

ment of purposeful, authoritative direction to Federal endeavors affecting the arts.

I have described the proposed Federal Advisory Council as a first step. What then should be the second, and third, and other steps? It may be premature at this point to formulate an answer to that. The recommendation of such steps would lie more properly in the hands of the Council. Certainly I believe the Congress should give serious and sympathetic consideration to legislation which would facilitate the international cultural exchange programs of the State Department. Another proposal would ease the burden of the Federal admissions tax imposed on the performing arts. Parenthetically, it might be noted that the admissions tax is a part of our tax structure which is foreign to other countries whose programs are carefully designed to stimulate artistic development. Writers on this subject have commented that, while other nations subsidize the performing arts specifically and unashamedly, we impose a special penalty on them.

A second step Congress should consider is the consolidation of the multitude of Federal activities now concerned with the arts under the jurisdiction of the Council.

If this could be accomplished, and it is far from certain that it can, it would be a healthy and praiseworthy advance. But what of a unified program of direct grants-in-aid for the improvement of the arts?

In weighing such a program for the future, let's take a look at the experience of kindred nations. In Great Britain there has been since the desperate early days of World War II, a systematic government assist to the arts. I can't help noting, in passing, that the greatest common turning of people to their cultural wellsprings seem to occur in periods of the greatest stress. Witness our Federal projects in the depression days of the thirties. In beleaguered England, the Government, determined that events would not cause the continuity of British culture to falter, created the Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts. Its purpose was to maintain the highest possible standard in wartime arts. At the war's end the name was changed to the Arts Council of Great Britain, and it embarked on a program of direct subsidies. In 1955-56, the Council received an annual grant from the British Treasury of approximately \$2,400,000. The renaissance of British drama, music, ballet, and of its imaginative film industry, can be traced in large part to the efforts of the Council.

Three years ago our Canadian neighbors formed the Canada council to provide for Canada the same kind of assistance that the British Arts Council provided in Britain. There is a fundamental difference, however, between the two systems. The Canadian Government funded the council with two grants totaling \$150 million directing that the council was to use primarily the income from the fund for subsidies, encroaching on the fund directly only for certain limited types of projects. Thus, the Canada council is relatively unfettered by the need to seek an annual appropriation. The work of the Canadian council has gone forward with signal success. It has carried Canadian culture to the depths of each Province, and has been universally acclaimed.

Even broader, and far more deeply rooted, is the French program of state subsidies. The great performing societies of Paris, the Opera,