gaps in the literature on the arts in Alberta by examining the historical evolution of performing arts policy in Alberta. My objectives are twofold. First, the thesis will provide a descriptive history of performing arts policy in Alberta by identifying government activities, shifts in policy-making, and methods of

implementation. Second, the thesis will suggest explanations for why performing arts policy has developed in the manner it has.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The specific focus of this study is on the performing arts¹ that encompasses the activities of music, drama,² and dance. The visual and literary arts, as well as media and film, have been excluded because, although closely related, they have experienced different patterns of development and have their own identifiable community of participants. This scope establishes policy³ parameters to my study. The time frame to be examined includes the years from 1905 when Alberta became a province to the last provincial election held on March 11, 1997.

My research on performing arts policy development in Alberta uses both primary and secondary sources, including government documents, as well as minutes, constitutions, mission statements, and bylaws of arts groups. In addition, I have completed extensive elite-type interviews of government officials, members of arts associations, and selected members of the arts community. Finally, arts forums, conferences, as well as workshops involving arts groups and government officials formed part of my research.⁴

Theoretical Framework

In order to explain the historical evolution of performing arts policy in Alberta, I utilize Paul Sabatier's (1991; 1988; 1987) advocacy coalition approach. This conceptual framework is sufficiently broad to allow for inclusion of all the relevant factors that influence policy-making.

Sabatier's framework of advocacy coalition views policy change over time as a function of three sets of factors (1991):

- a) policy participants interacting as an advocacy coalition;⁵
- b) the influence of factors external to advocacy coalition; and
- c) the stability of changing system parameters.

Policy Participants

Policy participants are individuals, groups, organizations, and agencies that interact by virtue of their shared interest in a particular public policy sector, thus comprising what Sabatier (1991) terms a policy coalition. The extent to which these participants are able to agree on policy objectives directly relates to not only what kind of policies are developed but also the process of policy development that is involved within the policy community. The level of agreement among members of a policy-making coalition can also effect the strength of the policy sector within the overall scheme of public policy-making. This is particularly true in what is a weak policy sector such as the arts, which occupies a relatively low position within the existing hierarchy of policy sectors. The dynamics of interaction among participants within a policy coalition, in the sense the relative importance of different participants, is dependent upon stability of both government and non-government organizations, the availability of financial resources, and the agendas and political strengths of individuals, both governmental and private sector.

Within the coalition of policy participants not all stakeholders have equal influence and power. Different stakeholders have had varying degrees of influence in forging a change in the arts policy. Horst Schmid, Minister of Culture, Youth and Recreation (1971-74) and Alberta Culture (1975-1978), for example, was a policy innovator. Unlike some other ministers who later headed the government department concerning the performing arts, he was effective in carrying his agenda through cabinet (Johnson, 1981). Similarly, some bureaucrats (such as J.S. O'Neill, Deputy Minister from 1979 to 1992) — particularly those who were long tenured and experienced — had a better chance of influencing the government agenda than those who were shuffled in and out.

The participants interacting as an advocacy coalition in the performing arts policy-making arena include (1) elected officials of the government of Alberta — MLAs,

ministers, and high-level bureaucrats; and (2) organizations and collectivities — Alberta government departments, a variety of corporation-like foundations, and organizations of artists — collectively they constitute the stakeholders in enhancing/changing performing arts policies in the province.⁶

Influence of Factors External to the Advocacy Coalition

No public policy is impervious to external influences. Many times public policies are defined, readjusted, and even eliminated because of the environmental changes. It is a given that provincial policy has to operate within the constitutional and political framework of Canadian federalism. Moreover, within the province itself, public policy in one area is affected by what is happening in other public arenas. Where an over-arching or meta-public policy exists, it steers what happens in other policy sectors. My thesis suggests that performing arts policy was situated within the state-building economic policies of the Alberta government throughout the 1940s and 1950s.

Stable or Changing System Parameters

System parameters determine public policy feasibility. Some parameters may be fixed — physical boundaries of a country; others may be rooted in ethnic composition of the country, political ideology, belief systems, and political culture. Public policy-making copes with these fixed and evolving system parameters.

The function of Canada's culturally diverse society as a system parameter is illustrative. This means that public policies dealing with art at all levels of government - national, provincial, and municipal - are constrained by this ideal. Consequently, even when the Alberta government felt like enhancing and advancing its performing arts policy, it did not intervene directly in determining the content of the performing arts. Instead, it preferred to set up arm's length organizations in the form of foundations.

The Alberta government's approach in the area of performing arts was very Fabian. It was marked by a slow and gradual entry into this area, which did not occur until political elites felt the arts policy area could be included within the acceptable scope of

government functions as defined by political elites and citizenry. Thus, while the government watched the development of performing arts through the private and educational sectors from 1905 to almost 1946, it kept itself out of this policy area except to indirectly subsidize the private efforts. As the political culture changed and money became available to finance extended government activity, particularly after the economic boom in the wake of the 'Leduc' oil discovery, the government's increasing effort in developing and enhancing performing arts activities found greater public acceptability.

Policy Types and Policy Instruments

I have found that most of the current literature on policy classification is not very useful in my historical analysis of performing arts policy in Alberta. Almond and Lowi (Almond & Powell, 1984, 1978; see also Aucoin, 1971), for example, suggest a typology of public policies that includes: distributive, redistributive, regulatory, and symbolic. Alberta performing arts policy does not fit neatly in this typology, nor does this typology help explain the evolution of this policy. At best, the government's policy can be characterized as non-coercive; it symbolizes the government's attempt to enrich the cultural life of Alberta through limited distribution of financial resources.

On the other hand, the literature on policy instruments is more useful. Doern and Phidd (1992) have identified five different policy instruments for implementation of public policies: exhortation, taxation, regulation, legislation, and public enterprise. In the context of performing arts, the Alberta government has used exhortation widely — encouraging the development of consultative and advisory bodies. It has also used legislation to create arm's length foundations to encourage and enhance performing arts in the province. Because of downsizing and budget cuts in recent years, the government seems to be attempting to withdraw itself from financially supporting the performing arts. Whether it actually does or does not withdraw financial support, the policy instruments used heretofore by the government in this area of public policy are not likely to change.

SYNOPSIS OF CHAPTERS

The evolution of Alberta performing arts policy falls into two broad categories: the years prior to government involvement beginning in 1946 and the period of evolving government activity. The period of government activity can be divided into three periods: the formative years from 1946 to 1970, the growth period from 1970 to 1991, and the restructuring phase from 1991 to 1997.

Chapter one covers the years from 1905 to 1946. This chapter examines the years prior to government involvement in the arts and the transition period preceding the first arts legislation passed in 1946. In this period art was outside the purview of government and was an activity to be pursued largely by amateurs for the purpose of entertainment. The main participants in this period were the Carnegie Foundation and the University of Alberta.

Chapter two examines the period 1946 to 1970. These were the formative years for government activity in the arts. Government moved from non-involvement to involvement through the passage of the first arts legislation, the *Cultural Development Act*, as well as through the creation of the initial government structures for implementing arts policy, namely a government department and Minister responsible for the arts as part of the portfolio of Economic Affairs, a Co-ordinator of Cultural Activities, and boards. This period is characterized by the belief that art is a necessary part of the quality of life – art is an activity that should be an option for any individual's leisure time. The number of participants in the nascent advocacy coalition expanded to include elected government officials as well as the bureaucratic structures and incumbents. During this period the advocacy coalition, as a force driving policy development, was beginning to coalesce.

Chapter three discusses the period from 1970 to 1991. This period is marked by a significant expansion in government activity with respect to the arts which saw responsibility for the arts moved into the Department of Culture and the creation of the arts Foundations. The professional artist⁷ became a relevant participant in the advocacy

coalition and was recognized as a candidate for government support. The advocacy coalition reached its zenith during this period. Agreement on policy objectives and cooperation among coalition participants was high.

The fourth period, 1991 to the present, is covered in chapter four. It is characterized by a restructuring of government policy with respect to the arts, reflecting a weakening of the advocacy coalition. The government began moving towards downsizing and privatization. In a government reorganization, the responsibility for arts was moved to the multipurpose Department of Community Development, and the various arts Foundations were amalgamated into a single Foundation. Art was recognized as not only a part of quality of life and a necessary part of community development, but was also important for its beneficial economic impact. Increasingly, public policy shifted to supporting the arts for their significance as a commercial enterprise. Arts policy, like other policy sectors, became subsumed within the meta policy of downsizing and privatization. The cohesion and stability of the advocacy coalition experienced in the previous period began to dissipate as arts groups faced the erosion of government financial support and policy commitment.

After summarizing the history of performing arts policy the concluding chapter will use the framework of Sabatier's advocacy coalition approach to suggest explanations for the pattern of the development of performing arts policy.

NOTES

- 1 This definition of performing arts is derived from what activities are eligible for funding from government grants, from the activities that are generally accepted as performing arts through their inclusion in Fine Arts programs, and through reference to the arts by the media. Activities subsumed under the performing arts umbrella include festivals, touring, commissioning of new works, residencies, continuing studies, and training. Artists include choreographers, playwrights, composers, designers, dancers, actors, musicians, and arts administrators among others. These artists may participate in the arts activities as an amateur or as a professional.
- 2 In government documents, the terms theatre and drama are used interchangeably, while in the arts community the definition of the term theatre encompasses drama. For the purposes of this study I will use the terms interchangeably.
- 3 Public policy, as defined by Thomas Dye, is “whatever governments choose to do or not to do.” (1978, p. 3).
- 4 See Appendix 3.
- 5 An advocacy coalition is similar to the concept of policy community as developed by Coleman and Skogstad (1990), Howlett and Ramesh (1995), and Sabatier (1991). According to Howlett and Ramesh (1995), a policy community identifies those participants and potential participants “drawn from the policy universe who share a common policy focus” (p. 128), meaning that a policy community includes all those involved in the formulation and implementation of policy for a specific area. Coleman and Skogstad (1990) add a time dimension to the concept of policy community by defining it as all participants or potential participants “with a direct or indirect interest in a policy area or function who share a common ‘policy focus,’ and who, with varying degrees of influence shape policy outcomes over the long run” (p. 25). The concept of policy community is useful for considering participants in the development of Alberta arts policy, but it does not provide a framework for analysis of the relation of the arts to other policy sectors, or account for external factors such as economic conditions.
- 6 I have excluded the general public because it forms part of the arts policy-making community on a sporadic basis, demonstrating at best a limited interest in arts policy.
- 7 A professional artist is someone who receives remuneration for their arts activity as opposed to an amateur who participates as a volunteer.

REFERENCES

- Alberta. (1946). *Statutes of Alberta*. Edmonton: King's Printer.
- Almond, G. & Powell, G. (1984). *Comparative Politics Today: A World View*. (3rd edition). Toronto: Little, Brown & Company.
- Almond, G. & Powell, G. (1978). *Comparative Politics: System, Process and Policy*. Toronto: Little, Brown & Company.
- Aucoin, P. & Doern, B. (Eds.). (1971). *The Structure of Policy-Making in Canada*. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada.
- Cobb, R. & Elder, C. (1972). *Participation in American Politics: the Dynamics of Agenda-building*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Coleman, W. & Skogstad, G. (Eds.). (1990). *Policy Communities and Public Policy in Canada: A Structural Approach*. Mississauga, Ontario: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd.
- Cummings, M. & Katz, R. (1987). *The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America and Japan*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Doern, G. & Phidd, R. (1992). *Canadian Public Policy: Ideas, Structure, Process*. (2nd ed.). Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.
- Dye, T. (1978). *Understanding Public Policy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Globerman, S. (1987). *Culture, Governments and Markets: Public Policy and the Culture Industries*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Howlett, M. & Ramesh, M. (1995). *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Johnson, A. (1981). A Minister as an Agent of Policy Change: the Case of Unemployment Insurance in the Seventies. *Canadian Public Administration* 24 (4) Winter, 612-633.
- Sabatier, P. (1991). Toward Better Theories of the Policy Process. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, June, 147-156.
- Sabatier, P. (1988). An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein. *Policy Science* 21, (Fall), 129-169.

Sabatier, P. and Pelkey, N. (1987). Incorporating Multiple Actors and Guidance Instruments into Models of Regulatory Policymaking. *Administration and Society* 19 (September), 236-263.

Schafer, D. & Fortier, A. (1989). *Review of Federal Policies for the Arts in Canada (1944-1988)*. Ottawa: The Canadian Conference of the Arts.

CHAPTER 1

THE PERIOD OF NON-GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT IN ARTS POLICY: 1905 TO 1946

During this early period of Alberta provincial history the government did not regulate or support the arts on an ongoing basis nor did it have any general or specific policies concerning the arts. As a result, government expenditure on the arts was irregular and limited to special events. Until the 1940s, the arts were considered to be a leisure activity and were pursued by amateurs in their spare-time for relaxation, socializing, enjoyment, and entertainment. While this view of the arts remained constant throughout the period, during the later stages the role of government in the arts underwent a transition culminating in the first arts legislation: *The Act to Promote the Cultural Development of Alberta*, 1946. This chapter examines the pre-arts policy era by focussing upon participants in arts activity, who were the precursors to the arts policy advocacy coalition.

ALBERTA ARTS SCENE

During the period 1905 to 1946, the Alberta arts scene included a variety of private foundations, educational institutions, professional and amateur artists, audiences, presenters, and arts organizations.

The Carnegie Foundation

Based in the United States, the privately funded Carnegie Foundation was instrumental in providing encouragement for the development of arts in Alberta. The Carnegie Foundation provided grants to the University of Alberta's Department of Extension to administer three programs. The first program allowed for the hiring of a university extension specialist in drama in 1932 (Mann, 1993, p. 105). During the 1930s, the second program "rewarded and trained Alberta playwrights" (Wetherell & Kmet, 1990, p. 237). The third and largest program established the Banff School of Fine Arts (the

School is described later in the section on educational institutions) and provided operating funds to the School from 1932 to 1937 (Wetherell & Kmet, 1990, p. 227).

Grants from the Carnegie Foundation provided support through incentives, rewards, information, and resource people, which helped to nurture and expand existing arts activities. For example, although theatre events were common before the grants, attendance was generally limited to wealthier classes. The grants broadened accessibility, allowing theatre to reach more people. Financial support from the Foundation also set an example for other private foundations and corporations that the arts were a legitimate area for sponsorship and donations. The Carnegie Foundation helped to plant the seeds for government involvement in the arts by showing that additional funds were necessary for the expansion of arts activities, but also that even small grants were a publicly visible route for the provincial government to make ties with the rural communities.

The support from the Carnegie Foundation focused largely on amateur arts activities, suggesting that the Foundation was interested in arts activities as leisure pursuits rather than in the development of professional artists. That is, the grants were not designed to help individuals pursue a career in the arts, but were intended to allow people to continue pursuing the arts for enjoyment as well as to learn and develop their arts abilities for personal satisfaction and community involvement.

The University of Alberta

Department of Extension

The Department of Extension offered training and resource information to amateur drama groups. Support was provided through the offering of equipment loans as well as the establishment of summer schools and lending libraries. During the 1930s and 40s, the Department employed drama specialists who acted as resource people, adjudicators, conducted classes and lectures, as well as assisted groups through mail correspondence and community visits (Day & Potts, 1987). The University of Alberta was instrumental in fostering the early development of arts activities in the province. As discussed by

Wetherell and Kmet (190) several projects provided support to the arts. In the early 1940s the University of Alberta administered the Alberta Folklore Project that had a two-fold purpose. First, it was designed to encourage Alberta writers; and second, it tried to create a body of Alberta-based material by stressing the development of indigenous drama based upon Alberta myths, legends, and history. The drama programs at the University of Alberta, in conjunction with The Banff School of Fine Arts, helped to establish "community theatre as one of the most important cultural forces in the community life of the Province," especially in rural and small town communities (p. 228). Similar to the kind of support offered to drama, The University of Alberta Department of Extension offered music training programs during the 1920s and 1930s. The University of Alberta provided a type of resource to the arts that was not available from other provincial sources.

Two key people in the early evolution of the arts in Alberta were employed by the Department of Extension – Elizabeth Sterling-Haynes, the first drama specialist from 1932 to 1937 (Day & Potts, 1987, p. 15) and Ned Corbett, the director of the Department. Both Haynes and Corbett were instrumental in the establishment of the Banff School of Fine Arts. Haynes wrote the first high school drama curriculum and also helped to found the Edmonton Little Theatre, the Alberta Drama League, and local drama groups throughout Alberta in the 1930s (Day & Potts, 1987, p. 32). She was a major force in the development of theatre in Alberta.

The University established its first Department of Fine Arts in 1945 (Stuart, 1984, p. 154). The new department provided a formalized study of the arts, in contrast to the workshop and service function of the Department of Extension. This expansion of the curriculum was significant because artists could pursue their arts activities as part of their academic training, demonstrating a movement towards a role for the arts that encompassed more than leisure activity.

Because the University of Alberta received its funding from the Government of Alberta, the government became involved in arts activities in an indirect manner. This

financial aid however, was situated within the parameters of post secondary education policy and did not reflect any governmental policy aimed specifically at the arts.

The Banff School of Fine Arts

The Banff School of Fine Arts was established in 1932 through funds from the Carnegie Foundation and the administrative support of the University of Alberta's Department of Extension. Donald Cameron, the director of the School, "raised money, scrounged old buildings, and persuaded Parks Canada to provide" (Banff Centre for the Arts, 1996, p. 44) a site for the campus. These initiatives were combined with funds from the estate of Colonel J.H. Woods to build the original buildings on the current site of Tunnel Mountain.

The initial program at the Banff School focused on theatre and was attended primarily by rural school teachers (Day and Potts, 1987, p. 19). In 1935, the School formalized a relationship with the Institute of Technology and Art in Calgary (which offered painting classes in Banff), resulting in the renaming of the School to The Banff School of Fine Arts and the expansion of the mandate to include a more encompassing curriculum (Stuart, 1994, p. 138). The School underwent further expansion with the addition of music in 1936 (Banff Centre for the Arts, 1996, p. 44). As the School developed it extended into many different aspects of the arts community and over the years, was able to establish an international reputation as a place to study the arts. This also contributed to the growing public perception that the arts were a legitimate area of study.

To diversify its funding base and operate year round, the School added Management programs in 1952 and Conference programs in 1953 (Banff Centre for the Arts, 1996, p. 44). Even with this continued growth, however, it was not until 1978 that the Alberta Government legislated The Banff Centre Act.

Amateur Artists

In the early 1900s, amateur artists' activities were popular in Edmonton and Calgary as well as in the rural areas and small towns. Activities ranged from "the presentation of plays, minstrel shows, musical and variety concerts, readings, lectures, tableau entertainment, dances, orchestral events, and recitations" (Skinner, 1996, p. 18). Wetherell & Kmet (1990, p. 228) argue that community theatre was one of the most important cultural forces in the community life of the Province. These arts activities were a popular social event for the amateur artist, and their productions remained popular with audiences throughout the period.

Presenters/Audience

Private sponsorship was a key component to the presentation of professional touring shows. Local committees of citizens contracted with touring companies to present Chautauqua performances (Jameson, 1987, p. 4). The local committee was responsible to pay for any shortfalls in ticket revenue up to an agreed amount, thus guaranteeing the Chautauqua companies a minimum revenue for each performance. Without the agreement of the local committees to provide a guarantee to the touring companies, few companies could afford to take the financial risk involved with touring. After 1930, with the economic downturn resulting from the Depression, Chautauqua performances declined because presenters could not afford to pay the contract fee and many potential audience members could not afford the ticket for admission. Despite the Depression and the decline in the number of Chautauqua events, audiences for amateur productions remained relatively steady.¹

Professional Artists

The major source of employment for professional artists was the touring Chautauqua shows. While an important component of Chautauqua and minstrel shows, music by itself, in the form of recitals and concerts, was also a popular performance which provided work for professional musicians. Various musical performers and groups

travelled throughout the province, particularly to Calgary and Edmonton. Unlike the professional touring shows, musical performances did not suffer a major decline in popularity during the 1930s (Wetherell & Kmet, 1990, p. 237). The popularity of dances provided a steady source of income for dance band musicians, while the introduction of silent movies provided employment for accompanists (pianists). Although these were regular activities, they occurred on a much more limited basis than the amateur productions.

Media

Radio provided support to the arts through the broadcasting of arts activities. Radio was an ideal means of airing musical performances and live performances of plays. The University of Alberta's radio station, CKUA, broadcasted drama as a regular feature, including plays mounted by the CKUA players, and in 1931, it broadcast four of the Alberta Drama Festival plays from Convocation Hall (Wetherell & Kmet, 1990, p. 231). Station CJCA, in Edmonton, set up a drama club paying performers and a director for drama broadcasts. These broadcasts provided a more widespread exposure to the arts than was possible by live performance.

In contrast to radio, movies presented a challenge to the viability of theatre. Movies featured handsome stars, lavish sets, and special effects; characteristics which became expected parts of performances and not just novelties. Audience members transferred these expectations to what was considered a successful live performance. The content, actors, and sets of theatre events became much more important and also made the event more expensive to present when compared with the minimal requirements of only a projector and screen for movies. Additionally, the quality of the touring groups was variable and questionable (Johnston & den Otter, 1985; C. Skinner, personal communication, March 31, 1997) because the same artists did not necessarily tour in both the rural and urban areas. As a result people found movie tickets cheaper than those for

live performances; movies provided consistent quality regardless of the locale, which meant decreased attendance for the performances.

Canadian Arts Council

On June 21, 1944, several arts associations led by the Royal Canadian Academy of the Arts presented a joint brief to the Special Committee of the House of Commons on Reconstruction and Re-establishment, chaired by J.G. Turgeon. The Turgeon Committee was formed by the federal government in response to governmental concerns with respect to employment after the war (Schafer & Fortier, 1989). The joint brief made three recommendations to the Committee. First, it requested the creation of a federal agency that would become the centre of cultural activities. Second, it suggested that a network of community centres for the production and dissemination of the arts be organized. The third recommendation included proposals respecting most federal cultural agencies, copyright, and tax measures affecting artists. The arts associations advocated a more active and planned approach for the federal government in arts activities. More importantly, the recommendations attempted to move the arts into a prominent position on the federal political agenda.

The collaboration of artists in preparing the joint brief to the Turgeon Committee was especially significant because it led to the formation of the Canadian Arts Council, formed in 1945 (Currently called the Canadian Conference of the Arts). As Schafer and Fortier (1989) argue, the Council “assured greater cohesion and continuity in the arts community’s representations to various governments” (p. 6) at the federal and provincial levels. In April of 1946, the Council sent a report to Prime Minister Mackenzie King reiterating the proposals of the brief presented to the Turgeon Committee.

The brief presented to the Committee and the subsequent formation of the Canadian Arts Council proved to be relevant to the arts in Alberta because it involved a national group committed to promoting the arts. This was the first organized attempt by a group of Canadian artists to put the arts on the public policy agenda. Although the

group's activities were directed at the federal government, spillover into the Alberta political arena was inevitable. Through the provision of information and support to Alberta artists, the Council served as a catalyst for political mobilization of artists at the provincial level and importantly, a gateway was provided to the Alberta political elite to allow them to begin considering the role of government in the arts.

Government

Alberta Government

Although the Alberta government had no specific policy with respect to the arts, it did provide irregular support to some artists, such as amateur musicians. The Lieutenant-Governor of Alberta, George Bulyea, organized the first competitive music festival in Canada, which was held on May 5, 1908, in Edmonton. According to Kallman, Bulyea acted "on a suggestion of Governor-General Earl Grey, a man anxious to foster the arts in Canada" (p. 218). In addition, the provincial Department of Education provided grants for music festivals and bursaries for students taking exams from the Western Board of Music.

Alberta government involvement in the promotion or regulation of professional artists and their performances was also limited. The government did not provide financial or administrative support for performances, and it did not play a role in the presentation of the performances. Content of performances was occasionally a concern. In 1919, the government informed all theatres that no performer would be permitted to use the name of any person in making laughter at their expense, (Wetherell & Kmet, 1990, p. 221) but this course of action was unusual and not repeated. It would seem that the action was an angry reaction that quickly subsided. Despite pressure from groups such as the Calgary Local Council of Women and the Calgary Council on Child and Family Welfare, the government refused to become involved in formal censorship of vaudeville (Wetherell & Kmet, 1990, p. 221). This government response reinforced the argument that the limited

arts policy existing during this period was not going to be extended to the regulation of the content of live performances.

Municipal Governments

Municipal governments did make some funding available to local amateur musicians. Prior to World War II, town councils provided funding to citizens' bands which were often composed of musicians from the local fire brigade or police department. Funding was limited because "along with public subsidy came public criticism" (Wetherell & Kmet, 1990, p. 243) regarding the quality of the music. The bands were criticized when they played, but were missed when they did not. This public funding was not regulated or controlled by the provincial government. Also, the provincial government did not attempt to develop a similar type of funding, again showing a reluctance to become involved in arts policy.

THE ABSENCE OF GOVERNMENT ARTS POLICY: SOME OBSERVATIONS

The lack of government initiative in the development of any specific policy for the arts during this early period of provincial history can be partly traced to three general circumstances. First, when the province of Alberta was created in 1905, the new government was focused on province-building. The task of building a governmental organization was the immediate concern of the political leadership and of the people of the new province. Regulation or funding of leisure activity including the performing arts was at best considered a peripheral concern.

Secondly, World War I (1914-1918), The Great Depression (1929-39), and World War II (1939-45) were major societal problems that demanded large-scale responses. These occurrences consumed scarce resources of both time and money from the government and the populace, again diverting interest away from the arts.

And thirdly, little precedent for government support of the arts existed prior to 1946. No other Canadian government or any other North American government had an official arts policy during the period (C. Padfield, personal communication, September

19, 1994). Support for artists from wealthy patrons still existed in some countries, but had never really been established in Canada. The Alberta government did not have any other government example to follow in terms of an arts policy and thus had little motivation to hurry into establishing an arts policy.

Additionally, prior to 1944 and the presentation to the Turgeon Committee, the artists and art groups were not active in attempting to change this lack of government involvement.

THE SHIFTING POLICY EMPHASIS: SOME OBSERVATIONS

The Alberta government only began moving toward an active role in arts activities in the mid 1940s. Legislation took place in 1946 as part of the postwar reconstruction program. Shifting public attitudes, combined with financial resources and a growing interest by government elites legitimized government entry into the field of arts policy.

The shift in public attitudes coalesced with the public policy of economic expansion. The Alberta government was anxious to publicize the industrial possibilities of the province to attract new investment. Officials wanted to show the rest of the country and the world that Alberta was a mature, forward looking, developed province, not a hinterland that was only a potential source of natural resources to be exploited.

The arts were seen as a way of proving maturity. Officials wanted to show that “the pioneer days of Alberta,” where “hard work and a continual struggle for existence left little time for appreciation of the finer things of life,” had been replaced by a demand for a richer cultural experience (Alberta, Department of Annual Affairs, 1946, p. 14). According to the 1946 *Annual Report* of the Department of Economic Affairs, Albertans “wanted to understand and appreciate music, drama, arts and crafts, folklore and many other spheres of learning and accomplishment, the development of which marks the maturity of a people.” Albertans had developed beyond a frontier mentality; they were ready to appreciate leisure time that allowed for the enjoyment of artistic activities.

Related to the desire to develop an industrial base came the desire to attract people to the province. Tourism was seen as growing in importance, and any expenditure for the purpose of expanding the tourist trade was considered a lucrative investment (Alberta, 1946). Again the arts were a measure of maturity that could be used to attract new people to the province.

The Canadian federal government was taking initiatives in the area of arts policy, such as the consideration of the arts by the federally appointed Turgeon Committee, which may have encouraged the Alberta government to take action. By including the arts in the postwar reconstruction plan, Alberta became the first province to enact arts legislation. It was followed by the first municipal arts council, formed in Vancouver in 1946, and the Saskatchewan Arts Board, created in 1948 (Schafer & Fortier, 1989, p. 78). A growing acceptance and expectation of government involvement in the arts was beginning to emerge.

NOTES

- 1 The Alberta Theatre Performance Calendar Database provides an bibliographic index to performances in selected cities in Alberta from 1885 to 1990.

Website: <http://home.uleth.ca/sfa-apc/>

REFERENCES

- Alberta. (1946). *Statutes of Alberta*. Edmonton: King's Printer.
- Alberta. Department of Economic Affairs. (1946-1960). *Annual Report*. Edmonton.
- Banff Centre for the Arts. (1996). *Handbook*. Banff: Author.
- Canada. House of Commons. (1944). *Special Committee of the House of Commons on Reconstruction and Re-establishment: Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*. Ottawa: King's Printer.
- Day, M., & Potts, M. (1987). Elizabeth Sterling Haynes: Initiator of Alberta Theatre. *Theatre History in Canada*, 8 (1), 8-35.
- Jameson, S. (1987). *Chautauqua in Canada*. Calgary: Glenbow-Alberta Institute.
- Johnston, A. & den Otter, A. (1985). *Lethbridge: A Centennial History*. Lethbridge: The City of Lethbridge.
- Kallman, H. (1960). *A History of Music in Canada 1534 - 1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mann, G. (1993). *Theatre Lethbridge: A History of Theatrical Production in Lethbridge, Alberta (1885-1988)*. Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.
- Schafer, D. & Fortier, A. (1989). *Review of Federal Policies for the Arts in Canada (1944-1988)*. Ottawa: The Canadian Conference of the Arts.
- Skinner, C. (1996). "The Actors Excelled Their First Efforts": Amateur Theatre in Lethbridge, Alberta, 1885-1900. *Prairie Forum* 21 (1), 17-27.
- Skinner, J, and Conine, J. (1997). *The Alberta Theatre Performance Calendar Database*. <http://home.uleth.ca/sfa-apcl/>.
- Stuart, E. (1984). *The History of Prairie Theatre: The Development of Theatre in Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan 1833 - 1982*. Toronto: Simon and Pierre.
- Wetherell, D. & Kmet, I. (1990). *Useful Pleasures: The Shaping of Leisure in Alberta 1896 - 1945*. Regina: Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism and Canadian Plains Research Centre.

CHAPTER 2

THE ENTRY OF THE ALBERTA GOVERNMENT INTO PERFORMING ARTS POLICY: 1946-1970

Following World War II, the Alberta government entered a formative period of arts policy-making. The government began a policy of conscious support for the arts with the passage of the *Cultural Development Act* in 1946 and the creation of bureaucratic structures to support its implementation.

This chapter reviews these early years of Alberta government involvement in the arts. First, the initial piece of arts legislation will be described. Second, the chapter will identify entrants into the arts policy advocacy coalition. These include government agencies and officials and provincially established arts boards. The impact of the federal government activity involving the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts and the creation of the Canada Council on provincial arts policy will also be discussed. Finally, the expansion of government arts policy, continuing support for arts activities from educational institutions and special events like the Centennial celebrations that began to occur in the late 1960s will be analyzed.

THE CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT ACT

With little media attention, the *Cultural Development Act* was passed on March 27, 1946 (Alberta, 1946a). It was this Act that articulated the initial arts policy for the province. The Act was based on the understanding that “it is desirable that the utmost encouragement be given to the cultural development of the People of the Province” (Alberta, 1946a). This statement became the foundation for future government arts policy. As stated in the Act, the function of the Alberta government was to provide for the “encouragement, co-ordination, expansion and development of different aspects of the cultural life of the Province, and in particular, library facilities in both urban and rural districts, music, art, drama, handicrafts and physical recreation” (Alberta, 1946a). The

Cultural Development Act was also nationally significant because it was the first legislation with respect to the arts by a government in Canada.

The Act established the principle of government support for the arts and provided public recognition to the arts. Additionally, the Act facilitated the establishment of the first government administrative structures to support the arts, which included a coordinator of cultural activities, volunteer boards, and later music and drama divisions within the government department. These structures assisted with the expansion of arts activities throughout the province.

The Act defined the arts as music, art, and drama and related the arts to activities such as physical recreation, libraries, and handicrafts. This defined the arts as a leisure activity making them a necessary part of quality of life. At this stage in policy development, a consensus was emerging among participants within the advocacy coalition over the role and importance of the arts.

Although the Act marked the first legislation in the area of arts policy, some activities remained as they had been before the legislation. The government continued its support of the arts through subsidizing music and drama festivals that had started after World War II (Wetherell & Kmet, 1990, p. 246). The education sector continued its support of the arts through the University of Alberta establishment of a Drama Department in 1947 (Stuart, 1984, p. 154) and The Banff Centre arts programs.

Thus, the period from 1946 to 1970 was characterized by the shared belief among political elites, both non-governmental and governmental, that art was a necessary part of the quality of life – art was an activity that should be an option for any individual's leisure time. As any individual should have the choice to participate in sports, volunteer work or horticulture, they should also have the opportunity to participate in the arts. Moreover, a flourishing arts scene signalled that a neighborhood was progressive and forward looking. Thus, it was desirable for a neighborhood to offer arts activities to its residents, as well as use arts to attract new residents to the neighborhood.

NEW GOVERNMENTAL STRUCTURES

The Cultural Development Act set forth the initial governmental structures for implementing arts policy. It included boards, a Co-ordinator of Cultural Activities, a department responsible for arts, and a Minister responsible for arts as part of his portfolio of Economic Affairs.

Boards

The new legislation allowed for the establishment of Boards, composed of private individuals appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council on recommendation of the Minister, to carry out the functions described by the Act. The Alberta Music Board was created in 1946 followed by the Drama Board, created in 1947 (Wetherell & Kmet, 1990, p. 229). Board activities varied from the sponsorship of concerts by Alberta artists to festivals, tours, and competitions for drama groups.

The Boards, as opposed to a departmental type of organization — that was hierarchical, regulatory, and accountable to the legislature through a minister (Kernaghan & Siegel, 1991) – were set up by government to experiment with an arm's length adjudication process. As Hillman-Chartrand (1986) points out, the arm's length principle allows for a separation of powers. A board receives resources, such as grants, from the government and distributes these resources on behalf of the government, thus removing the government from the decision of which artist will receive what type or how much support. The principle is intended to avoid "undue concentration of power and conflict of interest" (Hillman-Chartrand, 1986, p. 2).

The Boards provided the government with a convenient mechanism to recognize the previous contributions of private individuals in arts activities by allowing them a voice in the new government responsibilities as outlined in the legislation. Also, through participation in the arts Boards, the government attempted to involve private citizens in the process rather than exclude and alienate them. At this point in time a relatively cosy

arrangement was beginning to occur between government and non-governmental participants within the advocacy coalition.

The use of a regulatory structure by the government would have opened the door for potential allegations of censorship of art or the creation of a government-condoned version of art. The government wished to encourage, not regulate the arts. By using the Boards as a means to carry out the functions outlined in the Act, the government was able to support and encourage the development of the arts while maintaining community involvement and giving a degree of legitimacy to recent government activity in the policy area. Because the government was entering an area which was traditionally the preserve of the private sector, it needed to be perceived as maintaining the contributions from the private sector and cooperating in this new policy area, not as controlling it and avoiding allegations of government-directed art.

Divisions

The government later created Divisions within the Department of Economic Affairs that paralleled the arts disciplines represented by the boards. The Drama Division was established in 1955, with the Music and Art Divisions being created later (Stuart, 1984, p. 125). The Divisions provided administrative support to the Boards. Functionally, they also differed from the Boards in that they were staffed by a paid government bureaucrat, which gave a direct line of financial accountability through the departmental budget to the legislature. As the government continued to expand its support for the arts, the use of public money and resources demanded a greater level of accountability, which was available through the departmental device of Divisions.

The Boards and Divisions operated in conjunction with each other until 1968, when the Boards were dissolved and their responsibilities were transferred to the Divisions. By 1967, the Boards were operating at a limited capacity considering their original purpose of carrying out the functions described in the Cultural Development Act. The 1967 *Annual Report of the Department of the Provincial Secretary* describes the

boards as “associated with the branch in an advisory capacity” (p. 29). The functions of the boards had been largely taken over by the Divisions before the Boards were dissolved. The 1968 *Annual Report* contains no mention of the Boards or the dissolution. The Boards were not immediately replaced by an alternative consulting or advisory mechanism, probably due to the upcoming provincial election.

Dissolving the Boards and moving their functions to the departmental Divisions had a long-term effect on government structure and policy, in that it provided the opportunity for the creation in 1972 of an art foundation modeled after the Canada Council, which was a new structure for supporting the arts that involved private citizens in addition to government staff. A more immediate effect of the dissolution of the Boards suggests that the government was no longer in a formative phase of arts policy where it was trying to gain legitimacy for its activities in a new policy area.

Co-ordinator of Cultural Activities

Another position outlined in the legislation was that of a Co-ordinator of Cultural Activities. The duties of the office included, among other activities, “co-ordinating and correlating the activities of various cultural agencies with the policies of the respective Boards” (Alberta, 1946b, p. 196.). The Co-ordinator also acted as the secretary for the various Boards.

The position of Cultural Co-ordinator, within the Department of Economic Affairs, was given to Richard MacDonald in 1946. He was succeeded by Blake MacKenzie in 1950. These men functioned primarily to provide continuity to the direction of the Department’s arts activities and to provide administrative support to the Boards. According to the *Department of Economic Affairs Annual Report* (1951), “as far as possible the methods of the former Co-ordinator [MacDonald] have been followed, so that the general direction of cultural development in the Province remains unaltered” (p. 23). Both Co-ordinators supported the government’s continued and growing activity in the arts. MacKenzie was replaced by J.E. Plewes (Acting) in 1955, and then by Walter Kaasa

in 1956. Kaasa remained as Co-ordinator throughout the rest of the period, until 1970. He was an enthusiastic proponent of the arts, believing that “active participation in ... the arts ...not only provides the opportunity to spend leisure time in a useful way but also enables the individual to enrich his own life and make a contribution to the cultural life of the community” (Alberta, Department of the Provincial Secretary, 1967, p. 28). In his *Annual Report for the Cultural Development Branch* (1968), Kaasa wanted to see the “further extension of branch activities into more Alberta communities,”(p. 8) and he encouraged artists to “approach government agencies at all levels for financial and other assistance” (p. 9). It was during his tenure that Alberta Culture and the first arts Foundations were later created. Because of his lengthy, uninterrupted term, Kaasa provided a sense of continuity to the government arts activities, despite changes in the organization in terms of departmental responsibility and ministerial leadership.

Department

Responsibility for the new *Cultural Development Act* was placed in the Cultural Activities branch of the Department of Economic Affairs. The location of responsibility for the arts within a particular government department reflected the definition given to arts activities. After the struggle of the pioneer days and the War “the people of Alberta emerged as a social entity and long suppressed desires for cultural experiences demanded expression” (Alberta, 1946a, p. 14). People wanted to fill their free time with pursuits of “learning and accomplishment” (Alberta, 1946a, p. 14). Culture was grouped in the Department of Economic Affairs with the Housing Branch, the Publicity Branch, the Travel Bureau, and the Technical Development Branch that focused on developing services to the community. These branches were responsible for encouraging growth through the attraction of new industry and people to Alberta by promoting the province as a developed and progressive area. Arts and cultural activities, along with the industrial potential of the province, were considered to make Alberta a desirable place to live.

The location of the Cultural Activities branch within the Department of Economic Affairs continued until 1959 when it was moved to the Department of the Provincial Secretary. This relocation was part of a larger government reorganization that dissolved the Department of Economic Affairs. All leisure activities were transferred to the Department of the Provincial Secretary, reinforcing the view of art as a leisure activity by continuing to group the arts with other leisure activities such as recreation and libraries.

In 1960, the Cultural Activities branch was renamed the Branch of Recreation and Cultural Development. The branch was reorganized again in 1966, which created the Branch of Cultural Development separate from recreation. While still grouped with other leisure activities under the Provincial Secretary, the arts were recognized as being related to, but having a separate identity from, the other leisure activities.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ACTIVITY

While the Alberta government was entering the arts policy field, the federal government was also making corresponding initiatives in arts policy. These federal initiatives provided a long-term influence through the creation of the Canada Council.

The Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (Massey-Levesque Commission) was established in 1949 by the federal government in response to pressure from Universities, the Canadian Arts Council, provincial and municipal governments, and arts associations. It recognized “the need to address the federal government’s role in the development of the arts in Canada” (Schafer & Fortier, 1989, p. 7). The study was part of the federal government’s increasing responsibility for Canada’s “economic and social destiny,” and made recommendations based on “the conviction [that] the federal action was essential at the time, and on all fronts, to make Canada a great and united country” (Schafer & Fortier, 1989, p. 7-8). The federal government had reasoning similar to the Alberta government, in that the arts were a way of promoting Canada as a nation. This similarity helped to give legitimacy to the Alberta government’s arts policy direction.

The most important recommendation of the Commission, based on a brief presented to the Turgeon Committee, was the establishment of a National Council which would be responsible for “promoting the creation and production of works of art in various disciplines” (Schafer & Fortier, 1989, p. 8). While this recommendation was not acted on when the report was released in 1951, it was realized with the creation of the Canada Council in 1957.

Canada Council

The Canada Council, established by statute as a corporation in 1957, had the objective “to foster and promote the study and enjoyment of, and the production of works in, the arts” (Canada, 1985, Vol II, Chapter C-2, p. 2). Employees of the council were not bureaucrats, that is, they were not part of the public service of Canada (p. 3). The Council’s initial funding consisted of a \$50-million endowment, which came from the death duties on the estates of Sir James Dunn and Isaak Walton Killam (Woodcock, 1985, p. 55). The Council provided a central agency to which artists could look to for support and became a publicly identifiable show of government support for the arts.

The Canada Council’s immediate effect on the Alberta arts policy community was to provide an alternate source of funding and support. It was not until the 1970s that the Alberta government seriously considered the Canada Council as a model upon which to create a provincial agency. The result was the creation of the Alberta Arts Foundations which will be discussed in the following chapter.

EXPANSION OF THE ADVOCACY COALITION

Towards the end of the 1960s professional artists began to play a more significant role within the advocacy coalition. Increasing levels of support from educational institutions and the government, along with funding available for the Centennial celebrations, elevated the professional artist within the arts community. A major part of the increased role of the professional artist was the expansion of the scope of the performing arts.

Dance, which had previously been limited to primarily a social event, evolved to include performance and the study of areas such as ballet, jazz, and character. Part of this expansion was the formation of The Alberta Ballet Company in 1966 (Alberta Ballet, 1996), which included both a school for ballet and a professional touring company as a new participant in the arts advocacy coalition.

The evolution in dance was paralleled by the growth of professional theatre artists - actors, producers, playwrights, among others, and the growth in number and types of musicians, such as: classical, jazz, popular, and folk. Organizations such as Theatre Calgary (1966) and the Citadel Theatre (1965) were formed during this time. The arts were pursued by artists as an area of study, not just as an activity for leisure time. This growth of professionalism was also a continuation of the development of the amateur arts in the province. As described by Walter Kaasa: "it takes many years of work and sacrifice by amateur groups to create an interest in the arts" (Alberta. Department of the Provincial Secretary. Cultural Development Branch 1968, p. 8). The amateur artist creates a growing audience for the arts.

Despite the flourishing of professional arts activity, professional artists were a group that did not fit within the existing government support system, which was expected to provide them with a level of support comparable to the amateur artist. The professional artist had a different set of needs and expectations from government. For example, grants might form part of a professional artist's income and while these subsidies may be generous to an amateur group, they provide little assistance to a professional company with salaries to cover. The growth of the professional artist was responded to by government arts policy through the creation of the arts foundation in 1978 and new grants specific to touring professionals.

The response of the government to the needs of professional artists signalled the stability of the advocacy coalition during this policy phase. Government largess seems to

be readily accepted by artists. The arts community was unified with no competition for resources or strong disagreement upsetting the balance.

REFERENCES

- Alberta. Department of the Provincial Secretary. Cultural Development Branch. (1968). *Annual Report*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Department of the Provincial Secretary. (1946a). *Annual Report*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. (1946b). *Statutes of Alberta*. Edmonton: King's Printer.
- Alberta. Department of Economic Affairs. (1946-1960). *Annual Report*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Department of the Provincial Secretary. (1960-1970). *Annual Report*. Edmonton.
- Alberta Ballet. (1996). *Alberta Ballet Homepage*.
<http://www.culturenet.ca/cpaa/memberinfo/alberta-ballet>.
- Banff Centre for the Arts. (1996). *Handbook*. Banff: Author.
- Canada. (1985). *Statutes of Canada*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Canadian Conference for the Arts. *Who are We?* Ottawa: Author.
- Hillman-Chartrand, H. (1986). Towards the International Evaluation of Arts Council Funding. Presented to *The Fourth International Conference on Cultural Economics and Planning*. Avignon, France.
- Kernaghan, K. & Siegel, D. (1991). *Public Administration in Canada*. Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.
- Schafer, D. & Fortier, A. (1989). *Review of Federal Policies for the Arts in Canada (1944-1988)*. Ottawa: The Canadian Conference of the Arts.
- Stuart, E. (1984). *The History of Prairie Theatre: The Development of Theatre in Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan 1833 - 1982*. Toronto: Simon and Pierre.
- Wetherell, D. & Kmet, I. (1990). *Useful Pleasures: The Shaping of Leisure in Alberta 1896 - 1945*. Regina: Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism and the Canadian Plains Research Centre.
- Woodcock, G. (1985). *Strange Bedfellows: The State and the Arts in Canada*. Vancouver: Douglas & MacIntyre Ltd.

CHAPTER 3

POLICY IMPLEMENTATION THROUGH ALTERNATIVE POLICY INSTRUMENTS: 1970-1991

Following the election of Alberta's first Conservative government in 1971, the Alberta arts community experienced a period of extensive growth which lasted until 1991. The arts were used to help celebrate and commemorate Alberta's 75th Anniversary, the 1974 World Exposition, and the 1976 Olympic Games. The Alberta Government expanded its role in arts activities through the creation of a separate Department responsible for arts and culture in 1975 and provided an increase in funding of the arts from \$4.2 million budgetary allocation by the Department of Culture in 1980 to \$15.2 million (budgetary allocation by the Department combined with Art Foundation funds) in 1989 (see Appendix 5). The increase in funding was made possible in part from windfall oil profits and lotteries revenue. Public awareness of the arts was on the increase.

This chapter will focus upon the development that occurred within the arts advocacy coalition from 1970 to 1991, which included the reorganization of the government department responsible for the arts and the entry of new participants into the advocacy coalition such as the government-created Arts Foundations and Decidedly Jazz Danceworks.

This chapter will conclude with a discussion of the policy shift towards a decreased role for government in the arts, which was motivated by factors such as the recession, and the growing government deficit. These factors led to a change in government spending priorities and a reduction in government resources for the arts by the early 1990s. This economic factor combined with the philosophy of privatization made certain activities such as the arts expendable in terms of government support. For example, the role of government officials in adjudicating the relevant importance of art activities through the financial support of granting mechanisms or choosing which artists should be allowed to participate in the annual arts conference came under fire as

inappropriate activities for publicly funded staff members. Finally, the concluding discussion will suggest factors that led to the downsizing and restructuring of arts policy characteristic of the post-1991 period.

PARTICIPANTS

Re-organization of the Government Department Responsible for the Arts

In 1971, a government reorganization resulted in responsibility for the arts being transferred from the Department of the Provincial Secretary to the newly created Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation. According to the latter Department's *First Annual Report*, the Department's functions were "to initiate, foster and encourage the orderly development of all constructive forms of culture, youth and recreational activities" (Alberta. Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation, 1971, p. 70).

By 1974, the Department experienced an accelerated public demand for services which reflected the greater interest of people generally in leisure pursuits (Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation, *Annual Report*, 1974, p. 3). The increased interest was recognized when the organizational relationship changed in 1975. Arts, culture, youth and recreation were split into separate departments to clearly identify culture from sports. The responsibility for the arts was placed in the new Department of Culture. The *Department of Culture Act* specified that the Minister could enter into agreements "concerning the cultural development of Alberta or historical resources in Alberta" (*Revised Statutes of Alberta*, 1980). The Act also allowed the Minister to define what activities were related to culture for the purposes of government guaranteed loans.

The Department of Culture was a junior, small-budget portfolio, but it gave a boost to public recognition for the arts. Another restructuring of the Department occurred in 1986, with the addition of multiculturalism to the Department of Culture. The addition, as its name implies, reflected the national emphasis on the cultural mosaic, and thus dovetailed with the emerging federal policy on multiculturalism. For practical purposes the mandate of the department was broadened as was the definition of art, which was now

linked with multiculturalism, recognizing the folk arts and the ethnic heritage aspect of art. The Department remained basically unchanged until 1993.

Throughout the changes at the departmental level, little change occurred at the branch level. From 1966, when the Provincial Secretary had responsibility for the arts, through to the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism in 1991, cultural development was a separate branch within the department. The branch retained its internal organization which was based on discipline (that is, a different division was established to correspond to the different arts activities, such as the Drama or Music Divisions), and Walter Kaasa remained as Director until 1982, when he was followed by Glen Buick, who remained until 1990.

The reorganization of the arts policy portfolio during the period from 1971 to 1986 can be evaluated from several perspectives. Instead of a more basic decision on whether or not to support arts activities, the relocation of responsibility for the arts in various departments reflected varying degrees of emphasis on support for cultural activities. A stronger department such as the Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation may have put the arts in a better position within the Cabinet hierarchy. The cabinet portfolio for cultural activities, however, has symbolic value. By locating the responsibility in a separate department, cultural activities, which include art, appear to have a higher priority and importance to members of the arts policy advocacy coalition than when the responsibility is located in a much larger department with several responsibilities.

Political Leadership

Horst Schmid became the Minister of the newly created Department of Culture, Youth, and Recreation in 1971. He remained as Minister during the change to the Department of Culture in 1975, and left the Department in 1977. Schmid was described as being "not only sympathetic to culture but effective in getting money for cultural programs" (Stuart, 1984, p. 126). During Schmid's tenure in office the arts gained considerable recognition. It was under Schmid that the first foundation - The Alberta Art

Foundation - was created in 1972 to support the visual arts. He also engineered the successful creation of the Department of Culture. The initial step to create The Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts that was finally established in 1978 also took place.

According to Johnson (1981), a minister's policy-making role involves the functions of surveillance whereby ideas are criticized, scrutinized, as well as refined and the function of legitimation where a policy must be promoted to receive cabinet acceptance. Minister Horst Schmid was able to synthesize the growing interest in the arts with the favorable economic climate in the province to articulate and promote support for the arts.

Mary J. LeMessurier replaced Schmid as Minister in 1978. She was supported by the continuation of C. Les Usher as Deputy Minister and Kaasa as Director of the Arts Branch. At the end of her tenure as Minister, the Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts was created. LeMessurier was replaced by Dennis L. Anderson in 1985, and Greg Stevens in 1986. While Anderson and Stevens held short terms in office, J.S. O'Neill, Deputy Minister from 1979 to 1992, and Glen Buick, director of the Cultural Activities Branch from 1982 to 1990, provided continuity to the Department and the activities with respect to the arts. Doug Main became minister in 1988, with his term continuing to 1992.

The lengthy terms of the Deputy Minister and of the Director of the Cultural Development Branch suggest that they had the potential for a great deal of influence on both the Minister and the operations of the Department. The Deputy Minister and the Branch functioned to provide the Minister with briefing memos (C. Padfield, personal communication, September 1994). These memos alerted the Minister to situations in need of consideration, for example, when other provinces were considering a new policy or a problem had developed with respect to a specific departmental procedure. Through these memos and any follow-up information, the bureaucratic staff controls the information flow to the Minister, which allows them to promote specific policies or items for action. This control is tempered by the Minister who has the final authority to decide which items

he would like additional information on or which will be acted upon. The durability of bureaucrats and ministers provided both continuity and change in arts policy.

The Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts

The Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts was established on May 16, 1978 through an amendment to the *Cultural Development Act*. Part 2 of this Act, which referred to the establishment of the new foundation (Alberta. *Statutes of Alberta*, 1978, p. 108) is identified in later statutes as the *Cultural Foundations Act* (Alberta. *Revised Statutes of Alberta*, 1980, p. 1385).

The Foundation had three stated objectives:

- (a) to promote the performing arts in Alberta;
- (b) to provide persons and organizations the opportunity to participate in the performing arts;
- (c) to support and contribute to the development of the performing arts (Alberta. *Statutes*, 1978, p. 108).

It was modeled after the Alberta Art Foundation (AAF), created in 1972. The AAF specifically focused upon the visual arts, and thus does not fall within the purview of this study. It was significant because it was a model for the more recent Foundation for the Performing Arts which provided support to the performing arts (refer to Appendix 1).

The Foundations were corporations at arm's length from the government. Of Kernaghan and Siegel's (1991) several rationales for the creation of a crown corporation, one is particularly relevant for the area of arts policy. The corporation model gave the government a policy instrument that allowed them to support the arts, while maintaining a distance between government and the artist in order to prevent allegations of government intervention in the creative process of the artist. Additionally, the government was filling a void left by the relative absence of non-governmental funding, since Alberta did not have any private philanthropic organizations such as the Carnegie Foundation. The Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts, therefore, was a new structure in both the public and private realms. Second, the Foundation attempted to provide regular, equitable service throughout the province. Grants and support were publicized and available to any

artist wishing to follow the application process. That is, the grants and supports of the Foundation were specified through eligibility criteria based on discipline and types of activities funded. Funds were distributed based on formula calculation or a competitive jury process and were not assessed on a case-by-case basis.

The Foundation's board of directors were drawn from the general public and appointed by the Lieutenant Governor in Council. No special criteria or qualifications for the directors were stated in the enabling legislation. These members were volunteers and were not government personnel selected through the Public Service Commission. They were paid for their out-of-pocket expenses only and received no remuneration for the time involved in their work for the Foundation.

The Foundation received direction from the Minister of Culture. According to the legislation, the Minister may give direction to the Foundation for the purpose:

- (a) of providing priorities and guidelines for it to follow in the exercise of its powers; and
- (b) of co-ordinating the work of the foundation with the programs, policies and work of the Government and of public and private institutions, in order to avoid duplication of effort and expense (Statutes of Alberta, 1978, p. 110).

Funds for the Foundation came from three sources with the primary source of money being the Government of Alberta Lottery Fund. A second source was the interest accrued from the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts Reserve Fund, an investment fund "to provide a long-term autonomous source for the Foundation's grant program" (Alberta. Foundation for the Performing Arts, 1984). Gifts, bequests, and fundraising formed the third source of funding.

The Foundation's mandate was outlined in the *First Annual Report* (1979). Generally, projects were considered for support which:

- (a) involved co-operation between two or more organizations, institutions or agencies engaged in performing arts activities; or
- (b) assisted individuals or organizations in the presentation of national or international touring (p. 2).

Projects were evaluated on four criteria:

- (a) those which increased public awareness in the performing arts;
- (b) those which developed research in the area of the performing arts or in arts administration;
- (c) those which gave performing artists the opportunity to perform and/or become known nationally and internationally; or
- (d) those projects which encouraged co-operative and/or co-ordinated programs for administrative support of performing arts activities (p. 3).

By defining criteria for the evaluation of projects, the Foundation was defining how its mandate would be fulfilled.

Programs of the Foundation grew and evolved in response to changes within the arts community. In 1981, the Foundation established "The Performing Arts Incentive Funding Program." The object of the program was "deficit reduction for the professional performing arts organizations in the province" (Alberta Culture. *Annual Report*, 1984, p.3). The program was an attempt on the part of the Foundation to help arts organizations achieve balanced budgets.

In 1984, the eligibility criteria for funding from the Foundation was clarified. Who qualified for financial assistance was defined as "individuals and organizations, professional and non-professional [amateurs], who are involved in or contribute to the performance, production, and creation of the performing arts in Alberta" (Alberta Culture, 1984, p. 3). Disciplines in the performing arts were defined to include: dance, video, mime, etc. The types of projects eligible to receive funding were categorized into four areas: Exposure, Marketing/Audience Development, Management/Administration, and Research (p. 3).

The criteria for supporting projects was further defined. Funding would be granted to projects of artistic merit which:

- (1) are unique and/or innovative and enhance and enrich an individual's or an organization's usual and recurring activities; or
- (2) are of long-term benefit to the career of an individual artist or to the artistic growth or financial health of an arts organization; or

- (3) promote co-operation among organizations and the concentration of their efforts; and
- (4) are not eligible for funding under existing programs of Alberta Culture (p. 3).

Projects had to meet the following additional criteria:

- (1) be designed to meet a well-defined need;
- (2) increased public awareness of the performing arts in Alberta; and
- (3) have potential benefit for Alberta's performing arts community and the Province as a whole (p. 3).

While these new criteria reiterated the original funding priorities, they also helped to further define the Foundation's support of the performing arts. The importance of cooperation between organizations and the need to increase public awareness were emphasized, as was the restatement of the importance of avoiding the duplication of services. The Foundation would not fund the entire budget of a project and applicants were to first investigate "all other possible funding sources" (Alberta Culture, 1984, p. 3). The Foundation was moving towards a clearly defined policy of what types of performing arts activities it would support.

The role of the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts continued to evolve. In the 1984 Alberta Culture *Annual Report*, the Foundation's Board of Directors perceived its role to be a "facilitative and enabling" (p. 4) with respect to the promotion of the performing arts in Alberta. By 1989, in addition to the partnership with Alberta Culture, the community partnership role for the Foundation became evident. This role is clear in the declaration of the function of the Foundation. "The Foundation for the Performing Arts, *in partnership with many Albertans*, plays an important role in maintaining and enhancing the cultural growth of our province"(my emphasis) (Alberta Culture, 1989, p. 2). In 1989, the Foundation approved several new project grants based on specific activities such as touring in rural areas or organizing festivals.

Professional Artists

Unlike previous policy periods, professional arts groups such as the Alberta Ballet Company, established in 1966, and Decidedly Jazz Danceworks, established in 1984, emerged as participants in the arts policy sector. These professional companies were composed of paid artists whose primary employment was membership in the company. The growth of these companies was important because they were another group, along with amateur artists, seeking government funding.

Generally, the funding requirements of the professional artists were much greater than those for amateur artists because of the costs for production, administration, staff, and artistic personnel. The professional companies often required continuing grants, as opposed to project grants, to help subsidize their operating budgets.

These needs were met by the government through the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts in 1981. The Performing Arts Incentive Fund Program was aimed at reducing the deficit of professional companies. The professional artists were also recognized by the Foundation in 1984 when they were specifically listed as a type of applicant eligible for funding. The professional artist created a new demand for support, which the government responded to through the expansion of the activities of the Foundation.

POLICY SHIFTS

Western Canadian Lottery Foundation

The Alberta government tied arts policy to economic policy by entering into its first lottery¹ agreement in 1974, with the creation of the Western Canada Lottery Foundation (WCLF). Membership in the agreement included: Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and British Columbia; the Yukon and Northwest Territories were included as associate members. Prior to 1974, there were no government-operated lotteries in Alberta (Hillman-Chartrand & Ruston, 1982, p. 33). Arts and culture received 20% of the net

income of the WCLF in Alberta (Hillman-Chartrand & Ruston, 1982, p. 34). This agreement resulted in new financial support for arts activities.

Because lottery money was not generated through tax dollars, it constituted a type of windfall gain for the government. Rather than direct the additional funds to the already large budgets of social programs such as health care, the government channeled the revenue to non-essential, but socially desirable activities such as recreation and the arts. This funding was originally designated to supplement the arts budget, but later became the bulk of the budget. By 1991, the Alberta Foundation for the Arts' entire budget of \$17 million was lottery funded. (After the amalgamation of the arts Foundations in 1991, funding for the performing arts was included in the Alberta Foundation for the Arts' budget. See page 50.)

The shift to lottery funding for the arts was a gradual movement by the government away from funding the arts through general tax revenues. While this shift in funding showed a shift in government priority towards a scaling down of its commitment to the arts, in reality it ensured continued funding to the arts. Department staff view the lottery funding as a success for the arts, because these funds have been safe from government cutbacks. While Departmental programs and staff funded from general revenues have been cut, lottery funds have remained constant, thus maintaining arts funding through the Alberta Foundation for the Arts. This safety does not provide a guarantee of continued funding for the arts. A renegotiation of the Lottery Agreement, or a drop in lottery revenues, would mean diminished dollars available for arts funding.

Looking Ahead: A New Approach for Arts Policy

In 1987, the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism's Cultural Development Division initiated a strategic planning process to clarify its role with respect to the arts community. This process included the publication of the booklet: "Looking Ahead: Toward Partnership for Cultural Development in Alberta" (Alberta. Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism, 1989). This booklet was "designed to encourage and facilitate wide

discussion for the Division's plans" (p. 2). The Division wanted to test the response of the arts community to its proposals. Legitimacy for the government's role in the arts as a supporter of the arts, but not as a controller of the arts was assumed in the plan. The question of whether or not to support the arts was not a major concern; the question of how to support the arts was the central issue.

The plan was significant because it introduced the concept of 'shared responsibility' of all constituents (p. 4), and the importance of "co-sponsorship and partnership among the cultural community, the private sector, and government" (p. 6). The input from artists or clients indicated that they wanted more influence on the Division's activities, but were also prepared to share the responsibility.

A change from past government arts policy of leaving arts activity relatively undefined was evident in the new policy. The "Looking Ahead" booklet suggested that there was a need for a written policy with respect to the arts. It was argued that the policy should set the context for the Division's activities. A clear role for the Division was necessary to enter partnership agreements with non-governmental participants.

TRANSITION TO THE NEXT PERIOD

By 1991, another transition began to occur within the Alberta arts policy community. The Alberta government entered a period of restructuring with a goal of downsizing. The widespread agreement within the advocacy coalition about the role of the arts that existed in the previous two decades began to dissolve. Following the election of Ralph Klein as premier, the advocacy coalition began a downward spiral as government support for the arts fell victim to the meta-policy of downsizing. The coalition fragmented as various constituents sought to protect their interests. Several factors appear to have contributed to this change — economic, political, and social.

Alberta experienced an economic slowdown in the late 1980s. Government revenues began diminishing due to lower royalties in the gas and oil industries and combined with upward spiralling costs for major social programs such as healthcare and

education. Because Alberta no longer enjoyed the budget surpluses of earlier years, budget restructuring became necessary. The 1990s also saw the election of Ralph Klein as the new leader for the Conservative government. His government reflected a neo-conservative approach to governing that emphasized a balanced budget and private sector takeover of many government functions. This approach led to cutbacks in government's staff and resources, as well as the elimination or amalgamation of government departments, including Alberta Culture, which was incorporated into the Department of Community Development in 1991.

On the political front, two new arts groups emerged within the arts advocacy coalition in the 1990s, namely the The Arts Touring Alliance of Alberta (ATAA) and the Coalition for Cultural Awareness. The ATAA began to offer services that had previously been offered by government to the arts community, as well as beginning a public information campaign to keep the arts on the policy agenda and to attempt to continue to maintain government funding for the arts. Both the ATAA and the Coalition attempted to affect government policy with respect to the arts.

The growing dependency of arts funding on lottery revenues and the introduction of professional artists into the arts policy community changed the interaction of the participants involved in the process. A greater variety of needs and preferences within the arts policy community began to emerge towards the end of the third period, thus making the multifaceted nature of the arts community apparent.

NOTES

- 1 A lottery contains three elements: a prize, a chance for a prize, and a consideration or a bet. A lottery is defined as all games of chance including card games, raffles, casinos, bingos, wheels of fortune as well as ticket lotteries.

REFERENCES

- Alberta. Alberta Culture. (1975-1986). *Annual Report*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism. (1989) *Looking Ahead: Toward Partnership for Cultural Development in Alberta*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation. (1971-1974). *Annual Report*. Edmonton. Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. Foundation for the Performing Arts. (1979-1991). *Annual Report*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. (1978). *Statutes of Alberta*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. (1980). *Revised Statutes of Alberta*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Hillman-Chartrand, H. & Ruston, J. (1982). *Lotteries and the Arts: the Canadian Experience 1970 to 1980*. Ottawa: Research and Evaluation, Canada Council.
- Johnson, A. (1981). A Minister as an Agent of Policy Change: the Case of Unemployment Insurance in the Seventies. *Canadian Public Administration* 24 (4) Winter, 612-633).
- Kernaghan, K. & Siegel, D. (1991). *Public Administration in Canada*. Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.
- Stuart, E. (1984). *The History of Prairie Theatre: The Development of Theatre in Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan 1833 - 1982*. Toronto: Simon and Pierre.

CHAPTER 4

GOVERNMENT DOWNSIZING AND THE INCREASED IMPORTANCE OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN ARTS POLICY: 1991 - 1997

The economic slowdown of the late 1980s, coupled with an increasingly large provincial budgetary deficit, led to new government policies that focused upon organizational and financial downsizing and privatization. The effect of this meta-policy of government retrenchment and privatization forced members of the arts policy coalition to scramble to protect their interests. This led to a fractionalization among non-governmental members as well as between government and non-government parties. The minister and bureaucrats had to conform to the inflexible government policy and the different performing arts participants had to move to protect their own interests. Cooperation became a fragile commodity. The Canada Alberta Cultural Industries Agreement, the amalgamation of the Foundations, and the multifunctional approach of professional artists like Decidedly Jazz Danceworks were important results.

GOVERNMENTAL REORGANIZATION

Following the election of Ralph Klein's government in 1993, responsibility for the arts was moved to the newly created Department of Community Development. Gary Mar became Minister of Community Development in July 1993, following the brief tenure of Diane Mirosch. In October 1996, after a cabinet shuffle and rumors of an upcoming election, Mar was replaced by Shirley McClellan, who had been Minister of Health.

As Minister of Community Development, Gary Mar was a proponent of the arts, but he expected the arts community to share in the responsibility of supporting the arts. The arts community should exhibit "initiative, self-reliance, self-help, and mutual help to play decisive roles in the affairs of their communities" (Mar, 1994, p. 3). He saw the goal of his Department as instituting change to improve quality of life and to provide technical

support and encouragement to communities who themselves should drive the process of change.

The Department of Community Development (DCD) houses responsibility for a wide variety of policy areas ranging from culture, recreation, heritage, to the welfare of senior citizens. According to the Department's *Annual Report* (1993), the merger of functions from previously separate departments was based on the view that each policy area was part of a broader mandate: "to ensure the continuation of the unique Alberta experience and its quality of life." Additionally, the Department was to provide "efficient assistance and technical expertise," to help communities "achieve their goals" (p. 5). The Department was to function as a facilitator to assist communities to become "self-sufficient" and "innovative" (Alberta. Office of the Premier, 1994).

Within the Department, responsibility for the Arts was located in the Arts and Cultural Industries Branch of the Community Services Division. The Arts Branch was further divided into the Arts Services Section, the Arts Awareness Section, the Cultural Industries Section and Film Classification Services Section (Alberta. Community Development, 1993, p. 13).

The Branch's purpose was to "support conditions in which the arts flourish and in which active participation is an integral component of an Alberta lifestyle." It functioned to provide "professional development for individuals, organizational development for arts agencies, and administered grant programs on behalf of the Alberta Foundation for the Arts" (Alberta. Community Development, p. 13-14).

The movement of responsibility for the arts into a larger, multipurpose department had not only a symbolic effect for the arts policy community, but also pointed to a political repositioning of the arts. Arts (as part of Culture) no longer had the distinction of a separate department as Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism; it became just one of the many responsibilities of a larger Department. The arts became one step removed from the public in terms of name recognition and its relation to the purpose of the government

department. The Department of Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism was easily recognizable as having responsibility for arts and culture. By contrast, Alberta Community Development did not list its specific responsibilities. In a sense, the larger Department did provide limited advantages to the arts community. The new Department of Community Development held a stronger political presence within government and was led by more publicly recognizable Ministers. However, it also meant that the branch had to share its resources through the secondment of staff to other branches. Moreover, the arts community was no longer represented in Cabinet by its own minister, but was represented instead by a minister with responsibility for the arts as only one of many varied obligations.

This reorganization within the Branch was a break from the previous structures. The Branch had originally been set up with separate service areas based on discipline, such as Music or Visual Art. By contrast the new organization was based on function and did not distinguish the different disciplines. This melding of the Arts (Visual, Music, and Performing) was similar to the amalgamation of the various Foundations into the Alberta Foundation for the Arts (discussed in the following section). It again reduced the number of public agencies responsible for the arts; that is, Branch activities were no longer recognizable by the specific arts disciplines but by generic services.

Shirley McLellan's assumption of the portfolio in October, 1996, also witnessed a change in the structure of the Department. The Arts and Culture Branch became the Arts, Recreation and Libraries Branch. This organizational change again grouped the arts with recreation, pointing toward a government view of the arts as part of leisure activities.

Amalgamation of the Foundations

A significant restructuring of the Alberta government occurred on September 1, 1991, with the passage of the *Alberta Foundation for the Arts Act*. This new Act repealed the *Alberta Art Foundation Act* and the *Cultural Foundations Act* resulting in the discontinuation of the Alberta Art Foundation, the Alberta Foundation for the Performing

Arts, and the Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts (Alberta, 1991, *Revised Statutes of Alberta*, ch. A-21.5). The new Alberta Foundation for the Arts (AFA) subsumed the mandates of the three former Foundations. The AFA was modeled after the previous Foundations and was created as an arm's length corporation responsible to the Minister.

The AFA's mandate was to support all types of art, where art was defined as "the literary, performing, visual, and media arts, and anything prescribed by the regulations" (Alberta, 1991, *Revised Statutes of Alberta*, ch. A-21.5). The Foundation had five stated purposes:

- (a) to support and contribute to the development of and to promote the arts in Alberta;
- (b) to provide persons and organizations with the opportunity to participate in the arts in Alberta;
- (c) to foster and promote the enjoyment of works of art by Alberta artists;
- (d) to collect, preserve and display works of art by Alberta artists;
- (e) to encourage artists resident in Alberta in their work (Alberta, 1991, *Revised Statutes of Alberta*, ch. A-21.5).

In addition to these stated purposes, and similar to the previous Foundations, the Minister served to provide "priorities and guidelines" (Alberta, 1991, ch. A-21.5) to the AFA.

The combining of the three earlier Foundations and the creation of the new AFA was primarily a cost-saving measure (Buick, 1992, p. 4). The administrative costs for the three Foundations kept rising. In 1987-88, costs for the foundations were \$730,000, and in 1989-90, the costs were \$883,000 (Buick, 1992, p. 4), an increase of 21%. Streamlining the three foundations into one foundation with a larger mandate was intended to reduce the number of board members and staff to in turn decrease the amount of funds spent on administration. This amalgamation of the foundations paralleled changes that were being made in other publicly funded sectors, such as healthcare, where regionalization was taking place.

A second reason for amalgamating the Foundations involved accessibility to grants. Multidisciplinary artists (artists whose work involves elements from more than one area, such as a visual artist who incorporates sound and music into a gallery exhibition

as an integral part of the show) were restricted by the funding provided through the three Foundations. Some artists received funding from two or more sources, while some “found that the system’s discipline-based structure could not accommodate their requests, and received no grant” (Buick, 1992, p. 4). The new Foundation was meant to allow accessibility to grants for all artists.

Initially, the creation of the Foundation met with resistance from within the arts community due to fears of reduced funding and reduced public recognition for each discipline. The amalgamation has not had a significant, long-term negative effect for artists because arts funding was not affected (Alberta. Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism, 1991).

On April 1, 1994, the Minister of Community Development made a significant change to the Alberta Foundation for the Arts. When Glen Buick, Executive Director of the Alberta Foundation for the Arts, retired he was replaced by Dr. Clive Padfield who assumed the position in addition to his role as Director of the Arts and Cultural Industries Branch. This dual responsibility was politically justified to ensure the continuation of the “excellent working relationship that presently exists between the Foundation and the Branch,” (Announcement from the Minister, 1994). Padfield was the administrative liaison who provided the communication link between the Branch and the Foundation. While the dual role for Padfield has not effected the daily operation of the Foundation programs or the granting process, it has meant a change in how the Foundation is publicly represented. Since the transition, the Board Chairman of the Foundation, Jock Olsler, has maintained a more public position with respect to the ongoing activities of the Foundation. For example, during speeches and attendance at special events such as Showcase, the Foundation is represented by the Chairman of the Foundation, a government appointee, not by the Executive Director, a government bureaucrat. The elimination of the separate position of the Executive Director was a measure to reduce the administrative cost of operating the Foundation. The prominent role for the AFA Chairman is part of Minister

Mar's initiative to have the arts community play a more active role, leaving the government to provide technical support (as discussed earlier).

The Canada-Alberta Cultural Industries Agreement

As part of its restructuring, the Alberta provincial and Canadian federal governments entered into a pilot project on arts funding called *The Canada-Alberta Cultural Industries Agreement*. Signed on April 22, 1992, the agreement attempted to provide a stable economic base to selected arts activities (Alberta. Community Development, 1993, p. 15). The agreement encompassed sound recording, book and periodical publishing, and film and video companies, which are collectively referred to as cultural industries. The funds were administered by the Community Services Division of Alberta Community Development.

The agreement was designed to “strengthen the long-term economic viability of Alberta companies active in the cultural industries” (Canada-Alberta, 1992, p. 2). To help these companies the program provided funding support to three types of activity:

- (1) assist cultural industries companies with business and management initiatives designed to assure long-term economic viability;
- (2) assist cultural industries companies and professional associations in the development and expansion of domestic and international marketing and distribution networks, in order to bring Alberta's high-quality cultural products to the consumers, and;
- (3) help companies and associations train and develop a highly-skilled professional workforce to sustain the industry over the long term (Canada-Alberta, 1992, p. 3).

The funds were intended to help companies to establish an organizational infrastructure and a sufficient number of trained employees to be competitive in the marketplace. The four year, \$7 million program “was subsequently reduced by 20 percent due to fiscal restraint at both government levels” (J.L. Nowicki, personal communication, August 5, 1994). This reduction in funds was matched with an oversubscription to the program by artists.

The intent of the agreement was to provide companies with long-term stability, not to fund short-term projects. According to Ruth Bertelsen, general manager of the agreement (Anderson, 1992, p. 2), “the Canada-Alberta agreement is unique because it is based on business planning, not project-specific funding.” The agreement was part of the government’s trend to privatize and reduce dependency on government support. It focused on those types of arts activities which were concerned with economic viability in addition to creativity and expression. This trend may serve as a model for future policy direction.

NEW PARTICIPANTS WITHIN THE ARTS ADVOCACY COALITION

In response to the government’s fiscal restraint, the reorganization of the government agency responsible for arts policy and changes to the grant system, new interest groups have emerged – the Arts Touring Alliance of Alberta, a service-based clientele organization, and the Coalition for Cultural Awareness, an ad hoc public interest group. These groups emerged to represent the interests of members at the provincial level through policy advocacy, participation in the policy process, and service delivery.

The Arts Touring Alliance of Alberta (ATAA)

The Arts Touring Alliance of Alberta (ATAA) is a provincial service organization that supports touring companies of the performing arts. The ATAA originated in the Alberta Showcase of Performing Arts Society, a group which “acted in an advisory capacity to the staff of the Arts Branch,” (Hendrickson, 1993) in the Department of Community Development. The Society, composed of an Advisory Board, functioned to provide input into the planning and coordinating of the annual government arts marketing conference (Alberta Showcase), and to help “develop a proposed structure that would endeavour to meet the needs of the people in the Touring Arts Industry” (Hendrickson, 1993). The ATAA is the structure that emerged.

The government was involved in the development of the ATAA in two key areas: initiative and guidance. The government provided the initial impetus for the formation of

the ATAA through its beginning as the Performing Arts Society to its evolution into the ATAA. That is, the idea for forming the Alliance originated in the Arts Branch. The ATAA is a result of the government initiative “encouraging mutually beneficial partnerships in arts development” (Hendrickson, 1993).

The government provides guidance to the ATAA through a close working relationship. The government and the ATAA are partners in organizing and coordinating the annual Showcase conference. This conference of presenters and artists provides an opportunity to see new artists perform, to contract artists, and to attend workshops. Ongoing contact between the ATAA and the government is maintained through attendance at meetings and department visits. This relationship provides the ATAA with the opportunity to develop contacts with resource people in the government and to learn from government staff who have been active in providing services to the arts community.

The government initiative and support in the growth of the Touring Alliance has allowed the Department to download services to the Alliance. The government has ensured that programs that it has cut [such as the discontinuation of the artists directory], are maintained, without any disruption to consumers of these services. Additionally, by supporting and maintaining a partnership with the Alliance, the government has kept a reputation of being supportive to artists and limited criticism of its cuts to programs. When combined with the financial support from the provincial service organization grant, the government has been able to guide some of the ATAA's activities by including the ATAA as a partner in existing government programs and by encouraging them to take over government initiated projects.

The Alliance has four main functions. In addition to copresenting Showcase, it provides membership benefits such as “access to resource information and a valuable network of colleagues,” (Hendrickson, 1993) as well as a discount on Showcase registration fees, a touring information bulletin, a quarterly newsletter, a presenters' profile (a list of presenters, their average budget, venue information, names, etc.), the

Alberta Performing Artists directory (formerly produced by the government), and discounts to Alliance workshops. Third, the Alliance presents workshops, such as their workshop on Presenting Dance, which occurred in September of 1995. Fourth, it promotes an arts awareness campaign which encourages advocacy on arts issues. The Alliance is trying to create an awareness of who they are and what they do, as well as to increase awareness of arts issues. Because the ATAA receives government funding as a provincial service organization and is essentially a government created clientele group, it is prohibited from actively pursuing advocacy campaigns. Rather than the Alliance publicly pursuing a specific stand on a policy issue it ensures that members are aware of the issues and are provided with the information and resources to respond to these issues. While the lack of an advocacy capacity is a major limitation for the Alliance as an interest group, indirect lobbying and government funding have strengthened the ability of the Alliance to function as a service group for the Arts Touring Industry. This function may expand to allow the Alliance to become a vocational-based organization, providing member services similar to other professional groups such as the Alberta Teachers Association. The long-term growth of the Alliance into a professional service organization is consistent with the government's gradual move toward downsizing and privatization of certain government functions.

Although limited by its mandate and organizational structure, the Alliance does endeavour to ensure that the government continues to provide support to the arts. The Alliance attempts to be involved in the policy process through three main contacts: the Department, the Minister, and the Alberta Foundation for the Arts. The Alliance maintains regular contact with the staff of the Arts Branch through its partnership in presenting Showcase. This contact provides ongoing discussion and awareness of Department activities, and opportunities for the ATAA to express preferences and expectations with respect to these activities. The Alliance board maintains contact with the Minister responsible for the arts (currently the portfolio of Community Development) through

meetings, letters, and phone calls. Similar activities occur to maintain contact with the Board of the Alberta Foundation for the Arts. These activities are ongoing as part of the ATAA's attempt to promote the arts in Alberta. Because of the recent formation of the ATAA, it has a limited record in terms of how its activities have effected government policy.

Coalition for Cultural Awareness

The second group was the short-lived Coalition for Cultural Awareness. Composed of provincial arts and cultural organizations, it functioned to "address common issues and concerns confronting its constituents throughout Alberta" (Coalition for Cultural Awareness, 1993a). The Coalition arose out of a series of meetings involving several Alberta provincial arts associations. The first of these meetings occurred on October 30, 1991, in response to an invitation by Joe Forsyth (Assistant Deputy Minister) to attend a meeting of provincial service organizations. At the October meeting the associations agreed that "a joint lobbying effort is essential to the survival of arts groups, and of the arts in Alberta" (Coalition for Cultural Awareness, 1992). After further meetings of the associations, and meetings with Joe Forsyth, the Coalition for Cultural Awareness was formed on January 18, 1992, with a membership of 21 provincial arts and cultural organizations (Coalition for Cultural Awareness, 1993a). Many of these organizations represented smaller member organizations. For example, the Wordworks Society of Alberta had a membership of 13 organizations which included groups such as the Alberta Booksellers Association. Membership in the Coalition was open to "any interested cultural organization" (Coalition for Cultural Awareness, 1992).

Through meetings initiated by the invitation of Assistant Deputy Minister Forsyth, and which included his attendance, the government department was involved in the creation of the Coalition. This involvement occurred shortly before the announcement by the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism that a series of public meetings were to be held throughout Alberta. These meetings, which took place in May 1992, were part of

a broader government consultation process referred to as "Let's Talk Culture." This initiative provided for small group discussion, open forums, and written submissions. It was designed to seek public input and support for arts funding in the province. An information package which summarized the results of the meetings was released in early fall of 1992. It included recommendations and concerns about the AFA, the Department and arts funding in general. Concerns were raised about stability of funding and the need for long-term planning, the importance of rural arts development, and improved communication.

This consultation process may have been an attempt by the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism to protect its constituency, and therefore preserve the organizational viability of the department (Paltiel, 1982). Since in 1992 Ralph Klein campaigned and was elected on a platform of reduced government spending and downsizing, the Department of Culture and Multiculturalism may have been anticipating its merger into the Department of Community Development and hoped to have a strong, vocal, support group which would oppose this move and the loss of a distinct identity for culture and art.

The purpose of the Coalition was to put "culture on the political, public and personal agendas" (Coalition for Cultural Awareness, 1993b). As part of this objective, the group wanted to emphasize the importance of fine arts in the education system (Coalition for Cultural Awareness, 1993a): "the fine arts stimulate students in all aspects as they prepare to take their place in the social, cultural, and economic life of Alberta."

Thus,

fine arts education is not a "frill" and it is not a luxury to be reserved only for those who can afford it. It is an investment which must be made in all children and young adults to ensure the development of well balanced individuals, some of whom continue their involvement in the arts as adults and become masterful artists (Coalition for Cultural Awareness, 1993a).

The Coalition's broad objective included all aspects of culture, regardless of the discipline or age group involved.

The group attempted to be involved in the policy process through three main areas. First, it encouraged public awareness of the group's concerns. The release of a Political Action Kit, a summary of party positions with respect to culture prior to the last provincial election (1992), was an example of this activity. Second, it prepared briefs for the government. While still in its formative stage the Associations prepared a brief entitled "Provincial Service Organization for the Arts." Third, the organization attempted to act as an advisory or information source for its membership.

The Coalition's life-span was brief. It has held no recent meetings and has dropped its efforts to lobby government. The Coalition was significant because it demonstrated concern from within the arts community for government policy, and it showed initiative by artists in attempts to influence policy. But their activity was not well organized. The associations involved seemed to have been more concerned with a quick response to feared cutbacks, rather than with an attempt to become an ongoing influence in policy formation.

The General Public

In recent years the general public has become occasionally relevant to the arts advocacy coalition and the policy process. For example, members of the public who were not previously active in the arts policy community have become a specifically interested public through criticism of the arts. The recent production of *Angels in America* by Alberta Theatre Projects received criticism from people who were not familiar with the play but who were offended by the content and the subject matter. Opposition has given publicity to the arts and has meant that the government was forced to consider issues such as what types of art receive government funding. The Alberta government has responded with the position that art will be measured against the Canadian criminal law. "Art that breaks laws dealing with obscenity, child pornography, and promotion of hatred against identifiable minorities is subject to criminal prosecution" (Mar, 1994). This contentious

issue of regulating the content of art has been largely avoided by the politicians, but has caused public scrutiny of the arts.

Professional Artists

A number of professional artists have broadened their focus beyond just the creation of art to ensure that they have a greater degree of financial stability. New activities have included an increased emphasis on instruction as well as residency projects. Additionally they have sought funding through alternate, non-governmental sources such as private donation and fund-raising activities.

An example of this approach is Decidedly Jazz Danceworks (DJD). DJD is a professional dance company formed in 1984. While the company was originally established as a professional dance company, it has added a dance school at which the company members act as instructors. The school has been very successful, with classes often wait-listed for prospective students. The school has provided several benefits to the company: the school studios may be used as rehearsal space when they are not occupied, thus eliminating the expense of renting additional space, and it provides a source of community outreach for the company by attracting and providing a liaison between the professional dancers and their amateur dance students, allowing an ongoing contact and exchange of ideas. Additionally, the school allows the company to train their own dancers, ensuring the development of a high-quality professional dancer to apprentice with the company, as well as providing year-round employment for professional dancers, allowing them to focus on their art (dancing), as opposed to seeking alternate, unrelated sources of income.

DJD relies on ticket buyers, dance school students, bingos, individual and corporate donors as well as government grants to maintain financial stability. Unlike other dance companies who receive an average of 41% of their budgets from government funding (Sundstrom, 1996), DJD receives only 11%. DJD has been successful in operating within their budget, and had a surplus in their most recent fiscal year. The move toward

economic stability for DJD, combined with the limited dependence on government funding, may become a model for other professional arts organizations throughout the province.

A second example is Quest Theatre. The Theatre for Young Audiences company tours productions to theatres, schools, and festivals. In addition, Quest coordinates drama workshops for children, as well as participates in residency projects with other organizations such as the University of Lethbridge Division of Theatre and Dramatic Arts. These additional projects provide diversity to the Company, but support the primary focus of the Company.

The concern for economic stability and the decreased dependence on government funding have become important priorities for arts organizations due to the ongoing policy of the Klein government towards government downsizing and the uncertainty of continued lottery funding at existing levels.

REFERENCES

- Alberta. Community Development. (March 4, 1994). *Announcement from the Minister*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Community Development. (March 9, 1994). *Announcement from the Minister*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Community Development. (1993). *Annual Report*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism. (1991). *Working Together: Arts Funding, One Foundation and One Branch*. Edmonton. Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. Office of the Premier. (1994). *A Message from the Premier, Ralph Klein*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. (1991). *Revised Statutes of Alberta*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Allied Arts Council of Lethbridge. (1993). *Letter to Premier Klein*.
- Anderson, T. (1992). Industrial Strength Money for Strong Industries: The New Cultural Industries Agreement. *Arts Bridge: An Arts and Information Publication*, 1 (#1, issues 1), 2.
- Buick, G. (1992). *Provincial Arts Funding in Alberta 1980-1990: A Summary*. Edmonton: Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism.
- Canada-Alberta. (1992). *Agreement on Cultural Industries*.
- Coalition for Cultural Awareness. (1992). *Background Summary*.
- Coalition for Cultural Awareness. (1993a). *Letter to Mr. Halvar Johnson, Minister of Education*.
- Coalition for Cultural Awareness. (1993b). *Compilation of Minutes: October 30, 1991 to September 19, 1993*.
- Hendrickson, D. (1993). *Letter from the Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Alberta Showcase for the Performing Arts Society*. Presented at first annual AGM of the ATAA. Edmonton.
- Mar, G. (1994). Speech give at *Luncheon and Annual General Meeting Arts Touring Alliance of Alberta Showcase '94*. Edmonton: n.p.
- Paltiel, K. (1982). The Changing Environment and Role of Special Interest Groups. *Canadian Public Administration* 25 (2), 198-210.

Quest Theatre. (1998). *Quest Theatre Homepage*.
http://www.iul-css.com/mall/quest_theatre/index.htm.

Sundstrom, K. (1996). Backstage: How's this for a Jazzy Idea: Financial Responsibility.
Hoofer's Log: The Newsletter of Decidedly Jazz Danceworks, November, 2.

CONCLUSION

The year 1946 marked the beginning of the formative period in Alberta arts policy-making. The first legislation, the *Cultural Development Act*, was followed by the appointment of a minister responsible for arts within the portfolio of Economic Affairs. During the next two decades, the responsibility for arts policy shifted into the Office of the Provincial Secretary. Volunteer arts boards based on the drama and music and departmental divisions that mirrored these boards were developed. Also, the position of cultural co-ordinator was created. A period of expansion began in 1970 — arts policy was placed in a separate portfolio in the Department of Alberta Culture, the Art Foundations were created, and the Western Canadian Lottery Foundation agreement was enacted. Since 1991, arts policy has undergone a period of restructuring. The Canada Alberta Cultural Industries Agreement was reached, the three art foundations were amalgamated (see Appendix 1) and the department responsible for performing arts underwent significant change to become a community development-based department. It was also during this period that the government-sponsored arts group, the ATAA, emerged.

From the beginning arts policy involved experimentation with various structures of support such as the early boards and the more recent foundations, reflecting not only governmental desire to develop arm's length relationships with the arts community but also shifts in government thinking about how arts activity should be financed. Departmental financial and personnel resources have changed depending upon the organizational location of this policy sector. Recent years have witnessed a downturn of government support for the arts and a shifting of the financial base for the arts more toward the private sector.

How can the development of performing arts policy in Alberta be explained? My study suggests that the pattern or evolution can be traced to the dynamics of the arts

advocacy coalition, and the particular manner in which the external factors and system parameters steered arts policy development.

ADVOCACY COALITION

Historically, the arts policy advocacy coalition has exhibited a distinct internal hierarchy of influence, thus allowing politicians and bureaucrats a great amount of policy-making freedom. Ministers and deputy ministers have been the most important participants with corresponding levels of influence in the development of arts policy. Their relatively lengthy terms allowed a familiarity with both the policy area and the non-governmental participants, such as the consumers of the department services. In the early years of Alberta arts policy (1946-1970), Ministers Alfred J. Hooke (1946-1955) and A. Russel Patrick (1955-1961) and Deputy Ministers R. Ralph Moore (1946-1958) and E.R. Hughes (1959-1963) were in an initiatory phase of policy development in a new policy area where they could stamp their choice of policy content, policy instruments, and departmental organization on arts policy. Experimentation with the volunteer boards and the departmental divisions which mirrored and then later replaced these boards are examples. Minister Ambrose Holowach and his deputy minister P.B. Howard were in a routinization phase of policy development where the policy matters consisted basically of bureaucratic management and incremental change. When the Conservatives replaced the Social Credit Party in 1971, Horst Schmid was in a position to effect an overall reorganization of arts policy. Under his direction the Department of Alberta Culture and the Foundation for the Performing Arts were created. The election of the Klein Government ushered in a distinctive phase of arts policy development. The meta-policy approach of the Klein government to all policy sectors, in effect, reduced arts policy to a level below the routinization phases. Ministers and senior bureaucrats have functioned within a policy of downsizing and privatization, which has restricted their ability to control policy direction. This has also meant that the new elites within the arts policy advocacy coalition have lost much of their ability to steer policy.

Arts groups have been weak sisters within the advocacy coalition and have not been particularly effective in influencing policy development. Arts group activity has occurred essentially since 1992 when the Arts Touring Alliance of Alberta (ATAA) and the Coalition for Cultural Awareness emerged. Government sponsorship created a patron-client relationship between government agencies and functionally related interest groups (Paltiel, 1982). As suggested by Noel (Paltiel, 1982), the relation between the patron and the client is an exchange relation. While the ATAA benefits from the receipt of both funding and guidance from the Department, the Department benefits because the ATAA has maintained programs which the government has cut, which in turn, provided public support for the department (as supporters of the ATAA). This support allows the government to co-opt the arts groups leaders into their process.¹

Despite initial government support, the short-lived Coalition was hampered by anti-bureaucratic tendencies, as well as the lack of a sufficient grassroots movement expressing concern for issues in arts policy. When ongoing support from the government was not forthcoming, the Coalition faltered and no longer attempted to influence government policy or serve as a supportive arts constituency for governments. The ATAA, in contrast, has acquired many of the characteristics of an 'institutionalized interest group' as defined by Pross (1992). The organization has a well-developed structure with clearly defined bylaws, membership fees and benefits, as well as objectives. Board members have brought the organization extensive knowledge of and connections to government. Government support for the ATAA as a provincial service organization has provided an ongoing resource base. Membership is relatively stable, with plans for maintenance and increases. The developing institutionalization of the ATAA has meant that the organization is well positioned to begin to influence policy, unless government support carries a muzzling effect with it. In which case the group may develop alternatively as a professional organization.

The government role as initiator and sponsor for the arts groups suggests one reason why little advocacy activity occurred prior to 1992. Certain factors have served to prevent the formation of stable arts groups. Limited cohesion among the different kinds of artists, working conditions endemic to the arts community (artists are often touring or working unusual hours), minimal knowledge of government process, objectives that focused on creativity not issues of public policy, and a low disregard for organizational objectives has hindered self-initiated political activity within the arts community. These factors, where combined with government policy perceived by artists as favorable to the arts, created a comfortable atmosphere for the arts community. It was only when the arts community was confronted by the serious prospect of declining government support did attempts at political mobilization occur, and it still took government initiative as a catalyst.

Activities of educators, particularly educational institutions which possess organizational stability, have been more important to the development of arts policy, albeit in a less direct fashion. The University of Alberta's Department of Extension was instrumental in the formation of the Banff Centre for the Arts, which has turned out to be a key player in developing the arts community in Alberta. In later years, the Centre's focus on the professional artist helped to establish an international reputation for Alberta artists.

Key non-governmental elites within the advocacy coalition have played a significant role at times in the development of Alberta arts policy. Lieutenant-Governor George Bulyea organized the first music festival in the province. Elizabeth Sterling-Haynes, drama specialist for the Department of Extension, also set up the first high school drama curriculum and founded the Edmonton Little Theatre. The estate of Colonel J.H. Woods provided funds for the construction of the Banff School of Fine Arts. Later people like Dean Hendrickson, who was instrumental in organizing the ATAA, and Paul Moulton, the first president of the ATAA and editor of *Culture Shock*, have also actively promoted support for the arts by the Alberta government.

The advocacy coalition, dominated by politicians and bureaucrats, has meant that arts policy development has been basically driven by those at the top of the advocacy coalition. Its development has been propelled by the visions of arts policy that government elites held and how their visions could be accommodated or melded with major government policy initiatives. The dynamics of the arts policy advocacy coalition have been in contrast to the relation of the participants in economic policy-making. In the case of economic policy-making, sector business and industry are institutionally entrenched within the policy-making process (Lindblom, 1980). Moreover, the relatively low level of salience that arts policy has for the public has meant that governmental elites could virtually ignore this policy-making area.

My study indicates that external factors and system parameters have played a major role in arts policy-making in Alberta when compared to other policy-making areas. Publicity and concern for the arts appears to have emerged only for special events such as Alberta's 75th anniversary celebrations, or when art has offended someone's moral standards. Performing arts policy has evolved slowly with little criticism or public debate in comparison to other major policy sectors.

EXTERNAL FACTORS

Changes in governing political parties and socioeconomic conditions, as well as activities in other policy areas, have steered all phases of arts policy development and implementation. The postwar reconstruction program treated the arts as an important component in promoting Alberta as a progressive, advanced community to counter the then prevailing conception of a hinterland to be exploited for its natural resources. To attract new people and keep them in the area, government considered it necessary that communities offer activities similar to those in the larger eastern centres, which resulted in attempts to establish theatre companies and the building of theatres. The arts were promoted as a leisure activity, an integral part of any community activities. As a result,

the Department of Economic Affairs, and later the Secretary of State, were responsible for arts policy.

The election of Alberta's first Conservative government in 1971, coupled with an economic windfall from oil profits and lotteries revenue, furnished the basis for a period of growth for the arts. Surplus money generated from natural resource development allowed government to devote an increasing proportion of lottery money to arts foundations. The result was the creation of the Department of Alberta Culture and the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts.

The election of the Klein Government signalled a major setback for arts support. The "system-wide" governing approach of the Klein Government resulted in large-scale cuts to portfolios such as health care and the downsizing of the civil service. With respect to the arts, it has meant cuts to the Department of Community Development, which is responsible for the arts, the freezing of the budget of the Alberta Foundation for the Arts, threatened decreases in lottery funding suggested in the *Lottery Review of 1996/97*, and proposed organizational changes to the Alberta Foundation for the Arts. Premier Klein's economic policy has created a climate of uncertainty for the arts with diminished resources and lack of confidence in the future of financial support for the arts.

The Klein Government's policies not only demonstrated how arts policy has been historically driven by economic and state building policies, they also show the weakness of the non-governmental members of the arts policy advocacy coalition. Instead of the widespread public and interest group protest that has occurred in the social, health and educational policy sectors, the arts community joined the government policy agenda. For example, the arts have been touted for their economic importance. As pointed out by Douglas West at the seminar at Showcase 1992, the arts community is now placing emphasis on the economic multiplier effect of arts activities. It points to consumer spending on hotels, restaurants, and shopping as being generated by the arts. Rather than

promoting the arts to enhance culture and quality of life the arts are considered as part of a pattern of consumer spending.

Throughout the development of Alberta arts policy we find a consistent relationship between economic policy and arts policy. The government increased support to the arts during periods of economic expansion and responded with reductions in funding during periods of downsizing and privatization. The role of the arts in the development of culture has been at best a secondary consideration.

THE ROLE OF STABLE SYSTEM PARAMETERS

Certain enduring factors within society have placed both restraints and constraints on the formulation of Alberta arts policy. These factors range from the perception of the acceptable scope for government activity to the perception of the nature of art. Also the federal political system within which the Alberta government operates functions as an important system parameter in arts policy-making. The development of arts policy has been conditioned by these over-arching and system-wide factors.

Prior to 1946 regulation or support of the arts was believed, in both the government and public spheres, to be beyond the scope of acceptable government activity. This resistance by government to enter new policy fields effectively limited government to random expenditures on the arts and no formal arts policy. After World War II, changing government attitudes and a permissive consensus on the part of the public provided a window of opportunity, creating an opening for the Alberta government to develop a performing arts policy as part of the postwar reconstruction program. By 1970, an arts policy that supported the arts was an expected government activity. Even the current governmental emphasis on privatization has not delegitimized government support of the arts as an acceptable activity; rather it resulted in the imposing of limits on public resources available to the arts.

The definition of art held by government elites within the advocacy coalition has varied since 1905, affecting the type of activity supported or regulated by arts policy as

well as the policy instruments involved. In the early years (1905-1946) covered by this study, art was conceptualized as an activity primarily for entertainment. The nascent arts community and the government showed little or no interest in government activity in the arts, which effectively precluded an arts policy. After 1946, the view of art as integral to community development gained currency and was recognized in government policy by locating the arts in the Economic Affairs portfolio. By the 1970s, the definition of art was broadened to encompass the professional arts as shown by the creation of a grant structure to support professional artists. The creation of the Department of Alberta Culture and the Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts reflected this evolution of the view of art.

Government downsizing in the 1990s resulted in a view of art that can best be described as fragmented. Art as a part of quality of life, closely related to the idea of art as necessary to community development, resurfaced within government circles. Responsibility for arts policy was shifted into the new portfolio of Community Development. Focusing on the importance of community and neighborhoods, this portfolio incorporated other leisure activities such as recreation, libraries, and seniors' concerns. Professional artists appear to have accepted this concept of art. This view was exemplified at meetings such as the professional development seminar held in October of 1993, which focused on this argument, as well as in the creation of the Canada-Alberta Cultural Industries agreement, which sought to strengthen the economic viability of certain arts corporations. In summary of this point, government's definition of the arts has effected the level of governmental support and nature of policy instruments. It appears to have not affected the belief that government has a legitimate role in the arts.

The federal arts policies have served as a system parameter, providing examples for and influences to arts policies of the Alberta government. The 1949 Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (Massey-Levesque Commission) formally examined policies with respect to the arts and suggested alternatives. The Commission considered the role of art as part of national statebuilding,

reflecting the government's concern with Canada's international reputation. This was consistent with Alberta's concern with overcoming the hinterland image of the province.

The Canada Council arose from a recommendation of the Massey - Levesque Commission. Created in 1957, the Council was a public show of government support for the arts. It served as a model for the later-created Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts and Alberta Foundation for the Arts.

Finally, arts policy at both the provincial and federal levels has reflected the goal of furthering the regional and national distinctiveness of Canadian culture. Within this context, the arts have been given equally defensive and offensive roles. The arts have been supported and promoted to influence Alberta's international reputation. The government has been concerned with breaking the hinterland image of Alberta through policies such as the encouragement of international touring of Alberta performers as a means of showing off talent and accomplishments. The arts have also been promoted as a means of preventing cultural imperialism from the United States. Grants favoring the presentation of Alberta performers over international performers reflect this attitude.

THE FUTURE OF PERFORMING ARTS POLICY

Recent trends point to future performing arts policy moving in new directions. Innovative approaches of professional companies such as the examples of Decidedly Jazz Danceworks and Quest Theatre may serve as models for other artists. A trend is also emerging that distinguishes the professional and amateur artist in terms of types of support and level of funding. While the approach of Decidedly Jazz Danceworks may be duplicated by artists such as Alberta Ballet or Alberta Theatre Projects, it provides little guidance to amateur artists, particularly those in rural communities. The level of involvement, formalized structures of paid staff, and facilities for a professional artist or company differ from the composition and purpose of an amateur arts group. Alberta performing arts policy will need to recognize this amateur-professional distinction, and

adjust policy and delivery structures to continue to support the amateur artists, while allowing a climate in which the professional artist may flourish.

For the future, the integration of art and leisure, combined with the amateur-professional distinction, may lead to different policy approaches. While closely related, alternate policy initiatives that recognize the needs of the amateur and professional artist will provide a more effective means of government support. Professional artists would benefit from assistance with long-range business planning, facility development, and support for both international touring to promote Alberta externally as well as in-province touring to continue contact with the rural communities. Resources such as leadership, information, guidance, and access to facilities in which artists can create, practice, and perform are more immediate requirements for the amateur artist. While government may support both types of artist through the building and ongoing maintenance of facilities, variances occur in the need for specialization of resource people, access, and types of funding support. Rural, amateur artists would benefit from field visits by teachers and professional artists who can help stimulate their participation in the arts. Professional artists require business or management support as well as project funding to allow their creative process to thrive. Thus, a future direction for government activity which targets specific artists and programs will ensure the ongoing growth of the Alberta arts community, while providing effective use of government resources.

NOTES

- 1 This is similar to the findings of McCartney (1991).

REFERENCES

- Alberta. Alberta Lottery Review Committee. (January 1995). *New Directions: Alberta Lotteries*.
- Decima Research & Les Consultants Cultur'Inc Inc. (1992). *Canadian Arts Consumer Profile 1990-1991: Findings*.
- Lindblom, C. (1980). *The Policy-Making Process* 2nd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- McCartney, P. (1991). Government Sponsorship of Voluntary Associations in Canada: Research and Reflections. *Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association*.
- Paltiel, K. (1982). The Changing Environment and Role of Special Interest Groups. *Canadian Public Administration* 25 (2), 198-210.
- Pross, P. (1992). *Group Politics and Public Policy*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Sabatier, P. (1991). Toward Better Theories of the Policy Process. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, June, 147-156.

**APPENDIX 1:
ALBERTA ARTS FOUNDATIONS**

Year of Formation	Foundation	Mandate
1972	Alberta Art Foundation (AAF)	visual arts
1978	Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts	theatre, music, dance
1984	Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts	book and periodical industry (writers, publishers, libraries)

Foundations Amalgamated

1991	Alberta Foundation for the Arts (AFA)	visual, performing, literary, media arts
------	---------------------------------------	--

**APPENDIX 2:
TIMELINE OF ALBERTA GOVERNMENTAL PARTICIPANTS**

Premier	Department	Minister	Deputy Minister	Branch	Branch Director
Manning	Economic Affairs	A.J. Hooke	R.R. Moore	Cultural Activities	R. MacDonald
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	B. MacKenzie
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	A.R. Patrick	-	-	J.E. Plewes
-	-	-	-	-	W. Kaasa
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	Provincial Secretary	-	E.R. Hughes	-	-
-	-	-	-	Recreation & Cultural Activities	-
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	A. Holowach	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	P.B. Howard	-	-

Year	Premier	Department	Minister	Deputy Minister	Branch	Branch Director
1965	-	-	-	-	-	-
1966	-	-	-	-	Cultural Development	-
1967	-	-	-	-	-	-
1968	Strom	-	-	-	-	-
1969	-	-	-	-	-	-
1970	-	-	-	-	-	-
1971	Lougheed	Culture, Youth Recreation	H.A. Schmid	C.L. Usher	-	-
1972	-	-	-	-	-	-
1973	-	-	-	-	-	-
1974	-	-	-	-	-	-
1975	-	Alberta Culture	-	-	-	-
1976	-	-	-	-	-	-
1977	-	-	-	-	-	-
1978	-	-	M.J. LeMessurier	-	-	-
1979	-	-	-	J.S. O'Neill	-	-
1980	-	-	-	-	-	-
1981	-	-	-	-	-	-
1982	-	-	-	-	-	G. Buick
1983	-	-	-	-	-	-

Year	Premier	Department	Minister	Deputy Minister	Branch	Branch Director
1984	-	-	-	-	-	-
1985	-	-	D.L. Anderson	-	-	-
1986	Getty	Culture & Multiculturalism	G. Stevens	-	-	-
1987	-	-	-	-	-	-
1988	-	-	D. Main	-	-	-
1989	-	-	-	-	-	-
1990	-	-	-	-	-	J. Forsyth
1991	-	-	-	-	-	-
1992	-	-	-	-	-	-
1993	Klein	Community Development	D. Mirosh G. Mar (July)	-	Arts Branch	-
1994	-	-	-	J. Nowicki	-	-
1995	-	-	-	-	-	-
1996	-	-	S. McLennan	-	-	-
1997	-	-	-	-	-	-

APPENDIX 3: PRIMARY RESEARCH

- a) Attendance at *Afrocubanismo* (1994, 1996) (an International Festival of the performing arts)
- b) Attendance at *Alberta Showcase* (1993-1996) (annual Alberta arts conference)
- c) Attendance at *Presenting Dance* (1995) - a workshop co-presented by the Alberta Dance Alliance and the Arts Touring Alliance of Alberta
- d) Attendance at various meetings of the Lethbridge Folk Club, Lethbridge Children's Festival, Lethbridge Allied Arts Council, Lethbridge Performing Arts Coalition, Arts Touring Alliance of Alberta
- e) Interviews:
 - Dr. Clive Padfield (Executive Director of Alberta Foundation for the Arts and Director of the Arts Branch)
 - Marie Gynane-Willis (Arts Development Officer)
 - Dick Foose (Arts Development Officer)
 - Gary Cristall (Canada Council Touring Office)
 - Gail Barrington-Moss (President of ATAA, former staff member of the Arts Branch), Cathy Miller (Alberta performing artist)
 - Kurt Bagnell (presenter, employee Banff Centre for the Arts)
 - Marg Hallet (amateur presenter, Vice-president of the ATAA)
 - Paul Moulton (presenter, publisher)
 - Rob Hood (Arts Branch)
 - Judie Drucker (former employee City of Calgary, current Executive Director of ATAA)
 - Kathleen Specht (freelance technician, arts manager)
 - Board Members of the ATAA

**APPENDIX 4:
LOTTERY FUND COMMITMENTS TO THE ALBERTA
FOUNDATION FOR THE ARTS**

1992/93	\$15,754,000
1993/94	\$15,754,000
1994/95	\$16,104,000
1995/96	\$16,104,000

Source: Alberta Lotteries: Annual Reports (1993-1996).

**APPENDIX 5:
BUDGETARY ALLOCATION TO PERFORMING ARTS FROM THE
DEPARTMENT OF ALBERTA CULTURE 1976 - 1995**

Funding from the Cultural Development Division - Performing Arts

1976/77	\$1,980,978
1977/78	\$2,479,741
1978/79	\$3,411,909
1979/80	\$3,714,365
1980/81	\$4,242,499
1981/82	\$5,695,824
1982/83	\$6,818,247
1984/85	\$6,656,360
1985/86	\$6,843,418
1986/87	\$6,712,322
1987/88	\$6,003,560
1988/89	\$5,608,827
1989/90	\$3,981,626
1990/91	\$3,967,914
1991/92	\$1,170,144

Funding from the Arts Branch budget - the Visual Arts, Performing Arts and Film and Literary Arts branches were amalgamated to form the Arts Branch

1992/93	\$2,091,739
1993/94	\$1,490,996
1994/95	\$1,503,409

Source: Annual Reports from Alberta Culture, Culture and Multiculturalism and Community Development.

**APPENDIX 6:
PERFORMING ARTS ACTIVITY AND GRANTS 1975 - 1987**

Year	Attendance	Number of Community Organizations	Grants to Community Organizations
1975	5,594	9	\$9,000
1976	62,193	24	\$36,000
1977	125,192	49	\$83,000
1978	190,500	85	\$155,000
1979	268,000	120	\$205,000
1980	296,342	134	\$260,000
1981	318,687	146	\$453,005
1982	377,365	173	\$595,024
1983	480,869	159	\$730,496
1984	560,830	168	\$651,780
1985	808,124	181	\$579,089
1986	828,889	191	\$631,327
1987	964,053	206	\$638,003

*Figures include non-profit community organizations sponsoring performing arts series.

**APPENDIX 7:
COMPARISON OF BUDGETARY CHANGE FOR ARTS FUNDING
WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF THE PROVINCIAL SECRETARY**

	1960	1968
Drama	\$10,000	\$69,000
Music	\$22,000	\$224,5000

**APPENDIX 8:
COMPARISON OF BUDGETARY CHANGE FOR ARTS FUNDING
WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS**

Total budget for the promotion of Cultural Activities

1946/47 \$12,516

1953/54 \$85,440

Total staff for the promotion of Cultural Activities

1946/47 2

1958 17

APPENDIX 9: CONSTITUTIONAL JURISDICTION FOR THE ARTS

Because the Constitution contains no reference to art, the jurisdiction for the arts is derived from the distribution of power of similar activities defined in sections 91 and 92 of the Constitution, and by the division of new or undefined activities as defined by the Canadian judiciary. By these sections, the responsibility is divided between the federal and provincial governments.

Specifically, federal jurisdiction for the arts is derived from the “power over the peace, order, and good government of Canada” (section 91 opening words), and by the power over interprovincial undertakings (s.92(10)(a)). The courts have used the Canada Temperance definition of the good government subsection, that is, that a matter “goes beyond local or provincial concern or interests and must from its inherent nature be the concern of the Dominion as a whole” (A-G Ont. V. Can. Temperance Federation, 1946), to determine that the media is under federal responsibility. This responsibility includes both interprovincial and intraprovincial broadcasting, in terms of both the content and the broadcasting equipment. As a result Alberta performing arts policy has been precluded from activities such as the creation of a performing arts television or radio station, beyond the scope of educational activities, which has meant the government had been limited in terms of making the arts accessible to the public.

Provincial jurisdiction for the arts is derived from considering some of the arts to be matters of “property and civil rights in the province” (s.92(13)) or “matters of a merely local or private nature in the province” (s.92(16)). By this approach, film, theatre and literature are under provincial responsibility. Although the performing arts are not specifically mentioned they have also received significant support and attention from the provincial government in developing Alberta performing arts policy.

These jurisdictions may be altered. Three sections of the constitution allow for a transfer of power from the provincial to the federal legislature. Section 92(10)(c) “enables

the federal parliament to assume jurisdiction over a purely local work by the simple (and unilateral) device of declaring the work to be 'for the general advantage of two or more of the provinces'" (Hogg, 1985, p. 484). That is, responsibility for film, theatre and literature may be assumed by the federal government at any time. Section 38(1) allows for the transfer of provincial legislative powers relating to education or other cultural matters from provincial legislatures to Parliament, and in conjunction with Section 38(1), Section 40 provides reasonable compensation to provinces which do not participate in a transfer under subsection 38(1). Although the federal government has not chosen to assume responsibilities from the provinces, it has created institutions such as the Canada Council which served as a model for the Alberta government's Alberta Foundation for the Performing Arts.

Thus, unlike other government responsibilities such as health care, the responsibility for the arts is divided between the two levels of government. This division occurs because art does not appear in the constitution as a specific area of jurisdiction, and therefore is derived through similar activities' jurisdictions. The lack of a clear jurisdiction also allows for no activity by either level of government or for conflict over areas competing activities and interest.

**APPENDIX 10:
THE CANADIAN CONFERENCE OF THE ARTS**

The Canadian Conference of the Arts was formed as “a national, non-governmental, not-for-profit arts service organization representing the interests of 200,000 artists, cultural workers and arts supporters across Canada” (Canadian Conference of the Arts, p.1). The multidisciplinary organization researches and formulates policy on current arts issues to keep the membership informed and to affect government policy. The Conference, a longstanding organization networking artists across the country, has tried to influence government to continue to support the arts.

CUMULATIVE REFERENCES

- Adler, A. (1993). Why Art is on Trial. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 22 (4).
- Alberta. (1946). *Statutes of Alberta*. Edmonton: King's Printer.
- Alberta. (1978). *Statutes of Alberta*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. (1980). *Revised Statutes of Alberta*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. (1991). *Inventory of Agencies, Boards and Commissions*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. (1991). *Revised Statutes of Alberta*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. Alberta Culture. (1975-1986). *Annual Report*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. Alberta Culture. (1987, June 16). *A Description of the Programs and Services Offered by the Department of Culture: A Report to Deputy Minister of Culture J.S. O'Neill*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism. (1989). *Looking Ahead: Toward Partnership for Cultural Development in Alberta*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism. (1991). *Working Together: Arts Funding, One Foundation and One Branch*. Edmonton. Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. Alberta Lottery Review Committee. (January 1995). *New Directions: Alberta Lotteries*.
- Alberta. Community Development. (1993) *Annual Report*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Community Development. (Winter 1994). *Community Connections Newsletter*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Community Development. (1994). *Business Plan 1994-95 to 1996-97*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Community Development. (March 4, 1994) *Announcement from the Minister*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Community Development. (March 9, 1994) *Announcement from the Minister*. Edmonton.

- Alberta. Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation. (1971-1974). *Annual Report*. Edmonton. Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. Department of Economic Affairs. (1946-1960). *Annual Report*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Department of the Provincial Secretary. Cultural Development Branch. (1968). *Annual Report*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Department of the Provincial Secretary. (1959-1970). *Annual Report*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Foundation for the Performing Arts. (1979-1991) *Annual Report*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta. Office of the Premier. (1994). *A Message from the Premier, Ralph Klein*. Edmonton.
- Alberta. Publication Services. (1987). *Organization of the Government of Alberta*. Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Alberta Ballet. (1996). *Alberta Ballet Homepage*.
<http://www.culturenet.ca/cpaa/memberinfo/alberta-ballet>.
- Allied Arts Council of Lethbridge. (1993). *Letter to Premier Klein*.
- Almond, G. & Powell, G. (1984). *Comparative Politics Today: A World View*. (3rd edition). Toronto: Little, Brown & Company.
- Almond, G. & Powell, G. (1978). *Comparative Politics: System, Process and Policy*. Toronto: Little, Brown & Company.
- Anderson, T. (1992). Industrial Strength Money for Strong Industries: The New Cultural Industries Agreement. *Arts Bridge: An Arts and Information Publication*, 1 (#1, issues 1), 2.
- Arts Touring Alliance of Alberta. *Tour Talk*. Quarterly Newsletter. Calgary: Author.
- Aucoin, P. & Doern, B. (Eds.). (1971). *The Structure of Policy-Making in Canada*. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada.
- Banff Centre for the Arts. (1996). *Handbook*. Banff: Author.
- Brademas, John. (1991). Arts and Public Policy. *The Journal of Arts Management and Law*, 21 (1, Spring), 79-97.
- Brooks, S. (1993). *Public Policy in Canada*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Inc.

- Buick, G. (1992). *Provincial Arts Funding in Alberta 1980-1990: A Summary*. Edmonton: Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism.
- Burton, T., & Kyлло, L. (1974). *Federal - Provincial Responsibilities for Leisure Services in Alberta and Ontario: A Report Prepared for Alberta Recreation, Parks and Wildlife*.
- Canada-Alberta. (1992). *Agreement on Cultural Industries*.
- Coalition for Cultural Awareness. (1992). *Background Summary*.
- Coalition for Cultural Awareness. (1993a). *Letter to Mr. Halvar Johnson, Minister of Education*.
- Coalition for Cultural Awareness. (1993b). *Compilation of Minutes: October 30, 1991 to September 19, 1993*.
- Canada. (1949-1951). *Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences*. Ottawa: King's Printer.
- Canada. (1985). *Statutes of Canada*. Ottawa: Queen's Printer.
- Canada. Department of Communications. (1982) *Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee*. Ottawa: Information Services of the Government of Canada.
- Canada. House of Commons. (1944). *Special Committee of the House of Commons on Reconstruction and Re-establishment: Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence*. Ottawa: King's Printer.
- Canada. House of Commons. Report of the Task Force on Funding of the Arts. (1986). *Funding of the Arts in Canada to the Year 2000*.
- Canada. House of Commons Standing Committee on Communications and Culture. (1988). *Review of Taxation of Artists and the Arts*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Canadian Conference for the Arts. *Who are We?* Ottawa: Author.
- Canadian Conference for the Arts. (1981). *More Strategy for Culture: More Proposals for a Federal Policy for the Arts and Cultural Industries in Canada*. Ottawa: Author.
- Cobb, R. & Elder, C. (1972). *Participation in American Politics; the Dynamics of Agenda-building*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

- Coleman, W. & Skogstad, G. (Eds.). (1990). *Policy Communities and Public Policy in Canada: A Structural Approach*. Mississauga, Ontario: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd.
- Cummings, M. & Katz, R. (1987). *The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America and Japan*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Day, M., & Potts, M. (1987). Elizabeth Sterling Haynes: Initiator of Alberta Theatre. *Theatre History in Canada*, 8 (1), 8-35.
- Decima Research & Les Consultants Cultur'Inc Inc. (1992). *Canadian Arts Consumer Profile 1990-1991: Findings*.
- Doern, G. & Phidd, R. (1992). *Canadian Public Policy: Ideas, Structure, Process*. (2nd ed.). Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.
- Dye, T. (1978). *Understanding Public Policy*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Fryd, V. (1994) The Politics of Public Art: Art in the United States Capitol. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 23 (4).
- Gehrig, C. (1993). A Foundation Perspective on Judgement Making and the Arts. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 22 (4).
- Globerman, S. (1987). *Culture, Governments and Markets: Public Policy and the Culture Industries*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.
- Hall, P. (1993). Policy Paradigms, Social Learning and the State: The Case of Economic Policy-making in Britain. *Comparative Politics*, 25 (3), 275-96.
- Hammer, J. (1992). On the Potential Impact of *Rust v. Sullivan* as a Model for Content-based Restrictions on Federal Arts and Humanities Funding. *Arts Management, Law and Society*, 22 (3).
- Hendrickson, D. (1993). *Letter from the Chairman of the Advisory Board of the Alberta Showcase for the Performing Arts Society*. Presented at first annual AGM of the ATAA. Edmonton.
- Hillman-Chartrand, H. (1986). Towards the International Evaluation of Arts Council Funding. Presented to *The Fourth International Conference on Cultural Economics and Planning*. Avignon, France.
- Hillman-Chartrand, H. (1985a). A Poli-Economic Assessment of the Fine Arts. Presented to *The Five College Canadian Studies Faculty Seminar*. Amherst: Massachusetts.

- Hillman-Chartrand, H. (1985b). *Alberta and the Arts: The Investment, the Dollars, the Jobs and the Votes*. Presented to the Members of the Board, *Canada Council*. Ottawa: Canada.
- Hillman-Chartrand, H. & Ruston, J. (1982) *Lotteries and the Arts: the Canadian Experience 1970 to 1980*. Ottawa: Research and Evaluation, Canada Council.
- Henighan, T. (1996). *The Presumption of Culture*. Vancouver: Raincoast Books.
- Hogg, P. (1985). *Constitutional Law in Canada*. (2nd ed.). Toronto: The Carswell Company Limited.
- Howlett, M. (1994). Policy Paradigms and Policy Change: Lessons from the Old and New Canadian Policies Towards Aboriginal Peoples. *Policy Studies*, 22 (4) 631-51.
- Howlett, M. & Ramesh, M. (1995). *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Horsman, M. (1994, January/February). Community, Culture and Public Policy. *Policy Options*, 15 (1), 3.
- Jameson, S. (1987). *Chautauqua in Canada*. Calgary: Glenbow-Alberta Institute.
- Jenkins-Smith, H., St. Clair, G., & Woods, B., (1991). Explaining Change in Policy Subsystems: Analysis of Coalition Stability and Defection Over Time. *American Journal of Political Science*, 35 (4), 851-80.
- Johnson, A. (1981). A Minister as an Agent of Policy Change: the Case of Unemployment Insurance in the Seventies. *Canadian Public Administration* 24 (4) Winter, 612-633).
- Johnston, A. & den Otter, A. (1985). *Lethbridge: A Centennial History*. Lethbridge: The City of Lethbridge.
- Kallman, H. (1960). *A History of Music in Canada 1534 - 1914*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Kernaghan, K. & Siegel, D. (1991). *Public Administration in Canada*. Scarborough, Ontario: Nelson Canada.
- Lindblom, C. (1980). *The Policy-Making Process* 2nd Ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Lortie, Pierre. (1978). "Education, Broadcasting, Language Policy and the Provinces. In M. Walker (Ed.), *Canadian Confederation at the Crossroads: The Search for a Federal-Provincial Balance* (pp 225-268). Canada: The Fraser Institute.

- McCartney, P. (1991). Government Sponsorship of Voluntary Associations in Canada: Research and Reflections. *Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association.*
- Mar, G. (1994). Speech give at Luncheon and *Annual General Meeting Arts Touring Alliance of Alberta Showcase '94.* Edmonton: n.p.
- Mann, G. (1993). *Theatre Lethbridge: A History of Theatrical Production in Lethbridge, Alberta (1885-1988).* Calgary: Detselig Enterprises Ltd.
- Milner, A. (1994, February 18) "What are the Arts Really Worth?" *The Globe and Mail.*
- Mulcahy, K. (1991). The Public Interest in Public Culture. *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* 21 (1) Spring, 5-27.
- Paltiel, K. (1982). The Changing Environment and Role of Special Interest Groups. *Canadian Public Administration* 25 (2), 198-210.
- Powell, K.L. (1977). *A History of Name Changes of Alberta Government Departments and Agencies, 1905-1973.* Edmonton: Queen's Printer.
- Pross, P. (1992). *Group Politics and Public Policy.* Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Quest Theatre. (1998). *Quest Theatre Homepage.*
http://www.iul-css.com/mall/quest_theatre/index.htm.
- Sabatier, P. (1991). Toward Better Theories of the Policy Process. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, June, 147-156.
- Sabatier, P. (1988). An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein. *Policy Science* 21, (Fall), 129-169.
- Sabatier, P. and Pelkey, N. (1987). Incorporating Multiple Actors and Guidance Instruments into Models of Regulatory Policymaking. *Administration and Society* 19 (September), 236-263.
- Schafer, D. & Fortier, A. (1989). *Review of Federal Policies for the Arts in Canada (1944-1988).* Ottawa: The Canadian Conference of the Arts.
- Skinner, C. (1996). "The Actors Excelled Their First Efforts": Amateur Theatre in Lethbridge, Alberta, 1885-1900. *Prairie Forum* 21 (1), 17-27.
- Skinner, J, and Conine, J. (1997). *The Alberta Theatre Performance Calendar Database.*
<http://home.uleth.ca/sfa-apcl/>.

- Stuart, E. (1984). *The History of Prairie Theatre: The Development of Theatre in Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan 1833 - 1982*. Toronto: Simon and Pierre.
- Sundstrom, K. (1996). Backstage: How's this for a Jazzy Idea: Financial Responsibility. *Hooper's Log: The Newsletter of Decidedly Jazz Danceworks*, November, 2.
- Watson, W. (1994, January/February). The Artist as Rent Seeker. *Public Policy*, 15 (1), 46-47.
- Wetherell, D. & Kmet, I. (1990). *Useful Pleasures: The Shaping of Leisure in Alberta 1896 - 1945*. Regina: Alberta Culture and Multiculturalism and the Canadian Plains Research Centre.
- Woodcock, G. (1985). *Strange Bedfellows: The State and the Arts in Canada*. Vancouver: Douglas & MacIntyre Ltd.
- Zeigler, J.W. (1994). *Arts in Crisis: The National Endowment for the Arts versus America*. Chicago, Il.: A Capella Books.