

the product of centuries of interchange between artist and audience, here the council is being charged with the difficult task of helping to bring forth the chicken and the egg simultaneously. Finding and encouraging creative artists is not enough. To insure the final independence and even survival of these artists, an important part of the council's function must be to help enlarge the demand for their talents."

In other words, creating an audience. After 4 years' experience, this aspect of the problem has earned more and more of the council's attention. Creation and re-creation is very well, but getting the audience and the performers together is of crucial importance. To this end, the Canadian Players (a company employing many of the Stratford actors during the winter months) were sponsored by the council on a tour of 60 towns from coast to coast last year. At the same time, 6,000 high school students were shipped from rural districts into the towns on the company's itinerary.

Subsidies for a theater troupe rarely amount to more than a fraction of their touring costs. The council pares down its assistance to the crucial point where the company would decide to give up the tour, then adds a smidgin more.

Two years ago the Canadian Opera Company, operating out of Toronto, gave a 2-week season with three works (including Prokofiev's "Love for Three Oranges"), then went on a cross-country tour of 40 performances. The resulting deficit of \$137,000 was met by private donations of \$77,000, and a \$60,000 grant from the council.

There have been critics of the council, but most of them have objected to the way in which assistance is meted out rather than to the principle of assistance itself. Some feel that the system of piecemeal grants is pernicious. Others have contended that if the arts were really respected, they would be supported by a Ministry of Culture with a large budget. Probably the most common criticism of all is that a council is a long-haired outfit, somewhere up on cloud 9, and that it should take steps to get in touch with the common man, or consult the average taxpayer on how this money should be spent in the cultural fields.

To paraphrase the council's attitude, the council has been charged with the job of making the common man less common, and they have no intention of consulting him on methods.

The council has only six salaried officers, none of them identified with political parties: a director, Dr. A. W. Trueman; an associate director, Eugene Bussiere; a treasurer, Douglas Fullerton; a supervisor of the arts program, Peter M. Dwyer; a supervisor of the scholarship program, Henri Charbonneau; and a secretary, Lillian Breen. The chairman, Dr. Claude T. Bissell, replied recently to charges against the 19-member council (voluntary and noncompensated) by pointing out that at present it relies on informed groups and individuals for its decision, with applications for grants from the endowment fund sifted by, for the arts, 150 adjudicators. He admitted that information is often marked by "cults, petty jealousies, and prejudices. But the alternative is to shift our sources of advice to those people who, to coin a phrase, know nothing about art but know what they like. Ultimately this is to substitute the most terrible of all tyrannies: the tyranny of the uninformed."

Russia, observes Dr. Bissell, had tried this pseudodemocratic method of promoting culture, and the result was "picture postcard painting and propaganda fiction. You will notice that the U.S.S.R. has not adopted the same method in the sciences. That is why its conquest of outer space is more significant than its conquest of inner space."

No one has attempted to assess the result of the Canada Council's work. Four years is hardly time enough to allow such a "first growth" to bear ripe fruit.

But the council itself is sure enough of its importance to the country and of the direction in which it is going to ask the Government for another \$10 million to help it along.