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The Canada Council Art Bank: National Treasure, Support to Artists, or Decorating Service for Governments

The Canada Council Art Bank was conceived by Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne and implemented in 1972 in the spirit of Gérard Pelletier's ideology of democratizing and decentralizing cultural activities in Canada. As the title implies, the Art Bank's function can be perceived from several perspectives: financial support to artists, art rental service to the government, or a large collection of contemporary art. Although its mandate suggests all these objectives and, in the form of various programs provides a strategy to fulfill them, it is my thesis that the Canada Council Art Bank is primarily a cultural program which was initiated to democratize the visual arts and to bring the best work of Canadian artists out of museums and into every day contexts.
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INTRODUCTION

It was once stated that the concept behind the Canada Council Art Bank, commonly referred to simply as "The Art Bank", was so logical and obvious that it is surprising to learn that nobody had thought of it before 1971. What is unknown to most Canadians, is that this concept originated in their country. Unlike many other Canadian cultural institutions, whose structure and programming were founded on models from abroad, no prototype for the Art Bank existed anywhere. The programs, policies and activities have been the subject of considerable debate throughout the 20 years this institution has been in existence. In Canada and abroad the Canada Council Art Bank has been praised as a paradigm for the subsidy and audience development for contemporary art and criticized by some politicians and members of the general public as extravagant squandering of public funds.

Public art, or better known today as "Art in Public Places", existed in Canada before 1972 primarily in the form of portraits and monuments in and around government buildings. But its tradition reflected political rather than aesthetic concerns and favoured a very small number of artists. With the exception of the most visible examples of traditional public art, such as war memorials and sculptures of political figures and local heroes, most Canadians were unaware of works of art which were acquired with public funds.
A. Public Funding for the Arts in Canada and the Status of the Visual Artist

In Canada's settler society, 19th century philanthropies and 20th century foundations never really evolved to the same extent as in the United States. For this reason, the organization and promotion of cultural activities—cultural activities—such as theatre productions, choral recitals, the exhibition of works of art and other means of cultural expressions—were initially carried out by locally-based interest groups and associations which were primarily funded by their membership and administered by volunteers. In 1949, responding to a strong lobby by the artistic community, Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent created the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences. This commission was to provide a survey of the arts in Canada, investigate the activities of existing cultural agencies and make recommendations with regard to the national radio broadcasting policy. The commission was chaired by Vincent Massey, a former High Commissioner in London and connoisseur of art, literature, and the theatre. Georges-Henri Lévesque, a Dominican who was both founder and Dean of Social Sciences at Laval University, historian Hilda Neatby from Saskatchewan, University of British Columbia president Norman A.M. Mackenzie, and Montreal civil engineer Arthur Surveyor assisted Vincent Massey as commissioners and provided regional representation.¹

For two years members of the Commission travelled 10,000 miles across Canada to consult with communities at large, heard 462 briefs, held 462 public meetings and sought advice from 1200 witnesses as well
as from leading Canadian artists in all media such as Charles Comfort and Sir Ernest MacMillan.\(^2\)

The Massey Report was tabled on June 1, 1951, and focussed on three fundamental issues: to make the arts more accessible to the general public; to provide financial subsidy to artists and arts organizations; and to encourage a cultural climate for Canada\(^3\), in which the arts could develop independently from other countries, in particular the United States.

Although the report was criticized by those who either felt that the government should not concern itself with issues relating to the funding and development of cultural activities or considered cultural independence not to be an important issue, it was generally well received and most of its recommendations were eventually adopted. One of the Commission's most important recommendations was the creation of an independent arts council, to be called the Canada Council. It was not until 1957, however, that, thanks to a $100 million windfall in the form of succession duties from the estates of Isaak Walton Killam and Sir James Hamet Dunn, the Canadian Government saw fit to announce the establishment of the Canada Council in the Speech from the Throne on January 8, 1957. Defining the status of the Council as "not an agent of Her Majesty" and in the hope that funding would be provided from the interest of the Killam-Dunn endowment rather than through government funding, the Canada Council Act received Royal Assent on March 28, 1957.\(^3\)
The mandate of the Canada Council, as originally outlined in the Act, is to foster and promote the study, enjoyment and production of works in the arts, humanities and social sciences. 4

The support to the arts was and still is provided by the Council to individual artists and to organizations through a variety of grants. Income is also channelled indirectly to artists in the form of pay cheques and honoraria for performing in orchestras, dance, opera and theatre companies which are funded by Council as well as through royalties on the sale or distribution of their work.

It is important to mention that following the establishment of the Canada Council as the national funding agency for the arts, most Canadian provinces followed the federal example and instituted their own arts councils to address regional cultural concerns.

Reflecting on the position of the living artist within society and the relationship between the artist and his or her audience, the Canada Council 1972-1973 Annual Report suggests that

Public attitudes towards creative artists are ambiguous. The idea of artistic creativity is generally accepted as a good thing, while the living, working artist is often thought of as something of an embarrassment. Artists, and particularly the best of them, often enrage many more people than they delight and are accepted by a larger public only when time and custom have dulled the sharper edges of their work. Even sensitive experts may dismiss brilliant work, whether their bias be towards the "traditional" or the "experimental", since all of us tend to define excellence in terms of what we have already seen and recognized as excellent. 5

Because of the nature of their production, visual artists have always occupied a separate and problematic place within the structure of art funding. To produce their work artists require a specific space, the
studio (which can be anything from a spare bedroom to a specialized, "state of the arts" studio building), expensive equipment (brushes, printing presses, lenses and cameras, welding, casting and wood working equipment, easels and dark room equipment) and materials (canvas, paper, clay, steel, inks, paint and solvents, to name only a few). And although works of art are widely accessible to the public through exhibitions which have been carefully curated and documented by galleries and museums, (and continue to be seen by a relatively select audience) the private ownership of art objects is only slowly becoming a viable possibility for most Canadians.

The marketing of works of art as such, does not receive government subsidy and, unlike performing artists, painters, sculptors or printmakers are not employed in their profession as artists by public institutions. A relatively small number of artists are working in museums and public or commercial galleries as exhibition preparators, registrars or sales personnel.

Despite funding for exhibition programming, research and the publication of catalogues, the visual artist's end product—and therefore its consumer—is not subsidized. In this context it is important to note that without government subsidy or corporate sponsorship the price for performance tickets would be unaffordable for the general public and without grants to publishing houses books and periodicals would also be considerably more expensive. But performance tickets, books (other than rare editions), periodicals and admissions to exhibitions are not commodities. Works of art, on the other hand, are. Prices for works of art, especially if the artists are represented by
one or several dealers, are strictly controlled and kept within a very specific range which is established by a well structured marketing system. Any means of public subsidy directed at lowering prices for works of art in order to make them more affordable for the general public would meet with considerable resistance from dealers and collectors. (Instead, what dealers, who generally profit 40%-50% from all sales, would like to see implemented are forms of subsidy of ongoing business expenses and tax shelters, neither of which would benefit the public at large.)

In addressing the problems of Canada's art market several factors have to be considered. The first can be attributed to the country's small population base and a society that traditionally invested its savings in bank accounts rather than works of art. Another contributing fact is that today most mainstream artists use a means of communication to which neither the general public nor the financial and, surprisingly, the intellectual elite have ever been exposed. Most Canadians are not comfortable with mainstream art and are even less inclined to purchase works of art which they have never been educated to appreciate. The few serious and knowledgeable art collectors in this country include only a handful of individuals who are committed to collecting contemporary art. It is, however, encouraging to observe that the collecting of works of art by the private sector has increased considerably. Compared to 15 years ago, more Canadian corporations retain the services of professional art consultants and actively purchase works of contemporary art for their collections. Yet, according to Susan Whitney, President of the Professional Art Dealers Association, the total number of
significant corporate collections in Canada remains at around 200.⁶ And the acquisition budgets of most public galleries and museums are too modest to have any sustaining impact on the market for contemporary Canadian art.

For the reasons outlined above, artists' income from the sale of their work or from the occasional small contributions in the form of artists' fees received for exhibition of their work in public galleries (often not even covering production expenses) remain low. Most artists continue to subsidize their practice by teaching, through employment in a related field (for example graphic design and commercial photography) or in a totally different occupation, and the occasional grant from various levels of public funding agencies.

B. The Art Bank Concept: Origin and Formulation

During the 1960's, because of the effects of increased federal, provincial and municipal subsidy, the arts began to manifest themselves. Cultural projects and activities, especially those associated with Canada's Centennial Year and Expo '67, molded a new national self-awareness. In order to reflect this trend and to effectively validate and support living artists, the Canada Council, under the guidance of then Visual Arts Officer David Silcox, began in 1966 to purchase contemporary works of art. Rather than keeping them in storage, the paintings and other works were placed in the offices of the Council to promote its mission and attract public attention.⁷
After three years of collecting, the number of works which had been purchased on advice of its visual arts juries at a cost of $90,000, had grown to several hundred and consisted of paintings, sculptures, tapestries, drawings and graphics. According to Dale McConathy, this collection "impressively caught the scope and excitement of the scene that had been emerging in the 1960s and some of its major pieces were circulated throughout Canada by the National Gallery in 1969. In 1970 the majority of works from the Canada Council Collection was sold for $125,000 to the Department of External Affairs to be displayed in its new head office on Sussex Drive in Ottawa.

At about the same time, Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne succeeded David Silcox at the Canada Council and was immediately impressed by the attachment Council staff--both officers and support personnel--feit for the paintings, sculptures, and graphics that had been an important part of their working climate. Le Moyne, herself trained as an artist and well aware of the limited art market in Canada, asked the question that if art had this effect on people who did not have to like it, why restrict such an opportunity to the Council and why not use government spaces, schools, and hospitals for the display of works of art.

The Assistant Director of the Council Robert Elie and Le Moyne presented a proposal to Council and Treasury Board which argued that by continuing to purchase works of art the Canada Council would be in a position to support Canada's artists through the purchase of their work, and at the same time gather what she referred to as a "réserve d'art" to develop an audience for contemporary art which up to that point had never been addressed. As a consequence, a more sophisticated and
visually literate audience would be able to contribute significantly to the development of a Canadian art market in general.12

The concept of controlling the display of works of art in and around government premises was not new. Maria Tippett, in a study of the practices of English-Canadian institutions and the arts before 1957, points out that as early as 1884 several Toronto painters formed the Society of Mural Decorators. The aims of this society were to encourage and influence municipal art commissions and to protect new public buildings from any inadequate interior decoration. As well, in January 1907, the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts petitioned the federal government to appoint an arts council which would advise the government on all matters concerning the purchasing and commissioning of art.13 Tippett further points out that it was to be the aim of this advisory body to inform the government on all activities requiring correct artistic judgement and "to promote the growth of a true taste and general interest in public art amongst the people of Canada".14

Thus, the practice of commissioning site-specific works of art for public spaces, primarily in the form of historic and commemorative monuments and paintings as well as portraits, had a considerable history and reflected the desires of various governments to display Canada's growing cultural maturity. What was fresh and appealing about Le Moyne's concept was that government buildings would display not only immovable works of art but instead could establish a flexible resource from which works could be rented for a reasonable fee to enhance any office, boardroom, corridor, or reception area. The proposal was furthermore attractive because it suggested that the program would be
self-supporting since the income generated from the rental activities would be directed to the Canada Council to offset expenses.

Here, too, it should be pointed out that the notion of renting works of art had existed for private individuals for some time through organizations such as the Picture Loan Society which was established in Toronto in 1936 to "help young artists exhibit and sell their work and to promote a new understanding between the artist and the people".15 Therefore, by joining and adapting two established practices, i.e. the convention of art in public places and art rental for private individuals, Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne hit upon the novel concept of a national "réservoir d'art" which would benefit Canadian artists, the federal government and the general public.

The political climate of the early 1970's could not have been more favourable for Le Moyne's recommendation. Gérard Pelletier, Secretary of State at the time and the Minister responsible for the implementation of cultural policies and initiatives, was firmly committed to his government's ideology of "democratization and decentralization".16 In his speech to the Canadian Club in Calgary of March 28, 1972 he stated:

Democratization means increasing access to the products of cultural activity for all tax payers, not only for a select group as has been the case in the past. Since this concerns the use of public funds, it would be unfair to promote cultural activities that are reserved for the happy few. . . . Decentralization, in a country such as Canada, signifies an active battle against vast distances in order to make our cultural symbols available to all Canadians, no matter where they live.17

Given the benevolent attitude of the federal government at that time, the groundwork for the creation of a "réservoir d'art", or an "art
bank" as it soon was referred to, was done very quickly. Encouraged by the Director and Associate Director of the Canada Council, Le Moyne first presented her proposal directly to Secretary of State Gérard Pelletier in the context of his cultural policy's objectives of democratization and decentralization, and initially requested $300,000 to implement her plan. According to Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne, Pelletier's response was most positive and he further encouraged her to undertake the appropriate consultations in order to quickly develop the project. Within two weeks a submission to the Department of Secretary of State was drafted requesting financial approval and found a receptive ear at Treasury Board in the person of Al Johnson, the Board's Secretary.

Johnson, a collector of contemporary art himself and shortly thereafter appointed President of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, felt that in order to get the program off the ground and to make it eventually self-sufficient, the plan needed a substantial budget ($1 million per year) and ought to be carried beyond the proposed three year duration. Recalling his role in obtaining funds for the Art Bank, Johnson stated in a conversation with McConathy:

The idea of art for federal offices wasn't hard to digest. But I told Suzanne to ask for more. She needed backing to carry the plan beyond the first year. The leasing program made it attractive since it might eventually pay its own way. It was thought more money would give it a chance of being truly self-sustaining.

All that remained to be done was for the Canada Council to present a formal proposal for the establishment of the Art Bank to Treasury Board and to receive formal approval from Cabinet.
C. The Art Bank Mandate

1. Definition and Evolution

On April 12, 1972, on the recommendation of the Committee on Priorities and Planning of Treasury Board, the Federal Government announced an allocation of $1,000,000 per year for a period of five years for the establishment of an Art Bank\textsuperscript{22} and in a press release dated May 19, 1972, the Department of Secretary of State officially announced the creation of the program, the objectives of which were fourfold:

a. To familiarize the Canadian public with contemporary art;

b. To assure artists of supplementary income;

c. To assist commercial galleries;

d. To encourage the private collecting of art.\textsuperscript{23}

It is interesting to note that the primary reason for the establishment of the Art Bank was described for the first time in the Council's 1971/72 Annual Report as primarily a means to assist Canadian artists in making their living from the sale of their work.\textsuperscript{24} This important aspect of the Art Bank Program has consistently been emphasized in subsequent Council publications. The above mentioned government press release, however, lists the 'familiarization of the Canadian public with contemporary art' in first place but, according to Suzanne Rivard Lemoyne "It was the government who chose to invert objectives 1 and 2, for obvious political reasons. It did not matter to us, as long as the 4 objectives were clearly stated."\textsuperscript{25}
In setting up the operation of the Art Bank the question arose who the actual owner of the future holdings would be: the Canadian Government or the Canada Council. At this point Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne again showed considerable foresight and insisted that the Canada Council, protected by its arms-length principle, had to retain sole ownership of the collection to act as a "buffer" and to protect the integrity of the program.26 Thanks to Le Moyne's assertiveness, ownership of the collection was granted to the Council and works of art have since been listed as assets of that organization in annual reports.

In 1977, shortly before the Art Bank's five-year mandate was to expire, the Canada Council submitted a second request to Treasury Board asking to extend the operation of the Art Bank for 1977-1978 and, within the framework of continuous Council programming, for subsequent years.

In this second submission, the Canada Council stressed the Art Bank's potential not only as a resource for the arts community but also for the general public. It recommended the revision of procedures in order to bring about financial self-sufficiency and proposed to introduce non-revenue producing activities such as loans of works from the collection, advisory services, promotion and publicity for the artists. The Council also suggested that the Art Bank increase its extension/diffusion function and concluded the submission in proposing that

... the Art Bank has come to be recognized by the artistic community and the media as one of the Canadian government's most imaginative creations and one of the Council's most effective and valuable programs. Still, much remains to be done to realize the potential of the Art Bank resources and to raise general awareness of contemporary art. Council would now like to see a balanced emphasis on acquisition on the one hand and renting and
education/diffusion on the other. By changing the emphasis in this way and redeploying resources, we will improve the services we offer and more effectively fulfill the original intentions of the Art Bank. With more publicity for the Art Bank and its artists, with more rentals outside Ottawa and with special exhibitions of the collection in public galleries, more Canadians will have the opportunity to develop an interest in contemporary Canadian art. If these Canadians could be encouraged to buy contemporary art for their homes and offices, then the art market would expand. Ultimately, the Art Bank will have a lasting effect only if it can contribute to the stimulation and expansion of the art market so that Canada's artists can devote full time to their art. The Art Bank with its dual emphasis on acquisition and diffusion can continue to play a leading part in this development.27

The request and its recommendations to Treasury Board were approved in January 1977 but very specific budgetary conditions were put forth. Unlike the 1972 Treasury Board Directives which implemented the Art Bank program but did not designate specific and separate amounts or budgets for purchases and administration, the approval for funding Art Bank activities for 1977-1982 outlines in great detail how monies were to be allocated. And whereas during the first five years of the Art Bank's operations the relationship between funds available for the Purchase Program and administrative costs was closely related (i.e. the higher the costs of administration the smaller the amount available for purchases) a clear division between program costs and administration expenses had been established.28 But, the Art Bank's continued existence appeared secure for the future and the following additional functions, which were outlined in the submission to Treasury Board, were added to ongoing activities:

a. To bring about an increase in the Art Bank's rental activities the client base will be enlarged to include provincial and municipal governments, non-profit organizations, hospitals, and educational institutions.
b. The Art Bank will offer specific works from its collection for extended loan to public galleries.

c. A Special Purchase Assistance Program for public galleries and other collecting institutions will be initiated in the form of matching grants for up to $10,000 per year to encourage public galleries in collecting works of contemporary Canadian art.

d. Artists will be given the opportunity to buy back their works from the Art Bank at a combined price of purchase costs (consisting of the acquisition price, initial transportation costs to the Art Bank, framing expenses where applicable, and provincial sales tax) plus a small administration fee.²⁹

The Art Bank's mandate was thus formally expanded to include activities which were not part of its original objectives but had evolved alongside ongoing programming.

In 1978, only one year after the Government declared its support for the continued existence of the Art Bank, Treasury Board announced that, as a consequence of general budget cuts, funds for the Art Bank Purchase Program would be withheld from the Council's appropriation and that only $200,000 to cover the expenses of administering the rental program would be forthcoming.³⁰

Irritated by the government's interference in its affairs through Treasury Board directives, the Canada Council refused to acknowledge the intervention in its affairs and announced that the Art Bank would continue to purchase works of art for its collection.
Insisting on the maintenance of the Council's arms-length relationship with the government, including the allocation of funds according to the needs of the artistic community as the Council deems fit, the members of the Board of the Canada Council supported this decision and at their 1978 fall meeting unanimously approved the re-establishment of the Purchase Program, albeit at a reduced budget of $300,000 which was later that year raised to $400,000. The Council's 1978/79 Annual Report stated that "In reaffirming its belief in the concept of the Art Bank, Council's members drew attention to the Art Bank's role as a source of income for artists and its importance in strengthening the entire art market." Since September 1978, the Art Bank's purchase budget has been allocated from the Council's arts granting budget.

The Art Bank had survived a very threatening situation and the existence of its programs appeared safe within Council's mandate even if the defence was based on a matter of principal rather than on a specific commitment by the Canada Council towards this relatively small program. This view is substantiated by the fact that Council management moved shortly after to review and assess program policies and procedures as well as the administrative aspects of the whole Art Bank operation. To this purpose it commissioned Dr. Davidson Dunton, assisted by the consulting firm of P.S. Ross and Partners, to prepare a study and to examine the following questions:

a. Is the Art Bank's policy framework adequate and appropriate?
b. Does the Art Bank carry out its operations as effectively as possible?
c. Is the present formal mandate adequate, given the unexpected
and growing obligations of the Bank as the leading
collection of contemporary Canadian art, to provide extension
services and works for exhibition? If not, what changes are
indicated?
d. Is the funding adequate to discharge the appropriate mandate?
If not, what funding levels are indicated?\textsuperscript{32}

The report was published in 1979 and a press release issued by
the Canada Council on September 25 stated that: "Professor Dunton fully
endorses the Art Bank mandate and concludes that the Bank's rental and
acquisition operations are efficiently managed and that its extension
services are of great value".\textsuperscript{33}

In his report Davidson Dunton points out, for the first time in
a public document, that the original mandate of the Art Bank contains
two, combined and complementary objectives:

There are obviously some in-built tensions between the two main
purposes of the Bank. If its sole aim had been successfully to
rent works of art to federal agencies it could operate on a
commercial kind of basis, acquiring only works that it found from
experience would readily appeal to prospective clients. But the
Bank was not conceived as just a service agency. It had the other
purpose of supporting newly produced Canadian art, and under the
general tenets of the Council this could only mean art judged by
experts to be of high quality. Such quality is not necessarily the
same as rentability, although often the two happily coincide.\textsuperscript{34}

Besides revealing the complexities arising from the mandate,
the Dunton/Ross Report proved significant because it included a number
of recommendations with regard to increases in rental fees and improved
marketing strategies as well as better access of some works to the
public through loans to museums and public galleries across Canada. The
paper further addressed issues relating to the Art Bank's mandate
vis-a-vis extension services, the allocation of sufficient staff and warehouse space, and suggested that Art Bank activities be reviewed again after four years. In concluding his report Davidson Dunton suggested that:

the Art Bank concept was a good one, a credit to Canada; that it has in general well served its combined purposes in its years of operation; and that it would be a great loss if abandoned at this stage.35

Most of the recommendations put forth in the Dunton/Ross Reports were implemented over the course of several years and a study aimed at resolving physical as well as administrative problems related to the management of the collection and warehouse conditions was undertaken in 1980.36 Policies and administrative procedures continued to improve over the next years and no external, independent, assessment of the Art Bank mandate and programming has been required since 1979.

In the context of the Art Bank's extension services, it should be noted that one of Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne's original proposals brought forward in conjunction with the establishment of the Art Bank, was to set up a documentation centre of contemporary art with slides, biographical information, publications and tape recordings. Funds for this centre had initially been included in the allocation for the set-up of the Art Bank but were subsequently cancelled.37

By 1981, the Art Bank's existing warehouse and office facilities had become sufficiently inadequate to necessitate a considerable increase in storage and working space. A warehouse bay adjacent to its location in the east-end of Ottawa became vacant and was leased from the Art Bank's landlord. This increased space provided not only urgently
needed storage space but made it possible to set aside space for a gallery to display larger works from the collection and for a small visual arts Resource Centre. Unfortunately no additional funds or staff, as proposed by Le Moyne, were allocated at that time to develop this centre. Still in existence, the Resource Centre contains biographical information on all artists represented in the Art Bank, slides of all works in the collection as well as those submitted by artists who received grants from the Council’s Arts Awards Service, periodicals, catalogues, Canada Council publications and reference material. The Resource Centre is available for consultation by staff, the visual arts community, students and the general public.

Over the last twenty years the Art Bank evolved, at times by trial and error and on occasion with difficulty, from a noble concept which proposed a dual set of objectives, into a modern organization. In September 1989, the whole operation, including offices, workshop and storage facilities, the Resource Centre and gallery, moved from the warehouse in Ottawa’s east-end to new premises located closer to Ottawa’s downtown at 370 Catherine Street. The much improved facilities made it possible for the relatively small staff to care for and maintain the collection according to museological standards and to provide rental clients with better service. The more central location made the Art Bank significantly more accessible for artists, rental clients and visitors.
2. Program Implementation and Development

Broadly speaking, the development of Art Bank programs can be separated into three major periods. The first, loosely spanning the years 1972-1977, can be considered one of formation and innovation since all efforts had to be directed towards the setting-up of an operation which was neither a museum, nor an art gallery, nor a commercial art rental service--yet had to have some characteristics of each--and for which no model existed.

The Art Bank's first Director, Luke Rombout, came to the organization in May 1972\textsuperscript{38} with a solid curatorial and administrative background which he had acquired while working with the Beaverbrook Art Gallery in Fredericton, as curator at the Owens Art Gallery in Sackville and at York University.\textsuperscript{39} Within the ideology, policies and administrative framework of the Canada Council (the Art Bank was still a unit within the Visual Arts Section), Director Rombout was responsible for putting into place not only an instant art collection but also an organizational structure that would coordinate a rental service to the Federal Government.

It was Rombout who, in consultation with Le Moyne, set up the Art Bank's acquisition procedures through a jury system based on Council's structure of grants adjudication. During the first year Rombout travelled with the juries across Canada to visit galleries as well as artists studios and supervised the acquisition of 2181 works of art.\textsuperscript{40}
The Art Bank's small staff of three, however, was not trained in either museological procedures, such as the cataloguing and documenting of a collection or in the handling of works of art. To correct this situation employees were sent for short periods of time to the National Gallery to familiarize themselves with the skills necessary to protect and maintain art collections. As the first acquisitions began to arrive in considerable numbers at the warehouse, procedures had to be established very quickly to inventory, frame and store the growing collection and to prepare the works for installation in the offices of waiting rental clients. Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne remembers that Rombout's curatorial expertise and overall efforts were exceptional and contributed significantly to setting the operation of the Art Bank in motion.41

Throughout the first five years, activities focussed primarily on the acquisition program and almost 7000 works were selected for the Art Bank collection by numerous juries. On the other hand, the rental operation was slow to get off the ground, and logistics prevented active rental activity before November 1973.42 The "inactivity", however, of works accumulating in storage caused concern amongst artists and the public. A typical comment was expressed by Yves Gaucher, a senior artist from Montreal and himself a member of several Art Bank juries, who noted that, "I don't want to sell my best work to the Art Bank for two reasons: one, it may never get out of the warehouse and two, if it does, in five years it will be a rag".43 In reviewing an exhibition of paintings from the Art Bank collection at the Saidye Bronfman Centre in Montreal in 1977, one of many special projects the Art Bank coordinated
at that time, the critic George Bogardi declared that "most of the collection, especially the more 'daring' items, are permanently warehoused in Ottawa".44

Reference to the Art Bank's rental services and the number of works rented also began to appear in various newspaper articles which reported on Art Bank activities and quoted the percentage of works rented around 50%-60% of the total collection. In a commentary published on June 4, 1977, Art Perry provided general information on the Art Bank in the entertainment section of The Province and stated that of the approximately 7000 works purchased by April 1st of that year, about 4200 (60%) were rented and that "the remainder stay in the vault".45 However, according to Art Bank records (which, today, are considered by staff not to be particularly reliable) the actual number of works rented was considerably lower and the number of works rented in 1977, as quoted in the Ross Report was 3454 or (49%).46

Disenchanted with bureaucracy in general and with what he referred to as the lack of "a climate of ideas" Rombout left the Art Bank after only two years to replace Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne as Head of the Council's Visual Arts Section. A permanent director was not appointed until 1976. For three years the juries, most of them chaired by Rombout's interim replacement, Christopher Youngs, continued to purchase works for the collection. At the same time, the day to day operation of the Art Bank was in the hands of an administrator.47

The years between 1976-1981 developed into a period during which the activities in both the acquisition and the rental programs had
to be refined and consolidated. Christopher Youngs was officially appointed Director of the Art Bank in 1976. Originally from the United States where he graduated from the San Francisco Art Institute, Youngs had earlier opened and operated the Nightingale Gallery in Toronto, a centre for the exhibition and distribution of contemporary art which later evolved into A Space, an artist run centre still in operation in 1992. He later followed Luke Rombout as director/curator to the Owens Art Gallery in Sackville, N.B. and, according to The Ottawa Citizen's art critic Kathleen Walker, had "spent a great deal of time trying to arouse the Canadian consciousness".48

Art Bank juries continued to travel across Canada and the collection increased by several hundred works per year. To make the growing inventory more visible beyond the scope of the Rental Program and accessible to the general public several exhibitions of works from the Art Bank were put together to travel through Canada and abroad. However, the disappointing performance of the rental service and especially the shortfall of anticipated revenues gave rise to considerable concern. Since the originally expected self-sufficiency of the rental program was what first persuaded the federal government to support the Art Bank concept,49 it became increasingly apparent that greater efforts had to be made to achieve a balance between the acquisition of works and rental activities. It was only after the implementation of several of the recommendations of the Dunton/Ross Report that a slow but steady increase in the number of works rented, and consequently in revenue, began to materialize. The 1980/81 Annual Report of the Canada Council states that "On March 31, 1981, 5778
works, 62 per cent of the collection, were being rented. Revenues from the rental program that year totalled $358,903.50

By 1981, the Art Bank, in its role as source of funding and promoter of contemporary art, had been fully integrated within the visual arts milieu in Canada. Artists quickly began to consider the purchase of their work equal in importance to grants—indeed, many preferring a purchase to a grant—because, apart from the positive financial aspects of the transaction, their work could be seen by a very wide audience across Canada and abroad.

The Dunton/Ross Report had stressed that the financial objectives, i.e. to generate sufficient income from the rental program to cover its own costs, be intensified through various marketing strategies. It suggested in particular that thought be given to:

Increasing the client base as the means to increasing the volume of works rented. In particular, Federal Government departments and agencies in Ottawa and the regions with significant wall space potential must be identified and a specific plan for approaching them must be developed. In the regions, where potential is highest, marketing efforts must be made more economic, and in particular the average value of contracts must be increased to offset the high cost of marketing there. . . . Also of importance is the need to market the Art Bank’s works to the untapped para-public and provincial government markets, which currently represent the area of greatest potential. During the coming year, an approach to Ottawa-based para-public organizations and provincial government departments should be planned and carried out as a test of the potential of this market.51

Although the Canada Council had previously confirmed its commitment to the Art Bank and Davidson Dunton recommended its continued existence in his report, the objectives and programs remained controversial at that time. It can be argued that even seven or eight years after its establishment the Art Bank’s dual mandate remained
fundamentally incomprehensible for politicians and the public. The chronic lack of information material on programs, policies and procedures and the limited accessibility to the public contributed significantly to the Art Bank's enigmatic image.

During the third major period in the development of the Art Bank, 1981-1991, more recommendations of the Dunton/Ross Report were implemented and the last ten years have been marked by significant growth in all aspects of the organization's activities. Christopher Youngs left the Art Bank in 1980 and was replaced in 1981 by William Kirby, a former Director of the Edmonton Art Gallery, Curator of Contemporary Art at the Winnipeg Art Gallery and Visual Arts Officer at the Canada Council. The new course for the Art Bank was outlined by Kirby in a report to Council in September 1981 which proposed that "the most important new direction we have set for the Art Bank is the plan to become more publicly accessible". Part of this plan for greater accessibility and visibility of Art Bank programming was to initiate a more targeted marketing strategy in the regions, to expand the activities of the rental program and to increase rental fees to cover the costs of the Rental Program. It also included the organization of information sessions for artists and the public to explain policies and procedures of all Art Bank programs and the introduction of public tours of the storage facilities.

As a result of the Art Bank's efforts to increase its accessibility and visibility in the regions, the number of submissions from artists and requests from rental clients increased dramatically.
Submissions to the Purchase Program from artists and dealers grew from a total of 661 in 1980/81 to 1035 in 1989/90. Unfortunately, during the same period the Art Bank's budget for new acquisitions increased only from $510,000 to $800,000. Taking into consideration a sharp rise in prices for works of art and the accumulative effects of inflation, the constant dollar value of the purchase budget declined significantly.

At the same time, the growth of the Rental Program can be observed in the sharp rise in the number of works rented, which increased from 5804 in 1980/81 to 10,309 in 1990/91 (during the same period the number of works in the collection rose from 9697 to 15,957) (Appendix A). As targeted, much of this growth took place outside the National Capital Region and today 41% of all works rented are installed across Canada from St. John's to Victoria. In 1992 the Rental Program, according to Art Bank staff, finds itself in the position of not having enough works available to provide clients with a reasonable selection to choose from because several hundred of unrented works are either on loan, awaiting installation, temporarily in a regional rental exhibition, in the frameshop or undergoing restoration.

Faced with the double dilemma of, on the one hand, not having sufficient funds to respond to increased demands on the Purchase Program, and on the other, experiencing the frustrating situation of not having a large enough inventory to satisfy the request from potential rental clients, the Art Bank reported in its 1990 Report to Council that

The Rental Program is being seriously affected by the decreasing number of works available. Unless the Art Bank can secure sufficient funds to allow for adequate purchases and staff, we will
be unable to serve the growing demand we have created and will therefore begin to fall back.56

Since the Council’s budget was frozen and therefore no new funds could be expected to ease the Art Bank’s financial squeeze it was suggested, according to staff, that if additional resources were required to sustain the Art Bank’s programs, attention should be directed towards the assets of the collection. The Repurchase Program, introduced in 1977 as an added service to artists, produced a modest amount of revenue each year for the Canada Council, and since 1989 specifically for the Art Bank. A new repurchase policy, aimed at generating additional funds through the de-acquisition of works came into effect April 1, 1991. To date no works have been de-accessioned from the Art Bank under this policy.

Today, at a time of severe restraints and cut-backs not only in cultural production but in all sectors of the Canadian economy, the Art Bank finds itself at a crossroads to decide on either a reduction in all its programming activities or, to better fulfil its mandate, a considerable expansion.

D. Literature Review and Research Material

Although it has been in existence for 20 years, only two independent assessments of the Art Bank have been undertaken. Dale McConathy’s "The Canadian cultural revolution: An appraisal of the politics & economics of art" was published in the Autumn 1975 issue of now defunct artscanada and examined the events leading to the Art Bank’s creation and early development, its programs and situation within the
cultural fabric of Canada. The other analysis was commissioned by the Canada Council in 1978 to obtain an unbiased review of the Art Bank's mandate and operations. Dr. Davidson Dunton was asked to conduct this research with the help of management consultants P.S. Ross and Partners. The Dunton Report (at times also referred to as the Dunton/Ross Report) assessed the Art Bank's mandate and effectiveness of operations and based on their assessment recommended the implementation of various procedures.

Besides the McConathy study and the Dunton/Ross Reports only brief newspaper articles had been published, which were often slanted towards the more sensationalist aspects of the Art Bank and related to specific events such as the opening of an Art Bank exhibition, the public's reaction to the display of sculptures or the announcement of a new repurchase policy.

Several books dealing with issues of Canadian culture such as Maria Tippett's Making Culture, Susan Crean's Who is afraid of Canadian Culture, Bernard Ostry's The Cultural Connection, George Woodcock's Strange Bedfellows and the reports of Royal Commissions and Committees provide background information on the development and funding of cultural activities but refer only in passing to the Art Bank.

Neither the assessments by McConathy and Dunton nor the above mentioned books, reports and newspaper articles provide a comprehensive history of the Art Bank, in-depth study of the development of its policies and programs, an assessment of the collection or the influence on the art market or public taste.
The majority of useful and concrete background information could be found in internal documents of the Canada Council and the Art Bank: memoranda, letters, reports to Council, surveys, program information brochures, Art Bank catalogues and Annual Reports. In addition, a vast amount of data relating to the collection, the Purchase and Rental Programs and statistics were obtained from the Art Bank's data-base.

To investigate issues not dealt with in the above mentioned literature and to verify facts, numerous personal informal conversations were conducted with Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne, the Head of the Art Bank William Kirby and his staff, the President of the Professional Art Dealers Association of Canada, Susan Whitney, and members of the visual arts community.

E. Thesis

The past pages provided the reader with background information on the status of the artist, a history of the events leading to the establishment of the Art Bank, the evolution of the Art Bank mandate and the organization's corporate history. Chapters I-III will examine in detail the policies and procedures of the Purchase, Rental and Non-revenue Producing Programs and assess their overall effectiveness. Information on the Art Bank's relationship with the Canada Council, the means it has been provided to fulfill its objectives and a strategy for the 1990's will contribute to substantiate the conclusion of my thesis.

The title of this study refers to the fact that the Art Bank is perceived from different perspectives. For artists it is primarily a
source of income and an effective means to have their work displayed across Canada. The federal bureaucracy considers the Art Bank a service, in the words of Treasury Board "to adorn public areas and offices". The arts community and the general public see the Art Bank as a large collection of contemporary art. Although its mandate suggests several specific objectives and provides a strategy to reach them, it is my thesis that the Art Bank is primarily a cultural program which was initiated to democratize the visual arts by bringing works of art out of the museums and into every day contexts and to make the work of our visual artists accessible to all Canadians and not, as has been the practice in the past, just a select few.
CHAPTER I

THE PURCHASE PROGRAMS

A. The Art Bank Purchase Program

1. Selection Criteria for Works of Art

When Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne proposed the creation of a "réserve d'art" for the purpose of bringing large numbers of Canadians in touch with works of contemporary art through a rental program, the emphasis was both on the "réserve" (the collection) and on "art". The notion that subject matter, colour, size, rentability, aesthetic direction or durability of a work should be a consideration for its selection never arose. Consistent with Council ideology, excellence was to be the sole reason for a work of art to be purchased for the collection. In a memorandum to Council, dated July 1974, Luke Rombout reinforced the principle of excellence as the one and only standard in the selection of works for the Art Bank:

There was never a question in our mind, but that we were going to be involved in the formulation of the most important collection of contemporary art in this country, and this is exactly what has happened. We are now into the third year of operation, and a consensus of opinion regarding the quality of the collection has in the meantime been obtained. The substance of this opinion, from experts in the field, is that we have brought together a collection encompassing a broad representation of many kinds of imagery, media and ideas with which a large segment of Canadian creative artists are presently preoccupied... We have a clear responsibility, we feel, to see that we obtain in qualitative terms the best works produced in this country if we believe, as we do, that this collection also serves as an important didactic vehicle to individuals not usually exposed to contemporary art. We are most concerned that the works brought to this segment of the population are in the opinion of the juries we employ the best works we can obtain. 58
The origins for this uncompromising position can be traced back to 1966 when David Silcox initiated the original Canada Council collection. At that time juries, which adjudicated visual arts grants, were also asked to make recommendations for the purchase of works of art and only works considered of the highest quality were acquired; that these works were subsequently displayed throughout the offices of the organization was irrelevant. From the first jury in 1972 until today, the fact that works purchased for the Art Bank collection are available for rental to government offices, was never a consideration in the selection process. Current Purchase Program guidelines state that "juries do not assess according to quotas for success rate, gender, region, or standing of the artist; medium, style or selling price of the work; or size or possibility of rental of a work". 59

In her original proposal for the creation of an Art Bank Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne proposed that in order to accommodate hierarchies which exist in the administrative systems of governments, the collection should consist of two levels: the "programme de prestige" and the "programme public". 60

It was suggested that a "programme de prestige" should consist of works by distinguished artists, priced at an average cost of $2000, for the display in the offices of cabinet ministers, ambassadors and senior officials. At the same time Le Moyne advised that works of art loaned to government departments from the National Gallery of Canada be returned since these pieces are national treasures, represent important elements of Canada's heritage and must be preserved in more controlled environments. Le Moyne added, however, that this suggestion does not
imply that works from the Art Bank might necessarily be of inferior quality, except that artists who agreed to participate in the program would have been aware from the beginning that their works could be exposed to less than perfect conditions and, like the artists themselves, are perishable. 61

In contrast, the "programme public", although larger in volume and consisting of less costly works (around $300), would provide the foundation for the most important aspects of the program. According to Rivard Le Moyne, it would be at this level that large numbers of works should be made available to the public and the process of democratization of and public access to contemporary art be given the greatest opportunities. Works from the "programme public" were to be displayed in corridors, cafeterias, open offices and other equally visible spaces so that a public, which would never or only rarely set foot into an art gallery or museum, could come in first direct contact with contemporary works of art. 62

In this context it is important to note that not all paintings and sculptures are of relatively large dimensions or all works on paper small; as well, works on paper are not necessarily inexpensive nor do paintings or sculptures always demand high prices. Neither are small works the prerogative of young artists (and therefore less expensive) and large ones the exclusive territory of more established practitioners (and costly): and big, so called "major" works are not automatically aesthetically more successful than those executed in more modest dimensions.
Referring to the two-tier collection Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne noted:

If I recall well, this idea came from Robert Elie. For me it was acceptable as a way to ensure protection of major works in areas of restricted circulation. It certainly was not to accommodate hierarchies of the system, a concern I certainly did not have or shared. It is no accident that it was never implemented, it was deliberately left out. It had been a sort of political compromise, early in the game.63

The two tiers of the program and a division of the collection into a V.I.P. and a public category, as stated by Le Moyne, were never officially implemented. What evolved unofficially, however, was that works on paper, i.e. drawings, water colours, original graphics, photographs and mixed media and, to a lesser degree small paintings, were consistently purchased in relatively large quantities. During 1972/73 the Art Bank acquired a total of 2021 works of which 368 (18%) were paintings, 71 (3.5%) sculptures, and 1582 (78.5%) works on paper; and the breakdown for 1991/92 was 2020 (12.5%) paintings, 910 (5.6%) sculptures, 12,506 (77.6%) works on paper and 685 (4.2%) other works (installations, fibre wallhangings, bookworks, holograms as well as film and video).64 As Le Moyne correctly anticipated, it is the smaller works which, still today, represent the bread-and-butter inventory for the requirements of the Rental Program and are indeed those most accessible to the general public.

The prices paid for works of art by the Art Bank have been subject of much speculation. A memorandum from Associate Director Timothy Porteous to Council dated June 17, 1974 sheds light on early Art Bank purchase guidelines and specifically refers to the maximum amount which could be paid for a single work. This document recommended that
For major sculptures, we would like to set a ceiling of $40,000 per work with payment to the artist to be spread over two years or more.

For works other than sculpture . . . we would like to set the maximum price per work at $20,000. . . . In exceptional cases such as Pellam, Riopelle or Colville, who command prices in excess of $20,000 per work, we would obtain Council authorization in each case and spread the payment over two years.65

The above recommendation was approved by Council and, in order to keep up with rising prices, the maximum price per work or the total amount paid to any single artist for the purchase of several works within a given year would not exceed the level of a Canada Council senior arts grant. Following the departure of Christopher Youngs in 1981, the Board of the Canada Council again examined Art Bank policies and the minutes of the March 1981 Meeting of the Board recorded that "in future, no work of art costing more than $10,000 be purchased without formal approval from Council".66 This restriction was lifted soon afterwards and today the maximum amount an individual may receive over a 12-month period from the Canada Council (i.e. the Arts Awards Service and/or the Art Bank) is $42,000. The acquisition of works costing more than $60,000 must be approved by the Canada Council and payment to the artist or dealer made over two years. According to William Kirby, no purchase over $50,000 has been made since 1978.

The pricing of works of art is part of a complex process. For artists who are represented by dealers, the price for their work is usually determined in comparison with those of artists at similar stages in their career. But it must be kept in mind that the art market is not immune to manipulation and in order to promote demand and foster careers, prices for works by a specific artists may increase very
quickly and be kept at artificially high levels compared to those of other artists. Even at times when the art market experiences low sales activity, as has been the case since 1990, once prices are established, they are usually not reduced, and, at worst, remain at the level of previous years.

For artists who market their own work and primarily exhibit in public galleries or artist-run centres, establishing prices is difficult. Costs for materials and labour intensive techniques may play a role in determining a price, especially if expensive processes such as the printing of large photo-based work, casting, media productions or electronic components are involved. However, artists familiar with the price structure of contemporary art are prepared to sell their work for less than production costs, often for no other reason than to eliminate storage problems or the option of having to destroy a work.

From the beginning, artists and dealers determined the prices for works of art offered for purchase to the Art Bank. In the above mentioned talk to the Art Gallery of Ontario in 1974, Luke Rombout pointed out that

Obviously, with the amount of money at hand, a substantial responsibility was placed upon us to ensure that prices on the Canadian market would not sky-rocket. We waved a flag to everyone, saying that we would stringently exercise our prerogative not to purchase, if the prices, as a result of the program, were to go up brazenly, so to speak. What we mentioned then, and what we are saying now, is that if the price structure of the art market were to go up, it might significantly prevent the further encouragement of private and corporate collecting.67

According to Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne, prices for works of art were not negotiated in the early years of the Art Bank and she recounted
that "When works were considered too expensive the policy was not to purchase and not to negotiate".\textsuperscript{68} During Christopher Youngs direction, however, it was common practice for the Art Bank to negotiate with artists for lower prices. In an interview with Roy Bongartz for an article in the April 1977 issue of \textit{ARTnews} Christopher Youngs stated that "I don't like to get the jury involved with haggling over prices if they like a work - I try to take care of that part. If the price is too high, we negotiate, but it can be too low, too. and then I'll try to raise it. We are not out there to take advantage of an artist."\textsuperscript{69} Be that as it may, it is important to point out that, even before 1981, the artist's asking price was automatically paid for the majority of works in the Art Bank and that institutional discounts, which are common practice whenever public galleries acquire works from dealers, have never been requested.

Today, the Art Bank considers pricing to be part of a professional artists' responsibilities, or that of their dealers, and acquisition costs are no longer negotiated between staff and artists. It should be added that jury members who recommend purchases are themselves involved in the art market and therefore keenly aware of current market prices. Considering the decreased purchase power of the acquisition budget as well as the stiff competition amongst artists across Canada for Art Bank purchases at an approximate success rate of 1:10, works which are priced at a level inconsistent with the quality of the work or an artist's career and production, are simply not recommended for purchase. Art Bank guidelines point out that "Each jury
works within a different context and makes its recommendations according to the quality of the submissions and the funds available".70

2. Eligibility Criteria

The eligibility criteria for individuals who may submit works to the Art Bank are consistent with those for other Canada Council programs. When the Council was first established only Canadian citizens were eligible to apply for grants; this restriction was later opened up to include landed immigrants who had been residents for at least five years. To comply with the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms the Council's citizenship regulation for all programs, including the Art Bank Purchase Program, was changed in 1987 to read "Applicants for all grants must be Canadian citizens or permanent residents of Canada".71

The other major eligibility rule for individuals submitting their work to the Art Bank centres around the term "professional" and, consistent with Council policy, Art Bank documents specify that only professional artists are eligible to apply.

The term "professional" is usually defined in the sense that an individual has completed formal training (completion of a university or college program in the fine arts), has created an independent body of work and has exhibited this work in a professional context such as in public galleries or artist-run centres. While more and more artists today are eligible to apply for purchases or grants under this definition, a number of well known and critically acclaimed practitioners might not have qualified in the early stages of their
careers. Highly respected artists, for example Shirley Wiitasalo, Geoffrey James or Murray Favro, never attended or completed art school, others received their university training in a discipline other than the fine arts. A considerable number of artists, in particular those who work entirely outside the mainstream or any other art milieu (in particular indigenous and folk artists) rarely and if at all then only towards the end of their careers, had the opportunity to exhibit in a "professional context".

For the reasons outlined above, the Art Bank almost never rejects submissions on the basis of the artist's professional eligibility. In contrast to the assessment procedures for Council grants, which are awarded based on the quality of an artist's overall production, the merit of the proposed project and support material, acquisitions for the Art Bank collection are based entirely on the merit of the work presented to the juries.

According to staff, the Art Bank occasionally receives submissions from individuals who clearly have not finished their formal training and are therefore producing work under the supervision and guidance of another artist. In order to retain a generous rather than bureaucratic perspective of the assessment process, such submissions are nevertheless presented to the juries. Since student work tends to be unfocussed and often reflect the young artist's lack of intellectual and aesthetic maturity, not to mention lack of skill, purchases of works by students are very rarely recommended and then only if an artist has returned for post-graduate studies.
Three other eligibility criteria which relate to works of art rather than artists and therefore have no parallels in other Council programs are important for the Art Bank acquisition program. The first applies to the policy that the mandate of the Canada Council is to support and promote the work of living artists and that therefore only works by living artists may be purchased.

The second condition relates to purchases which are made through dealers, and Art Bank guidelines specify that only works on consignment from the artists are eligible for purchase. Works owned by a commercial gallery, an artist’s representative or works from private collections cannot be purchased by the Art Bank.72

The earliest reference to the consignment policy can be found in a memorandum documenting a meeting on December 21, 1976, between several dealers, the Director of the Art Bank and Geoffrey James, Head of Council’s Visual Arts Section. This document states that:

The policy of only works which are on consignment being purchased, is not inflexible. It exists today because there have been abuses of this system by professional art dealers in the past who have taken advantage of artists by purchasing the work at a low price once they have had the commitment from the Art Bank to purchase the work at the gallery at higher prices.73

Since that time the policy of only purchasing works from commercial galleries that are on consignment has been firmly adhered to, with one exception. The only deviation from this policy occurs in acquiring works by Inuit, and to a lesser degree by native artists, that otherwise could not be purchased. The marketing of Inuit art is carried out primarily through Canadian Arctic Producers, a government-sponsored agency dedicated exclusively to the distribution of such work. Attempts
are now made by the Inuit Arts Council to bring Inuit artists personally into the structure of the southern art market. The various co-ops in the North and Canadian Arctic Producers, however, still purchase the work directly from the artists and then resell the drawings, prints, sculptures, wall hangings and products aimed at the tourist trade to commercial galleries as well as to gift and souvenir shops.

Unlike Inuit artists, native artists do not rely on a central government agency to market their work, but many will only sell directly to the dealer and will not leave their work on consignment.

According to staff, the Art Bank has consistently acquired works by Inuit and native artists since 1972 and has always supported the concept that these works belonged in a collection of contemporary art. Until a more direct process can be created by which works by indigenous artists can be collected, Art Bank juries will therefore continue to purchase either directly from Canadian Arctic Producers or from dealers specializing in native and Inuit art.

The third eligibility restriction concerns the purchase of what is generally referred to as "limited edition prints". Art Bank guidelines state that "Facsimile reproductions printed by any means, either autographic or photo-mechanical, of images which were previously created and completed in another medium are not eligible for purchase".74

Generally speaking, it is the Art Bank's aim to remain as accessible as possible to all individuals who consider themselves professional, practising artists (and who are confident enough to
participate in a professional and highly competitive context) as well as to a very broad range of artistic practices. For this reason all guidelines are kept general and, according to staff, in recent years only one individual—an eight year-old attending primary school—was asked not to submit until basic art training has been completed.

3. The Adjudication Process

In her proposal for the creation of the Art Bank Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne stated that the selection of the works as well as the general administration of the program was the responsibility of the Canada Council.75 Because the policy of allocating funds based on the recommendations of peer juries is central to most Council programs, David Silcox's Canada Council collection was purchased according to jury decisions and a similar system was to be implemented for the Art Bank.

When Luke Rombout was appointed as first Director of the Art Bank in 1972, his—and Le Moyne's—most important task was to come up with procedures based on existing Council policies and practices that were suitable for the selection of works of art. In this context it must be noted that the differences which exist between a grant and the purchase of a particular work were given consideration. As previously mentioned, a purchase for the Art Bank collection is recommended only on the aesthetic quality of specific pieces. The work of art, and therefore aspects of that object's materiality, take on considerable importance in the acquisition process. Rombout was therefore reluctant to implement an expedient selection process which, like grants juries, was based only on slides submitted to juries meeting in Ottawa. Instead he introduced
the Art Bank's travelling juries, also frequently referred to as selection committees. From 1972 on, the concept of the travelling juries, which met, and still meet, in all regions across Canada to visit artists studios and commercial galleries, remained at the core of the Art Bank's selection process. However, to accommodate requests from the growing number of artists, shrinking purchase budgets and criticism from the arts community, the composition of the juries and jury procedures experienced considerable changes over the past 20 years.

Luke Rombout's objective was to come up with a process that had a maximum degree of flexibility. To this end juries consisted of Rombout himself (insisting that his vote was important to provide continuity and consistency between juries and, according to Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne, to ensure a balance as the collection grew)76 and two members from the visual arts community, primarily artists but also could include curators, gallery directors and art historians.77 In his December 1972 report to Council Rombout provided a detailed account of the Art Bank jury process and stressed that "We attempt, at our end, to compose balanced committees to ensure, at all times, that the interests of artists as well as the government, are protected".78 The balance Rombout spoke of in the above quotation refers to the fact that one jury member was from the immediate region being visited, the other from outside that area, that the two jury members reflected different aesthetic points of view and represented varying degrees of seniority. No particular effort was made to provide the juries with equal gender representation and of the 48 jury members listed in the 1972-73 Annual Report of the Canada Council, only 11 were women.79
In his talk to the members of the Art Gallery of Ontario in November 1972, Rombout shed further light on the mechanics of these early juries: "Committees thus composed, can be appointed for one or two days, or for a week, or even for a few hours, when necessary. The last time we worked in Toronto, for instance, we were here for three days, and had a different committee for each day." After a day of jurying the juries decided what works were to be purchased and the artists or dealers were informed accordingly almost immediately.80

In conjunction with the travelling selection committees Rombout also organized juries which met in Ottawa on a monthly basis to provide a forum for artists who could not be visited. Artists were invited to submit slides of their work to the Ottawa juries and, according to Rombout, "four things can happen: 1. the work can be rejected; 2. the work can be purchased; 3. a studio visit can be arranged; 4. the works could be sent at our expense to Ottawa, for the Committee's consideration".81

Over the next eight years the jury procedures remained relatively unchanged. The Art Bank Director, or his representative (who was not an employee of the Art Bank but engaged specifically for this purpose), continued to be a member of all travelling juries but, as outlined in the minutes of a meeting between delegates of the Professional Art Dealers Association of Canada and Council staff, the Director usually cast his vote last in order not to influence the other two committee members.82
During the 1970's the number of practising artists increased sharply and a more systematic approach had to be found to decide which artists merited Art Bank jury visits. Whereas during the first few years of purchasing it was primarily up to the Director's discretion to decide whose work should be seen, it became more and more the task of the above mentioned Ottawa juries to recommend studio and gallery visits. In a letter of August 15, 1977, to the President of the Canadian Conference of the Arts and in reply to allegations relating to irregularities in the Art Bank's jury procedures, Timothy Porteous, Associate Director of the Canada Council, pointed out that:

There appear to be misunderstandings about the Art Bank jury procedures although they are described in the attached document which we have circulated as widely as possible. You will see that studio visits are made only upon application by artists who must submit slides to our monthly juries. When a sufficient number of recommendations have been made within a region, a trip is arranged. The artists concerned are clearly notified in advance. We no longer send our juries on "fishing trips".83

In other words, as has been the practice with Council's programs all along, studio and gallery visits were supposed to be made only upon the recommendation of juries. The fact that this policy was not consistently complied with was openly admitted by Christopher Youngs in a talk he presented at the Symposium of the Canadian Museum Association in September 1980. On that occasion he pointed out that it was still the Director's prerogative to independently approve visits.84 According to staff who worked at the Art Bank at that time it was not uncommon for some artists or dealers to phone the Director and ask that a jury visit an exhibition for the purpose of purchasing work. Depending on how
Youngs personally felt about an artist's work, he acted upon such requests by either rejecting them or by visiting the show with a jury.

In an effort to lessen administrative costs, the Art Bank reduced the number of the Ottawa jury meetings at first from twelve to seven and, by 1979, to three meetings per year. These juries purchased almost all works on paper and recommended studio and gallery visits but no longer selected specific works for acquisition based on viewing of slides only. In 1979 as well, the Art Bank's Visual Arts Officer assumed the chair of the Ottawa juries but did not participate as voting member in the juries' decisions.85

A major shift in the Art Bank's purchase policy and jury system occurred in 1981 when William Kirby was appointed as the third Director of the Art Bank. In an extensive report to Council in September of that year he pointed out that

The Advisory Selection Committees (Ottawa juries) and travelling Selection Committees each have three members. In the past the Director of the Art Bank has been a voting member of both . . .

This system was mainly intended to give direction, continuity and an overall perspective to purchases for the Art Bank. The one problem with the system is that it runs against the general practice of Canada Council officers not taking part in specific aesthetic decisions. As the P.S. Ross Report pointed out, the necessity of always having to be with selection committees placed an enormous burden on the Director who was expected to be an administrator as well as virtually a full-time travelling juror.

Beginning with the resumption of purchases this fall, the Director proposes not to be a voting member in order that he may have more time to meet with the art community independently of the committees and also to spend more time administering the Art Bank.86

Kirby further proposed that the Director's place on the juries would be taken by a third artist or curator and that he or the Visual
Arts Officer would continue to chair the juries. What was not mentioned in the report was that all juries from that point on had to include at least one female or one male and that Council policy, that a majority of votes, i.e. two out of three, was required for a positive jury recommendation was reconfirmed.

As the number of emerging artists continued to grow during the 1980’s, so did the volume of requests for purchases to the Art Bank. By 1986 the volume of submissions from across Canada to the Ottawa juries had grown to the extent that their two functions, the purchasing of works on paper and the recommendations for studio and gallery visits, were divided: two juries per year dealt only with studio visit requests and two others with submissions of works on paper. In 1989 this system was further improved when the number of jury members for the four Ottawa juries was increased from three to five to ensure better representation of the five major Canadian regions, i.e. Atlantic Canada, Quebec, Ontario, the Prairies and British Columbia. Until then Ontario and Quebec were always represented by one jury member from each province, but the third juror was selected on a rotating basis from one of the three remaining regions.

As pointed out earlier, it was Art Bank policy that juries travelled to a city or region only if a sufficient number of visits for that general area had been recommended. The difficulty with this practice arose from the fact that the majority of Canadian artists live in the Metropolitan Toronto area and in or near Montreal. The Art Bank therefore received many more requests from artists living in these centres, and consequently more artists were recommended for studio
visits. Because of their relatively large number, their work could be seen by a jury much sooner and more frequently than those of artists in other parts of the country. Another difficulty in the Art Bank's adjudication process, one primarily of discontinuity, persisted to cause problems which originated in the long established practice that the pre-selection juries, and the juries which would eventually view the work in artists studios, operated entirely independently from each other. For this reason, travelling juries would be seeing the work of different artists who might have been waiting for a studio visit for two or more years and, not infrequently, had been recommended by as many as five different pre-selection committees. To illustrate this point, Appendix B of the Art Bank's report to Council in 1981 shows that between 1972 and 1981, 78 different juries met in Ontario to visit studios and dealers and 38 in Quebec but only four in Prince Edward Island, six in Newfoundland and New Brunswick and eight in Saskatchewan.\textsuperscript{88} According to Art Bank staff, this system had long given cause to considerable frustration and criticism not only from the artists who were kept waiting for years, as expressed in a letter from the President of the Canadian Conference of the Arts to the Chairman of the Canada Council,\textsuperscript{89} but also from the travelling juries who, to them, had to deal with frequently inexplicable recommendations by various pre-selection juries.

The change from the three to the five member juries made it possible to introduce procedures which provided equal access to artists in all regions and a certain degree of continuity between the pre-selection and travelling juries. Since 1990 only one pre-selection
jury per year now meets in Ottawa and all artists and galleries recommended by that committee are certain to be visited within the same fiscal year. Each of the five jury members is also asked to serve on the follow-up travelling juries to his or her particular region. In other words, the pre-selection jury member from British Columbia is also a member of the jury which visits studios and dealers in that province during the same year. Today, a minimum of twelve different juries travel to every region in Canada (as more studio visits are recommended for Ontario and Quebec, several juries travel to each of those two provinces every year) and the response from the community to the present adjudication system has been enthusiastic.

To further increase access to the Purchase Program the Art Bank introduced a third jury for the direct purchase of small works on paper in 1990. These juries have become increasingly popular with the artists and dealers since drawings and watercolours, graphics, photographs and mixed media works within a certain price and size range can be sent directly to Ottawa for a direct purchase.

4. Juries

Jury members are selected by the officer responsible for the administration of the Purchase Program and approved by the Head of the Art Bank. The objectives in the selection of Art Bank juries are to use as many different individuals as possible and although several artists or other professionals in the visual arts have served on more than one occasion, no two jury compositions have ever been the same.
Art Bank guidelines state that the criteria for jurors are that they be practising professionals in the visual arts, are respected by their peers and are able to respond to and consider a wide range of work. They should be able to articulate their responses to the work presented and be capable of working in a group which is charged with the responsibility of making collective decisions.91

As previously noted, juries are composed of both men and women, are to represent various regions or communities and must provide a balance of senior, mid-career and emerging artists. Since all Art Bank juries have to assess works in a variety of media, jury members are also selected according to their technical skills as, for example, printmakers, sculptors, painters or photographers. A typical jury visiting artists studios in Montreal, could consist of:
1. a senior, francophone, woman painter from Montreal
2. a mid-career, francophone, male sculptor from Quebec City, and
3. a mid-career woman installation artist from London, Ontario.

A similar jury travelling to the three prairie provinces might consist of:

1. a mid-career, anglophone, woman sculptor from Edmonton
2. a senior, anglophone, male painter from Regina, and
3. an emerging, anglophone, male artist producing photo-based work from Winnipeg.

What contributes to the complexities in selecting artists for Art Bank juries is that most Art Bank juries meet for at least five
days, some for as long as ten, and a significant number of artists have obligations as teachers, are preparing for exhibitions, or are working on commissions and are therefore unable to be away from their residences or studios for longer periods of time. This is true especially for women who, in addition to the demands of their profession are raising families and can only participate in juries which meet in their immediate area. Another obstacle in putting together juries is that some excellent artists either refuse to sit on juries altogether or do not feel comfortable adjudicating. Some individuals are known to have difficulty in communicating with other members of the committee or would for reasons of health find it difficult to tolerate the physically and mentally taxing jury schedules and are therefore not suitable for the task. An additional consideration important in selecting members for travelling juries is that they do not function anonymously, hidden away in a board room in Ottawa, but instead meet the artists and dealers personally in their studios and galleries to evaluate the works submitted in a process which demands considerable tact and discretion.

One aspect in the jury selection process, which has been haunting all Council juries for years, is that of "over-use" and the perception that some individuals serve more frequently on competitions than others. Today, artists are not asked to serve on Art Bank juries more than once every four or five years and then never for the same type of jury or region. But, according to staff, because between 50-60 visual artists serve on Art Bank juries alone every year and an even higher number on other Canada Council competitions a certain degree of duplication and repetition, although not desirable, is inevitable.
For all the reasons listed above it is not uncommon that as many as 15 different individuals have to be contacted to assemble a competent five member jury. Between September 1972, and March 31, 1992, 517 professionals in the visual arts have served on Art Bank juries\textsuperscript{92} and their names are listed in Appendix A.

The jury process can create difficult situations for the artists who submit their work to them and for the committee members who have to pass judgement on the work of their peers. To assure that competitions are carried out in a professional and objective manner, all juries are instructed that they must respect the confidentiality of the process and understand that the information provided, the nature of their recommendations as well as the names of the applicants cannot be disclosed. In order to avoid genuine or perceived conflicts of interest, jurors are asked to identify applications of close relatives or friends and absent themselves during the discussion of such submissions.

Staff admits that the jury system is not perfect and that no jury will be "right" for every applicant and point out that the realities of a jury process are such that decisions have to be made but that utmost care is given to assure that this process remains objective and equitable to all artists. Until a better and fairer system can be devised, peer juries will continue to function as the only means of Art Bank adjudication.
5. The Collection

In 1992 it is generally agreed that the Art Bank does not represent an art collection in the museological sense of the word, but for lack of a more appropriate term, the 16,000 works of art owned by the Canada Council are referred to as a collection. "Collection" in its museological connotation implies focussed selection criteria which reflect an institution's acquisition policy and the guarantee of a certain level of "quality". The majority of public collections, however, have been put together under the direction of successive curators, therefore reflecting the aesthetic points of view of various individuals and depend to a large extent on donations (solicited as well as non-solicited). Today, curators and museum administrators tend to evaluate curated public collections more highly than those built around the consensus of juries. But to assume that a curated collection is automatically of a high aesthetic quality or more valuable is a wrong assumption. And to dismiss the Art Bank collection (which has been put together by over five hundred professional artists whose collective judgement is at least equal to that of a small number of individual curators) as a second-rate assortment of works of art, is equally incorrect.

In 1972, Luke Rombout pointed out that "the Bank project has a number of objectives but one of the principal ones, from my point of view, is that we wish to formulate a representative, balanced, and first-rate collection of contemporary Canadian art for placement in federal buildings in Canada and abroad". Two years later, in answer
to a request for more information on the nature of the collection, Rombout re-iterated these objectives in a report to Council as follows:

The observation was made, for the first time, that the quality of the collection was perhaps of secondary importance. We would be less than candid if we did not state that the quality of the collection was of utmost importance to us in the development of this program. Although this matter had never been officially discussed, we simply assumed that this subject was a built-in factor to the whole concept and implementation of the program. The reason we assumed that the quality of the collection was not a matter of discussion was because the ramifications of this program in terms of Canadian art and funding were and are of enormous dimensions. There was never a question in our mind, but that we were going to be involved in the formulation of the most important collection of contemporary art in this country . . . We have a clear responsibility, we feel, to see that we obtain in qualitative terms the best works produced in this country if we believe, as we do, that this collection also serves as an important didactic vehicle to individuals not usually exposed to contemporary art. We are most concerned that the works brought to this segment of the population are in the opinion of the juries we employ the best works we can obtain.94

That Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne’s Art Bank was originally conceived as a collection in the museological sense of the term and not as merely a casual gathering of works of contemporary art is also reflected in the terminology used when a five-year operations budget was put forth in 1972. Rather than following Council terminology for staff titles, such as Visual Arts Officer or Records Clerk, the proposal lists staff positions as "Curator/Registrar" and "Assistant Registrar", titles generally given to museum and gallery personnel.95

It is not the purpose of this study to examine or prove the aesthetic quality of the Art Bank collection. What is important to investigate, however, is to what degree the collection reflects 20 years of contemporary Canadian art practices, taking into consideration that the 16,000 works represent the opinions "of the juries we employ".
In this context Dale McConathy stated that

... the Art Bank isn't a collection - a collation, I almost said - in the usual sense ... It doesn't represent a point of view nor is it limited by any observable criteria, except perhaps by money and the supply of art. I can't think of any more evocative way to describe what I saw other than by connecting it to a wine cellar.

McConathy's analogy between the Art Bank collection and a wine cellar was probably intended tongue in cheek. It does not apply to the Art Bank, however, because wine cellars are usually stocked by one single individual who selects and consumes according to personal taste and pocket book, not unlike a curator's selection process. A better metaphor would have been that of a family basement containing shelves filled with bottles gathered by many relatives and paid for by a generous but distant benefactor. It stands to reason that such a wine cellar would offer a very eclectic and challenging selection: old and rare specimens for special occasions; some unexpected surprises; numerous good but less expensive bottles for every day use; many examples which looked very promising when they first came on the market but appear less so today; and a number of disappointing vintages that should never have made it into the cellar. The same can be said for the Art Bank collection.

In the initial spirit of democratization and because the Art Bank acquisition policy only specifies that works purchased be of the highest quality, the collection is eclectic and broad. As of March 31, 1992 the Art Bank had acquired a total of 16,172 works by approximately 2500 different artists. A breakdown of works purchased by province, place of residence of the artist at the time of purchase, and a list of
purchases made directly from the artists or from dealers are attached in appendices B and C. The Art Bank data base does not contain information regarding artists career levels (emerging, mid-career, senior), ethnicity (although the artists' place of birth is recorded there is no special designation for work by indigenous artists) or categorisation into art and craft media, information which can only be gleaned by close examination of the collection.

Generally speaking, the Art Bank consistently purchased from artists at all career levels and many senior artists, including Paterson Ewen, Jack Chambers, Betty Goodwin and Charles Gagnon as well as Joyce Wieland, Yves Gaucher, Chris Pratt, Guido Molinari, Jean-Paul Riopelle and Michael Snow, are represented in the collection. Their work was purchased in 1972 and, in the case of Goodwin, Gaucher and Wieland, in 1991 as well. A good number of these artists, including Irene Whittome, Colette Whiten, Jacques Hurtubise, or Ron Martin, were at the beginning of their careers when the Art Bank first purchased works from them—although several, like Jacques Hurtubise, had already received a considerable degree of recognition in Canada and abroad. Some major artists of the early 1970's have since passed away (Bush, Chambers, Kurelek, Pellan and Roberts) but their works are still part of the collection.

Especially during the first ten years of its operation the Art Bank came under strong criticism from women's groups for supporting a much higher number of men than women artists. Indeed, of the 322 artists purchased from in 1972—and listed on pages 127-128 of Council's 1972-73 Annual Report—only 62 (20%) were women. In this context it is
important to realize that, unlike today, a much smaller number of women had either the opportunity or the necessary financial and professional support to follow careers as visual artists. It was not until 1976, the year marking International Women's Year, that the work of women artists was officially validated through special exhibitions and purchases by most public galleries, including the National Gallery of Canada. How much the number of works purchased from women by the Art Bank has increased since 1972 can be examined in Appendix D. This print-out shows that the total number of works acquired in 1972 was 2063, of which 1689 (82%) were purchased from men and 374 (18%) from women; the total number of works purchased in 1991 was 572 of which 302 (53%) were bought from men and 268 (47%) from women. The same print-out also provides evidence that the average price for work by women artists is still considerably lower than that by male artists. This fact was first mentioned in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada which stated that

It has been suggested that women painters receive lower prices because collectors, speculating in new paintings by artists whose work is potentially valuable, think women are less likely to keep working until they realize their early promise.

Records from the Art Bank database support this argument. The average price paid per work to male artists in 1972 was $511 compared to $260 to women and although the difference narrowed somewhat over the past 20 years, by 1991 the ratio still was $1800 to $1200. Part of the reason for this discrepancy also lies in the fact that prices for works purchased from dealers are higher than those of independent artists and that more male than female artists have commercial representation.
With regard to the acquisition of works by aboriginal artists similar trends can be observed. In 1972, at a time when the acquisition policies of most public galleries still resisted the purchase of works by native and Inuit artists because they were considered to belong to the domain of ethnological collections, the Art Bank purchased works from Alex Janvier, Norval Morrisseau, Allan Sapp and Jessie Oonark. As already pointed out, most of these works were bought from dealers and not directly from the artists. It should also be noted that as early as 1982, the Art Bank acquired works by Carl Beam, Jane Ash Poitras, Bob Boyer and Robert Houle, artists whose work was validated only in recent years by public galleries. According to William Kirby, approximately 850 works by 150 indigenous Canadian artists have been purchased by the Art Bank to date.

Art Bank guidelines state that works in all media are eligible for purchase and the distinction between works of fine art (painting, sculpture, drawings and original graphics) and craft (ceramics, tapestry, and wood carvings) was never established. Ceramics, textiles and works executed in other media which are usually classified as craft were selected for the collection by the same juries who purchased sculptures and paintings. And although the Art Bank does not offer an abundance of works which would be relegated by purists to the minor arts, a surprising number of ceramics, fibre works and several pieces of furniture have been collected since 1972.

At the time when the Art Bank was established, artists produced primarily paintings, sculptures, graphics, drawings and photographs. In one word, media most appropriate for the display in office buildings or,
for that matter, any official or domestic interior. Although the artistic production of a number of Canadian artists during the early 1970's included video, installation works or performance pieces, the majority of acquisitions for the Art Bank during the first ten years fell into the categories of two or three dimensional media. By the late 1970's and early 1980's the visual arts scene had changed considerably and Art Bank juries began to recommend the acquisition of less conventional work such as installation pieces. And because a classification according to media has become so complex in recent years (many works can be classified in more than one category) the most recent catalogue, published in May 1992, provides a listing of the collection in alphabetical order according to artists' names and not, as in the early catalogues, according to medium.

With regard to the collecting of video tapes and films it is interesting to note that the first public mention of media arts can be traced to Luke Rombout who wrote in 1975 that

We have received some requests to include this medium in the Art Bank collection and while our hearts are willing, our minds are not. It should be obvious that we are dealing with a public largely uninitiated in the visual arts. We are involved in a didactic process of bringing contemporary Canadian art to this public - not just installing the works and running off with rental fees; ... We are trying to cover new ground but this cannot be done hastily. Only careful cultivation will bring about the results we all desire. ... If this process develops well it will not be long before we can bring in video or other media.

Over the following years the media arts community continued to argue for inclusion of their work in the Art Bank collection as for example in a report by Clive Robertson in 1979 which stated in no uncertain terms that the Art Bank ignored media and performance artists.
and did not serve "the other visual artists" at all.\textsuperscript{102} After consultation with the community the Art Bank opened its Purchase Program to include film and video and in 1987. Since 1988, one three-member jury meets in Ottawa to recommend the purchase of films and video tapes, and by 1992\textsuperscript{106} such works have been added to the collection.

According to staff the independence to purchase works in all media is important if the Art Bank collection is to reflect current art practices. What happens to the pieces after they have been acquired, if they will become accessible to the public through rental and exhibitions or are on view only in the offices or the warehouse of the Art Bank, remains the challenging responsibility of its programs.

A careful study of the most recent catalogue reveals a certain imbalance within the collection. The imbalance referred to here is the result of the Art Bank's reactive purchase policy (artists must approach the Art Bank every time they wish to submit their work for purchase) and does not concern an imbalance in aesthetic quality or artistic practices but depth of works by individual artists. Some artists, who submit their work on a regular basis, have had literally hundreds of works purchased by the Art Bank while others, who rarely present their work, only have one or two pieces in the collection. Several major artists are represented by one or two graphics (there are, for example, only two silkscreen prints from 1967 and 1969 by Alex Colville in the collection). Others are represented primarily by a number of major works (for example Ed Zelenak), and some artists, who are currently receiving considerable curatorial attention, such as Jana Sterbak, are not represented at all. Obviously, commercially successful artists,
such as Alex Colville, no longer need the financial support of the Art Bank and choose not to submit their work to juries. But others, regardless of their success in the art market, consider it important to have work purchased by Art Bank on a regular basis. Unfortunately, the Purchase Program's diminishing budget plays an additional role and William Kirby refers to it as "the fourth jury member" in that market prices for major works by senior artists eliminate realistic chances for purchases. For that reason artists whose prices have risen dramatically during the past 12 years such as David and Royden Rabinovitch, Paterson Ewen, Joanne Tod and Geneviève Cadieux, have not been purchased for several years.

The implementation of the Art Bank's Repurchase Program in 1977, provides another explanation why a few artists are now no longer included in the collection or represented only by one or two works. Artists, among them Paterson Ewen, Betty Goodwin, Marcel Barbeau and Ian Carr-Harris have bought back a considerable number of their works and are now represented in the collection by only a few pieces each. Only artists who consistently request studio visits every two or three years, submit repeatedly to the works-on-paper juries or have their work presented by their dealers, are purchased from on a fairly regularly basis. The Art Bank has excellent selections of works by artists such as Colette Whiten, Ed Zelenak, Michael Snow, Irene Whittome, Jack Shadbolt, Jacques Hurtubise, Yves Gaucher, Joe Fafard and Joyce Wieland and many younger artists, amongst them Barbara Steinman, Nicole Jolicoeur, Evergon, Wanda Koop, John Greer, Susan Schelle, Marc Gomes,
Paul Beliveau, Jamelie Hassan and Allan McWilliams are equally well represented.

For the Art Bank, the question whether it represents, from a curatorial point of view, an important collection of contemporary Canadian art or not, is of minor significance. What is important, however, is that the Council's 16,000 works of art, amongst them some of the finest paintings, sculptures, installations, films, videos, drawings, graphics and photographs produced since 1960 reflect the sum total of contemporary artistic production in Canada. What is equally important is that unlike the works in other public collections which are stored in vaults and exhibited maybe once or twice every decade--thereby perpetuating the notion that works of art are alien, incomprehensible, unreachable and unaffordable symbols for an initiated elite--a minimum of 70% of Art Bank holdings are in circulation at any time and have become an expected and accepted part of every day life for many Canadians who would never set foot into a museum or visit galleries.

B. The Repurchase and Special Purchase Assistance Programs

In late 1976 the Canada Council negotiated with Treasury Board to extend the Art Bank's mandate for a second five-year or indefinite term. At the same time Christopher Youngs also recommended that, in order to strengthen the basic objectives of the Art Bank's mandate, three new programs be added to the already established activities:

1. The sale of works from the collection.
2. The establishment of a matching fund program for public
institutions to purchase works by living Canadian artists.

3. Long-term loans of works from the collection to museums and galleries. 103

The establishment of the Repurchase Program, the Special Purchase Assistance Program and a Loan Program was approved by Council and publicly announced in a press release on May 13, 1977. 104 The Repurchase Program as well as the Special Purchase Assistance Program, closely tied to the Art Bank’s mandate to support artists through the purchase of their work, will be examined below; the loan and Long-term-loan Programs, relating to the diffusion of the collection, will be discussed in Chapter III.

1. The Repurchase Program

By 1976, the notion of selling works from the Art Bank collection had been a topic of discussion on several occasions between the Art Bank and the Professional Art Dealers Association of Canada. The following recommendation, relating to the sale of works, was first put forth to the December 1976 meeting of Council:

In response to requests from various artists and institutions, it has become clear that we require a policy for sales of works from our collection.

We recommend that works from the Art Bank collection may be re-purchased by the original artist at any time. Our selling price would be determined by our investment (amount of purchase, sales tax, transportation and framing), plus an administration charge of $25 per work. In an attempt to encourage healthy artist dealer relationships, an effort should be made to re-invest our monies received from sales with the original source of the work involved. Additionally, artists should be encouraged to involve their dealers in any subsequent resale of works which have been acquired from the Art Bank. All sales require the approval of the Director of the Art Bank and the Head of the Visual Arts Section.
Such an arrangement will allow artists to speculate on their work; and, with the approval of a jury, it would permit them to trade a new work for an older work in our collection. This measure would also ensure that artists have a say in the disposition of their work. Indirectly this concept would allow public and private collectors to acquire works from our collection. These measures would serve to make the art market more viable and would ensure that we do not create an artificial situation with our acquisitions program. \(^{105}\)

The implementation of the Repurchase Program was approved by Council in April 1977 and applied to works by living artists only. \(^{106}\) The question of the sale of works by deceased artists, however, was raised several months later during the December 1977 meeting of Council. (It is interesting to note that two very prominent Canadian artists, Jack Bush and William Kurelek died during 1977. Since the Art Bank had purchased a substantial number of works from the two artists it appears to be more than a casual coincidence that the sale of works by deceased artists suddenly emerged as an additional and significant issue.) Council agreed during this meeting that works in the Art Bank by deceased artists could be sold as well but, in order not to compete with immediate sales following an artist’s death or the settlements of estates, only after a five year moratorium and then at fair market value. \(^{107}\)

It is also important to note that the “trading” process, first outlined in the original proposal and repeated in the May 1977 press release, that would have allowed artists to exchange a more recent work for an older one with the approval of a jury, was never implemented.

Between 1977 and 1991, the Art Bank repurchase policy remained ideologically unchanged, although the following procedural modifications were implemented in 1978 and 1981:
a. The administration fee per work was increased in 1981 to $50 per work and three years later to 20% of the original purchase costs or $50 per work, whichever is greater.

b. Works had to be in the collection for a minimum of three years before becoming eligible for repurchase.¹⁰⁸

By the late 1980s the Art Bank was confronted with the fact that the collection was coming of age and that a considerable number of works were over 20 years old and had to be viewed in an increasingly historical context. In addition, the question of the Art Bank's "non moving inventory", i.e. works which had never or only rarely been rented or exhibited, was raised on a regular basis including within the Dunton/Ross Report and internal audits. But more importantly, the Art Bank's budget for new acquisitions had remained unchanged for years and Art Bank management was given to understand that no new monies would be forthcoming in the near future. Because revenues from the sale of works have been added to the purchase budget since 1988 and applied towards the acquisition of new works it was suggested by some members of Council that the Art Bank adjust its repurchase policy to initiate a more pro-active sales activity to generate additional funds for the Purchase Program.

Thus pressured, the Art Bank set up meetings with the arts community to develop a policy that would respect the concerns of artists, dealers and public galleries and introduced a de-accessioning policy in September 1990. This new initiative was justified and outlined in the Art Bank program brochure as follows:
On April 1, 1991, the Art Bank will implement a de-accessioning policy which will enable the Bank to offer works from its collection for sale. Over the past number of years, the Bank’s purchase budget had been eroding, which has undermined its ability to respond to the growing diversity and quality of contemporary art. The de-accessioning policy has been designed, therefore, to extend the Bank’s support to Canada’s visual artists as well as to enable the Bank to maintain as contemporary a collection as possible. Funds generated through the sale of art works will be placed in the Art Bank Endowment Fund, income from which will be available for new purchases of works of art.

Under this new policy artists would be able to buy back their work between three to fifteen years after acquisition by the Art Bank under the same conditions as outlined in the previous repurchase policy, with the exception that the administration fee was increased from 20% to 30% of the original acquisition costs. After fifteen years certain works by living artists would be offered for sale by the Art Bank at a reserve price. In order to encourage public institutions to acquire works from the Art Bank, only galleries and museums would be eligible for the first six months to submit competing bids. If a work was not sold within six months of being offered for sale by the Art Bank, competing bids would be accepted from the general public. Should a work not be sold during this additional period, the Art Bank would make the work available on a first come, first served basis at or above a reserve selling price. Should a work be sold, 50% of the profit (the difference between the original purchase costs and the selling price) would be paid to the artist and the remaining 50% would be placed in the Art Bank’s Endowment Fund. Should a work remain unsold, the artist would continue to have the option to repurchase the work for the original purchase cost plus the 30% administration fee. All works acquired by the Art Bank before April 1, 1991, the implementation date of this policy, would be offered for sale by the Art Bank only with permission of the artist.
With regard to the sale of works by deceased artists the policy states that

Unless de-accessioning has already been initiated at the time of an artist's death, works of a deceased artist will only be offered for sale two years after the artist's death or upon settlement of the artist's estate, whichever comes first, according to the terms and procedures outlined above.

The Repurchase/De-accessioning policy has remained unchanged since 1991, but, according to Art Bank staff, an overall review of the policy is being considered to insure that certain key works in the collection remain in the public domain and do not disappear into private collections.

From the time of its introduction in 1977, the Repurchase Program and the practice of selling works from the collection has been the most controversial of all Art Bank activities and over the years has caused considerable discussion amongst the arts community and in the press. The two main points of contention which continue to provide disagreement relate to

a. the perceived weakening of the collection by relinquishing valuable works in the collection and

b. the loss of revenue for the Art Bank by selling works back to artists for less than full market value.

Already in 1977, Luke Rombout (by then the Director of the Vancouver Art Gallery) mentioned in an interview that he had hoped for the Art Bank to develop into a national resource:

I made a special attempt to get early works by contemporary Canadian artists, in order to build up a base of quality for this collection, and although the works in the collection were
originally slated for display in government offices, we made a point of saying that we were not going to simply be the 'interior decorators' for the government, but a leading example of what is happening in Canadian art.

Frankly, I'm worried that if we begin selling off works from this original collection (which were carefully chosen) and abandoning the long-term philosophy of establishing it in the first place, it will not be a resource . . . or even a good 'lending library' . . . but simply a hodge-podge of trends.112

A similar attitude was expressed by Davidson Dunton in his 1979 report:

Not long ago the Bank adopted a policy of on request selling works back to an artist at the original purchase price. I have heard sharply conflicting views about this practice. On the one hand it is argued that the Bank collection should not be regarded as something immutable and permanent, that there is no reason not to be obliging in this respect to artists, and that the resulting funds can be used to make purchases of other, later works from the same artists. Others hold that the practice constitutes a form of financing for artists, reduces the strength of the collection and its long term public value, and takes away good and often very rentable works. While I do not think the matter is a vital one for the future of the Bank I am inclined to side with the second view. . . . I believe the overall strength of the Bank's holdings as a national resource and as a collection for renting should take primacy.113

More recently, Montreal gallery owner René Blouin expressed concerns in stating that although limited funds could be generated for the Art Bank through a de-accessioning program, which, he suggests has to be carefully monitored, such a program should not be seen as the Bank's salvation from financial shortcomings. He also puts forth the notion that historically important works which were purchased with public funds for the Art Bank collection, represent an important part of Canadian heritage and must therefore remain in public institutions.114

The other, earlier mentioned issue of the resale of works at original cost versus market value was discussed in detail as early as
the December 1979 meeting of Council and diverging opinions expressed were as follows:

Those supporting the market value approach suggested that the appreciation in the value of an asset should accrue to the owner, that resale at original cost confused the nature of purchases and grants and amounted to "anti-selection against the Bank", and that sale at market value would provide more funds to purchase the work of emerging artists. Those supporting repurchase at original cost cited the fact that the ultimate buyer is usually a public gallery, so that the work would normally remain in public ownership; they thought it appropriate that the artist should benefit from the capital appreciation realized on the transfer from one public institution to another.115

Generally speaking, most artists and their dealers favour the sale of works from the Art Bank at the original purchase costs plus an administration fee since this practice provides further financial support to the art market. But, speaking from a more ideological point of view, Andrew Sylvester, the Director of the Equinox Gallery in Vancouver, is quoted as saying that the Art Bank as a federal institution should get a much better return on its investment, especially since works were purchased with public funds and the public should therefore be able to reap some benefits from their sale.116 According to a number of newspaper articles announcing the Art Banks de-accessioning policy this point of view is also most often expressed by members of the press and the general public.

Given the favourable conditions under which artists may buy back their work, it is surprising that between 1977 and 1992 only 241 works have been repurchased by artists.117 It is important to note that a considerable number of the works repurchased to date have indeed found their way into major public collections, including the National Gallery of Canada, the Vancouver Art Gallery, The Glenbow Museum, the Art

In contrast to the ongoing repurchases by artists, no works, as mentioned earlier, have been sold so far under the Art Bank's 1991 de-accessioning policy. It stands to reason that the grand scale wholesale sale of works, which, according to William Kirby was never the intention of the Art Bank but was anticipated with great anxiety by dealers and to a lesser extent by artists, did not and probably never will materialize.

The reasons why neither artists and dealers, nor museums and galleries through them, take advantage more often of the Repurchase Program are twofold:

Firstly, most artists are more interested in selling works from their own, often considerable inventories rather than having work change collections. Only if an artist's work has appreciated sufficiently and no other similarly successful piece is available from either the artist or his or her dealer, does a repurchase from the Art Bank represent a financially viable option.

Secondly, Canadian museums and galleries always could buy works from the Art Bank for their collections through the artists and therefore will probably continue to follow this practice in preference to entering into a long, drawn-out and cumbersome bidding process. What remains to be seen is what interest might be shown by institutions and collectors in works by deceased artists now in the collection. Also, we must wait to see if Christopher Youngs' prediction, that he could
anticipate a time when the Art Bank would be selling as many works at is purchasing, will become reality.118

In the meantime Art Bank management continues to propose that the 16,000 works in the Art Bank represent a flexible tool and are not, as those in the collections of public galleries or museums, frozen assets. In this spirit, Council reaffirms its most fundamental objective of assisting individual artists and provides them with the opportunity to financially benefit from increases in the market value of their work.

2. The Special Purchase Assistance Program

The first reference to the creation of a program to encourage the increased collecting of contemporary art by museums and public galleries in Canada can be traced to Dale McConathy's 1975 assessment of the Art Bank. In his research, McConathy refers to Luke Rombout's aspirations for possible additional Art Bank interaction with other institutions and quotes in particular Rombout's remark that "I would have liked to start a director's choice acquisitions program formed to back up the collections in the public galleries. Maybe a matching grant for purchases. I think it's vital to re-integrate the museums corporation into the Council".119

The next official mention of a program, aimed at assisting public galleries to increase their collections of contemporary art, can be found in Christopher Youngs's memorandum to Timothy Porteous, dated November 22, 1976:
As a result of a growing concern on the part of public galleries regarding their collections of contemporary Canadian art, a new program of assistance is a clear priority.

In 1977-78, we wish to set aside $100,000 from our Art Bank purchase budget to establish a Special Purchase Assistance Program. Hopefully Council could allot an additional amount of $50,000 to this sum. This money would be available to public galleries for the purchase of selected works by contemporary artists. The money would be directed towards the purchase of specific works on the condition that the gallery contributes 50% of the purchase price with special funds, i.e. funds other than their regular acquisitions budget. The maximum amount available to any one institution in a fiscal year would be $10,000.

While this new program will weaken the purchasing power of the Art Bank, it will serve to fill our basic aims: to assist artists, to assist certain galleries who have made a significant contribution to Canadian art, to educate the public, and to strengthen the art market. One obvious advantage of such a program is that it will generate an additional $100,000 to $150,000 investment in the market place.

The Art Bank's proposal was approved in May 1977, and Council announced the implementation of the Special Purchase Assistance Program in a news release:

As a pilot project, the Art Bank will set aside funds from its purchase budget in 1977-78 to establish a Special Purchase Assistance Program for public galleries. Funds will be made available to gallery directors to buy selected works by contemporary Canadian artists, on the condition that the gallery contribute 50 per cent of the purchase price with special funds -- that is, funds other than those in its regular acquisition budget. To provide a national dimension to gallery collections, priority will be given to purchases of works of Canadian artists living outside the gallery's province. The maximum amount available to any institution in a fiscal year is $10,000. The program will be confined to public galleries currently supported by Council.

The general guidelines under which public galleries could purchase works of art with contributions from the Art Bank were, and still are, similar to those of the Art Bank's Purchase Program:

a. Works must be by living Canadian artists or by artists otherwise eligible under Council's citizenship requirements.
b. Works must be purchased directly from the artists or from dealers where they are on consignment from the artist; works from private or other public collections are not eligible.

c. Institutions must present proof of purchase before being refunded for half of the acquisition costs of works purchased under this program; the purchase price of a work may include provincial sales tax but not framing, shipping or installation costs.

d. The matching funds for works of art purchased with monies from the Art Bank's Special Purchase Assistance Program must be raised by the institutions from sources other than their general acquisitions budgets.

e. Museums and galleries can apply for one grant of up to $10,000 per year and funds are allocated by the Art Bank on a first-come first-served basis.

Since 1977, the the Special Purchase Assistance Program has experienced several minor modifications. Originally, funds for the program were allocated from the Art Bank's general purchase budget at $100,000 per year. After two years of successful existence, however, the Bank was faced with general budgetary cut-backs and the program was suspended during 1979/80. At that time Davidson Dunton expressed the opinion that although much is to be said in favour of the program it was clearly not part of the Art Bank's basic mandate and pointed out that

the question of re-instituting the Special Purchase Assistance Program (dropped in 1979-80) should be considered as a matter distinct from the basic function of the Bank. It may be decided by the Council, on considering its various activities in support of the visual arts, that Purchase Assistance has a strong priority and that the Art Bank is the best mechanism for operating the program.
Then Purchase Assistance should be added as an additional mandate for the Bank, and designated funds should be provided for it.\textsuperscript{122}

Based on this suggestion and further supported by Council's Advisory Arts Panel, Council obviously decided that the Art Bank was indeed the most suitable place to fund the collecting of contemporary Canadian art by public institutions and, at its June 1990 meeting, approved an allocation of $150,000 to provide separate funds for the Art Bank in order to reinstate this program. At the same time members of Council suggested that eligibility to apply for S.P.A.P. grants should not only be the privilege of those galleries and museums which receive funding from Council but be opened up to a wider range of institutions. Since then, any public gallery or museum which has shown a serious commitment to collecting and exhibiting contemporary Canadian art is eligible to apply to the Art Bank for funding.\textsuperscript{123}

In the 15 years of its existence 70 different museums, galleries and artist-run centres have purchased more than 2000 works under this program. To date the Art Bank's total contribution of $1.75 million infused a minimum of $3.5 million into the Canadian art market.\textsuperscript{124} Because the Special Purchase Assistance Program is only indirectly part of the Art Bank's original mandate, it has been more vulnerable to restrictive measures and budget fluctuations. To divert funds to the Art Bank's decreasing purchase budget the $150,000, allocated to the program in 1980, was reduced to $100,000 in 1984 and further to $50,000 in 1991/92. At a time of rising prices for works of art, these budget cuts have had a drastic effect on the program. Whereas during the first years and into the early 1980's any institution requesting monies under the program would receive funding almost immediately, today galleries
and museums are put on a waiting list and can expect to obtain their allocation as much as three years after making their initial submission. According to Art Bank records, 25 institutions are presently waiting to receive grants for a total amount of $207,000.

Despite its minimal budget and long waiting periods the Special Purchase Assistance Program remains to be one of Council's most popular—and least known—activities for two reasons. Firstly, the Special Purchase Assistance Program is the only federal source of this kind to fund acquisitions of contemporary Canadian art and is therefore for many institutions the only means to obtain any contribution towards their either very modest or non-existing acquisition budgets; secondly, both small municipal galleries as well as large provincial ones have equal access to the program. Monies are allocated on a strictly arms-length, first come basis and are not distributed according to jury or staff decisions. It is not necessary for institutions to justify purchase priorities or to anticipate outside interference with their acquisition mandates and they retain curatorial autonomy in the selection of purchases for their permanent collections. Although its budget is very modest, a suspension of this program, which presents a genuine possibility given the present 1992 fiscal restraints of Council and the Art Bank, would have a most detrimental effect on the whole visual arts milieu and art market in Canada.

C. Conclusion

To evaluate if and to what degree the Art Bank has met its objectives to provide "tangible recognition" to Canadian artists it is
important to return to the original concept as proposed by Le Moyne and the political ideology of the late 1960's - early 1970's which allowed the creation of the Art Bank to happen. Le Moyne's proposals to Council and Treasury Board as well as the federal government's press release announcing the establishment of the Art Bank in 1972 and the 1977 expanded Art Bank mandate all emphasize the creation of an art collection and the importance of financial assistance to visual artists through the purchase of their work by the Art Bank.

The intended "tangible recognition" for artists, as proposed by Le Moyne, can be assessed easily. According to an information brochure published in June 1992, "The Art Bank has invested more than $15 million in contemporary Canadian art, and it now holds some 16,000 works by more than 2500 artists.\textsuperscript{125} Averaging these numbers would suggest that an artist netted approximately $6000 from sales to the Art Bank. If this amount is distributed equally over 20 years, however, the financial average per year per artist comes to only $300. If further averages are calculated with regard to frequency of purchase, these numbers tell us that each of the 2500 artists sold 6.4 works to the Art Bank, or approximately one work at $937.50 every three years (if a work was sold through a dealer the artist's income from the sale would be further reduced by 40\% to 59\%). Based on these averaged figures, the "tangible" recognition provided by the Art Bank to an individual artist would appear to be minimal.

Of course, statistics don't tell the whole story and averages applied to a program which has been developing over 20 years are misleading. For this reason, a closer examination of the Art Bank's
most recent catalogue provides much clearer evidence and shows that some artists, primarily mid-career and senior artists who can look back over a professional practice spanning at least two decades, have sold a considerable number of works to the Art Bank and have received significant tangible recognition indeed. In contrast, younger artists or those who only very sporadically submitted their work to Art Bank juries, are represented by only one or two works. And even these facts do not reveal the degree of financial support provided by the Art Bank because in terms of dollars one artist might have sold a single major work for a higher amount than another artist who might have had 20 small, but lower priced pieces purchased. Based on the catalogue listings it can be concluded that a substantial number of artists received considerable financial support, especially during the first five years of the Art Bank's mandate when the annual budget was $1 million. And artists today relate stories of how an Art Bank purchase early in their careers provided the first official validation of their practice by a public collecting institution. These purchases not only made it possible for artists to continue in their careers but, in more mundane terms, improved the quality of their every day lives by providing funds for a downpayment on a home or studio, or to get a much needed car or washing machine. Since 1978, when the Art Bank's purchase budget was greatly reduced (and subsequently never regained its initial effectiveness) such happy incidents have become rarer, but, according to staff, occasionally still happen.

Although, as pointed out above, the size of financial subsidy to individual artists varied greatly, the infusion of $15 million into the
Canadian art market for Art Bank acquisitions represents without a doubt a significant sum of money. If one adds to this amount the $3.5 million which were generated through sales partly funded by the Art Bank’s Special Purchase Assistance Program as well as the financial benefits for artists and dealers from the Repurchase Program, the total influx of monies into the Canadian art market easily exceeds $20 million over the past 20 years. Without the Art Bank in place, some of these funds would have found their way into artists pockets, since works of art would have been either purchased or commissioned for public buildings and offices. But is is doubtful that the art buying practices by federal departments, which were rather haphazard before 1972, would have been carried out in a democratically accessible process across Canada equal to the one developed by the Art Bank.

In contrast to the directives provided for the subsidy to artist, i.e. through the purchase of their work according to Council adjudication practices, no official guidelines were provided regarding the nature of the collection. All the 1972 announcement reported was that "It will consist of a large collection of contemporary Canadian art".127 No mention was made if the collection should have a curatorial focus or not, if works in all media and sizes could be considered for purchase and if limitations should be established to accommodate the needs of the anticipated rental clients.

Based on Rombout’s memoranda to Council, his interview with Dale McConathy and the fact that he considered it the Director’s role to provide continuity by voting with the juries and by personally initiating studio visits for some select artists, it can be strongly
concluded that he—and for that matter his successor Christopher Youngs—indeed favoured a curatorial approach to the purchase of works for the Art Bank collection. (It remains incomprehensible how Youngs, on the one hand, insisted on providing "continuity" and direction in the selection of works and on the other introduced a program which made it possible for some of the best pieces to leave the collection.) A close examination of Art Bank catalogues provides evidence that although many artists sold one or several works during the first 10 years, a number of well established painters and sculptors, most of them male and living in Montreal, Toronto, London (Ontario) and Vancouver, were recognized in a most tangible way indeed and had their works purchased in great depth.

William Kirby’s democratization of the purchase process in 1981—the removal of the director’s vote from the jury and the requirement of a pre-selection jury recommendation for all studio visits—brought about a recognizable shift in focus. From that point on juries also travelled regularly to all regions but only rarely recommended more than one or two major works for purchase by one artist at one time. As a consequence the collection grew increasingly more eclectic and not at all curatorial in character.

If, in the spirit of Pelletier’s ideology of democratization and decentralization, it was the Art Bank’s aim to collect the best of visual expression from artists across Canada, the collecting practices of Rombout and Youngs did not reflect this policy and were neither democratic nor particularly decentralized. In contrast, the jury procedures implemented by the Art Bank since 1981 are certainly more democratic (as well as more accessible than any other Council program)
and provide financial assistance in a fairly equal measure. But, because now purchases can be made only from those artists who choose to initiate contact with the Art Bank to have their work seen by a jury (and the majority of artists do), the question arises if the combined objectives of a democratic selection process and the acquisition of a first rate collection are compatible and at all possible? The answer is: probably yes, because, although the small number of artists who refuse to submit their work to a jury process will be left out, the production of high quality works of art by the estimated 4000-5000 Canadian visual artists is far greater than the demand filled by the 50-60 public and 200-250 serious corporate and private collections in Canada. Of course, an increase in the budgets for the Art Bank's Purchase and Special Purchase Assistance Program, would allow the Art Bank to more fully reach the objectives of its mandate and not only be able to support a greater number of artists, but resume a certain degree of in-depth buying to adequately represent the work of especially deserving individuals.
CHAPTER II
  THE RENTAL PROGRAM

Considering that the Art Bank was conceived as a program of the Canada Council the development and implementation of policies and procedures for the Purchase Program were relatively uncomplicated; the Council's jury system and guiding principle of selection based on excellence provided a logical and suitable foundation for the acquisition process. In comparison, the implementation of the Art Bank Rental Program with all its financial and legal implications presented a much more daunting task.

Apart from its mandate to promote the work of Canadian artists by providing the Federal Government with works of art for their offices and buildings, the aim of the Rental Program was, from the beginning, to generate income for the Art Bank and to cover the administration costs of the rental activity. Contrary to other Council programs which are mandated to dispense funds to artists and cultural institutions, the implementation of the (revenue producing) Rental Program's objectives proved to be more complex. A non-existing client base had to be solicited from the federal bureaucracy and a market created for a service which, so far, had never been a high priority. And last but not least, procedures for the day to day operation of the Rental Program needed to be established, guidelines for framing, transportation and installation standards to be drawn up and an efficient process developed by which clients could select works for their offices. Since neither a feasibility study nor market survey had been prepared prior to the
creation of the rental program, the full implementation of the rental activities took considerably longer than those of the Purchase Program which the Art Bank was able to set in motion almost immediately in 1972.

A. Treasury Board Guidelines

Before the creation of the Art Bank several federal departments—the Department of External Affairs, Secretary of State, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, Transport Canada and Public Works—maintained separate budgets for the purchase of works of art as part of ongoing departmental programming. The purchase of works of art for offices or more public areas of other federal ministries was not defined. Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne's proposal for the creation of the Art Bank suggested, as mentioned earlier, that only the Canada Council could provide the level of professional competence necessary to purchase works of art for the federal government and should therefore have sole responsibility for the co-ordination of this service. To achieve exclusivity for the Art Bank program, Treasury Board agreed to implement appropriate guidelines for all government buildings and, in a document of May 23, 1972, addressed to Deputy Heads of Departments and Heads of Agencies put forth the following directive:

1. Original works of art may be obtained through annual rental from the Canada Council art bank. These works of art are principally intended to be shown in public lobbies and other public areas, in conference rooms, in Minister's suites, in Deputy Ministers' offices and in the offices of other senior managers dealing frequently with the public. Rental fees will be paid from the furniture and furnishings budget of the department or agency requiring the works of art. No department or agency to which this policy applies may purchase original works of art for use in office buildings or rent them except from the Canada Council. This does
not, however, preclude arrangements with the National Gallery for the loan of works of art for the offices of Ministers.\textsuperscript{127}

These directives remained unchanged for about eight years, except that government departments were able to pay for Art Bank rental fees from their general operations budgets rather than their usually small and inflexible dedicated funds for furnishings. In September 1980, however, Treasury Board attempted to enforce its initial guidelines and returned art rental costs to dedicated funds budgets. According to a survey conducted by the Art Bank at that time, the implementation of this directive would have resulted in a considerable decrease in rentals\textsuperscript{128} and Council was successful in persuading Treasury Board to remove Art Bank rental costs from dedicated funds.\textsuperscript{129}

Ten years later the federal government initiated P.S. 2000, a proposal aimed at reducing some of government's restrictive and cumbersome administrative procedures and at providing managers with more autonomy in administering their centres of responsibilities. Within the framework of this investigation Treasury Board also questioned the possibility of eliminating the Art Bank's exclusive status as the sole provider of works of art for government buildings and proposed that in order "To give departments flexibility, art may also be leased or purchased from sources other than the Art Bank".\textsuperscript{130}

Realizing that the existence of the Art Bank, which, after all, had been established as a joint initiative of the Canada Council and Treasury Board, was in jeopardy, Council's response to Treasury Board was immediate. Chairman Alan Gotlieb intervened personally with two letters to Treasury Board President Robert de Cotret and outlined not
only the success of the program but also listed the advantages for government in maintaining the Art Bank as the sole provider of works of art over other options.\textsuperscript{131}

Following several meetings between Art Bank staff and, on occasion, Council Director Joyce Zemans with Treasury Board over a period of almost two years, the Art Bank's exclusive status as official supplier of artworks for government offices was not only re-instated but enforced. (According to William Kirby it was in particular the frequent consultations between Art Bank and Treasury Board officials, during which the Rental Program's role as a Council program and not as a service, was consistently emphasized, which brought about the government's continued support.) On April 2, 1992, the Policy for Art on Government Property was approved by Treasury Board, replacing Article 4.2 (Acquisitions of Art) of Chapter 240 of the former Administrative Policy Manual. The revised objectives of the new, seven-page policy are:

To support and promote the work of professional contemporary Canadian artists, and to provide departments with challenging and stimulating works of art for their premises.

The document further states:

The aim of this unique program is to promote Canada's visual artists, to reflect Canada's cultural identity and to enhance the progressive image of the government by displaying contemporary works of art.

The new policy, applying to all organizations considered to be departments "within the meaning of section 2 of the Financial Administration Act", specifies that "With regard to art purchases and rentals, departments and agencies must ensure that works of art for
display on their premises are acquired through the rental program of the Canada Council Art Bank". And in contrast with the previous directives, the new document specifies in considerable detail the Art Bank's responsibilities, provides guidelines for the Works of Art Policy and general information on the Art Bank mandate and procedures. All in all, the new statement became a much enlarged and precise document than the previous directives.

It is important to note that government offices were never forced to rent a specific number of art works according to formulas based on the number of staff or the square footage of office spaces and the decision to rent or not to rent works of art from the Art Bank continues to be optional within each government department or agency.

B. Rental Clients

According to Treasury Board guidelines all federal government departments and agencies, including crown corporations, may rent works of art from the Art Bank and until 1975 the federal government was the Art Bank's only eligible rental client. However, almost immediately in 1973 when the Art Bank began to install works from its collection in government offices, potential rental clients outside the federal government expressed interest in obtaining access to the Rental Program and, in a memorandum to Council dated December 12, 1975, the following proposal was put forth for approval:

In response to interest from potential renters outside the federal government, to broaden our potential market and to show more contemporary art in public spaces, we would like to broaden the mandate of the Art Bank to include provinces, municipalities, national service organizations, hospitals and post-secondary educational institutions. In requesting this expanded mandate, we
do not envisage competition with existing provincial loan schemes or public gallery art rental programs. Nor do we envisage renting to the business sector as the services of private art consulting forms are already available.\textsuperscript{132}

This proposal was approved and since then all levels of government (federal, provincial and municipal), non-profit organizations, educational institutions and hospitals have been eligible to rent works of art from the Art Bank.

The question as to whether the Art Bank should or should not open up its rental program to the private sector has been the subject of discussion throughout the Art Bank's history. In one of the first evaluations of Art Bank programs Ann Chudleigh, the first administrator of the Bank, expressed the opinion that rentals, of sculptures in particular, to the private sector could provide corporations and business firms with "a safe means of testing opinion and reaction before actual purchasing".\textsuperscript{134}

The topic of Art Bank rentals to the private sector was raised again in a meeting which took place on December 21, 1976, between officials of the Canada Council and representatives of the Professional Art Dealers Association of Canada. At that time it was agreed that, given the human and financial limitations of the Art Bank, rentals to private corporations were not a priority and that interested corporations are advised to initiate their own art acquisition programs.\textsuperscript{135} Davidson Dunton adopted a similar opinion and stating that "I do not think the Bank should enter the field of renting to private organizations, large or small. That field should be left to the art dealers of the country".\textsuperscript{136} To date the Art Bank has been successful in
excluding private corporations from its rental service, with one exception. This one deviation can be traced back to 1980 when the Bank of Montreal expressed interest in renting works by Canadian artists for its offices in Chicago, a request which was approved at the time.\textsuperscript{137} Although this client has continued to rent small numbers of works, this practice has recently been questioned and the Art Bank agreed to reconsider rental contracts with private business in the United States.\textsuperscript{138}

To date the majority of Art Bank clients are located in the Ottawa-Hull area, followed by a relatively large number of clients in the metropolitan regions of Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver and it is interesting to note that the ratio between federal and non-federal clients is smaller outside the National Capital Region. A detailed listing of Art Bank clients is provided in Appendix F.

C. The Rental Contract

1. Background

Once a market base was guaranteed by Treasury Board directives, the Art Bank's next task which had to be carried out before any rental activity could begin was the formulation of a leasing agreement to regulate the conditions under which government offices could rent works of art from the Canada Council.

The Art Bank's first rental agreement was relatively short and specified that rental fees were to be set at the annual rate of 17\% of the cost to Council "of such work of art", that rent had to be paid
annually in advance, that works could be rented for a period of between one and three years and that the Art Bank was responsible for transportation and installation costs. It also stated that the lessee agreed not to move or repair works of art and to contact the Art Bank immediately should damage occur.139

Over the past 19 years of steadily increasing rental activity, the content of the Art Bank contract underwent a number of metamorphoses. The current three page document stipulates all conditions of payments and credits, insurance arrangements and inventory control. It also specifies under what circumstances the Art Bank may exchange or remove a work from a client's premise, asks for the services of a "designated officer" who is responsible for all communication with the Art Bank, and outlines conditions for the rental of art works outside the National Capital area. Two appendices are attached to every contract: a computer print-out which lists the title, accession number, rental fee and exact location of all works leased under the terms of the rental agreement, and the Rental Directives which provide more detailed information on the conditions under which works may be rented.

Unlike most contract procedures, Art Bank contracts are drawn up after the fact, i.e. after all works have been installed. The reason for this reversed process is that rental clients tend to make final selections of art works only during their installation and some works which were initially chosen because they appeared to be suitable, turn out to be either too big or too small or do not meet the approval by staff and are therefore returned to the Art Bank. The preparation of rental contracts requires minute attention to detail since the exact
location of installation of each work has to be recorded and rental fees calculated according to the date or dates of installation(s). Depending on the size of the contract several weeks or even months may lapse between the date of the installation of works and the time the contract is ready for signature and invoicing. In early 1992 the Art Bank began to investigate administrative methods which would make the contract and invoicing procedures more efficient and decrease the time necessary to prepare these documents.

2. Rental Fees

A memorandum to Council of December 30, 1971, put forth a number of proposals for the policies and procedures of the planned Art Bank. One of the suggestions was that "it seems possible to absorb the administrative costs by charging client departments and agencies an annual rental fee in the vicinity of 12% of the cost of the works rented. Rental rates will be reviewed from time to time as needed." And indeed for the first several years rental costs were calculated by taking 12% of all cost incurred by the Art Bank for the purchase of a work: acquisition cost, Provincial Sales tax where applicable, framing expenses and incoming shipping costs. The 1975 Art Bank catalogue of Art Bank holdings included listings of all rental fees and the variance of prices is surprising, especially since amounts were not rounded up or down to simplify contract calculations. A random catalogue page lists the following amounts: $73.80, $163.68, $62.58, $138.00, $86.64, $56.16 and so on.140
The adequacy of the 12% formula was initially questioned by Ann Chudleigh, and referred to in a memorandum to Council in September 1975. The document suggested that a serious look should be taken at the 12% rental structure with a view to increasing rental income and it proposed that fees should be raised 1-1.5% to accommodate rising administrative costs. According to the documents consulted, the exact date when the 12% formula was changed and a different price structure established is unclear. However, another memorandum to Council in December 1978 reports on an increase in rental for works on paper from $25.00 to $35.00 and it can be concluded that rental fees were not only based on original purchase costs but medium as well.

Although rental fees increased gradually over the next 12 years (as was recommended by the Dunton/Ross Report), they continued to be calculated according to the 1978 formula. Because this system proved to be increasingly cumbersome and inconsistent, a radically new method was introduced in 1983. The new fee schedule established a system which allowed for the same rental fee to be applied to all works, regardless of medium, with purchase costs falling within a specific price range. Under the revised formula, all works purchased for less than $400 now had a yearly rental fee of $50; works purchased at costs between $401 and $800 were priced at $75 per year; and so on. The highest rental category, at $1000 per year, was applied to all works purchased at costs above $10,000. The new schedule resulted in some fees being increased, others being lowered and it was generally expected that under the new fee structure a number of works would prove to be more attractive to rent. The Art Bank also proposed that as a safeguard against damage the
rental fees for some of the works in the collection, in particular those that had appreciated significantly in value, would be raised to the maximum fee category and the place where they could be installed restricted to secure locations.\textsuperscript{143}

The decision to raise the rental fees for some key works due to a significant increase in their market value proved to be the first step towards bringing rental fees in line with market prices. When the Art Bank began to develop its rental operation in 1973, it made sense to charge fees based on purchase costs because those costs and the market value of the newly purchased works were identical. Over the following years, however, this practice became increasingly problematic. Already in 1978, probably prompted by a similar recommendation made by Council's internal auditors\textsuperscript{144} and repeated in the Dunton Report,\textsuperscript{145} Christopher Youngs suggested that the yearly rental fee should be based on the true value of works:

\begin{quote}
Such an adjustment would serve to increase rental revenues and eliminate some confusion concerning rental rates. It is understandable that in some instances our clients are disturbed when they found that the rental charges for two very similar works by the same artist may vary by as much as 400\% depending on when the works were purchased.\textsuperscript{146}
\end{quote}

In 1989 the Art Bank investigated various formulas to find a solution to the continuing dilemma of inconsistent rental fees. Tests were run on some 200 randomly selected works to determine an appropriate rate by which to increase the value of the works for a more current fee schedule and, in consultation with the Professional Art Dealers Association, it was concluded that a 10\% annual increase applied cumulatively would provide a workable basis for the calculation of
rental fees. At the same time it was also decided to add five new fee categories "to more evenly apply the system and selected multiples of 12 in order to more easily determine partial yearly rates based on the number of months". Although the minimum category of $60 is no longer applied towards new contracts and, according to staff, the next higher level of $84 will probably be eliminated by 1995, the rental fee calculation system established in 1989 is the one currently in use.

As the demand on the Rental Program began to increase and the Art Bank's resources to accommodate the many requests did not, it became evident that a minimum contract fee had to be implemented. This minimum amount was established at a level equivalent to the yearly rental fee for ten works leased at the lowest charge. First introduced in 1978, the minimum contract fee at that time was $350 ($35 x 10), was later increased to $500, $600 and stands presently at $800. For most rental clients complying with the minimum rental contract fee does not cause any difficulty and the majority of rental contracts are for considerably higher amounts. But a number of regional offices have neither the space nor the budget to enter into rental contracts with the Art Bank at the minimum amount required. In order not to lose sight of the program's primary goal, to bring the Canadian public in contact with works of contemporary art, the Art Bank has the option to consider special circumstances and waive the minimum fee.

The rental agreement states that the Art Bank is responsible for the costs of transportation, installation and removal of works of art at the beginning and termination of each contract. But the contract also specifies that for any relocation, removal or installation of an art
work during the term of the contract, the client will be charged professional fees for each person involved in the selection, transportation, installation or removal of the work(s) as well as an administration fee which varies for clients within and outside the National Capital Region. Service charges were introduced in 1978 and had the following objectives: to recover the costs incurred in the service provided; to discourage clients from arbitrarily changing or relocating works before the contract has expired; and to deter clients from cancelling rental agreements altogether. To what degree these additional charges prevent rental clients from calling on the Art Bank for various service requests between contract dates has not been determined but the income generated from service charges amounted to $54,734 in 1991/92.148

3. Rental Period

Rivard Le Moyne's initial proposal suggested that the length of a rental contract could be flexible and extend for periods anywhere between three to five years. During the first five years of rental activity from 1973-1978 and for reasons which are not documented, works were rented for 12 months but clients were given the option of yearly renewals.149 In 1978, compelled by chronic staff shortages and the continued growth of the Rental Program both in and outside the National Capital Region, the minimum contract period was extended to two years.150 The new and longer rental contracts raised the concern that some clients could theoretically continue to renew their rental agreements every two years and many works would remain installed in the
same office, boardroom or reception area for indefinite periods of time. This practice would not only prevent the circulation of the collection, it could also prove dangerous for some works which require regular maintenance and should be returned to the Art Bank for observation. All clients were therefore advised that any work could be renewed only once and at the same time they were encouraged to become more familiar with a larger variety of works by changing their selections more frequently. According to staff, it is difficult to enforce this directive because some rental clients simply refuse to give up "their" works of art and it is not uncommon for senior government officials to move their favourite art works every time they are appointed to a different position or department. Cabinet shuffles are anticipated with trepidation in the Art Bank's rental unit.

In 1984, for similar reasons as six years earlier, the Art Bank increased the minimum rental period from two to three years, initially only for large clients and those located outside the National Capital Region, and not long thereafter for all clients. In cases where the Art Bank incurs extraordinary installation expenses--such as the 1989 installation of several sculptures around Ottawa bus stations--rental contracts are drawn up for between five and ten years.

The decisions to increase the length of the minimum contract period, at first from one to two, and later from two to three years were introduced to bring about greater efficiency, to serve more clients, rent more works and to increase the rental income. Although all these expectations were realized the longer contract periods also created their own set of problems.
According to staff, some rental clients consider a three year rental period as too long and, especially if frequent staff changes occur, would prefer to have the opportunity to change the works of art more often. It has to be remembered that one of the justifications which made the Art Bank system initially so appealing to the government was, of course, the possibility for offices to select new works on a regular basis or, at least, have the option to do so. The present three year rental contract period limits this flexibility considerably and some rental clients have no choice but to "live" with art works, which were selected by predecessors with very different tastes, until the contract terminates and a new selection can be made. According to the terms of the current rental agreement a client is free to return works to the Art Bank but "is not entitled to a credit of rental for the instalment period during which the work(s) is(are) returned. Any subsequent instalment(s) will be adjusted accordingly. Only Ministers, Deputy Ministers and Assistant Deputy Ministers who are appointed and wish to change or remove their predecessor's selection, or are transferred and prefer to make a new selection or relocate works, will have their payments adjusted".151 In other words, it is a costly proposition for most lessees to return works before their contract has terminated. This is particularly true for Art Bank clients who are located outside the National Capital Region because in addition to the paying of rental fees for works which have been returned to the Art Bank, they are also responsible for absorbing transportation costs back to Ottawa.
Another aspect of the three year rental period concerns the negative impact it can have on artists' careers. Generally speaking, artists recognize the educational value of having their pieces placed in government buildings all over Canada and appreciate the visibility the Art Bank's Rental Program is able to provide for their work. Several artists even request yearly print-outs from the Art Bank and ask to be kept informed about the location of their works. Difficulties arise, however, if an artist wishes to repurchase a work which is rented. According to present guidelines, the artist has to wait with the repurchase until the contract has expired—if that particular work had just been rented this can be as long as three years.\textsuperscript{152}

For the Art Bank, the detrimental side effects of the three year rental period are the reduced contact with the clients, the difficulty to accommodate requests for additional works, and, because increases in rental fees cannot be applied until the end of a contract, potential loss of income. Although a reduction of the rental period back to two years has been considered, this step is unlikely to be implemented in the near future since staff shortages and the insufficient number of works available for rental already make it difficult to maintain the high level of service to the existing rental clients across Canada.

4. Insurance, Care and Inventory Control

In order to minimise damage to works of art due to unnecessary or untrained handling, the Art Bank's rental agreement requires that clients do not touch, remove, relocate, clean, or repair any works of art. The only exception to this clause relates to works on paper which
are framed and under plexiglass. These works may be moved with approval from the Art Bank as long as the client assumes full responsibility for the move, that Art Bank installation guidelines are followed, and a list indicating the new locations is submitted to the Art Bank once the move has been completed. In cases where loss or damage to a work of art occurs as a result of unauthorized handling, the client is liable for the costs of the loss or restoration of the work(s). Should accidental loss or damage occur, the rental agreement states that

the Art Bank will insure each work of art rented against such perils and subject to such deductibles as the Art Bank may decide upon ($500 at present). The client will be liable to indemnify the Art Bank for each occurrence of loss of or damage to a work of art to the extent of the deductible of the Art Bank's insurance policy.153

According to the contract clients are not held responsible for the costs of restoration due to normal wear and tear.

In order to maintain accurate records of all locations and to account for all works listed in Appendix A of the rental agreement, clients are asked to keep a running inventory which indicates the building, floor, section and office number and to submit this information to the Art Bank at the beginning of every fiscal year so that changes can be entered into the Art Bank database.

5. Removal of Works by the Art Bank

From time to time the Art Bank will request that a work be released by the client because it has been selected for inclusion in an exhibition which is considered to be important. In such cases the Art Bank will replace the work with another piece but does not charge the
client for installation or transportation costs; if the client does not wish to temporarily replace the borrowed work, a credit for the period of the removal is issued. On rare occasions, the Art Bank will also ask that a work be returned because it requires immediate restoration or is in danger of being damaged or destroyed. In this instance the client is expected to release the work.

6. Other Client Responsibilities

To provide clients with further information on the rental process the Art Bank established a number of additional guidelines over the years. These guidelines are not included in the main body of the rental agreement but are listed in Appendix B of the Rental Directives. This document is updated regularly to reflect current rental and service fees, the minimum contract period as well as specific information relating to contracts for clients located either within or outside the National Capital Region.

In order to establish more efficient and open channels of communication between the Art Bank and the client the Rental Directives are especially important because they also outline the client's role and responsibilities. The document specifies that each client must appoint a staff member responsible for liaising with the Art Bank. This "designated officer" is required to co-ordinate selection appointments, provide Art Bank staff with information relating to the client's budget, have signing authority for all Art Bank forms, make sure that contracts are signed and returned to the Art Bank, keep the running inventory, advise the Art Bank if works have been lost or damaged, relate the
information contained in the rental contract to departmental staff and ensure that identification labels for works of art are visible at all times. According to Art Bank staff, an efficient "designated officer" contributes considerably to a positive relationship between the Art Bank and the client organization. Unfortunately, liaison work with the Art Bank is frequently an additional task for already overworked client staff and at times not even recognized in their job descriptions. For that reason, and also because of frequent staff changes within the public service, departmental "designated officers" are replaced regularly and the desired continuity which these positions are supposed to provide, is not maintained.

D. The Selection Process

The process by which rental clients select works of art from the Art Bank, whether for a small office or for whole buildings, was established in 1973 and has remained virtually unchanged. It functions as follows:

All inquiries about art rentals are passed on to the office of the senior officer of the Rental Program who assigns an officer (the official title is Art Consultant) to liaise with the prospective client. To make first contact with an interested organization, the Art Consultant visits the premises of the prospective client to discuss the program as well as to provide information on the costs and conditions of the rental agreement, and to obtain an indication of the client's allocated budget. At the same time the officer views the space to assess where works of art could be placed and advises the client on the
type of work which would be most suitable. Based on the information obtained, the officer preselects a sufficiently large number of works for viewing and sets up an appointment for the client to come to the Art Bank's storage facilities and to make a selection. Once the client (who might be a senior official, a committee of several individuals, a secretary or whoever has been appointed to make a selection on behalf of the client organization) has reached a decision, the works selected are gathered. If necessary, some are reframed and cleaned; pedestals and plexiglass cases are constructed as required for sculptures; the works are set aside for installation; appropriate information is entered into the database; the necessary paperwork is prepared; and a mutually convenient date is arranged for installation. On the assigned date the works are installed, depending on the number of works, by one or two Art Bank technicians under the supervision of the Art Consultant. It is at that time that clients make their final choices and works which were not selected are returned to the warehouse.

The procedures as described above were initially developed by the Art Bank to provide its services to the federal bureaucracy in the National Capital Region. At that time prospective clients outside the Ottawa-Hull area had the option to either visit the Art Bank when in Ottawa or to make selections based on slides. Neither alternative proved to be very satisfactory and it soon became evident that other Rental Program procedures had to be established for regional government offices. To this end a pilot project was organized in 1975. It was outlined in the June 1976 report to Council:

From July 31 to August 10, 400 works on paper from the Art Bank collection will be displayed at the Dalhousie Art Gallery in
Halifax. Representatives of government departments in the Halifax and surrounding areas will be invited to a reception and viewing at which the opening remarks will be made by Brian Flemming. The two Liaison Officers will meet with clients during the first week to rent the works and during the second week to install them in the government offices. Contracts will be completed later in Ottawa.

The reason for taking the Art Bank to the potential clients is that it is difficult for them to make decisions on renting works of art based on slides. If this pilot project is successful, we anticipate similar projects in other regions of Canada.

The Art Bank's first rental exhibition in Halifax must have been a success because, ever since, similar events have provided the most effective opportunity for government offices to rent artworks from the Art Bank collection. Four or five "Art Bank at Work" rental exhibitions are co-ordinated every year in various centres across Canada. Due to the length of the rental period these exhibitions rotate on a three-year basis and take place in Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, Regina, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec, Fredericton/Moncton, Halifax, Charlottetown, and St. John's. Because Toronto and Montreal have a considerably higher number of rental clients than the other cities, rental exhibitions are held two years out of three. Depending on the number of clients in a region, between 300 - 800 works in all media are shipped in wooden crates from Ottawa to suitably large, centrally located, and if at all possible, rent-free locations such as a municipal gallery, artist-run centre or empty warehouse space. Once on location, some works are hung on walls or displayed on panels, while others remain in their crates but are in easy reach for viewing. Since selection appointments had previously been set up from Ottawa, representatives from various government offices and agencies in the area have the opportunity to choose works for their offices and to have them installed by Art Bank staff within a few days.
Because of the large increase in the number of out-of-town rental clients and the considerable size of some regional offices, the Art Bank rental exhibitions have become much longer than the 10 day pilot project in 1975 and now last up to 6 weeks. In conjunction with the "Art Bank at Work" exhibitions, which are also open to the public, the Art Bank usually invites the arts community to the opening and organizes information sessions and slide presentations for artists and the public.

According to Art Bank staff, the co-ordination of rental exhibitions is extremely time consuming and expensive. For this reason the possibility of Art Bank offices in the regions has been suggested in the past. Davidson Dunton recommended in his report that "It would be highly desirable for the Bank to have a western depot, perhaps in Calgary. This should increase renting in the western part of the country, where there are many possibilities, and provide better service to western clients".155 So far this suggestion has not been taken up but, in order to reduce travel and administrative costs, the Art Bank has begun to hire local art consultants and technicians to assist staff from Ottawa while on location and to provide back-up service to clients between rental exhibitions.

Today, 40% of all works rented are installed outside of the National Capital region and, according to staff, the greatest growth potential for the Rental Program is believed to be in areas such as the Hamilton-Windsor corridor, Thunder Bay, Victoria or the interior of British Columbia, all of which are at present not included in the Art Bank's regular rental exhibition schedule.
E. Audience Development

Part of the Art Bank's original mandate was to build an audience for contemporary art in Canada. It was argued that a significant number of individuals who were spending their working lives in close proximity with works of contemporary art would eventually develop a certain connoisseurship and a higher level of visual sophistication. As a consequence a greater public would develop more accepting attitudes towards mainstream art practices, visit museums and galleries more often and ultimately purchase works of art for their private enjoyment. To fulfill this objective, one of the Rental Program's most important functions is to bridge the gap between a closed but highly developed arts milieu and a public which never had the opportunity to be exposed to non-traditional visual art forms and which is highly suspicious of not immediately recognisable visual imagery. That the constant exposure to contemporary art has had some success within a short period was mentioned by Timothy Porteous in 1975:

Initially, many clients request thematic or realistic works but when they realize that the Art Bank is a collection of contemporary Canadian art, their reactions vary considerably. We have noticed that visitors returning a second or third time have been influenced by having contemporary works of art in the office environment. Most reactions indicate an increased enjoyment and a greater understanding of contemporary art.

Because the selecting of art is a highly subjective activity and personal tastes vary greatly, Art Bank rental activities usually stimulate enough interest to give rise to lively discussions on art in general and value judgements on the newly installed works are pronounced freely. In its 1990 Annual Year-End Report to Council the Art Bank commented on its educational role:
When the Art Consultants assist their clients in the selection of works for their offices and, later, when they supervise the installation of the works, they spend a significant amount of time discussing the individual works of art and concerns about contemporary visual art in general with both clients and passersby. For many, this exchange is a unique opportunity to engage in a "non-threatening" dialogue about art. 157

Unfortunately, the earlier mentioned chronic staff shortages, and lack of preparation time, have so far prevented the Art Bank from organising the lunchtime lectures and information sessions, which were part of Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne's vision and original proposal. 158 Apart from labels which are put up with every work, the casual discussions between Art Bank staff and clients during the selection and installation of the works, and more recently the availability of standardised artists biographies, the broad public which is put in touch with the collection receives very little information. According to William Kirby, his organization is in dire need of an information officer who would organise lectures as well as viewings of films and video tapes and arrange for artists to meet with rental clients to talk about their work.

That the Art Bank's uncompromising purchase policy, emphasising aesthetic quality rather than rentability, and its educational efforts are gradually having an effect on an uninitiated public is evident not only in the less traditional selections and increased contracts by longstanding clients but also in the considerable number of inquiries the Art Bank receives concerning the purchase of works from the collection. In such cases interested individuals are either put in touch directly with the artists (who can repurchase the work and then sell it to the interested party) or the artist's dealer. And although,
according to staff, prospective buyers tend to underestimate the costs involved in purchasing such works, the Art Bank nevertheless mediates several such sales every year.

**F. Conclusion**

When Treasury Board was presented with the proposal for the creation of the Art Bank, it was advised that such a program—besides supplementing the income for Canadian artists—would improve the environment and the quality of all government departments and agencies by displaying the works of Canadian artists for the benefit of both staff and visitors. Although a strategy to recover the Rental Program's administrative costs was outlined in the proposal under "Procedures", the financial self-sufficiency was not part of the official objectives. As mentioned earlier, it was most probably the concept of the program's anticipated independence from the public purse which appears to have made the creation of the Art Bank acceptable to Treasury Board officials. The principle of the Rental Program's financial self-sufficiency, especially following the recommendations of the Dunton Report, has taken on an increasing degree of importance in the eyes of Council's Board and consequently had a detrimental effect on the full implementation of the program according to its original ideology of democratization and decentralization.

The Art Bank's efforts and success in increasing rental income in order to offset costs are to be admired and give evidence for the Rental Program's achievements. Various Art Bank reports show that within 20 years of operation the number of works rented has increased from 1500
(29%) in 1974 to over 10,000 (65%) in 1992. During the same period of time the rental income rose from $62,789 to $1,386,560. But although both the number of works rented and the scope of the leasing operation have gone beyond all initial expectations, it has to be noted that the full potential of the Rental Program has not yet been reached.

From the beginning the rental fees charged to clients were the same regardless of their location and rental income generated in Central Canada, where a large number of clients can be serviced very cost-efficiently, has always subsidized the more expensive rental activities in, for example, British Columbia or Newfoundland. But because the Art Bank's rental operation is so closely tied to the concept of cost recovery and existing staff no longer has the capacity to cope even with the demand from established clients, the Art Bank had to reduce the promotion of its services in the hinterland and is able to respond only to the requests from potential clients in the regions who happen to know or hear about the rental program. Considering the present number of staff and available works, no rental exhibitions, where government offices can select works for their offices and the general public has an opportunity to see works from the nation's collection, are planned in the near future for Windsor, Kelowna, Brandon, Rimouski, Steenville and Whitehorse (some of which can hardly be called hinterland) or any other town of similar size. This situation is unfortunate because the remoter the region the fewer the occasions for the public to come in touch with contemporary works of art. And it is precisely these areas of Canada that Pelletier's ideology, which
after all gave impetus to the establishment of the Art Bank, was targeted to reach.

Furthermore, because Art Bank rentals are not mandatory for all government offices, a process for the democratic circulation of Art Bank works to the entire civil service, although encouraged by the Art Bank, was never implemented by Treasury Board. According to staff, the decision where to place works of art from the Art Bank rests with a department's senior management or C.E.O. and many clients still tend to place artworks primarily in executive offices. Personnel working in or visiting less prestigious spaces (who might never have had the occasion to come in touch with works of contemporary art and would benefit greatly from the experience) only rarely enjoy the same privilege.

Despite its successes, the Rental Program's mandate to reach a large segment of the population has, primarily due to lack of adequate resources, only been partially accomplished. It is indeed regrettable that the great emphasis on cost recovery--and therefore no subsidy from either the Canada Council or from the federal government in the form of a designated fund for regional development--prevents the Art Bank from providing its services to a segment of the Canadian population which would probably benefit from it the most. In the analysis of the program, however, it must be kept in mind that the Art Bank as an arm of the Canada Council is a cultural program mandated to support Canadian artists and to develop an audience for their work--and not a profit oriented business. The Rental Program's objective to bring contemporary art out of the museums to a wider public and to every corner of Canada (the mechanics and the potential to accomplish this aim certainly exist)
can only be realized if the appropriate resources and ideological support are provided. In this regard the Art Bank is not alone and finds itself in the same predicament as not only all other programs of the Canada Council but all national cultural institutions and arts organizations in Canada.
CHAPTER III
THE NON-REVENUE PRODUCING PROGRAMS

During the mid-1970's and after several years of intensive purchasing (and less intensive rental activity) it became evident that an increasing number of works in the collection, in particular sizeable sculptures, were very difficult to place with the Art Bank's rental clients. The cause for the lack of interest in such pieces was attributed to a previously unanticipated shortage of suitably large office spaces, timidity and lack of understanding of the works by civil servants and the relatively high rental fees for bigger pieces. On the other hand, many works which proved virtually impossible to rent were exactly those frequently sought after by public galleries, municipalities and universities for display in public spaces or for inclusion in retrospective and other exhibitions. A market analysis of the contemporary visual arts milieu, commissioned by the Canada Council at around the same time, indicated that artists and dealers alike were strongly in favour of increased and country-wide public exposure of the Art Bank collection. This study emphasized that

If there had to be a choice between continued renting to government offices, and working out rental arrangements with more public agencies such as public galleries, libraries, and companies and others dealing extensively with the public, the choice should favour the more public exposure.

A similar opinion was also expressed by George Woodcock:

The Art Bank is a project in which advantages and disadvantages are closely mingled. Clearly it has been a benefit to artists that there should be a reliable major customer for their works, and over the years hundreds of individuals have benefited. On the other hand, the way the collection is administered takes art into the heart of the political realm, for instead of making the $8 million
worth of works it has accumulated available to the small-town galleries and museums of the hinterland, which would be an appropriate place for them, the Art Bank rents them to government offices, so that one can see them only when visiting bureaucrats. Art in these circumstances becomes an appendage to the workings of the state.

Although it can be argued that in pronouncing the above statement Woodcock might not have been fully aware of the Art Bank's original mandate and relationship with Treasury Board, the fact remained that the collection continued to be not particularly visible for a public outside the federal bureaucracy and in particular for Canadians living outside major metropolitan regions.

From its inception, the visual arts milieu recognized the Art Bank primarily as a resource, not only with regard to additional income for artists but as an effective vehicle for the distribution and promotion of their work. Art Bank staff, aware of these expectations and confronted with an increasing demand for loans of individual works as well as whole exhibitions from the collection, proposed to Council in December 1975, that the following responsibilities be added to ongoing programming:

We would also like to undertake a series of special projects designed to show the collection in public art galleries across Canada, and, in co-operation with External Affairs, in major centres abroad. Several public galleries are very interested in preparing temporary exhibitions from the Art Bank collection and would pay all associated costs. . . . An extensive publicity campaign would be mounted to bring the Art Bank and the exhibitions to the attention of the general public and the artistic community.

The same report proposed to make the Art Bank's visual and documentary material available to educational institutions and Canadian missions abroad through slide kits and supportive texts.
These additional responsibilities of the Art Bank were outlined in Council's second submission to Treasury Board in 1976:

A major objective of the Art Bank is to recognize and support Canadian artists through purchasing quality works of art and exhibiting them in federal spaces, but certain non-revenue producing obligations fall upon the Art Bank because of the resources it contains. The Art Bank offers advisory services, loans to exhibitions in public galleries, publicity to the artists, tours for art specialists and diffusion through exhibitions.163

The so called "non-revenue producing programs", exhibitions, loans and other activities which supported artists only indirectly and, as their name indicates, do not produce revenues, were recognized by Treasury Board when the renewal of the Art Bank's second mandate was approved in 1977. Ever since, initiatives aimed at increasing the visibility of contemporary art as well as the education and audience development of the general public have become important facets of Art Bank programming.

A. Special Projects

The concept of making exhibitions from its collection available to museums and galleries was a logical step for the newly established Art Bank since its predecessor, the original Canada Council Collection, had been the focus of several shows including a travelling exhibition which was coordinated by the National Gallery of Canada in 1969. Only one year into the mandate, 72 works from the Art Bank were displayed during the summer of 1973 at the Canadian Cultural Centre in Paris. This first show was documented by a catalogue and, as noted in a report to Council, "The reaction of the Paris critics to the show was generally favourable and demonstrated that the Art Bank concept is unique in the
western world". The Paris exhibition was followed, amongst others, by Art Bank shows at the Dalhousie Art Gallery in Halifax, a special exhibit of six sculptures at the National Arts Centre in Ottawa as well as exhibitions at the Art Gallery of Ontario, the Musée d'art contemporain in Montreal as well as at the Art Gallery of Windsor and an exhibition of 21 paintings toured for three years to New Zealand, Australia, Western Europe and Scandinavia.

In a detailed account on the first five years of Art Bank programming Christopher Youngs provided further information on early special exhibitions. He emphasized in the document that these projects were initiated primarily in response to an increasing demand for greater public access of the collection:

By the third year of its operation, an awareness had been developed on the part of the artistic community of the size and scope of the Art Bank which led to a curiosity about its contents and a desire to draw from this source for the organization of exhibitions of works from any and all parts of the country. In addition, the Art Bank appointed a full-time officer to deal solely with projects directed to exposing works of art and promoting Canadian artists to as wide a segment of the population as possible.

Youngs also noted that while the concept of holding special exhibitions for rental in centres across the country remained a valid means of distributing works to clients outside of Ottawa (today's "Art Bank at Work" rental exhibitions) lack of staff and an increased demand by galleries for exhibitions from the collection contributed to define the Art Bank's role primarily as a resource rather than an organizer of exhibitions.

Davidson Dunton also addressed the issue of special projects in his report and pointed out that these services were valuable, effective
and indeed should probably be expanded to provide better public understanding of Canadian art. However, because the Art Bank’s official [1977] mandate continued to remain vague and was never expanded to specifically include special exhibits, Dunton suggested that it stick with its primary role:

in the interest of clarity of thought about the Art Bank and its functions, its basic mandate should still be considered to be the acquisition and rental of works of art. The Council should consider separately the question of extension activities by the Bank, weighing them and their financial needs against the calls of other programs in support of the arts. The Bank should have an additional mandate, apart from its basic one, for the extension program; and this program should have its own allocation of funds.167

Between 1973 and 1980, the Art Bank’s reporting on special projects was inconsistent and the precise number of special projects coordinated since 1973 is therefore difficult to determine. According to annual reports between 1981 and 1991 the Art Bank responded to 94 different requests from public galleries, museums, universities and libraries for exhibits of works from the collection.

Two recently organized exhibitions are representative of the projects the Art Bank is frequently asked to provide. In 1991, the Department of External Affairs approached the Art Bank to co-ordinate an exhibition of relatively recent acquisitions by Canadian artists for display in the Arts Pavilion at the World Fair 1992 in Seville, Spain. Since the Art Bank has no curatorial function or staff, Ottawa free-lance curator and artist Dennis Tourbin was asked to make a selection of suitably major works and manage the curatorial aspects of the exhibition which was scheduled for June/July 1992. Included in the exhibition were installation pieces, sculptures, paintings and
photo-based works by artists from across Canada such as Gisele Amantea, Jocelyne Alloucherie, Jeff Wall, Attila Lukacs, Dominique Blain, Evergon, Carl Beam and Bob Boyer—to name only a few. Unfortunately this exhibition was cancelled by the Department of External Affairs owing to a lack of funds only a few weeks before the intended opening. Earlier the same year, the Director of the Centre international d'art contemporain in Montreal, Claude Gosselin, selected 62 works by 35 women artists for an exhibition organized to coincide with an international feminist symposium sponsored by Montreal's Goethe Institute. The pieces in this exhibit were produced during the last 20 years and reflected the changing practices of artists such Irene F. Whittome, Colette Whiten, Betty Goodwin, Angela Grauerholz, Barbara Steinman, Monique Mongeau, and Jamelie Hassan.

Public galleries, museums and exhibition centres interested in showing works from the Art Bank are aware that although the 16,000 works provide a significant resource, the nature of the collection and the virtual unavailability of works rented, make the curating of carefully selected shows rather difficult. The Art Bank's special projects are therefore what their name implies, i.e. gatherings of works, admittedly often significant ones, that demonstrate the Art Bank's selection criteria and happen to be available for the time of the planned exhibit. Critical reviews of special projects reflect the non-focussed nature of these shows and David L. Shirey, speaking about a display of works from the Art Bank at Nabisco Headquarters in East Hanover, N.J., in 1980, observed that "Anyone who is somewhat savvy about this art will notice big gaps. It is, however, a thoughtful selection that demonstrates
special talents working in different ways, and it does provide a taste of diverse aesthetic directions\.168

It is important to note that, unlike the early projects organized during the 1970's, special projects have not been initiated by the Art Bank for sometime now and, in keeping with the concept of cost recovery, all expenses incurred for such shows--crating, transportation, installation and insurance costs for the works once they leave the Art Bank--are the responsibility of the institutions requesting the exhibitions. In 1979 Davidson Dunton estimated in his report that $100,000 (1979 dollars) would be necessary for Council to cover the direct expenses of special projects.169 This or any other significant amount, however, has never been added to the Art Bank's yearly budgets. As far back as 1985, William Kirby argued for additional funds:

If greater resources were available to us, we would be in a position not only to respond to requests but to perhaps initiate a series of prepackaged shows. Such exhibitions might answer the needs of the educational system (schools, colleges etc.) or the health care system (hospitals, clinics, etc.) or assist with programming in community centres in many of the small towns across our country. Working in concert with public galleries, and government cultural agencies, the Art Bank could fulfill its mandate of promoting the enjoyment and understanding of contemporary Canadian art as widely as possible.170

According to William Kirby, the Art Bank's 1992/93 budget for special projects is $3000--it was $90,000 in 1977/78171--and is intended to cover incidental costs. This lack of resources continues to prevent the Art Bank from implementing a number of planned activities such as the organization of small travelling shows aimed at introducing works of contemporary Canadian art to schools or colleges or the establishment of a Communications Fund which could be used to bring curators to the Art
Bank to research the collection in order to select works for exhibitions and to assist museums and galleries with the transportation and insurance costs of these shows.

According to staff, until new resources can be found to administer a more proactive exhibition program, the Art Bank will continue to respond, within its means, to requests for special projects and co-operate with galleries and museums to bring the work of Canadian artists closer to the general public.

B. Loans and Long-Term Loans

1. Loans

Within the museum and public gallery milieu loans have always played a significant part. In fact, most exhibitions would be impossible to curate if collecting institutions were unable to borrow specific works from other public or private collections. In such cases it is common practice that the borrowing institution takes on full responsibility not only for the appropriate museological care of loaned works but that it also assumes all transportation and insurance costs. Lending institutions and private collectors usually require the signing of condition reports and standard loan agreements to establish the terms under which works from their collections may be loaned in order to avoid the possibility of legal action should damage to a work or its loss occur. It is further common practice that a museum or gallery refuses a loan request for very valuable or fragile works of art if their safekeeping cannot be guaranteed.
Unlike most collecting institutions, the Art Bank acquires works which have had limited or no prior public exposure since most pieces are purchased "hot off the press" and a considerable number of new acquisitions represent key works from recent stages of artists' careers. Because it has always been the Art Bank's intention to provide maximum public exposure for all its works, the collection developed as an important and generous source for loans of art works.

The Art Bank, unlike other collections, does not keep its holdings in permanent storage vaults but instead has the large majority of its inventory scattered across Canada. And not only are over 10,000 works distributed from coast to coast, these pieces are tied to rental contracts and not as available for loans as interested curators or artists would like them to be. If a work which is requested for an exhibition happens to be rented and is not expected to be returned in time for the show, the Head of the Art Bank will decide if the exhibition is of sufficient importance to approach the client and ask for its release. If the client is willing to give up the work, the Art Bank will offer to temporarily install a replacement but all costs incurred for the exchange must be born by the borrowing institution. Despite such complications the Art Banks loans between 50 and 150 works per year to various public galleries and museums, but as many as 344 works in 1987/88 have been borrowed from the collection. During 1991-1992 works from the Art Bank were exhibited at the Museo de Arte Contemporaneo de Monterrey, Mexico, the Barbican Art Gallery in London, England, the National Gallery of Canada, the Galleria d'Arte Moderne in Bologna, Italy as well as the Vancouver Art Gallery, the Mendel Art
Gallery in Saskatoon, the Musée du Québec and the Art Gallery of Ontario.

2. Long-term Loans

The difference between loans and long-term loans lies in the fact that loans are requested by institutions for specific exhibitions and for the duration of such events only. Long-term loans, however, are intended to make some works from the Art Bank more accessible to the general public and are offered to museums, galleries, and universities on a cost recovery basis for the duration of one year with an option to renew the loan agreement for subsequent years.

The first suggestion of long-term loans can be found in a recommendation of Council's Advisory Arts Panel which suggested in 1975 that part of the Art Bank collection be made available to public galleries on an extended loan basis. A more formal proposal to Council was put forth by the Art Bank in December 1976 as follows:

We propose to offer specific works from the Art Bank collection for extended loan to public galleries. A condition of these loans would be that these works be on public display at all times. Additionally, with the approval of the Art Bank, the objects must be made available for special exhibitions in other institutions. As with other loans, galleries desiring to borrow works from our collection would be responsible for shipping and insurance. It is already our policy to seek an artist's approval for any loans.

While long-term loans may imply a loss of rental income, the works offered would consist primarily of large scale or conceptually oriented works which are difficult to rent. We estimate total rental value of loaned works would not exceed $10,000. Loaned works would continue to be available for rental to Art Bank clients and, as a result of their exhibition, some rentals may occur. In any case, it is certainly more desirable to have these works on public view than to have them in our warehouse.
The recommendation was approved and a press release dated May 13, 1977, announced the terms of reference:

The Art Bank will offer specific works from its collection for extended loan to public galleries. The Art Bank asks that the works be given reasonable visibility during the loan period and that they be made available, on request, for special exhibitions in other institutions. As with other loans, the borrowing gallery is responsible for shipping and insurance.175

In discussing the so-called "non-moving inventory", i.e. works of art which have never or only on rare occasions been rented, Davidson Dunton reinforces the notion of extended loans:

Loans of such works [should] be made on a permanent or long term basis to galleries that have use for them, or, in the case of suitable sculptures, public spaces available for long periods. While exhibitions and loans do not meet the objective of providing revenue they do fulfill the purpose of recognizing artists and displaying their works.176

Although works from the Art Bank collection have been loaned to museums and galleries under long-term agreements on a regular basis since 1978, this practice has caused some disagreement with the visual arts community. According to Art Bank staff several artists argued that if collecting institutions could borrow major works from the Art Bank for virtually unlimited periods of time for exhibit alongside their own permanent collections (and at relatively little expense), this practice could severely endanger possible sales to these galleries and even further reduce the already limited Canadian art market. To avoid any real or perceived conflict with artists, the Art Bank now makes works for long-term loans available only if the artist provides a written agreement.177
The total number of works loaned for extended periods of time since 1977 is not available, but the 1981 Art Bank report pointed out that at that time 29 works, 20 of them sculptures, were loaned on a long-term basis to various galleries in Regina, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Edmonton and Lethbridge. The report further noted that 10 of these works were never previously rented.\textsuperscript{178} As of March 31, 1992, only 63 works were placed temporarily with 10 institutions in Ottawa, Calgary, Edmonton, Gananoque, Longueil, Regina, Corner Brook, Lethbridge, Great Britain and Jamaica.\textsuperscript{179}

C. Public Programs

What is referred to as "Public Programs" in Art Bank reports and information literature is in fact not a defined program with formulated policies and procedures but refers to a variety of initiatives which were introduced to make the Bank's resources more accessible to the artistic community and the public at large.

Although the Art Bank has been funded from the public purse, its collection, operation and activities for years remained enigmatic for Canadians who had no direct dealings with the organization and unless individuals were able to establish personal contact with staff, Art Bank doors appeared to be closed to the general public. That the first warehouse and offices were situated a 20 minute car ride from Ottawa's downtown further contributed to the Art Bank's invisibility.

The introduction of special exhibitions provided the first move towards making the collection more public. This initiative was followed
in 1976 with the slide project, a collaborative effort between the Art Bank and the Canadian Government Photo Centre to create sets of slides of works in the collection. The first set consisted of slides of 100 paintings by 30 artists and was followed by a second set of 100 sculptures. These sets were produced at a cost of $60.62 per unit, including all publicity, copyright and brochure expenses, and sold for $75.00 to educational institutions. According to staff the painting sets have been sold out for some time and only a small number of the sculpture series are still available.180

It was, however, only in 1981 when additional space became available that the Art Bank decided to move beyond special projects and, at least with regard to what was available on its own premises, become more pro-active in making its resources generally available. At that time a report to Council outlined plans to improve public accessibility:

To further develop the Art Bank’s educational role and make information about the works and artists represented in the collection more accessible, we have begun to set up a Visual Arts Resource Centre. Included in the Centre will be the 10,000 slides from the Arts Awards Service. We will have by far the largest and most extensive slide collection of contemporary Canadian art anywhere. The Resource Centre will also house the Art Bank’s library of catalogues and books on contemporary art and our artists’ biographical files.

As the material in the Resource Centre is compiled and updated we will be able to provide extensive information about artists in our collection to the art community, the public and our clients.181

The same document announced that a gallery space, displaying changing exhibits of works from the collection, would be open during office hours and that guided tours of the warehouse will be offered to the general public once a week.
Despite its efforts to provide more public access and visibility for its resources, Art Bank management had to face the fact that again no additional staff or budgets would be allocated by Council to file slides and periodicals, update artists files, give guided tours or set up exhibitions in the gallery space. As a result a volunteer program, broadly based on a museum docent system, was introduced in 1981. Although volunteer guides initially provided effective assistance and indeed freed up staff time, a relatively high drop-out rate, the recruiting and training of new guides, as well as the overall co-ordination of the volunteer program eventually became more time consuming to administer than anticipated and the project was terminated in 1990. Today tours of the warehouse and storage facilities are again given by one staff member and are offered, by appointment, to the general public every Wednesday. According to the 1991 report to Council tours are still possible:

On request artists, curators, teachers and their students, foreign journalists and dignitaries and the general public may come at any time to view works on display and to consult material contained in the Resource Centre. The gallery space on the second floor has provided us with the opportunity of displaying a changing selection of recent acquisitions along with some more complex works purchased in past years.182

The Resource Centre was completely reorganized after the Art Bank's move in 1989. It now provides much improved public access to catalogues, periodicals and slides and is at present maintained by contract staff as well as periodically by practicum students. Although far from containing the wide range of documentation Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne initially proposed to have stored in the Resource Centre, the material available today has proven useful not only for general research
but also to publishing houses and graphic designers who were able to take advantage of the Art Bank’s slide library to select images from the collection for book, periodical and album covers.183

D. Conclusion

Considering the strong emphasis on covering expenses it is not surprising that Special Projects, Loans and Long-term Loans and the Public Programs today have all been grouped together under a designation assigned to them for what they do not accomplish—they do not produce revenue for the Art Bank—rather what they do—make works from the collection more accessible to a wider public. This has not always been the case. Davidson Dunton investigated and assessed the non-revenue producing programs but throughout his report referred to them with the more appropriate term “Extension Programs”.

Dunton’s premise for evaluating all Art Bank programs was based on the formulation of the 1972 mandate: to buy works of contemporary Canadian artists and to rent them for display in public buildings.184 He does not, however, take into consideration the Art Bank’s enlarged 1977 mandate which was clearly spelled out in Council’s 1977 press release and referred to not only the purchase and rental of art works but the increase of public knowledge and understanding of the work of Canadian artists.185

While the Rental Program is the most efficient means for the Art Bank to bring the work of Canadian artists to the general public (and it is certainly desirable for the Rental Program to generate income to cover operating expenses) Art Bank management realized early on that the
objectives of the Art Bank as a cultural program could not solely be accomplished through the Rental Program which reaches only a small segment of Canada's population. Davidson Dunton agreed:

As the Bank grew a need was felt for extension services, including providing works from the inventory on loan for exhibitions of different kinds. The development was natural. It seemed desirable that there should be some facilities for educational activities based on much the largest collection of contemporary Canadian art in the country. Loaning works from the inventory for exhibition would be a good means of letting members of the public see them. The extension activities would be making additional use of very important national artistic assets, and would assist in public knowledge and understanding of the Bank.

It is my view that these services as at present carried out are valuable and effective. Indeed, it could well be argued that they should be expanded and that the result would be a better public appreciation of Canadian art.186

Dunton, however, then argued that "in the interest of thought about the Art Bank and its functions, its basic mandate should still be considered to be the acquisition and rental of works of art" and suggested that the "the Council should consider separately the question of extension activities by the Bank".187 This suggestion seems to have fallen on receptive ears because today Council's opinion with regard to the Art Bank's extension programs is to--by all means--continue to do them as long as their production does not incur costs.

The importance of the "non-revenue producing programs" rests in the fact that they take full advantage of the Art Bank's valuable resources and are an important means for works from the collection to be seen by Canadians who neither work in nor visit government offices. As mentioned earlier, the majority of works selected for Special Projects and Long-term Loans are usually too large or too complex to be displayed in government offices and would most probably not produce revenue for
the Art Bank. It is unfortunate that at present long-term loans are available only to those institutions (most of which are located in major urban centres) who can absorb the high transportation and insurance costs. The operating budgets of exhibition centres, many of them built in small communities across Canada during the 1960's and 1970's within the framework of the same political ideology as the Art Bank, do not allow for a selection of major works from the Art Bank to be brought to their communities. These centres do not own permanent collections but are well equipped to show works of art and would be ideally suited to present works from the Art Bank, as would small municipal galleries, schools, universities and libraries located outside metropolitan areas. Should funds become available for extension services, the Art Bank, as a national cultural program which was implemented to democratize and decentralise the visual arts in Canada, should give first priority to all activities aimed at bringing exhibitions or long-term loans at no cost to the hinterland.

In the same vein it must also be said that the opening of the Art Bank facilities in Ottawa to the general public has been an important step in making the activities of the organization better known and more accessible. But although the Art Bank organizes Sunday Open House Days from time to time, the facilities must unfortunately remain closed to the general public after working hours and on weekends.

The difficulty for the Art Bank to balance programming aimed at increasing public awareness and understanding of contemporary art in Canada and efforts to generate income was expressed by Christopher
Youngs in 1973 in a memorandum to Council regarding financial aspects of Art Bank operations:

While we are anxious to maintain healthy revenues, we must not lose sight of our goals. In other words, there is a danger that in all our effort to make money we will fail to implement our mandate. We must maintain a reasonable balance between being a public institution and a fund raiser.  

Funding for all cultural agencies is much more restricted today than it was in 1978. In 1978, as mentioned earlier, the Art Bank was able to allocate $90,000 to Special Projects and other extension programming but by 1992 this budget had dwindled to $3000. The balancing act referred to by Youngs is becoming more and more difficult to maintain and it is precisely for that very reason that the Art Bank must not lose sight of its raison d'être.
CONCLUSION

When the creation of the Art Bank was announced in 1972, artists, dealers, curators and administrators had great expectations: the new program was to finally provide visual artists with a willing and affluent collector and assemble a substantial collection of contemporary art; it was to bring government offices into the 20th century and make the daily working climate of civil servants and their visitors more enjoyable; the display of work by Canadian artists in public spaces was to foster the public knowledge, understanding and enjoyment of contemporary art; and the federal model was to encourage corporations and private individuals to integrate the purchase of works of art into their own spending habits and thereby indirectly support commercial galleries and the art market. Some members of the artistic community had also hoped that the Art Bank would provide the basis for a national centre of contemporary art. 189

To assess fairly if and to what degree the Art Bank's mandate has been met and how it expects to meet the challenge of the fiscal restraint in the 90s, it is important to examine first the support structure and resources at present available for the program to accomplish its objectives and those the Art Bank will require to assure its future.
A. The Art Bank's Relationship with the Canada Council and
Administrative Structure

Over the 20 years of its existence the relationship between the
Art Bank and its mother organization developed into one of paradoxes.
Initially implemented as a program within the Council's Visual Arts
Section, the Art Bank's budget and staff allocation at that time were
comparable to those of other programs and, if anything, its resources
were comparatively generous. In 1992, however, the Art Bank is an
autonomous section within Council's Arts Division but receives the
smallest grants allocation; yet, it is the publicly most visible of all
Council activities. Despite the small budget for purchases, the
adjudication process of the Purchase Program requires a higher number of
juries (15-17), jury days (approximately 75) and number of jury members
(55-60) per year than any other single Council program, and the total
number of Art Bank staff (23 full-time and 2 contract) represents
approximately 10% of all Council personnel. In comparison with other
Council activities it is important to note that although the Bank
provides funding to individual artists, as do other Sections of Council,
the Art Bank, unlike any other section of Council, acquires assets and
covers a considerable amount of administrative costs by income generated
through programming. To continue listing incongruities it should also be
pointed out that the Bank shares Council's mailing address but has been
located in different premises from the beginning. Furthermore, the Art
Bank must conform with all of Council's policies, procedures and
guidelines and is subject to its administrative systems including those
pertaining to finance, informatics, human resources and communications support.

Generally speaking, the relationship between Council and the Art Bank has been a mutually beneficial one: the Art Bank offers public visibility for Council's mandate to support and promote the arts; social functions, such as openings of rental exhibitions or special projects in the regions, provide Council and the Art Bank with an opportunity to get in touch and exchange information with arts communities and the press. For the Art Bank, however, the most positive aspect of having been assigned to be "organized and administered by the Canada Council" comes from the protection provided by Council's arms-length relationship with government. This political independence makes it possible not only for the Purchase Program to maintain its integrity in acquiring works of art based solely on artistic merit but also for the Art Bank's existence and activities to be sheltered from political interference, the importance of which became evident in 1978 when Treasury Board decided to cancel funding designated for the Purchase Program. Through the Council, the Art Bank also enjoys much increased access to and support in communicating with all levels of the cultural and public sectors and, being integrated into Council's administrative structure, enables the Art Bank to operate with a smaller staff than would otherwise be possible. Finally, being a program of an arms length organization, the Canada Council provides the Art Bank with a certain degree of professional integrity it would certainly not enjoy were it part of a federal department such as Supply and Services.
As an autonomous section of Council the Art Bank was allocated a total operations budget of $3.5 million for 1992/92. Of this amount, $1.5 million are generated from the Rental Program and the total costs to Council are $2 million. A broad distribution of the budget reads as follows:

- **Purchase Program** (includes the acquisition budget, jury costs, transportation and framing costs for new acquisitions) $1,200,000
- **Accommodation** (offices, gallery, resource centre, art storage, warehouse, frame and workshops, garage) $1,000,000
- **Salaries** (salaries and benefits for permanent, contract and casual staff) $1,000,000
- **Administration** (general administrative and program expenses including staff travel and equipment) $300,000

**Total:** $3,500,000

Based on Council's 1992/93 budget the Art Bank's actual cost to Council of $2 million represent 1.7% of Council's total budget forecast.192

The Art Bank's integration within Council's ideological, financial and administrative structure has been most beneficial but, according to staff, also caused considerable frustration for years. This is especially true with regard to the income generating activities of the rental program whose expanding operations are market and client driven but must conform to Council's administrative policies. In examining memoranda and reports to Council between 1972 and 1992, the constant demand for additional staff is most noticeable and has been referred to repeatedly in this paper.
During the first six years the Art Bank's requests for additional staff must have been falling on receptive ears because the number of its employees grew very rapidly. When the program was established in 1972, the Art Bank counted a staff of three: a director, a registrar and one secretary. By 1975 the full complement had increased by 10 more positions and included an administrator, two rental (liaison) officers, registrar, five secretaries/clerks, two framers and two technicians (since at that time no new director had been appointed the tasks of the position were carried out temporarily by the head of Council's Visual Arts Section). Three years later a memorandum to Council in December 1978, listed the number of Art Bank staff at 19 and, in addition to the newly appointed director, included one more rental officer, one arts officer, one additional secretary/clerk and two more technicians. Although, as outlined in previous chapters, the demand on all Art Bank programs doubled since 1978, only four full time and two contract employees have been added to the number of Art Bank staff during the past 14 years (an organogram of the Art Bank as of March 31, 1992, is provided in Appendix F).

The Art Bank has been a full and autonomous section of the Canada Council since 1986 and its Section Head, the equivalent of the previous Director, oversees all aspects of ongoing activities. According to the Art Bank's 1991/92 report to Council the duties of Art Bank staff can be loosely divided into two overall responsibility units: those of the Purchase Programs and management of the collection and tasks related to the Rental Program and Special Projects.
The first unit consists of ten staff: the Purchase Programs Officer who manages the Purchase, the Repurchase and the Special Purchase Assistance Programs and oversees the co-ordination of the Public Programs and the Resource Centre; two clerical and one technical Purchase Programs Assistants who provide the professional and administrative support necessary to carry out the operations of the Purchase and Public Programs—including the clerical tasks of co-ordinating the juries, the receiving of new acquisitions and returning of not-purchased works, payments to artists, travel arrangements and itineraries for the juries, maintenance of the Resource Centre, preparation of information on the collection for rental clients, artists and the general public and the conducting of public tours through the storage and warehouse facilities. The museological care of the collection is carried out by the Collections Manager who deals with all aspects of safekeeping for the collection including responsibility for restoration, insurance, and the loan of works. The Registrar catalogues and documents all new acquisitions and co-ordinates the photography and framing requirements for the collection; the Collections Assistant provides administrative support for the Collections Manager and Registrar. The Head Technician has full responsibility for the storage and warehousing of the collection and oversees the production of special framing, display stands, shipping crates, shelving and office furniture which are carried out by one Framer and one Carpenter.

The Ar. Bank's Rental Unit counts 13 staff members and consists of: the Chief Art Consultant and Special Projects Officer who manages the activities of the Rental Program and co-ordinates Special Projects
and Extended Loans; three Art Consultants who render the professional services of the Rental Program and liaise with rental clients across Canada; four Rental Assistants provide administrative and clerical support to the Art Consultants including the preparation of rental contracts and invoicing as well as numerous tasks related to the preparation of rental exhibitions; a Senior Rental Technician who oversees the preparation of works selected for installation and maintains storage facilities; three Rental Technicians install, remove and relocate art works in the offices of rental clients; and one Administration Officer who oversees the scheduling of installations as well as financial and computer analysis related to the Rental Program.

A Receptionist passes on incoming telephone calls, receives and distributes mail and provides additional clerical support to the Head of the Art Bank. In addition to the 25 positions listed, short-term contract staff is hired on occasion during peak periods such as out-of-town rental exhibitions, special projects and works-on-paper juries.196

According to William Kirby it is the Bank's objective to remain as self-sufficient as possible. Therefore, all initial and subsequent re-framing, all pedestals for sculptures and plexiglass display cases, crates and even some custom furniture are produced in house. In the same vein, since April 1992 all photographic documentation of the collection, primarily in the form of slides, is now carried out by staff and the Art Bank no longer requires the services of a costly contract photographer. The only exception to the Art Bank's paradigm of self-sufficiency relates to services required for the maintenance and
restoration of the collection. Because most conservators offer very specialized skills, such as the restoration of works on paper, paintings, photography, or sculpture and the needs for the continued well being of the 16,000 Art Bank works require expertise in all media, it has proven more advantageous to rely on the knowledge of a number of specialists rather than on one single individual.

Staff increased relatively little over the past 14 years but it should be noted that extensive automatisation and revising of procedures has made it possible for the organization to continue to deal effectively with the greatly increased demand on the two main programs. For example, whereas previously the relocation of every art work had to be recorded manually in a card system—an activity which required one full staff position—these changes are now entered directly into the Art Bank's database through barcoding.197

The Art Bank's present administration is lean and the number of staff low. Although the Bank has no research or curatorial function and, unlike public galleries or museums, does not require security guards, cafeteria, bookstore or boutique staff, and several major administrative functions are centralised within Council's structure, the number of personnel compares favourably with that of collections of similar size, such as the Art Gallery of Ontario which until recently employed a staff of 275 full-time and 176 part-time staff.198 The Art Bank's personnel and the administrative resources have been maximised for years and there is no doubt that the need for additional staff to assist in the Purchase and Rental Programs as well as to provided improved information and educational services to clients and the public
has become urgent. William Kirby indicated that the next years will be particularly important for the existence of the Bank and the reporting structure and administrative procedures of his team will be examined in the near future.

2. The Challenge for the Nineties

William Kirby's introduction to the Art Bank's 1989-90 Year End Report states emphatically that in the past similar documents focussed entirely on the Art Bank's successes. The report, however, continues to note that while the most recent year was successful "the problems of the past have continued to grow and have now become serious enough to bring the future development of the Art Bank into question". In the same document Kirby documents the increasing demands on the Bank's two major programs and an inability to, on one hand, adequately respond to the growing number of requests from artists to have their work purchased, and, on the other, from government offices across Canada to secure more and improved services from the Rental Program.

The direct relationship between the Purchase and Rental Programs and the detrimental effects of a reduced purchase budget was first mentioned in 1978 by Christopher Youngs in a memorandum to Council:

One of the fundamental beauties of the Art Bank is that to a great extent the amount available for purchases has been regulated by the relative success of the rental program. This control is built into the system. Nevertheless, the amount of income is obviously strongly dependent on the amount of work available for rentals. Therefore, it must be anticipated that any cut to the purchasing budget of the Art Bank will decrease our revenues accordingly.

Given the fact that no additional monies would be forthcoming from Council and that revenues from the sale of works from the
collection would not be sufficiently high to enable the Art Bank to effectively deal with its dilemma, senior Art Bank staff began to examine the question as to whether potential growth in both programs was desirable, and if so, how it could be achieved without having to sacrifice the organization's original objectives.

With regard to the Purchase Program, several options were considered, including an implementation of limitations of purchases by either the type of work (installations, sculptures or large paintings) or the establishment of a relatively low maximum price per work ($10,000 - $15,000). But since such restrictions "would severely damage the original concept of the Art Bank by excluding the many artists that the Art Bank supports who do not have a market for their work"201 these and similarly formulated options were not considered viable alternatives. Administrative changes were also considered for the Rental Program in the form of rental fee increases, a continued moratorium on new clients as well as the delegation of consulting procedures to stringers in the regions. Following extensive deliberations it was concluded that only by increasing rental revenues and by reinvesting profits back into the organization, the Art Bank's continued growth as well as the full realisation of all its objectives and a higher degree of financial autonomy could be ensured. A first step towards more fiscal and administrative independence was the implementation of a new rental fee schedule in January 1990. As a result, the rental income increased immediately even though the percentage of works rented remains relatively constant.
From the beginning, smaller and less expensive works in the collection represented the "bread and butter" items for the rental operation since most of the spaces for which works are leased are small and can accommodate only moderately sized works of art. As well, the majority of rental clients allocate relatively low budgets for Art Bank rentals but, understandably, are interested in leasing as many works as possible for the amount set aside for that purpose. According to staff, the Art Bank was able to purchase a sufficient number of moderately sized and priced works until recently, at first through a print commission program and later the works-on-paper juries. In recent years, however, the number of smaller works purchased has fallen below the requirements of the Rental Program. The Art Bank's 1989/90 report points out that this produces problems for clients:

The diminishing number of works available to rent each year had had a deleterious effect on our ever-growing clientele. This inverse relationship means that an increasing number of prospective clients are leaving the Art Bank without making a choice. The Art Bank visit is often their first real contact with contemporary art and rather than being excited, they are often discouraged by the very limited selection of works available.202

To effectively accommodate the Rental Program's seemingly unchanging need for new and smaller sized works, the Art Bank decided to modify its purchase procedures for one year. After having consulted with its Advisory Committee in September 1991 the Bank reported to Council in November of the same year that, for 1992/93 only, it proposed to suspend all studio visits as well as two of the three works-on-paper juries. Instead, 20 different regional juries would be co-ordinated to meet in major centres across Canada to select works in all media, priced no higher than $1500 and no larger than 120cm.203 To introduce the
program change to the community about 4000 letters and submission guidelines were mailed to artists and arts organizations in January 1992. According to staff, the response to the circular in the form of 1700 (42%) replies was surprisingly high and by early June after only six jury meetings in Ottawa, Winnipeg, Charlottetown, Regina, Saskatoon and St. John's, 270 works had been acquired, a number which exceeds the total of all works purchased through studio and gallery visits in 1990/91.

Although the large number of smaller works purchased during 1992/93 will initially provide the Rental Program with a considerably larger supply, it is not expected to prove adequate for the anticipated interest in Art Bank rentals as a result of the recently approved new Treasury Board guidelines. According to William Kirby, the Art Bank is now in the process of developing a strategy which would allow it to secure additional funds from either Treasury Board or private sources to increase its capacity in terms of works of art available for rental and the staff required to carry out the increased purchase, rental and educational activities. The Art Bank Business Plan provides detailed background information, a market analysis and marketing strategy as well as a rental income analysis and recommends that Council should continue to financially support Art Bank operations at the 1991/92 level. However, additional funding in the amount of approximately $3 million would be advanced to the Art Bank over a period of four years to cover the necessary increase in the purchase budget and expenses related to administrative growth. This advance would be repaid within the subsequent five years from revenues generated through the added rental
volume and from the gradual phasing-in of higher fees. Any profits over and above increased operating costs and the repayment of the advanced funds would be re-invested into the Bank's acquisitions budget to ensure continued funding for the Purchase Program.204

With a further look to the future, the Art Bank also participates in the Canada Council's ongoing long-range planning process which defines strategies related to continued support of contemporary artistic creation, the future effectiveness of arts organizations, Canada's cultural diversity, audience development and Council's role in the support of international support of the Canadian arts community. Within the framework of Council's objectives for the next years, the Art Bank's own long-range planning process is closely tied to the approval of its business plan and the resources generated from the anticipated increased volume in rental activities. According to staff, the Art Bank hopes to eventually be in a position to develop and implement strategies aimed at increased promotion of contemporary art and audience development with its clients, at a broader exposure of the collection to public galleries and other exhibiting institutions. Such initiatives would include a Communications Fund, the implementation of a policy aimed at encouraging collecting institutions to acquire works by artists of diverse cultural backgrounds through the Special Purchase Assistance Program, and to develop a program to assist public and private sector institutions in the commissioning of works of art for public places.205

In speaking with staff it is evident that there is no shortage of ideas on how the Art Bank could improve service to artists and rental clients alike and ways to make the collection more accessible. It is
encouraging to learn that the Art Bank's Business Plan, which would bring about the implementation of improved service to the community, was endorsed by Council in June 1992 but is awaiting official approval and allocation of funds from Treasury Board. For the Art Bank, the 90's could develop into an exciting period of development and growth, of renewed support to artists at a time of great need, and increased rentals and exhibitions across Canada to foster the knowledge and understanding of the visual arts.

C. Conclusion

As demonstrated in the Introduction, the Art Bank was conceived in 1971 in the government of the day's political philosophy to decentralise and democratize cultural activities in Canada. The program's aim was to bring museum quality works of art out of a--for many Canadians daunting--institutional context and into every day public spaces. The 1972 mandate and its expanded 1977 version articulated that the aims of the program were to provide recognition and financial assistance to Canadian artists, to increase public knowledge and understanding of their work, to encourage public and private collecting and to strengthen the art market in Canada. The methodology to accomplish the objectives was to purchase works by living Canadian artists to create a large collection of contemporary works of art and to make these works available, through either rental, loans or exhibitions for display in government offices and public places across Canada. Chapters I-III investigated and evaluated how the Art Bank proceeded to
reach its objectives through the various programs. The conclusions reached so far provide the basis for final analysis.

1. To provide recognition and financial assistance to Canadian artists

The extent by which artists received financial subsidy through the Art Bank's Purchase Program has been examined in detail in Chapter I. The data gleaned from the research indicated that, especially during the first 10 years of the Art Bank's operation, some artists received substantial financial subsidy, many others less so. It was also established that present policies and procedures provide for an equitable selection process but that the Art Bank's current purchase budget of $800,000 is inadequate to provide significant financial assistance to any artist. However, the question remains to be asked if, in 1992, purchases are a viable form of financial assistance since subsidies to artists in the form of grants have been available since 1957. Instead of administering a complex and expensive purchasing program, why not simply increase the Canada Council's budget for grants to visual artists?

The choice of subsidy for artists through the sale of their work or in the form of grants was examined within the framework of several public and independent surveys relating to the status and subsidy for artists. A 1976 market study of contemporary Canadian art reported that "In all, the artists were significantly more favourable in attitude toward the purchase of their work by such institutions as the Art Bank than they were toward grants". 207 This opinion was later supported in
the Summary of briefs and hearings to the 1982 Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee:

A few intervenors rejected the grant system entirely, or saw it as a palliative for which an alternative must be found. John Sime was not alone when he declared: "on the whole I am opposed to the making of grants to individual visual artists. I think artists are best supported by buying their work (Hooray for the Art Bank) or by paying them for teaching or other work".208

Similar opinions are still expressed frequently and Ontario artist Tim Zuck declared recently that the Art Bank's Purchase Program, which provides the mechanism for an exchange between a willing seller and a willing buyer, was and continues to be the by far most honest program of support to visual artists.209

The documenting of the strong endorsement of financial assistance for visual artists through purchases does not imply that the granting system ought to be curtailed or eliminated and replaced by acquisition programs. It signifies, however, a relationship between a healthy art market and the need, or lack thereof, for subsidy and a link between the two forms of public support. Already in 1974, Luke Rombout made the following point in a report to Council:

In a number of cases [purchases] have allowed artist to free themselves for a year or two from teaching duties while in other instances it has allowed artists to build badly needed studio facilities. Also, it should be brought to the attention of Council members that a number of well-known Canadian artists who were about to apply for assistance in the Senior Awards category refrained from doing so following purchases from the Art Bank. It is a factor, we think, which should not be overlooked.210

The issue of supplementing the income of visual artists through the purchase of their work versus grants is raised in this context to demonstrate that, given an equal financial level, the former continues
to remain the preferred option and supports the importance that Art Bank purchases represent for artists. In the case of an Art Bank purchase artists receive hard cash in exchange for their work (and may use the money at their discretion rather than have it tied exclusively to a project), have their production validated through inclusion in a major collection and enjoy the exposure and promotion of contemporary art in general and their work in particular through the efforts of other Art Bank programs. How effectively this more intangible support has been provided by the Art Bank can be seen in the fact that, according to William Kirby, 92% of the collection has been exhibited or rented. (The remaining 8% include a considerable number of newly purchased works which have been accessioned but still require documentation, framing or other means necessary to be displayed and are therefore not yet available for rental or exhibition.)

Has the Art Bank provided, as Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne still prefers to call it "tangible recognition" to Canadian artists? Within the means provided to do so, it certainly has.

2. To increase public knowledge and understanding of contemporary art.

As described in Chapters II and III the second objective has been carried out primarily through the Art Bank's Rental Program and to a lesser degree through exhibitions and loans.

In quantitative terms, the accomplishments of the Art Bank's diffusion programs are not difficult to determine. According to the Art Bank's June 1992 report to Council, 10,113 works were rented at the end
of April of that year to 318 clients across Canada plus three in the United States and four in Europe.211 Considering the steady increase of works rented, a considerable number of federal employees had the opportunity to familiarize themselves with contemporary art over the past 20 years. This is not the case for the general public who only seldom visits government offices and for whom the majority of the Art Bank collection remains inaccessible. It is therefore unfortunate that the offices visited most frequently by the general public, such as passport offices or employment and recruitment centres, usually do not have Art Bank works on display. The reason for this lack of participation on behalf of these very public spaces is that the rental of art works is voluntary and the majority of bureaucrats managing these centres are either unaware of the Art Bank's existence or are uninterested in this service. If the rental of works from the Art Bank were mandatory for all government offices, the objectives of the rental program could probably be carried out more efficiently. It is, however, exactly because over 300 clients decided to participate voluntarily in the Rental Program, that the success of the leasing service is so surprising. It might prove even more astonishing were the Art Bank in a position to accommodate requests from potential clients in parts of Canada which are now not regularly serviced.

The examination of the Art Bank's objective to increase public knowledge and understanding of contemporary Canadian art is more complex. To begin, it should be pointed out that the Rental Program, the primary means to accomplish this task, reaches only a very small segment of the Canadian population. According to information provided
by the Public Service Commission,\textsuperscript{212} as of December 31, 1991, the Federal Government (including the Armed Forces, R.C.M.P. and all Crown Corporations) employed 530,000 civil servants. 530,000 individuals in itself represent a large number of people indeed, but as part of Canada's total population of around 27 million it represents only 1.9%. Even if contract and casual staff as well as visitors to government buildings and Art Bank exhibitions are added to the number of full time civil servants, the percentage of Canadians having regular access to works from the Art Bank is still very small and concentrated in large urban centres. For this reason, the objective to increase public knowledge and understanding of the work of Canadian artists through the Rental and Extension Programs has been a tall order for the Art Bank from the beginning.

Art Bank staff reports that despite the limitations of the Rental and Non-revenue Producing Programs in reaching a wide Canadian public, a surprising number of individuals have indeed become keenly interested, some even passionate about contemporary art and it can be assumed that having been exposed to works from the Art Bank collection contributed to this development. But staff also suggests that in their experience many Canadians remain suspicious of art practices which go beyond a 19th or 20th century aesthetic and prefer pseudo Group-of-Seven landscapes to the work of Genevieve Cadieux and Jeff Wall. In this context it must be remembered that according to the Canadian constitution, education is a provincial responsibility and the groundwork for recognizing and interpreting the visual language of our artists ought to be formally provided by the public school system from the primary levels on. The
fact is, that art education is not a priority of Canadian public school systems and that the majority of Canadians therefore remains visually illiterate. The often quoted expression "I don't know anything about art but I know what I like" should really be "I don't know anything about art but I like what I know". To break through the barriers of long established prejudices and preconceived ideas of what is and is not a work of art (one may only remember the many public objections to the National Gallery's acquisition of a painting by Barnett Newman or the exhibition of Jana Sterbak's meat dress) will require considerably more educational efforts on behalf of the Art Bank than handing out artists biographies.

In the past, the primary efforts of the Rental Program activities were aimed at renting as many works as possible, to maintain a healthy rental flow and to increase the rental income. Taking into consideration the limited resources which are provided to the Art Bank to carry out its tasks, this aspect of the program has been successful. With regard to its effect on audience development, however, the result of past initiatives has been weak and a more aggressive approach must be taken if Canadians were to become more receptive to contemporary art. It is fortunate that the Art Bank's present administration is aware of the situation and, as pointed out in Chapter II, is in the process of taking an active role in its efforts to increase the Canadian public's awareness and understanding of contemporary Canadian art.
3. To encourage public and private collecting and to strengthen the Canadian art market.

The Art Bank's third objective, to encourage public and private collecting and to strengthen the art market in Canada, has so far not been addressed in this paper since the aim to stimulate the art market was not to be realized through a specific program but was to come about as the indirect result of all Art Bank activities. It has generally been referred to as "The Art Bank Effect".

An investigation into whether, and if so to what degree Art Bank programs and initiatives had any significant influence on the art market through increased art sales, or have created a higher degree of appreciation of contemporary art by the general public over the course of 20 years, has never been undertaken and nor has data relating specifically to this issue been collected. The 1982 Report of the Federal Cultural Policy Review Committee comments on this issue:

We recommend the Canada Council Art Bank as a body whose program is consistent with the principles we would see embodied in a federal policy for the visual arts. But it is difficult to assess how successful the Art Bank has been in influencing the public to buy or even to appreciate contemporary Canadian art. Because the federal government is the Art Bank's main client, most of the collection can be seen only in the National Region and usually only in government offices.

It is interesting to note that during the first year of the Art Bank's operation, rather than expecting a sudden run on art galleries by newly converted admirers of contemporary art, dealers, collectors and collecting institutions feared that the influx of the Art Bank's five million dollars into the Canadian art market would artificially raise
prices and within a relatively short time make the acquisition of such works unattainable for most collectors and public institutions.

In anticipation of this argument Luke Rombout pointed out in 1972 that he and his colleagues at the Council had been fully aware of the concerns raised:

Obviously, with the amount of money at hand, a substantial responsibility was placed upon us to ensure that prices on the Canadian market would not sky-rocket. We waved a flag to everyone, saying that we would stringently exercise our prerogative not to purchase, if the prices, as a result of the program, were to go up brazenly, so to speak. What we mentioned then, and what we are saying now, is that if the price structure of the art market were to go up, it might significantly prevent the further encouragement of private and corporate collecting. We also conducted, at that time, a survey of the current Canadian art market - and when we set out on our first purchasing tour, we had obtained a reasonable reading of the art market in general.214

Five years later, Christopher Youngs reported to Council on the Art Bank Effect and observed that although over 7000 works by over 800 artists had so far been purchased for a total amount of $3 million there were other considerations:

It is perhaps the more indirect and subtle effects of the program on the market which are of greater interest. We have several indications that the Art Bank has stimulated the collecting of contemporary Canadian art. For instance it is an increasingly frequent occurrence that works are purchased by other parties before we have the opportunity to finalise our purchase. Additionally, we frequently receive purchase inquiries concerning purchases from individuals who have seen works from our collection in public spaces. Needless to say these more subtle effects of the Art Bank are closely linked with the educational aspects of the collection. Both effects are very long-term and difficult to monitor.215

Today the Art Bank's stimulus to individual commercial galleries through the Purchase Program is modest. According to William Kirby, approximately 44% of all works purchased over the last 10 years have
been acquired from commercial galleries. On average, 40% - 50% of the sales price of these purchases represent the gallery's profit and today the average annual financial benefit for each of the 80 dealers which receive yearly jury visits is only $2,269 (44% of $825,000 = 363,000, 363,000 : 2 : 80 = $2,269). This relatively small amount does not represent a significant contribution especially since dealers often incur staff costs to prepare their presentation to the juries. For this reason, dealers and the art market in general benefit considerably more from the indirect effect of the Repurchase Program and the Art Bank's promotion of contemporary art in general than directly from Art Bank purchases.

Perhaps the most important consequence of the creation of the Art Bank in Canada was the almost immediate creation of similar programs by most Canadian provinces and some larger municipalities. Although the purchase budgets of the provincial and municipal art banks were and still are relatively modest compared to their federal model, these new monies provided a much needed stimulus for the Canadian art market, especially at the grass roots level, and brought public attention to the concept that the work place, or for that matter any place, could be a suitable space for art works.

That the display of works of art in public places can have a significant commercial side effect, as hoped for in 1972, was confirmed by Susan Whitney, owner of an art gallery in Regina and current President of the Professional Art Dealers Association of Canada. Whitney pointed out that while a selection of approximately 30 works from the Art Bank was installed throughout the Regina airport in 1986,
sales in her gallery increased considerably and that several of her customer mentioned specifically that the art display at the airport was directly responsible for their decision to buy works of art for their homes and offices. 217

Although the Regina story might have been an isolated one, the fact remains that the notion of installing works of art in the work place is no longer considered an extravagance. According to Art Bank staff, several former rental clients such as Air Canada, Teleglobe and Petrocanada, who while they were still eligible crown corporations rented works from the Art Bank for several years. Subsequently, however, they decided to establish their own art collections. In addition, an increasing number of individuals who had the advantage of having Art Bank works in their offices, have inquired about either purchasing works through the Repurchase Program or from the artists whose work they have become familiar with. To what degree the Art Bank’s programs are responsible for a growing public awareness of artworks in the work place, or if this phenomenon coincided with a global trend that happened to catch on in Canada while the Art Bank was developing its initiatives in that very direction, has yet to be evaluated.

Through the Art Bank and similar provincial and municipal initiatives public awareness of contemporary art has generally increased. But it is also important to note that the collecting practices of private or crown corporations as well as those of other art banks remain "softer" than those of the Canada Council Art Bank’s "excellence" criteria and often size, content and price of works are
restricted to accommodate the taste, budget and space of the collecting organization. The Bank's paradigm of acquiring works of art based solely on aesthetic quality has not been equally successful with other similar institutions or corporate collections. Although some collectors and corporations are becoming more progressive and are willing to purchase so-called "difficult" works, most still consider specifically political, erotic, or socially questioning art works not suitable for the workplace, since "art for the office" is often selected to fit an organization's corporate image. Other reasons for resisting the collecting of more challenging work are of a more practical nature since many corporate and private collectors are unwilling to purchase works which are fragile, difficult to install and in the long run might prove to be liabilities rather than profitable investments. As well, works that are admired by even a receptive public in a gallery setting, are not necessarily purchased for private enjoyment.

Collecting works of art for private homes, previously considered the domain of a cultural elite, has long since become general practice. In contrast, the hanging of art in offices, above and beyond the usual corporate portraits of founders and board members or industrial photographs of company holdings, developed only over the last two decades. How much the notion of art in a working environment has become accepted was provided in an advertising feature for the Maritime Life Insurance in the Globe & Mail and titled "Art in the Office". The ad highlights the merits of corporate collecting in stating that "It's the thing to do . . . It's expected . . . It show's a level of sophistication. . . . Having no art is like having no decent furniture.
... It's the universal way to treat offices" and later points out that art in the work place not only "makes a noticeable difference in the attitudes, productivity and morale of the employees" but also impresses clients and helps to enhance the image of the company and provides tax incentives. Despite the questionable motives for corporate collecting suggested by the article it is encouraging to note that it also reports that the majority of corporate collections focus on contemporary Canadian art and states that

The time is past when every law office boasted its set of hunting prints, while other prestigious offices favoured Eskimo carvings, English or early Canadian landscapes, or ships in full sail ... More importantly there's a desire to latch onto the present and relate it to the everyday world.218

As stated earlier, no concrete evidence exists to prove the Art Bank Effect on the collecting practices of Canadian corporations and private individuals. It is, however, more than conceivable that the federal example has contributed significantly to the notion that works of art are considered today important aspects of public life. As a matter of fact, the Art Bank Effect is probably the objective the Art Bank was most successful in reaching.

In reviewing the Art Bank's history, programs and effectiveness it must be kept in mind that this institution was created at, for governments, supersonic speed. The implementation of a similar initiative today, if it were considered at all, would require significantly more time than the eight months it took to establish the Art Bank between October 1971 and May 1972. In the ideology of their time Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne, Robert Elie, Al Johnson and all the other
individuals responsible for setting up the Art Bank, were keenly aware that a great need existed in Canada to make contemporary art more accessible to the broad public. As members of the cultural elite they also knew that the visual arts, which, unlike other art forms, do not adapt particularly well to mass diffusion via the electronic media, demanded a distinct strategy to accomplish this task. When therefore Suzanne Rivard Le Moyne developed the brilliant concept of an Art Bank program it required prompt attention to see it materialize. The question must be asked, however, if, since no feasibility study or market analysis were undertaken at that time, any of the key players were aware of the extent of the challenge which lay ahead since it is doubtful that neither the depth of public suspicion, ignorance of and general resistance to works of contemporary art nor the degree of administrative complexities required to fulfil the Art Bank's objectives were fully comprehended. In retrospect, the fact that no feasibility study and market analysis were undertaken before the Art Bank was put in place must be considered a fortunate omission. Had, on the one hand, such studies been done the Art Bank might never have been realized. On the other hand, it is precisely the spirit of the romantic idealism in which the Art Bank was conceived, and consequently the Art Bank's unwillingness to compromise its mandate, which ultimately made the program so effective and successful.

But the haste in which the Art Bank was implemented, and incidentally its mandate expanded in 1977, also beg some questions. For example, if the Trudeau Government was so committed to the democratization and decentralization of the arts, why was the rental of
art works from the Art Bank left to the decision of individual managers and not made mandatory for all government offices in 1972? And why, when the true potential of the Art Bank as a cultural resource was recognized and addressed in enlarging the Art Bank's mandate five years later, was the rental of art works to schools free of charge never considered? These and other questions, which go beyond the scope of this paper, still need to be answered and their investigation should provide ample material for future studies as would, for example, an in-depth analysis of the Art Bank's effect.

In evaluating the Art Bank's effectiveness as a cultural initiative it is interesting to observe that its clients: artists, dealers, public galleries, civil servants and to a lesser degree the general public, are often not aware that the Art Bank's mandate goes beyond the one they are personally affected by and know little of the "other" programs. But despite the fact that its overall role has often been misunderstood, the Art Bank has frequently been praised as a unique Canadian invention and its model adopted and adapted by most Canadian provinces and municipalities as well as abroad. Over the past 20 years it has brought about a national collection Canadians can be proud of--but it is not only a collection; it provided tangible and intangible support and recognition to Canadian artists--but not only; and although one of its aims was to enhance government buildings it is certainly not, as Luke Rombout pointed out repeatedly in 1972, a decorating service for the federal government and only raison d'être; lastly, there is good reason to believe that the Art Bank contributed, indirectly but substantially, to strengthening the art market in Canada and encouraged
private and corporate collecting. Although there are still considerable tasks to be undertaken—such as making the collection more accessible to all Canadians by bringing it to more remote areas as well as the development of a more effective educational strategy—its effectiveness as a cultural program has been firmly established.

Unlike in 1972, Canadians are confronted today with a political climate which favours a market driven economy, privatisation, deregulation, balanced budgets and bankrupt cultural organizations. The country is threatened by separation and the attitudes of political leaders with regard to promoting the spirit of the country's culture are far from those advocated by Pelletier in 1972. Yet programs such as the Art Bank, which were implemented at a time in Canada's history when their contribution to the country's national identity and cultural awareness were deemed as essential as their obvious benefit to artists and their audiences, remain as important today as they were then and maybe even more so. Robert Fulford once referred to the Art Bank as the Federal Government's most inspired notion in the history of public cultural patronage.\textsuperscript{218} He also made the point that "those countries that aren't favoured artistically by history must compensate for their misfortune by creating an atmosphere in which the arts are a normal part of national life."\textsuperscript{219}

The Art Bank is a many-faceted, national cultural program which was designed to serve all Canadians, not just a select few. And this is the essence of the notion, an inspired and noble one indeed, which must be kept in mind in designing the Art Bank's present activities and its future.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCE/COUNTRY</th>
<th>NO OF ARTISTS</th>
<th>NO OF WORKS</th>
<th>PURCHASE PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO FIXED LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>2299</td>
<td>1,327,111.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO VERIFY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEWFOUNDLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Brook, Nfld.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division No. 4, Nfld.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14,180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holyrood, Nfld.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Carmel, Nfld.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>24,844.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasadena, Nfld.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's, Nfld.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>46,970.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Michael's &amp; Area</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenville, NF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>109,018.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belfast, P.E.I.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadalbane, P.E.I.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardigan, P.E.I.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlottetown, P.E.I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montague, P.E.I.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>431.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Wiltshire, P.E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township 34, P.E.I</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVA SCOTIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis County, N.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annapolis Royal, N.S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antigonish, N.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dartmouth, N.S.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax County, N.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax, N.S.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>165,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hubbards, N.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverness County, N.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>64,535.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketch Harbour, N.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>820.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool, N.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5,190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunenburg, N.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4,885.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orangedale, NS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paradise, NS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queens County, N.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truro, N.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria County, N.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVINCE/COUNTRY</td>
<td>NO OF ARTISTS</td>
<td>NO OF WORKS</td>
<td>PURCHASE PRICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterville, N.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weymouth, N.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolfville, N.S.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>505</strong></td>
<td><strong>436,004.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NEW BRUNSWICK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCE/COUNTRY</th>
<th>NO OF ARTISTS</th>
<th>NO OF WORKS</th>
<th>PURCHASE PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dieppe, N.B.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredericton, N.B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampton, N.B.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15,965.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moncton, N.B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quispamsis, New Bru.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverview, N.B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sackville, N.B.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint John, N.B.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21,570.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shediac Parish, N.B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shediac, N.B.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrews, N.B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvan Lake, N.B.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Isles Parish, N.B.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>21,025.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>123,475.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUEBEC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCE/COUNTRY</th>
<th>NO OF ARTISTS</th>
<th>NO OF WORKS</th>
<th>PURCHASE PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcan/Rupert, PQ</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11,335.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens, PQ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayer's Cliff, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,810.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylmer, Quebec</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baie d'Urfe, Quebec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaupre, Quebec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boucherville, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromont, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brossard, PQ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cap Rouge, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlevoix, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlesbourg, Quebec</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13,385.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charly, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3,975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chateauguay, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chateauguay, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chateauguay, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorval, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin, Quebec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatineau, Quebec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George River, Que</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>237.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson, Quebec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull, Quebec</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6,229.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ile d'Orleans, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonquiere, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Les Cheneaux, Quebec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,455.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longueuil, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16,840.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Islet, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVINCE/COUNTRY</td>
<td>NO. OF ARTISTS</td>
<td>NO. OF WORKS</td>
<td>PURCHASE PRICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mont. St. Hilaire, Q</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17,770.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal, Quebec</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>2514</td>
<td>2,387,272.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noranda, Quebec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,845.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre-Dame-du-Portage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9,490.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormstown, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>70,174.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outremont, Quebec</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>58,798.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierrefonds, Quebec</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe Claire, Quebe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Povungnituk, Quebec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>66,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec, Quebec</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Armand West, P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Placide, Quebe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Augustin-de-De</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Bruno, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint-Jean-Port-Joli</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senneville, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawville, Quebe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sillery, Quebec</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,574.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Louis-de-Terrebon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Michel-de-Bellech</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Roch-des-Aulnaies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St-Romuald, Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Agathe, Quebe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jacques le Mineu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16,164.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Jean, Ile Orlean</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6,515.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lambert, Quebe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Marguerite, Quebe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanstead, PQ</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste-Angèle, Quebe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>86,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste-Rose, Quebe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste. Adèle, Quebe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste. Foy, Quebe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,115.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste. Madeleine, Quebe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29,720.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste. Thérèse, Quebe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton, Quebe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trois Rivières, Quebe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2,925.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Val David, Quebe</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>44,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verdun, Quebe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmount, Quebe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19,410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>8343</td>
<td>8,472,884.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ONTARIO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCE/COUNTRY</th>
<th>NO. OF ARTISTS</th>
<th>NO. OF WORKS</th>
<th>PURCHASE PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria, Ontario</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alenford, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almonte, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylmer, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Ewart, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,125.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantford, Ontario</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,255.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burlington, Ontario</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caledon, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,405.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campbellford, Ont.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province/Country</td>
<td>No of Artists</td>
<td>No of Works</td>
<td>Purchase Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas, Ontario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo Bay, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elora, Ontario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4,735.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etobicoke, Ontario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27,640.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fergus, Ontario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19,670.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flamborough Township</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flesherton, Ontario</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64,945.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloucester, Ontario</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Valley, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21,270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimsby, Ontario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph, Ontario</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20,642.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, Ontario</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartington, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsdale, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howland Township, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kemea, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kempville, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenora, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Township, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston, Ontario</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>39,745.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsville, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33,108.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener, Ontario</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanark, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, Ontario</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>255,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markham, Ontario</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>68,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millbrook, Ontario</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2,820.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga, Ontario</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4,453.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Brydges, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepean, Ontario</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2,275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Dundee, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Liskeard, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newburgh, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,725.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newmarket, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niaqara-on-the-Lake, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North York, Ontario</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>69,032.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakville, Ontario</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>419.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa, Ontario</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>474,064.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Sound, Ontario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7,585.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, Ontario</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21,510.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry Sound, Ontario</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penetanguishene, Ont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough, Ontario</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>60,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickering, Ontario</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100,106.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picton, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hope, Ontario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5,335.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Rowan, Ont</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,945.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeville, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8,325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond Hill, Ont</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10,275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarnia, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PROVINCE/COUNTRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Country</th>
<th>No. of Artists</th>
<th>No. of Works</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough, Ontario</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheffield Township,</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>180,335.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Plantagenet To</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Bernadin, Ont.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catharines, Onta</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford, Ontario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,170.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydenham, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temagami, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,780.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terra Cotta, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,550.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay, Ontario</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,010.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>2,658,431.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verona, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4,410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vittoria, Ont.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo, Ontario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>199.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welland, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,515.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Township,</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>39,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lorne, Ontario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>316,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Township</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitby, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor, Ontario</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10,440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyebridge, ON</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarker, Ontario</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,375.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Country</th>
<th>No. of Artists</th>
<th>No. of Works</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>638</td>
<td>4408</td>
<td>4,094,934.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANITOBA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Country</th>
<th>No. of Artists</th>
<th>No. of Works</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brandon, MB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloraine, Manitoba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufferin, Manitoba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lac du Bonnet, Manjit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macdonald, Manitoba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,850.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Manitoba</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waskada, MB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg, Manitoba</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>949,454.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Country</th>
<th>No. of Artists</th>
<th>No. of Works</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>405,404.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SASKATCHEWAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Country</th>
<th>No. of Artists</th>
<th>No. of Works</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlyle, Saskatchewan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumsden, Sask</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert, Sask.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina, Sask.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>112,110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatoon, Sask.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>399,517.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell Lake, Sask.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>575.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Country</th>
<th>No. of Artists</th>
<th>No. of Works</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>664,411.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ALBERTA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province/Country</th>
<th>No. of Artists</th>
<th>No. of Works</th>
<th>Purchase Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banff and District.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14,450.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCE/COUNTRY</th>
<th>NO OF ARTISTS</th>
<th>NO OF WORKS</th>
<th>PURCHASE PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calgary, Alta</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>455,604.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Lake, Alberta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonton, Alta</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>200,278.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort McMurray, AB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunn, Alta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lethbridge, Alta</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22,975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Hat, Alta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,380.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace River, Alberta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Deer, Alta</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12,725.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruce Grove, Alta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Albert, Alberta</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,910.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tofield, AB</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>160</strong></td>
<td><strong>1122</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BRITISH COLUMBIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>751,947.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argenta, B.C.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnaby, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Saanich, B.C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>90,643.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemainus, B.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11,361.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comox-Strathcona Dis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35,275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay, B.C.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowichan Valley Dist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falkland, B.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>34,285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ganges, B.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibsons, B.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Vancouver Dist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaslo, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelowna, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Langley, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merritt, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Waddington Dist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanaimo, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanoose Bay, BC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Westminster, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Vancouver, B.C.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47,790.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parksville, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>27,973.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peachland, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond, B.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15,410.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardis, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sechelt, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidney, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skeena Queen Charlotte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>445.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squamish, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>16,175.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrey, B.C.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver, B.C.</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>634,607.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon, B.C.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,030.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria, B.C.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>113,580.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver, B.C.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>70,188.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Rock, B.C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVINCE/COUNTRY</td>
<td>NO. OF ARTISTS</td>
<td>NO. OF WORKS</td>
<td>PURCHASE PRICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>234</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,330,192 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YUKON TERRITORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehorse, Yukon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,700 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4,700 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWEST TERRITORIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baker Lake, N.W.T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>134 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Dorset, N.W.T.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>30,943 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eskimo Point, N.W.T.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2,674 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frobisher Bay, N.W.T.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>950 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gjoa Haven, N.W.T.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>950 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igloolik, N.W.T.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7,300 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Harbour, N.W.T.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,105 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W.T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pangnirtung, N.W.T.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,720 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelly Bay, N.W.T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,600 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rankin Inlet, N.W.T.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10,700 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repulse Bay, N.W.T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spence Bay, N.W.T.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>750 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>127,386 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER FOREIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>74,400 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin, Germany</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>24,451 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brussels, Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontenay-aux-Roses, France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,750 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47,145 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, England</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4,491 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris, France</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17,277 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pisa, Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,790 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice, France</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14,400 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna, Austria</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20,000 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>277,742 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER FOREIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,100 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riyadh, Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,190 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo, Japan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5,450 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5,790 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER FOREIGN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Miguel, Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,170 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,170 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROVINCE/COUNTRY</td>
<td>NO. OF ARTISTS</td>
<td>NO. OF WORKS</td>
<td>PURCHASE PRICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alton, Ill., U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attleboro, MA, U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA, U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11,260.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn, N.Y., U.S.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54,310.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buxtehude, N.Y., U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California, U.S.A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, Ill., U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut, U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6,330.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Neck, N.Y., U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich, CT, U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,075.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho, U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la Caríchonne, Franc</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles, CA, U.S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey, U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico, U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>425.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Rochelle, N.Y.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,190.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, N.Y., U.S.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>256,168.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York, U.S.A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21,558.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakland, CA, U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>575.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palous, WA, U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8,745.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania, U.S.A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA, U</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13,955.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara, CA, U</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont, U.S.A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>484,316.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** TOTALS</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>16296</td>
<td>14,397,062.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1282</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>608</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>662</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>361</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>513</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>580</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT 77: $652,891.00
TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT 78: $644,717.00
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APPENDIX C
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>W/P</th>
<th>PTG</th>
<th>SCULP</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3344</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 80 W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 81 W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 82 W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>710</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 83 W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 84 W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR 85 W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED THROUGH ARTIST = 80 FOR $24,720.00
TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED THROUGH DEALER = 526 FOR $547,569.00
TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 79 = $572,289.00
TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 80 = 389
TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 80 = $474,636.00
TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 81 = 650
TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 81 = $492,302.00
TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 82 = 730
TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 82 = $616,204.50
TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 83 = 473
TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 83 = $660,485.00
TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 84 = 709
TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 84 = $752,862.00
TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 85 = 600
TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 85 = $744,710.28
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR: 86</th>
<th>W/P</th>
<th>PTG</th>
<th>SCULP</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 86</strong></td>
<td>744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 86</strong></td>
<td>$870,028.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR: 87</td>
<td>W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 87</strong></td>
<td>659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 87</strong></td>
<td>$830,823.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR: 88</td>
<td>W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 88</strong></td>
<td>464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 88</strong></td>
<td>$838,547.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR: 89</td>
<td>W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 89</strong></td>
<td>602</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 89</strong></td>
<td>$876,154.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR: 90</td>
<td>W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 90</strong></td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 90</strong></td>
<td>$918,857.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR: 91</td>
<td>W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 91</strong></td>
<td>572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 91</strong></td>
<td>$900,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR: 92</td>
<td>W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>OTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 92</strong></td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 92</strong></td>
<td>$115,556.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # of work's bought</td>
<td>16,296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total amount spent</td>
<td>$14,397,062.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Works purchased from Male and Female Artists

### APPENDIX D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>W/P</th>
<th>PTG</th>
<th>SCULP</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED FROM FEMALE</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED FROM MALE</th>
<th>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR</th>
<th>PAID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>374 FOR $65,637.00</td>
<td>1699 FOR $852,974.00</td>
<td>2063 FOR $850,606.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41 FOR $17,045.00</td>
<td>947 FOR $498,316.00</td>
<td>2081 FOR $787,931.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>247 FOR $88,984.00</td>
<td>701 FOR $4,572,044.00</td>
<td>938 FOR $546,880.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>563</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>111 FOR $59,149.00</td>
<td>879 FOR $4,173,701.00</td>
<td>993 FOR $5,214,100.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>701</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141 FOR $74,078.00</td>
<td>385 FOR $44,174.00</td>
<td>680 FOR $608,096.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>336</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21 FOR $56,742.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>241 FOR $855,176.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR</td>
<td>2063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>$787,931.00</td>
<td>$546,880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>W/P</td>
<td>PTG</td>
<td>SCULP</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Total # of Works Purchased</td>
<td>Total Amount Spent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>$644,717.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$9,499.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>453</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>$547,912.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
<td>$87,306.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>$572,289.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>338</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>$512,904.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>101</td>
<td>$59,385.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>$386,452.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>717</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$88,184.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>227</td>
<td>$38,977.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>389</td>
<td>$474,636.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>$492,302.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>407</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>$122,325.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>475</td>
<td>$369,977.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>319</td>
<td>$246,228.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>$344,126.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$25,850.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$25,850.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>730</td>
<td>$616,204.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>$506,120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>$150,365.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
<td>$506,120.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # of Works Purchased in Year 83: 473
Total Amount Spent in Year 83: $660,485.00
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>W/P</th>
<th>PTG</th>
<th>SCULP</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total # of Works Purchased</th>
<th>Amount Spent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>$753,862.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$12,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>392</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>$556,157.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>$111,710.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$49,665.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>306</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>$477,375.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>$170,415.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$11,775.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>330</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>$467,846.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$151,118.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$1,007.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$491,679.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$280,482.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2,990.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>$333,547.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$333,417.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$144,696.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>222</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>$676,154.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 90</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>PTG</th>
<th>schöp</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED FROM FEMALE</th>
<th>273 FOR $416,649.78</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 90</td>
<td>605</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 90</td>
<td>$918,857.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 91</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>PTG</th>
<th>schöp</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED FROM FEMALE</th>
<th>268 FOR $333,150.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 91</td>
<td>572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 91</td>
<td>$900,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR 92</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>PTG</th>
<th>schöp</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED FROM FEMALE</th>
<th>75 FOR $50,431.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL # OF WORKS PURCHASED IN YEAR 92</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL AMOUNT SPENT IN YEAR 92</td>
<td>$115,556.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total # of works bought: 16,296

Total amount spent: $14,197,062.93
Administration de pilotage des Laurentides
Advertising and Public Opinion Research Branch / Direction de la publicité et de la recherche sur l’opinion publique
Advisory Committee on Cultural Policy
Advisory Committee on Parliamentary Accommodation
Agence Québécoise de valorisation indépendante de recherche
Agence Spatiale Canadienne / Canadian Space Agency
Agriculture Canada (National Grains Bureau)
Agriculture Canada / Agriculture Canada

Agriculture New Brunswick
Air Canada

Alberta Agriculture
Alberta Agricultural Development Corporation
Alberta Culture
Alberta Department of Agriculture
Alberta Foundation for the Literary Arts
Alberta Milk Producers Society
Alberta Oil Sands Technology and Research Authority
Alberta Research Council
Alcohol and Drug Dependency Commission
Alliance Québec
Anti-Inflation Act
Arsenal Canada

Association of Atlantic Universities
Association of Universities & Colleges
Association of Municipalities of Ontario
Athabasca University

Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency / Agence de promotion économique du Canada Atlantique

Atomic Energy Control Board / Commission de contrôle de l'énergie atomique
Atomic Energy International
Atomic Energy of Canada Ltd / Énergie atomique du Canada Ltée
Attorney General
Auditor General

BC Hydro
Bank of Canada / Banque du Canada

Bank of Montreal / Banque de Montréal
Board of Education
British Columbians for the Mentally Handicapped
C.D. Howe Institute

Montréal, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Ottawa, ON
Ottawa, ON
Montréal, PQ
Montréal, PQ *
Winnipeg, MB *
Charlottetown, PE
Fredericton, NB
Hull, PQ
Ottawa, ON *
Winnipeg, MB
Calgary, AB *
Saskatoon, SK
Victoria, BC
Fredericton, NB
Québec, PQ *
Montréal, PQ
Edmonton, AB *
Edmonton, AB
Edmonton, AB *
Edmonton, AB
Calgary, AB *
Edmonton, AB *
Calgary, AB*
Calgary, AB*
St. John's, NF *
Montréal, PQ
Ottawa, ON
Montréal, PQ
Ottawa, ON
Halifax, NS *
Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON *
Edmonton, AB
Athabasca, AB
Charlottetown, PE
St. John's, NF
Halifax, NS
Moncton, NB

Ottawa, ON *
Ottawa, ON

Ottawa, ON
Calgary, AB *
Montréal, PQ
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Regina, SK
Edmonton, AB *
Vancouver, BC *
Vancouver, BC
Montréal, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
New York, USA
Saskatoon, SK
Vancouver, BC
Toronto, ON
Art Bank Rental Clients 1972-1992

Cabot Institute of Applied Arts and Technology
Calgary Centre for Performing Arts
Calgary Roman Catholic Separate School District 1
Canada Council / Conseil des Arts du Canada

Canada Development Investment Corporation
Canada Harbour Place Corporation
Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation / Société canadienne d'hypothèques et de logements

Canada Museum Construction Corporation / Société de Construction des Musées du Canada Inc.
Canada Pavilion - Expo 86 / Exp. '86 Pavillon Canadien
Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement / Accord de libre-échange entre le Canada et les États-Unis
Canadian Aviation Safety Board / Bureau canadien de la sécurité aérienne
Canadian Broadcasting Corporation / Radio-Canada

Canadian Cable Television Association / Association canadienne de la télévision par câble
Canadian Cancer Society / Société canadienne du cancer
Canadian Centre for Management Development / Centre canadien de gestion
Canadian Commercial Corporation / Corporation commerciale canadienne
Canadian Conference Centre / Centre canadien de conférences
Canadian Conference of the Arts / Conférence canadienne des arts
Canadian Crafts Council
Canadian Cultural Centre
Canadian Dairy Commission / Commission canadienne du lait
Canadian Energy Research Institute
Canadian Film Development Corporation

Canadian Forestry Services
Canadian Government Task Force
Canadian Grain Commission
Canadian Hospital Association
Canadian Human Rights Commission / Commission canadienne des droits de la personne
Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security / Institut canadien pour la paix et la sécurité internationale

St. John's, NF *
Calgary, AB *
Calgary, AB
Charlottetown, PE
Moncton, NB *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Vancouver, BC
Halifax, NS
Charlottetown, PE *
Saint John, NB *
Montreal, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Regina, SK *

Ottawa, ON *
Vancouver, BC
Quebec, PQ
Montreal, PQ
Ottawa, ON
Edmonton, AB
Vancouver, BC

Ottawa, ON *
Hull, PQ
Moncton, NB *
Montreal, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON *
Ste. Foy, PQ
Vancouver, BC

Ottawa, ON *
Calgary, AB
Gatineau, PQ *

Ottawa, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Ottawa, ON
Ottawa, ON
Paris, France

Ottawa, ON *
Calgary, AB *
Montreal, PQ
Toronto, ON
Hull, PQ
Victoria, BC *
Ottawa, ON
Winnipeg, MB
Ottawa, ON *

Ottawa, ON *

Ottawa, ON *
Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat
/ Secrétariat des conférences inter-gouvernementales canadiennes
Canadian International Development Agency / Agence
canadienne de développement international
Canadian International Trade Tribunal / Tribunal
canadien du commerce extérieur
Canadian Judicial Council / Conseil canadien de
da la magistrature
Canadian Labour Market & Productivity Centre / Centre canadien du marché du travail et de la productivity
Canadian Museum of Civilization / Musée canadien
des civilisations
Canadian Museums Association
Canadian Penitentiary Services
Canadian Petroleum Association / Association
pétrolière canadienne
Canadian Radio-Television & Telecommunication
Commission / Conseil de la radiodiffusion et
des télécommunications canadiennes

Canadian Real Estate Association
Canadian Security Intelligence Service / Service
canadien du renseignement de sécurité
Canadian Standards Association
Canadian Transport Commission / Commission
canadienne des transports
Canadian Wood Council
Canertech Incorporated
Canterbury High School
CEGEP Edouard Montpetit
CEGEP Lévis Lauzon
CEGEP St-Jean-sur-Richelieu
Centre Communautaire Samuel de Champlain
Centre de Recherche Informatique de Montréal
Centre de recherche industrielle du Québec

Chilliwack Senior Secondary School
City of Brampton
Civic Hospital
Collège Bois-de-Boulogne
Collège communautaire du Nouveau Brunswick
Collège universitaire de St-Boniface
Commission de la santé et de la sécurité
au travail
Commission d'appel en matière de lésions
professionnelles
Commission de transport de la rive sud de Montréal

Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs /
Bureau du commissaire à la magistrature fédérale
Commissioner of Official Languages / Commissariat
aux langues officielles

Communications (Centre de recherche sur
l'information au travail)
Communications Canada

Ottawa, ON *
Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *

Hull, PQ *
Art Bank Rental Clients 1972-1992

Montréal, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Kingston, ON
Toronto, ON
Winnipeg, MB *
Grande Prairie, AB *
Cranbrook, BC *
Langley, BC *
Vancouver, BC *
Victoria, BC *
Kelowna, BC *
Prince Rupert, BC *
Prince George, BC *
Ottawa, ON *
Thunder Bay, ON *
Ottawa, ON *

Moncton, NB
Montréal, PQ
Montreal, PQ *

Hull, PQ *
Québec, PQ
Montreal, PQ
Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON *
North York, ON *
Mississauga, ON
Winnipeg, MB
Toronto, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
St. John's, NF *
Halifax, NS
Truro, NS *
Moncton, NB
Ottawa, ON *
Scarborough, ON
Toronto, ON
Saskatoon, SK
Edmonton, AB
Abbotsford, BC
Moose Jaw, SK
Edmonton, AB *

Ottawa, ON *
Fredericton, NB *
Newcastle, NB
Fredericton, NB
Montreal, PQ *

St. John's, NF
Montréal, PQ
Vancouver, BC
Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON

Ottawa, ON *
Edmonton, AB *
Montreal, PQ
Ottawa, ON *
St. John's, NF *
Ottawa, ON
Employment and Immigration Canada / Emploi et Immigration Canada

Quebec, PQ
Fredericton, NB *
Montreal, PQ *
Hull, PQ *
Ottawa, ON
Kingston, ON
Belleville, ON *
Peterborough, ON
Oshawa, ON
Scarborough, ON
Toronto, ON
North York, ON *
Brampton, ON
Guelph, ON
Hamilton, ON
Welland, ON
Niagara Falls, ON
St. Catharines, ON
Kitchener, ON
Chatham, ON
Windsor, ON
Sarnia, ON
London, ON
Owen Sound, ON
Barrie, ON
Pembroke, ON
North Bay, ON
Sudbury, ON
Timmins, ON
Sault Ste. Marie, ON
Kenora, ON
Regina, SK
Saskatoon, SK
Calgary, AB
Edmonton, AB *
Grande Prairie, AB *
Vancouver, BC
Quebec, PQ *
Tennessee, USA
St. John's, NF
Halifax, NS
Montreal, PQ
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Calgary, AB
Sidney, BC *
Vancouver, BC

Energie et ressources Québec
Energy Expo 82 (Can. Govt. Exp. Centre Tennessee)
Energy, Mines and Resources / Énergie, Mines et Ressources Canada

Energy, Mines and Resources, Canada Oil and Gas Lands Administration / Énergie, Mines et Ressources, Administration du pétrole et du gaz des terres du Canada
Energy Supplies Allocation Board / Office de répartition des approvisionnements d’énergie
Environment Assessment Board
Environment Canada / Environnement Canada

Halifax, NS
Ottawa, ON
Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON
Bedford, NS
Dartmouth, NS *
Ottawa, ON *
Ste. Foy, PQ *
Montreal, PQ
Hull, PQ *
Burlington, ON *
Downsview, ON *
North York, ON
Export Development Corporation / Société pour l'expansion des exportations

External Affairs / Affaires extérieures

Federal Business Development Bank / Banque fédérale de développement

Federal Court of Canada / Cour fédérale du Canada
Federal Office for Regional Development / Bureau fédéral de développement régional
Federal Provincial Relations Office / Bureau des relations fédérales-provinciales
Federation of Canadian Municipalities / Fédération canadienne des municipalités
Finance and Treasury Board / Finances et Conseil du Trésor du Canada
Finance and Treasury Board (Minister's Office) / Finances et Conseil du Trésor du Canada (bureau du Ministre)
Fisheries & Oceans Canada / Pêches et Océans

Fisheries Council of British Columbia
Food Prices Review Board
Foreign Investment Review Agency
Fraser Valley College

Frontier College
Gaylines Calgary
George Pearson Centre
Government House / Résidence du Gouverneur général

Government House Leader
Government of Ontario (Premier’s Office)
Government of Ontario

Government of Saskatchewan (Saskatchewan Executive Council
Government Services
Grace Hospital
Grain Transportation Agency / Office du transport de grains
Grand Théâtre du Québec
Harold and Grace Baker Centre
Harris Trust and Savings Bank
Hazardous Materials Information Review Commission/ Conseil de contrôle des renseignements relatifs aux matières dangereuses

Toronto, ON *
Winnipeg, MB *
Edmonton, AB
Vancouver, BC *
Montreal, PQ
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Halifax, NS
Ottawa, ON *
Vancouver, BC
Paris, FR
Washington, DC, USA
Boston, MA, USA
New York, NY, USA *
Philadelphia, PA, USA
Berne, CH
Sevilla, ES *
Québec, PQ
Montréal, PQ
London, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Québec, PQ *
Montreal, PQ *
Toronto, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Québec, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Vancouver, BC *
Ottawa, ON *
Québec, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Vancouver, BC *
Ottawa, ON *
Québec, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Calgary, AB *
Vancouver, BC *
Ottawa, ON *
Québec, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON *
Frankfurt, DG *
Paris, FR
Ottawa, ON
Winnipeg, MB *
Calgary, AB
Winnipeg, MB *
Québec, PQ
Toronto, ON
New York, USA *
Ottawa, ON *
Art Bank Rental Clients 1972-1992

Health and Welfare / Santé et Bien-être social
Canada

Halifax, NS *
Québec, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Scarborough, ON *
Toronto, ON
Winnipeg, MB
Edmonton, AB *
Vancouver, BC
Burnaby, BC

Ottawa, ON *
Brampton, ON
Ottawa, ON *

Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Sept-Iles, PQ
Montreal, PQ *
Toronto, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Regina, SK *
Calgary, AB *
Edmonton, AB *
Vancouver, BC *
Halifax, NS *
Sherbrooke, PQ *
Drummondville, PQ *
Trois-Rivières, PQ *
Montreal, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON *
Winnipeg, MB *
Calgary, AB *
Edmonton, AB *
Vancouver, BC *

Industry, Science and Technology Canada / Industrie, Science et Technologie Canada

Ottawa, ON
Ottawa, ON
Montréal, PQ *
Pointe-Claire, PQ
Québec, PQ *
Montreal, PQ
Ottawa, ON
Halifax, NS
Ottawa, ON
Ottawa, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Charlottetown, PE *
Halifax, NS *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON *
Winnipeg, MB

Industry, Trade and Commerce / Industrie et commerce

Information Centre on Canadian Unity
Institut international de formation en gestion aéro-civile
Institut national de la recherche scientifique
Institut de l'énergie des pays ayant en commun l'usage du français
Institut de recherches politiques
Insurance Canada
International Centre for Ocean Development / Centre international d'exploitation des océans
International Development Research Centre / Centre de recherches pour le développement international
Inuit Broadcasting Corporation
Investment Canada / Investissement Canada
Justice Canada / Justice Canada
Art Bank Rental Clients 1972-1992

Killarney High School
La Carte en Route Inc. (Air Canada)
Labour Canada / Travail Canada

Lakehead University
Law Reform Commission of Canada / Commission de
reforme du droit du Canada
Loto Canada
Luther College
Lycée Claudio
Lyndhurst Hospital
Manitoba Training Advisory Council
McGill University (Dept. of Epidemiology)
Medical Research Council of Canada / Conseil de
recherches médicales du Canada
Metro Toronto Project Office
Metropolitan Separate School Board
Ministry of Education
Ministry of Northern Development & Mines
Ministry of State for Science & Technology Canada/
Ministère d'État, Science et Technologie Canada
Ministry of Treasury and Economics
Misericordia Hospital
Montreal Children's Hospital, McGill University
Mount Royal College
Multicultural Television Workshops
Multiculturalism and Citizenship
Museum Association of Saskatchewan Incorporated
National Arts Centre / Centre national des arts
National Capital Commission / Commission de la
Capitale nationale
National Capital Commission (Official Residences)

National Defence / Défense nationale

National Energy Board / Office national de
l'énergie
National Film Board / Office national du film

National Film Board Theatre

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque
nationale du Canada
National Museum of Natural Sciences / Musée
national des sciences naturelles
National Museum Consultative Commission
National Museums of Canada / Musées nationaux du
Canada
National Research Council Canada / Conseil
national de recherche Canada

Saskatoon, SK
Edmonton, AB *
Vancouver, BC *
Vancouver, BC
Montréal, PQ *
Montréal, PQ *
Hull, PQ *
Ottawa, ON
Winnipeg, MB *
Edmonton, AB
Thunder Bay, ON *
Montréal, PQ
Ottawa, ON
Ottawa, ON
Regina, SK
Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON
Winnipeg, MB *
Montreal, PQ *

Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON *
Toronto, ON
Victoria, BC
Toronto, ON

Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON *
Edmonton, AB *
Montreal, PQ *
Calgary, AB *
Toronto, ON
Hull, PQ *
Regina, SK *
Ottawa, ON
Hull, PQ
Ottawa, ON *
Gatineau, PQ
Ottawa, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Vancouver, BC *
Brussels, BE *
Lahr, DG
Baden-Baden, DG

Calgary, AB *
Halifax, NS *
Montreal, PQ *
Ville St. Laurent, PQ
Ottawa, ON *
Saskatoon, SK
Calgary, AB

Ottawa, ON
Ottawa, ON

Ottawa, ON
Bechsherville, PQ
Montreal, PQ *
Ottawa, ON
Vancouver, BC *
Art Bank Rental Clients 1972-1992

National Search & Rescue / Programme national de recherche et sauvetage
Ottawa, ON

National Transportation Agency of Canada / Office national des transports du Canada
Hull, PQ *

Natural Sciences & Engineering Research Council of Canada / Conseil de recherche en sciences naturelles et en génie du Canada
Ottawa, ON

Newfoundland & Labrador Housing Corporation
St. John’s, NF *

Newfoundland & Labrador Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology
St. John’s, NF *

Newfoundland & Labrador Arts Council
St. John’s, NF *

Northern Pipeline Agency / Administration du pipe-line du Nord Canada
Ottawa, ON

Nova Scotia Commission on Drug Dependency
Calgary, AB

Offices of the Information and Privacy Commissioners of Canada / Commissariats à la protection de la vie privée du Canada
Vancouver, BC

Office of the Superintendent of Financial Institutions Canada / Bureau du Surintendant des institutions financières Canada
Halifax, NS

Olympic Coins

Ontario Civil Service Commission
Ottawa, ON *

Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation
Toronto, ON *

Ontario Securities Commission
Montreal, PQ

Ottawa Carleton Regional Transit Commission
Ottawa, ON

Patented Medicine Prices Review Board / Conseil d'examen du prix des médicaments brevetés
Toronto, ON *

Peel Board of Education

Petro Canada

Ports Canada

Prairie Farm Rehabilitation Administration
Mississauga, ON

Privy Council / Bureau du Conseil Privé
Ottawa, ON *

Procurement Review Board of Canada / Commission de révision des marchés publics du Canada
Toronto, ON

Progressive Conservative Party Association
Calgary, AB

Public Archives
Ottawa, ON *

Public Service Commission of Canada / Commission de la Fonction publique du Canada

Public Service Staff Relations Board / Commission des relations de travail dans la Fonction publique

Public Works Canada / Travaux publics Canada

Regina, SK

Quebec, PQ

Montreal, PQ

Hull, PQ *

Ottawa, ON *

Toronto, ON *

North York, ON

London, ON

Sault Ste. Marie, ON
Queen Street Mental Health Hospital
RCMP Public Complaints Commission / Commission des plaintes du public contre la GRC

Regina General Hospital
Regional Economic Expansion / Expansion économique régionale

Regional Industrial Expansion / Expansion industrielle régionale

Research & Productivity Council
Resource, Education & Advocacy Centre for Handicapped
Revenue Canada / Revenu Canada

Thunder Bay, ON
Regina, SK
Saskatoon, SK
Edmonton, AB
Vancouver, BC *
Toronto, ON
Edmonton, AB *
Ottawa, ON *
Vancouver, BC
Regina, SK *
Halifax, NS
Moncton, NB
Fredericton, NB
Trois-Rivières, PQ
Montreal, PQ
Hull, PQ
Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON
Regina, SK
St. John's, NF
Charlottetown, PE
Quebec, PQ
Montreal, PQ
Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON
Winnipeg, MB
Edmonton, AB
Vancouver, BC
Fredericton, NB

Ottawa, ON
St. John's, NF *
Charlottetown, PE
Rimouski, PQ *
Quebec, PQ *
Sherbrooke, PQ
Trois-Rivières, PQ
Montréal, PQ *
Chicoutimi, PQ *
Jonquière, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Scarborough, ON *
Toronto, ON *
North York, ON
Etobicoke, ON
Mississauga, ON *
Hamilton, ON *
Kitchener, ON *
Sudbury, ON *
Thunder Bay, ON
Winnipeg, MB *
Regina, SK *
Saskatoon, SK
Calgary, AB *
Edmonton, AB *
Surrey, BC *
Vancouver, BC *
London, ON
Ottawa, ON *
St. Lambert, PQ
Calgary, AB *
Ottawa, ON
Ottawa, ON

Revenue Canada - Taxation / Revenu Canada - Impôt
Regionale de Chambly
Rockyview General Hospital
Royal Architecture Institute of Canada
Royal Canadian Mint / Monnaie royale canadienne
Royal Canadian Mounted Police / Gendarmerie royale du Canada
Royal Commission on Corporate Concentration
Royal Commission on Economic Union
Royal Commission on Financial Management and Accounting
Ryerson Polytechnical Institute
Saskauto
Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission
Saskatchewan Institute of Applied Science and Technology
Saskatoon Community Health Unit
Science Council of Canada / Conseil des Sciences Canada
Science World
Secretariat for Social Development
Secretary of State Canada / Secrétariat d’État du Canada

Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON
Vancouver, BC *
Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON

Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON
Regina, SK
Saskatoon, SK
Saskatoon, SK

Moose Jaw, SK *
Saskatoon, SK

Ottawa, ON
Vancouver, BC *
Toronto, ON
St. John’s, NF
Halifax, NS *
Moncton, NB
Québec, PQ *
Montréal, PQ *
Hull, PQ *

Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON
Mississauga, ON
Winnipeg, MB *
Regina, SK *
Saskatoon, SK *
Calgary, AB
Edmonton, AB
Surrey, BC
Vancouver, BC
Victoria, BC
Kelowna, BC
Prince George, BC
Whitehorse, YT
North York, ON

Ottawa, ON *

Ottawa, ON *

Montréal, PQ
Québec, PQ
Montréal, PQ *

Ottawa, ON

Moncton, NB
Ottawa, ON *
Halifax, NS
Truro, NS
Moncton, NB *
Montreal, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Kenora, ON
Winnipeg, MB
St. John Fine Arts School
St. Joseph's College
St. Thomas University
Standards Council of Canada / Conseil canadien des normes
Statistics Canada / Statistique Canada

Status of Women Council / Condition féminine Canada
Supply and Services Canada / Approvisionnement et Services Canada

Supreme Court of Canada / Cour suprême du Canada
Tariff Board
Telelobe Canada
Telefilm / Téléfilm
The Canadian Red Cross Society
The Corporation of the City of Mississauga
The Corporation of the City of Ottawa
The Management Board of Cabinet
The Senate / Sénat
Toronto Board of Education
Trade Negotiation Office
Transport Canada / Transports Canada

Regina, SK
Saskatoon, SK
Calgary, AB
Edmonton, AB
Burnaby, BC
Vancouver, BC *
Calgary, AB
Edmonton, AB
Fredericton, NB
Ottawa, ON
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Winnipeg, MB
Vancouver, BC
Ottawa, ON *
St. John's, NF *
Charlottetown, PE *
Halifax, NS *
Dartmouth, NS *
Shediac, NB *
Moncton, NB
Quebec, PQ *
Montreal, PQ *
Hull, PQ *
Ottawa, ON *
Scarborough, ON
Toronto, ON *
Etobicoke, ON
London, ON
Winnipeg, MB *
Regina, SK
Saskatoon, SK *
Calgary, AB
Edmonton, AB *
Richmond, BC *
Vancouver, BC *
Ottawa, ON *
Ottawa, ON
Montreal, PQ
Montreal, PQ *
Ottawa, ON
Mississauga, ON *
Ottawa, ON
Toronto, ON
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Ottawa, ON
Quebec, PQ
Montreal, PQ *
Dorval, PQ
Mirabel, PQ *
Sept-Iles, PQ
Ottawa, ON *
Toronto, ON
Regina, SK *
Calgary, AB *
Edmonton, AB
Vancouver, BC *
Vancouver, BC
Art Bank Rental Clients 1972-1992

Transports Canada (Garde côtière canadienne)
Transportation Safety Board of Canada /
Bureau de la sécurité des transports Canada
University of Alberta
University of British Columbia
University of Lethbridge
University of Manitoba
University of New Brunswick Art Centre
University of Windsor
University of Winnipeg
Urban Affairs
Vancouver School of Theology
Veterans Affairs / Anciens Combattants Canada

Vérificateur Général
Ville de Québec
Walter & Duncan Gordon Charitable Foundation
Western Economic Diversification Canada /
Diversification de l’économie de l’Ouest Canada

Wexford Collegiate
Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce
Winnipeg Municipal Hospital
World Exposition (Canadian Government Exposition)

Toronto, ON
Hull, PQ *
Edmonton, AB *
Vancouver, BC
Lethbridge, AB *
Winnipeg, MB
Fredericton, NB
Windsor, ON *
Winnipeg, MB *
Montreal, PQ
Ottawa, ON
Vancouver, BC
Charlottetown, PE
Ottawa, ON
Québec, PQ *
Québec, PQ *
Toronto, ON *
Ottawa, ON *
Winnipeg, MB *
Saskatoon, SK
Edmonton, AB *
Vancouver, BC *
Scarborough, ON
Winnipeg, MB
Winnipeg, MB
Osaka, JP
Louisiana, USA

* Present Art Bank Clients
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