

Canadian Culture, the Canadian State, and the New Continentalism

Allan Smith

One of the most striking phenomena in contemporary North American life has been the greatly accelerated thrust toward fine-tuning and adjustment of important elements in the Canadian-American relationship. This push in the direction of a more ordered and rational continentalism, evident enough in such areas as pollution control and the handling of toxic wastes, has been most dramatic in the domain of economic affairs. The move toward regulation, procedure, and discipline so clearly manifest in the negotiation and signing of the 1989 free trade agreement has not yet yielded the frictionless functioning of the world's largest trade partnership which some quarters hoped it would. As recent events centered on the trade in fish, steel, pork, wood products, and other commodities show, much in that partnership continues to be disruptive and irritant-producing, but such difficulties ought not to obscure the important advances in other areas. In particular, the two countries' front-line negotiators are showing a heightened awareness of the principle that negotiations become meaningful and relationships well founded

only if the parties to them take each other's vital interests seriously.¹ Nothing less than the making of the free trade accord itself testifies that life has been breathed into this old and venerable notion, for it was only when officials and politicians on each side of the table recognized and moved to accommodate some of the deepest concerns of those on the other that an arrangement became possible.²

If action in conformity with this critically important principle of conduct can be clearly discerned in the way Canadian recognition of U.S. preoccupation with energy and services helped ease the path to agreement and in the manner in which U.S. acknowledgment of Canadian worries about dispute settlement smoothed movement along it, such positive behavior did not characterize all parts of what went on. In the realm of cultural policy, and particularly areas in which Canada's interests are centered, no significant progress is evident, though this does not mean the total absence of moves to address Canadian anxieties in the spirit called for. In some measure persuaded of the meaning government ownership, regulation, and subsidy in the cultural field has for Canadians, U.S. officials did finally agree that "cultural industries" should not be brought within the largely free market terms of the pact. Thus in making a gesture toward a vital Canadian concern, they contributed mightily to the successful outcome of the talks.³ Little real rethinking of positions was involved, however. Although the clauses in the agreement leave Canadians the right to subsidize, regulate, and control their cultural industries, they also reserve to Americans an equally clear measure of authority to retaliate if they think action resulting from the exercise of that right affects their interests.⁴ And though U.S. pronouncements on the matter seem to confirm American acceptance of Canada's view, a glance at the language in which those pronouncements are cast makes it plain that Washington officials were in actuality little more sympathetic to, understanding of, or even knowledgeable about what Canada thinks than they ever were. Still imbued with the idea that cultural industries are economic phenomena

Educated at the universities of Manitoba and Toronto, and a member of the Department of History at the University of British Columbia since 1967, Allan Smith is interested in Canadian-American relations and the history of ideas and culture in Canada. As well as editing the multidisciplinary journal B.C. Studies, he has lectured on Canadian-American affairs in Europe, North and South America, and Australasia. His published work has appeared in such journals as the Canadian Journal of Political Science, the Journal of Popular Culture, Canadian Literature, the International Journal, and the Canadian Historical Review.

2 Canadian-American Public Policy

like any others,⁵ and much taken up with the fate of a major export earner,⁶ the authors of the "Confidential Briefing Paper" circulated by the U.S. government to specify the meaning of the agreement came very close to replicating the tone of the dicta earlier issued by certain of their most (it has to be said) gratuitously ill-informed colleagues. Pulling back just a bit from U.S. Ambassador to Canada Thomas Niles's 1985 judgment ("We think that these questions should be resolved on a commercial basis and that governments shouldn't get mixed up in them")⁷ and distancing itself only a little more from U.S. Trade Representative Clayton Yeutter's 1987 expression of the free market view ("I'm prepared to have American culture on the table and have it damaged by Canadian influences after the free trade agreement. I hope Canada's prepared to run the risk too"⁸), their document did all it could to make clear that positions long considered essential had been secured in the most complete way possible. Even affirmation that "maintaining and promoting 'cultural identity' . . . is of significant political importance for any Canadian government" was rather an invitation to minimize the issue's importance than the reverse, for in conveying the impression that Canada's politicians and negotiators were concerned with it mainly because of lobbying and pressure, that apparent concession functioned to encourage classification of the matter as something with little real, substantive, or lasting significance. And when the text referred to the Canadians having been compelled during negotiations "to limit [their] freedom of action . . . to promote cultural development to specific industries (publishing, film, video, music, and broadcasting)," when it talked of their having been got to agree "that measures they take will not impair the benefits we would otherwise expect from the provisions of the agreement," and when it summed up by saying that "we were unable to resolve . . . a few other irritants but we retained the ability to take trade remedy actions on these issues,"⁹ it could not have made more plain the feeling of its authors that the neighbors to the north were to be seen as creatures in relation to whose cultural activities U.S. interests could best be served not by a program of comprehension, generosity, and understanding, but by one of containment, limitation, and restraint.

Nor was this continuing concern to keep a close watch on Canadian cultural policy evident only in relation to fears about that policy's possible impact on U.S. interests in the U.S.: Canadian action continued to be scrutinized because of its bearing on U.S. interests in Canada. Beyond the limits of a negotiation concerned with establishing conditions of access to each other's markets, this extraterritorial surveillance—and, more important, the actions to which it sometimes led—were not even discussed. As bound and determined as they had

ever been that, in any circumstances in which American cultural industries operated, those industries should face the absolute minimum of constraints, U.S. officials thus used all the tools they were accustomed to using in their efforts to avoid such constraints.

That so tough and unyielding a U.S. stance poses serious problems for Canadian policy makers has, of course, been clear for some time. Those policy makers are very much aware of American thinking and of the actions to which it can lead when U.S. officials or legislators become unhappy with Canadian cultural initiatives¹⁰ and have since at least the 1960s felt much pressure as they attempt to structure a cultural environment that will serve the needs of their compatriots.¹¹

American concern to get Canada playing by its rules can set in motion a process that complicates discussion, sours the Canadian-American atmosphere, and makes problems more difficult to solve. Canadians are not always willing to let go unchallenged what they regard as narrow, self-interested argument and behavior (Communications Minister Marcel Masse's September 1989 reaction to U.S. insistence that film distribution in Canada be kept largely in U.S. hands is a perfect case in point¹²) and sometimes respond to that argument and behavior in testy and exasperated terms. They thus ensure that the relationship is anything but smooth.

Perhaps the way these well-established realities work to perturb and unsettle relations is familiar and need hardly be noted. What does require comment is the extent to which their preservation and continuance stands to perpetuate the rough functioning in the system it is at least part of the purpose of the new regime to diminish. Keeping much Canadian cultural activity and many of the programs necessary to support it in an essentially besieged, defensive, and insecure position does not simply signal maintenance of a tension-producing situation. It does not even mean merely that moves toward the more rational and well-regulated continentalism putatively in view will be more complicated and difficult than they need to be. The demonstrated determination of Canada's cultural activists to protest anything they think dangerous to what they consider a vital component of national life, and the considerable strength they possess in carrying such protests forward,¹³ raise fundamental questions about the possibilities of success of those moves. Not much imagination is required to see that no more than a minimum of mutually beneficial cooperation and sound dealing is likely to emerge from a situation critical elements in the basic character of which are unsatisfactory to an important group involved in that situation, not only because those elements put in question the conditions of that group's existence but also because they raise doubts about

anything more than the purely formal survival of the nation to which it belongs.

The way to deal with this potentially serious state of affairs is readily apparent—have U.S. officials and legislators react to Canadian policy toward culture in the more informed and comprehending spirit that has not so far marked their responses to it. Knowing this solution, however, does not help much. Generating such a posture falls squarely into the category of things more easily talked of than accomplished. A look, nonetheless, at what would be involved in such a movement suggests that the prospects for success are not as bleak as at first appears. The key difficulty, of course, is that almost all the shifting of position necessary to a resolution of the problem would have to come from one side. Once, however, it is realized that what creates that reality also offers the possibility of dealing with it, the situation begins to show marked and obvious signs of a capacity to resolve itself. If Canadians see their culture as vulnerable and in need of husbanding and so allow little latitude in deciding what is necessary to preserve it,¹⁴ the fact that Americans view theirs as strong and capable of competing bespeaks just the kind of confidence in its capacity to survive and prosper which gives them room for concession, compromise, and generosity.¹⁵ Nor is this all that permits flexibility on the American part. Though there is not much now in U.S. life that supports the view that culture deserves special treatment, there is something, and in the past there was more. A look by Americans at what some of their own students of culture and society—Kenneth Boulding, for example¹⁶—have been arguing about the issue is, then, possible, and it could work to generate a certain sympathy for the Canadian point of view. That Americans once had cultural nationalists of their own—Daniel Webster, Joel Barlow, Ralph Waldo Emerson—and that those distinguished figures argued actively for exactly the sort of relationship among national vitality, self-awareness, and an indigenous culture that preoccupies Canadians provides them with a considerable body of domestically produced material, examination of which could help them comprehend why their neighbors are so concerned and anxious.¹⁷ There is even a body of institutional and policy practice in American life the contemplation of which could provide citizens of the republic with ground for sympathy with the idea that, in certain circumstances, culture should get state support. That practice has been limited,¹⁸ but, as use of the tax system to provide indirect public subsidies shows,¹⁹ it has not been nonexistent, and in time it even took on the form of a measure of direct state involvement. This close association between government and culture manifested itself, moreover, not just in Cold War-driven efforts “to structure an

international environment which is hospitable to American values and ideas"²⁰ through government participation in international broadcasting, travel abroad by American artists and performers, or circulation overseas of American published material.²¹ It can be seen as well in such domestic action as the founding of the National Endowment for the Arts.²²

That there are at least a few factors that might permit U.S. policy makers to come to terms with the Canadian position is, of course, one thing; whether those policy makers have an interest in letting themselves be moved by these factors is quite another. Luckily, they do. A refusal generously to acknowledge Canada's concerns in the cultural field would keep the country under wholly unacceptable pressure, all but guarantee continuing tension and difficulty, and so fly in the face of everything an association working in the interest of all the parties to it should be. The point, moreover, is far from general, abstract, and theoretical. It is concrete and urgent, for even if, as the friends of the free trade agreement insist,²³ that document does not turn out to require adoption of any particular policy or program in the cultural field, a number of issues outstanding in the area at large—in broadcasting, publishing, postal rates, and film distribution—are likely soon to need work. If they are not approached in the right spirit their potential to be disruptive and tension-producing will be very great.²⁴ Not only can U.S. policy makers capable of a general and overarching appreciation of the need to foster the smooth running of the Canadian-American system be said to have reason to reach out to Canadians in respect to these issues: legislators and lobbyists tied directly and closely to U.S. cultural industries possess this too. Failure so to extend themselves is likely to result in exactly the Canadian action that will be almost certain to damage their clients' interests. As the advance of the notorious Bill C-58 (1976) against the position of American publications in Canada showed, American failure to consider Canadian requirements in the cultural area practically guarantees policy and legislative action north of the border that will be altogether at variance with what Americans would prefer.²⁵

The central message contained in these pages must by now be clear. Presentation of that message, however, should include more than a sharp and insistent restatement that, in the interests of a sound and healthy Canadian-American relationship, Americans have to learn to take Canada's cultural needs seriously. Patently required is a demonstration of precisely why it is that Canadians see matters the way they do. Only if Americans appreciate the full measure of and complete reasons for the Canadian commitment to state action in the field of

culture will they be able to know why the onus for change and accommodation in this critical area must rest on them. In the cause, then, of moving U.S. policy makers away from the simple—and condescending—sense that what Senator Lloyd Bentsen once called “the cultural question”²⁶ is, in the words of an anonymous trade department official, an “emotional”²⁷ one for Canada and heading them in the direction of the much more constructive realization that many Canadians see that question as lying at the heart of their national life, being, and existence, let us now look at its origins, history, character, and meaning.

At the outset, of course, the inhabitants of what would become Canada had little consciousness of themselves or their society as anything separate, special, or distinct; they were not much concerned with building a national culture, and they felt no need for government support of cultural activity. Early British North Americans, aware of themselves in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries simply as inhabitants of tiny and isolated communities in a great and extensive empire, derived such sense of self and identity as they possessed largely from their contact with the artifacts disseminated from the center of that worldwide entity. Fur traders relied heavily on reading from home;²⁸ the earliest grand buildings were conceived within the confines of Old World architectural styles;²⁹ theatergoers saw the staples of the English stage,³⁰ and when attention was paid to what lay close at hand, this—as G. J. Parkyn’s color aquatints of Halifax (ca. 1800)³¹ or Thomas Cary’s Pope- and Goldsmith-inspired poem *Abram’s Plains* (1789) show³²—was done squarely within the framework of conventional methods, fashions, and approaches.

By the 1820s, the pattern was beginning to change. As the passage of time made British North Americans gradually more conscious of place and shared experience, they became interested in encouraging cultural undertakings by means of which this sensitivity to the near at hand could be accommodated and expressed. Montreal’s *Canadian Magazine and Literary Repository* (1823–25) was one indication of the new impulse,³³ the emergence of an indigenous style of architecture in the Maritimes another,³⁴ and a growing concern that the school system inculcate a sense of British North America’s values and history showed it being focused and formalized.³⁵ Writing and painting of course remained derivative in style, but there, too, a steadily developing interest in indigenous subject matter was clearly evident. By the 1840s the *Literary Garland* (1838–51) had established itself as a major vehicle for the expression of this self-consciousness;³⁶ John Richardson³⁷ and Thomas Haliburton³⁸ gave proof of its existence in their fictional explor-

ations of Upper Canadian and Nova Scotian themes; and, building on romanticism's fascination with the "indigenous," "natural," and "primitive," Paul Kane displayed it in his canvases of Indian life in the west.³⁹

Cultural activists were not, however, simply concerned with the production of cultural goods. At least as important an expression of this early interest in the local as direct involvement in the creative process was the emergence of a concern to stimulate it through state action, which was evident not just in relation to government involvement in science⁴⁰ and education⁴¹ but in respect of the arts as well. Richardson demanded—and got—a subsidy from the Province of Canada to help him publish his history of the war of 1812,⁴² and, under the influence of the publishers' lobby, an elaborate program of subsidized postal rates, tariff protection, and copyright legislation was proposed.⁴³

Much of what occurred in this realm was, of course, interest-based, but that this activity had to do with more than a simple jockeying for position and advantage by a small number of colonial publishers was made clear by poet, politician, and Father of Confederation D'Arcy McGee: aware, as a nineteenth-century romantic nationalist could not help but be, of the critical role culture played in defining, building, and consolidating a community, he insisted that culture and its support were a "state and social necessity."⁴⁴ Of course, this pronouncement left much unsaid. There was, in particular, nothing in it to indicate that McGee was thinking of anything even approaching a full-blown alliance between government and culture for the purpose of endowing the new Canadian state with what he considered to be a principal attribute of national life. But if all this was clear, it was no less obvious that, in McGee's view at least, culture was important, was to be encouraged, and therefore had to be seen as an entirely suitable candidate for public recognition and support of the kind that would ensure that it got its ample, extensive, and necessary due.

The impulse toward cultural growth, discernible in the years just considered, became even more pronounced in the post-Confederation period. Essentially a consequence of the continuing increase in Canadian society's complexity—of which the steady proliferation of writers, musicians, theater groups, artists, and, of course, readers, audiences, viewers, publishers, galleries, concert halls, theaters, and patrons was a measure—the enlargement in cultural activity was also stimulated by the seriousness with which cultural producers viewed the need to equip their new national society with what they saw as a key attribute of national life. "Now more than any other time"—journalist H. J. Morgan articulated this feeling perfectly—"ought the literary life of the New Dominion to develop itself unitedly. It becomes every patriotic subject

who claims allegiance to this our new northern nation to extend a fostering care to the native plant, to guard it tenderly, to support and assist it by the warmest countenance and encouragement."⁴⁵

Much of this "fostering care" continued to be associated with private effort. Book purchasers, magazine subscribers, theater and concert goers, cultural entrepreneurs, patrons, and, not least, the considerable efforts of the cultural producers themselves, provided the foundation for most cultural work. State involvement was evident too as government, enmeshed in the society over whose affairs it was presiding, became caught up in what was happening. This involvement, moreover, went beyond simply patronizing the arts—though the Dominion did commission such works as Arthur A. Clappé's masque "Canada's Welcome," performed in honor of Governor General Lord Lorne and Princess Louise at Ottawa's Grand Opera House in 1879,⁴⁶ and Robert Harris's monumental painting *The Fathers of Confederation* in 1884.⁴⁷ Responding to the concern with consciousness building spoken of by such observers as Morgan—and not a little moved by the activity of cultural lobbyists—the government found itself directly involved in promoting national self-awareness through the establishment of cultural institutions. The founding of the Dominion Archives (1872) grew out of a romantic nationalist sense of history's importance in the shaping of the nation,⁴⁸ and creation of the National Gallery (1880) was also closely linked to the nation-building enterprise. As one commentator put it, "An event such as this, in the history of Art in Canada, cannot fail to interest, not only the lover of pictures, but all who have a stake in the growing institutions and general purposes of our country."⁴⁹

Less obvious but at least as critical was the work the government did to structure an environment favorable to cultural production through its continuing and increasingly more sophisticated manipulation of tariffs, postal rates, and copyright. The role played by those with "a stake in the growing institutions . . . of our country" was particularly important as lobbyists strove to get the concessions, arrangements, and subsidies they considered the health of their businesses required.⁵⁰ It would, however, be a mistake to conclude that concern with a public presence in cultural life was interest-based in some crude, direct, and unsubtle way. Nor was it simply a function of society's natural growth and increasing complexity. More nuanced factors were at work—the romantic nationalist vision was one of them—and they began to take hold in an increasingly firm, directed, and obvious manner.

This can be clearly seen in the influence of the deepening conviction that, in an age of materialism, culture had an important role to play in society's uplift and should be given the resources it needed to do so.

Alive to the arguments in Matthew Arnold's *Culture and Anarchy* (1869) and taking the view, as the *Canadian Monthly* expressed it in 1874, that one must be "devoted . . . to the advancement of all that tends to elevate and refine the popular character,"⁵¹ cultural activists sought assiduously to involve the state in their projects for uplift and regeneration. The Ontario Society of Artists, moved by this impulse to improve, got government support for its School of Arts in 1876,⁵² and the governor general, mindful of art's "elevating and refining power,"⁵³ acted to give culture the dignity and status of state recognition by serving as patron of—and helping to organize—the Royal Canadian Academy (1879) and the Royal Society of Canada (1882).

Even more important in stimulating government support for culture and the arts was the strong feeling that, because of Canada's great size and small population (by 1880 the Dominion was slightly larger in land area than the United States—3,665,224 versus 3,610,000 square miles—but had only a tenth of its population—4.5 million versus 45–50 million), cultural products could have no impact—could not, indeed, even get produced and distributed—without state intervention.⁵⁴ Publishers particularly had difficulties in this domain, for the small market for Canadian books hardly justified the expense of producing them, and imperial copyright legislation (by which Canada was bound) made it easy for cheap, mass-produced British and American editions of popular British and American works to circulate in Canada and further reduced Canadian books' prospects of finding a clientele. Their call for the government to correct this situation—and the politicians' own sense that it was fundamentally inequitable—enmeshed the state in problems of publishing, regulation, and copyright until well into the twentieth century, creating a relationship that still exists.⁵⁵

The most critical role in generating support for the idea that the state involve itself in the community's cultural life was concern about the growing American cultural presence. As Canada's proximity to the U.S. and, in much of the country, the absence of a language barrier, caused Canadian contact with American newspapers, books, theatrical companies, vaudeville groups, and popular music to grow, it became increasingly easy to argue that Canadians were being drawn closer and closer to the life of the republic and, perforce, losing contact with their own. As one observer put it in 1889, "American papers, magazines, books, periodicals, secular and religious, for children and for adults, fill Canadian homes . . . daily intercourse popularizes the same peculiarities, slang expressions, and technical words throughout the continent. Whatever the position of the Dominion may be in detail, it is more and more recognized that its general history is necessarily bound up with that of the Great Republic, alongside of which it stretches like a fringe

on a garment."⁵⁶ It was also becoming distressingly clear to some observers that even those upon whom the Dominion had to depend for a sense of itself were being subverted by the American reality. Increasingly attracted to the American market, they found themselves compelled to produce what it required. "The market for literary wares," noted an anxious Sara Jeannette Duncan in 1887, "is self-evidently New York, where the intellectual life of the continent is rapidly centralizing."⁵⁷ Some Canadians accepted the irreversibility of these trends, but to others they were a spur to action. A Canadian cultural life was very much worth preserving, they thought, and the circumstances created by America's cultural might created a clear need to ensure that it was preserved. Deliberate and conscious action was required, and, taking a leaf from the book of the economic nationalists, they set out to build that action through intervention by the state. What was done to shape what the *Canadian Magazine* described in 1902 as "a home market for Canadian writers and artists"⁵⁸ turned out—not surprisingly, given its provenance—to be renewed and more vigorous efforts in the fields of copyright, preferential postal rates, and legislated measures to slow the flow of American periodicals into Canada.⁵⁹ Even though it was absolutely consistent with the interests of the publishers, an important part of the impulse behind it came from a deeply felt concern about matters of identity and survival which fundamentally distinguished that impulse from the sometimes narrowly based, self-interested initiatives of business.

The significance of all these actions must not be exaggerated. Even taken together, governors-general, politicians, and civil servants accomplished only what one historian of them describes as "the first few hesitant and tentative steps"⁶⁰ to use state power to build a national culture, keep United States influences at bay, and uplift and refine the people. But in supposing that a real relationship between state and culture could be—indeed, was—a reality, the performing of them signaled that a basic element in Canadian life and development was in place. So far was the legitimacy of such a tie from being questioned that when in 1907 McGill University architect Percy E. Nobbs addressed the federal minister responsible for cultural matters on the need to organize a coherent government policy on that subject, what he pronounced to be at issue in "the education of our people towards an homogeneous and distinctive taste in national architecture and design", was not state involvement—that could be taken for granted—but the level at which that involvement would occur: it was, thought Nobbs, "surely a National rather than a Provincial Matter." To him it was obvious that the state aid necessary to pull things together and give a lead to provinces and municipalities—particularly in the all-im-

portant area of establishing museums—could come only from the Dominion government.⁶¹

Not everyone accepted Nobbs's view of where the argument led. Quebec, in particular, refused to have the provinces so readily written out of the emerging cultural scenario. But few found much to say in opposition to its central assumption. The exigencies of shaping and maintaining a cultural life in Canada's space and under Canada's circumstances had already caused a sense of the need for and desirability and importance of state action to support culture—at whatever level, in whatever guise—to seep too deeply into Canadian consciousness for that to happen.

In the early decades of the new century, the impulse toward cultural creativity quickened substantially. Driven in part by the continuing growth in Canadian society's complexity—by 1921 the balance between the country's rural and urban populations was almost even,⁶² with the concomitant growth of audiences, proliferation of galleries and museums, and development of musical groups—and in part by the new burst of nationalism stimulated by pride in Canada's accomplishments during World War I,⁶³ this materially strengthened thrust in the direction of painting, literature, musical endeavor, and theater produced a body of work that, in both quality and quantity, was superior to anything that had gone before.

As in earlier years, much of what was produced was the result of private effort. Moved by a sharper sense of Canada as a northern nation, fully in touch with international influences, and operating very much in harmony with the requirements of the market, painters and their patrons developed a new view of the nation's landscape.⁶⁴ Publishers, responding to the heightened interest in things Canadian, produced and promoted work intended to demonstrate the existence of a Canadian cultural life.⁶⁵ Authors, wanting to take advantage of and promote sympathy for Canadian themes and subjects, formed a national association.⁶⁶ And composers, noting the new Stravinsky-inspired enthusiasm for the primitive and the authentic, built indigenous themes into their work.⁶⁷

Equally, however—here, too, we see a familiar sight—the state was involved. But just as the volume and quality of what was being produced show signs of change, so also did the character and extent of the state's presence alter. No longer manifesting itself merely at the margins and in principle, it began to play a full, active, and altogether central role.

Several factors moved it in this direction. The more complex and extensive cultural life that was coming into existence required ordering

and regulation. In publishing, for example, firms were demanding resolution of the copyright question not just on the old nationalist ground but because they could not conduct business in the absence of clearly demarcated rights of ownership and control of what was being produced.⁶⁸ The new broadcasting industry was more clearly in need of intervention, as the struggles of early station owners to get access to unencumbered frequencies made clear.⁶⁹ The steadily enlarging role of government had roots, too, in an essentially nationalist concern to showcase the nation's accomplishments. That motive moved the state to involvement in the Canadian War Memorials Fund, set up by Canadian-born Lord Beaverbrook to record Canada's contribution to the Great War effort through painting and sculpture,⁷⁰ and, after 1916, it played a part in the politicians' support of Beaverbrook's War Office Cinematographic Committee.⁷¹ Concern to show off what the nation was doing manifested itself, too, in the field of domestic development in the 1916 creation of a Canadian government film agency whose celebration of the nation was intended to attract tourists, investment, and immigrants.⁷² By the 1930s, the state was even seeing cultural activity itself as an object to be displayed, as its moves to notice and mark theatrical accomplishment through support for the Dominion Drama Festival (1932) showed.⁷³

The most important factor in the state's move toward a larger role in this period as earlier was concern about the continuing problem of American cultural penetration. New technologies were making the vulnerability to American influences which Canada's small population, large geographical size, and proximity to its great neighbor had created seem more a source of weakness than ever. The forces singled out by American journalist S. E. Moffett, when he wrote in 1907 of the way railways, steam presses, and the telegraph had knit the cultural life of the continent together,⁷⁴ were now being made effective beyond all imagining by the advent of movies and radio. As early as 1920 Archibald MacMechan added American films to his catalog of reasons for "the subjection of the Canadian nation's mind and soul to the mind and soul of the United States,"⁷⁵ and an equally disturbed radio listener saw an equal danger in the broadcasting of the republic: "Britannia rules the waves—shall Columbia rule the wavelengths?"⁷⁶

These worries were, of course, rooted in much the same places they always had been. There were interest-based feelings of anxiety and resentment as Canadian broadcasters and filmmakers watched American competitors enter their market.⁷⁷ There was a strong belief that the perceived shallowness and superficiality of American creations would undermine culture's moral role.⁷⁸ Members of the old elite feared that as Canadian society "Americanized," they would lose their status,

prestige, and authority.⁷⁹ And there were strong convictions, based on the careful working out of the relationship between national maintenance and the retention of a Canadian sense of self, history, and tradition which McGee had begun long before, that support of culture was essential to national survival.⁸⁰ But whatever their point of origin, they all tended toward the same end: the strengthening of the already potent sense that—in Canada at least—state and culture could not be separated in any absolute, dogmatic, and unqualified way. Because it seemed so clearly to be, as one activist put it, a matter of “the state or the United States,”⁸¹ there could be no question as to which should win out.

If effort powered by these concerns produced the Canadian Radio Broadcasting Commission in 1932, and, in 1936, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, similar effort based on similar anxieties yielded a similar move in relation to film. Here, to be sure, the impulse was in no small measure bureaucratic: government filmmaking, in existence since at least 1916, had by the late 1930s reached the point that it badly needed rationalizing and reorganization.⁸² The sense that film was an extremely potent force for the shaping of outlook and values had also grown, and there was a strong feeling that what American films were yielding in the way of close knowledge of, sympathy for, and orientation toward the United States needed qualifying. Lobbying by the National Film Society (1935) fostered interest in Canadian films,⁸³ and when the government established the National Film Board in 1939, its first director carefully stipulated that “it will through a national use of cinema see Canada and see it whole.”⁸⁴

By the end of the 1930s the nature of the culture-state situation had changed in important and striking ways. Earlier honored more in principle than in practice, state action in the field of culture had now become a fixture of the national life evident in relation to the new media, plain in what happened to theater, and to be seen as well in relation to art and even music. Whether state action’s new prominence would allow it to power Canadian culture to new triumphs remained, of course, very much to be seen; that it had that prominence, however, could not be doubted.

As before, both continuity and change were evident in the years after 1940. Factors in operation for a century—the ongoing evolution of society, the steady amplification of national consciousness—still worked to stimulate cultural activity, while imperatives present for decades—the thrust toward government regulation, the desire to display the splendors of the nation, and, above all, the concern with U.S.

penetration—persisted in fostering state involvement. In each of these areas, however, change was an unmistakable force and resulted in a range of phenomena and a set of responses to those phenomena which had an altogether new strength, vigor, and comprehensiveness.

An unprecedented vitality was certainly evident in the forces stimulating the production of culture. Social growth had, indeed, reached the point at which increased numbers of talented people and an ever larger cultural clientele were leading to two important sets of results. There was, first, more cultural accomplishment at a higher level of achievement, as the formation of the Toronto New Play Society (1946), the Royal Conservatory Opera Company (1950), and the Painters Eleven (1953) made clear. But there was also a thrust toward sophisticated organizational structures and lobbying techniques characteristic of a maturing society. As early as 1941, a militant group of activists who were convinced that the time was ripe to agitate for increased recognition met at Kingston under the leadership of painter André Bieler and sculptor Elizabeth Wyn Wood to form the Federation of Canadian Artists.⁸⁵ The momentum thus created was maintained when in 1945 sixteen arts and culture organizations came together to create the Canadian Arts Council (after 1958 the Canadian Conference of the Arts). The power and authority of the movement were augmented by the establishment of such new groups as the Society of Canadian Music (1953), the Society of Cooperative Artists (1954), the Association of Canadian Television and Radio Artists (1963), and the Writers' Union of Canada (1973).

The no less evident growth in national consciousness—spurred by a combination of changed historical circumstances and an increase in the numbers and confidence of the people expressing that consciousness—took the form of moves away from the idea—present as late as the 1930s⁸⁶—that the country was to be understood mainly in terms of its ties to or affinities with some other country and toward the notion that its essence could best be grasped by looking at its own unique characteristics. Leading in some cases to refinement and extension of the multicultural notion which John Murray Gibbon had begun to systematize in the 1930s,⁸⁷ in others to elaboration of the northern theme after Northrop Frye gave it a new lease on life in 1943,⁸⁸ and in still others to a fleshing out of Donald Creighton's powerfully orchestrated Laurentian idea,⁸⁹ the conviction that Canada was to be understood on its own terms powerfully strengthened the confidence and certainty with which Canadians went about the task of explaining its character and meaning, a development that not unnaturally found its clearest expression in the new forcefulness and determination with which issues of identity were approached.⁹⁰

In the domain of the forces making for a government presence in cultural life, a new strength was certainly to be seen in the part of them centered on concern that the nation's accomplishments be displayed in a way that was organized, systematic, and likely to come to the attention of people outside the country. Nor did the intensified thrust in this direction arise simply out of more determined efforts to use art for such purposes as demonstrating the nation's valor—though such efforts as the government's organization of an art program on World War II were clearly made.⁹¹ It came as well, and, in the event, much more importantly, from a new, more subtle sense that art in itself had value and that the possession of art showed Canada to be truly a nation—cultivated, urbane, and worth taking seriously as a member of an international community of civilized states. Stimulated partly by the war-born conviction that the struggle was one of civilization against barbarity, reinforced for a time by similar Cold War notions, and powered, finally, by the policy makers' conviction that getting the country recognized as a mature and cultivated entity ought to be a principal objective of Canadian external policy, this sense underpinned the Department of External Affairs' sponsorship of the CBC's International Service (1945) and was evident in such undertakings as that ministry's later involvement with the Musicana Festival in 1977 and the Toronto Symphony Orchestra's tour of China in 1978.⁹²

The circumstances making for government involvement with culture in the form of regulation and bureaucracy showed an even more obvious strength. The proliferation of cultural activists so evident in the postwar period made it all but certain that demands for regulation and order would come with increasing frequency. Private broadcasters, for example, sought, and in 1958 got, a regulatory agency (the Board of Broadcast Governors) that would look after their concerns,⁹³ and the need to take in hand new realities in the broadcasting field generally—cable systems, satellite broadcasting, telecommunications—played an important role in the formation of the Canadian Radio and Television Commission (1968).⁹⁴ The enlarged number of activists in the arts fostered an enhanced role for government by demanding that it take responsibility for funding their efforts. First taking up that line during the war, maintaining it in testimony before the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences (the Massey Commission, 1949–51), and keeping it alive during the 1950s, they finally saw it bear fruit in the formation of the Canada Council (1957).⁹⁵ By 1969 the government's responsibilities in the area of communications had become extensive enough to justify formation of a Ministry of Communications, by 1972 the Department of the Secretary of State's work in the cultural field had grown to the point that an arts and culture branch had to be established, and by 1980 a reorganized and greatly

enlarged Department of Communications was given responsibility for much of the government's work in the now greatly expanded cultural sphere.

The strongest influence making for a government presence in the cultural realm was, however—as always—that coming out of the United States. Some of what gave American culture its new reach and potency did not, of course, much affect Canada. But if the institutional apparatus set up to power American culture in its drive around the world—the United States Information Agency, Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America, the Fulbright program—had little impact to the immediate north, the technological innovations of the period had a great deal. American popular culture, assisted by new devices—television—and improved versions of old ones—film and radio—penetrated Canada to a greater degree than ever before, and, not surprisingly, moved Canadians to update and revise the concerns they had been expressing since at least the 1880s.

If the threat was greater than ever before, the response also took on an unprecedented comprehensiveness and sweep. The better-organized, more numerous, and clearer-sighted cultural activists now in existence were able to react to this more powerful variation on an old theme with an unprecedented vigor—not to mention ingenuity and cleverness. Their pressure for a policy response to the American “threat” played a key part in the formation of the Massey Commission,⁹⁶ helped shape that body's recommendation for a funding agency for the arts, and materially affected the final decision to establish such an agency in the form of the Canada Council.⁹⁷ Nor were the new cultural nationalists concerned simply with the way the American tide might erode high culture; they were also concerned over the state of the mass media and popular culture. Formation of the Royal Commission on Publications (the O'Leary Commission, 1961),⁹⁸ the Committee on Broadcasting (the Fowler Committee, 1964–65),⁹⁹ and the Senate Committee on the Mass Media (the Davey Committee, 1971)¹⁰⁰ clearly reflected concern with the extent to which periodicals and broadcasting were dominated by American content, and a major reworking of cultural law and policy in the 1960s and 1970s led to new instruments (the Canadian Radio and Television Commission's content regulations, 1970) and new tax provisions (Bill C-58, 1976) designed to meet that concern.¹⁰¹ Film, too, got attention, with the government moving in 1968 through creation of the Canadian Film Development Corporation (CFDC) to create a Canadian feature film industry, a step it augmented in 1983 with the establishment of Telefilm Canada.¹⁰²

Notwithstanding the great growth in the strength of the forces at work, the pattern of the events they shaped remained essentially the same as it had been for decades: American culture, entering the country,

generated concern, anxiety, and a search for ways to ensure that it did not overwhelm Canadian culture. In the 1960s, however, that pattern changed. Noting the undoubted appeal of American cultural products for many Canadians and not terribly concerned with the uplift and self-definition that were mainstays of cultural nationalism, many of the new cultural entrepreneurs in postwar Canada, particularly in broadcasting and film, began to seek government support, not to keep American culture out but because they wanted assistance (or at least a free hand) in bringing it in, so they could reap the resulting profits. Some, indeed, reversed the trend even more dramatically by seeking that support as part of a strategy to produce, in Canada, American cultural products mainly for sale in the U.S. market. Thus taking steps that carried them far beyond the point reached by earlier entrepreneurs (the action of those nineteenth-century Canadian publishers who had sought government intervention in the form of tariff assistance and copyright legislation, not to help them get Canadian material into the Canadian market but to aid them in delivering British and American material to that market pales by comparison), private broadcasters and cable companies in particular worked hard to get government aid to ease the path by which they could import American material. Successful in procuring a softening of the CRTC requirement that they produce minimal amounts of Canadian programming, the cable companies got government to agree to allow them to rebroadcast American programs without payment of royalty fees to the copyright holder.¹⁰³ Film interests were busy too, lobbying to maintain the framework of legislation and subsidy that had been put in place by the CFDC and basing their action less on a concern to keep conditions conducive to the making of Canadian films than on a desire to preserve the help they needed to put out—often in close association with Hollywood—products for the American market.¹⁰⁴

All of this was important. It certainly complicated the picture. And if it gave many Canadians cause to think that their cultural policies were being subverted, it also presented Americans with reason to add to the argument that Canadian government action was complicating their access to the Canadian market the claim that it was opening them up to subsidized and unfair competition in their own. One must not, however, assume that these departures from the traditional shape of things constituted an absolute and total shift in Canadian direction.¹⁰⁵ The CRTC might have yielded consistently to the blandishments of the private broadcasters concerning relaxation of Canadian content regulations,¹⁰⁶ but it also took the country's leading private network to the Supreme Court for failing to comply with its directives concerning the production of Canadian programming.¹⁰⁷ And the CFDC-Telefilm bu-

reaucrats might have precipitated a situation in which, as one recent observer puts it, "a large part of [private Canadian film companies'] success relates to servicing U.S. industry, producing programs that are competent, Canadian-made, U.S.-conceived, and murderously banal,"¹⁰⁸ but they were also maintaining the skilled technical assistance and infrastructure without which there could be no hope of a Canadian film industry capable of dealing with Canadian themes and subjects.¹⁰⁹

Cultural nationalists could take stock, too, in the fact that government regulation and subsidy had played a clear role in maintaining a Canadian presence in several areas of the country's cultural life. Bill C-58, it could reasonably be asserted, had made a national newsmagazine possible;¹¹⁰ the CRTC's content regulations had stimulated growth of a recording industry;¹¹¹ and the CFDC had fostered production not just of feature films in Canada but of Canadian feature films.¹¹² There was thus ample room for the claim—and the nationalists did not hesitate to make it—that the "traditional" approach was still alive, still working, and still to be supported: far from having degenerated into a set of interest-manipulated schemes to bring American culture into Canada or enable Canadians to service the American market, Canada continued to do essentially what it always had done.

The idea of a state role in culture continued, in consequence, to attract much support. Nor did that support manifest itself only in anxiety that the free trade agreement might sweep away the cultural industries' foundations in law, policy, and subvention; polls confirmed its existence;¹¹³ as did the action of the provinces in moving into the area of cultural support.¹¹⁴ Perhaps most striking, that Canadian responses to the emergence of global systems of culture and communications have been cast in terms of familiar Canadian nostrums about state involvement makes clear the extent of their vitality. In observing that "only by making national public broadcasting strong throughout the world can cultural development continue and cultural sovereignty survive"¹¹⁵ TV Ontario President Bernard Ostry thus made a statement that was at once timely, apropos, and evidential of the continuing strength of a Canadian tradition.

Belief in an essentially Deutschian conception that the state is an entity held together by the ability of its people to communicate with and understand one another thus remains strong, and no less strong is the conviction that that ability must be maintained and strengthened by the activity of the state itself. When, therefore, journalist Bronwen Drainie notes that "Canada has a tradition that says artistic and cultural activity is necessary to our well-being and sense of identity," and when, further, she underscores the Canadian determination that "we will

support such activity out of public funds," she is not simply making a casual reference to a minor phenomenon: she is—and the significance of the point can hardly be exaggerated—expressing a view that many Canadians consider cuts to the heart of national survival.¹¹⁶

Even a cursory glance at the country's cultural history makes it clear how deeply embedded in that history the state has been. No less fully in view—and at least as much to be noted—is the widely held feeling that that is exactly what it should be. Some of the support for that feeling—another obvious point—has been based on foundations and given for reasons that do not entitle it to be taken with great seriousness; much of it, however—this, too, is evident—rests on more substantial ground. Moved by the conviction that, in the special circumstances created by Canada's small population, large distances, and very close proximity to the United States, Canadians cannot experience a "normal" attribute of national life—contact with their own culture—in any other way than through the intervention of the state, substantial numbers of thoughtful, articulate, and informed citizens of the Dominion have, in fact, been a good deal more than merely the dupes of clever and manipulative interest groups, or the victims of a push by elites to maintain their influence, or puppets pulled along by some Weberian thrust toward bureaucracy and regulation. Directly in touch with the notion that, as a matter of principle, communities and societies have the right to contact with their own culture, that they are entitled to resist the imposition of the culture of some other community, and that they can do what they think necessary (so long as their action does not conflict with preexisting obligations and responsibilities) to secure these objectives, these people are the captives of nothing more than their own—sometimes quite acute—analysis of the situation in which they find themselves.

Underscoring the existence of this reality for the benefit of those who would change the policies and approaches it has helped foster and sustain is not, of course, necessarily to endorse maintenance of all, some, or even any of those policies and approaches. It is, however, to say that seeking to change them without a full grasp of how strongly they are rooted in a widespread conviction that state action is required for effective exercise of the Canadian community's right to know things about itself and to see the world from its point of view is to invite the most troublesome of difficulties. Moving, in particular, to raise what will inevitably be perceived as casual and thoughtless questions about the Canadian belief that Canadian culture—high and low—must be state-aided cannot help but chill and embitter the atmosphere. It will strike Canadians as at once ungenerous (the result, as they see it, of

doing away with such aid would be to deny them access to what makes life in definable and self-conscious communities possible) and, given the Americans' own early concern with national culture, not a little hypocritical. Returning at last to where we began, that one of the most venerable principles in the world of negotiation and diplomacy is at issue in all this, this paper concludes with the simple counsel offered at the outset: offense, bad feeling, and irritation ought not to be created if they can be avoided. Getting along—let this, too, reinforce an earlier message—requires understanding of each by the other and what that other perceives to be his needs. It can therefore be of no help to the process when one of the actors in it behaves in ways that have the effect of suggesting that he sees the necessity for that understanding as being of little—even no—account. Nor—this above all is worth repeating—is this advice brought forward purely in the service of a Canadian interest. As was shown by Canada's concessions on the cable retransmission issue during the free trade talks, even the most modest American movement (in that case the one toward the Canadian position on cultural industries sufficed) offers the prospect of American gain. There can, of course, be no guarantees. But bluster, incomprehension, and rigidity have produced not much more than half-measures, unsatisfactory compromises, and sometimes bitter stand-offs, so an approach more fully centered on acceptance of the legitimacy of Canada's position is worth trying. Certainly conducting the frequent negotiations that will be an increasingly important part of an ever more intricate relationship will require at least some adjustment in a stance that has so far bred little other than irritation, annoyance, and frustration.

Notes

1. See, for example, K. J. Holsti, *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*, 3d ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977), 202–3, and Howard Raiffa, *The Art and Science of Negotiation* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1982), 126.
2. For a detailed chronicling of the process leading up to the signing and approval of the agreement, see Robert M. Campbell and Leslie A. Pal, "A Big Deal? Forging the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement," in their *The Real Worlds of Canadian Politics: Cases in Process and Policy* (Toronto: Broadview Press, 1989), 315–96.
3. Though economist Richard Lipsey's generosity in suggesting that American concessions to the Canadian point of view were so ample

that "when all the hype about Canadian culture is discounted, precious little was given up" is certainly excessive ("Sovereignty: Culturally, Economically, and Socially," in John Crispo, ed., *Free Trade: The Real Story* [Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing Company, 1988], 155).

4. *The Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement* (Ottawa: Department of External Affairs, n.d.), Article 2005, clauses 1 and 2. For a spirited discussion of these and other of the agreement's clauses bearing on culture, see Susan Crean, "Reading between the Lies [sic]: Culture and the Free Trade Agreement," in Duncan Cameron, ed., *The Free Trade Deal* (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1988), 223–37.

5. This idea has become remarkably widespread and comprehensive. For the part of it that insists that "showbusiness," market-driven and market-oriented, "always [took] its cues from its audiences," see Robert C. Toll, *The Entertainment Machine: American Showbusiness in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 5. Robert Henry Stanley, *Mediavisions: The Art and Industry of Mass Communication* (New York: Praeger, 1987), 237, argues the related point that the mass media were shaped by "the logic of the market and profit maximization." Treatment of "high" culture as an economic phenomenon can be sampled in Gerald Reitlinger, *The Economics of Taste: The Rise and Fall of Picture Prices, 1760–1960* (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1961); Mark Blaug, ed., *The Economics of The Arts* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1976); and Michael P. Mokwa, William M. Dawson, and E. Arthur Prieve, eds., *Marketing the Arts* (New York: Praeger, 1980). For some critical comment on what one observer views as the increasingly close linkages in the U.S. between culture and what she terms "the engines of consumerism" (x), see Deborah Silverman, *Selling Culture: Bloomingdale's, Diana Vreeland, and the New Aristocracy of Taste in Reagan's America* (New York: Pantheon, 1986). The contrasting belief that the market should determine what cultural products circulate is developed in Ernest van den Haag, "Should the Government Subsidize the Arts?" *Policy Review* 10 (Fall 1979): 63–73, and Michael S. Joyce, "The National Endowments for the Humanities and the Arts," in Charles L. Heatherly, ed., *Mandate for Leadership* (Washington, D.C.: Heritage Foundation, 1980), 1039–56.

6. By 1988 some Washington legislators were arguing that American film companies could suffer losses of "as much as \$1 billion" if movement of their product abroad were curtailed. See "Film Dispute with Canada Triggers Interest in Harsh Retaliatory Language," *Inside U.S. Trade*, February 12, 1988, 13.

7. Quoted in Jeffrey Simpson, "Sovereign Principles," *Globe and Mail*, November 14, 1985.

8. Quoted in Jennifer Lewington, "Fuzzy Words Blur Culture Debate," *ibid.*, February 5, 1987. See also Ross Howard, "Mulroney Lashes Out at Free Trade 'Ignorance,'" *ibid.*, and "Editorial," *ibid.*

9. "U.S.-Canada Free Trade Briefing Paper for Secretary Baker and Ambassador Yeutter," *Inside U.S. Trade*, October 9, 1987, 14-15.

10. For a discussion of pressures brought to bear on Canada in the course of U.S. attempts to modify Canadian action against Canadian editions of U.S. magazines in the mid-1960s, see Denis Smith, *Gentle Patriot: A Political Biography of Walter Gordon* (Edmonton: Hurtig Publishers, 1973), 226-32. U.S. moves in retaliation for Canada's 1976 attempt to use its tax system to stem the flow of advertising dollars away from Canadian television broadcasters and toward operators of U.S. channels directing programming to Canada are discussed in Stephen Clarkson, *Canada and the Reagan Challenge* (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1982), 235-36. See also the essays in *Cultures in Collision: The Interaction of Canadian and U.S. Television Broadcast Policies* (New York: Praeger, 1984), esp. Theodore Hagelin and Hudson Janisch, "The Border Broadcasting Dispute in Context," 40-103.

11. In one instance, pressure amounted to threats from leading American communications conglomerate Gulf and Western of a "scorched earth" policy in Canada if Canada did not modify its opposition to the takeover by that conglomerate of a publishing firm in Canada. It did, and the subsequent feeling in Canada that there had been too much yielding to American demands—business and government—became so strong that Communications Minister Marcel Masse was finally compelled to issue assurances that he was as determined as ever—"the goals have not changed"—to pursue a policy of enlarging the Canadian presence in the publishing sector. See Andrew Cohen, "Book Firm Deal Will Fuel Ownership Row," *Financial Post*, March 15, 1986; Dan Westell, "Masse Reaffirms Vows to Toughen Publishing Policy," *Globe and Mail*, March 11, 1989.

12. Masse noted that "our distribution mechanisms do not give Canadian cultural products sufficient access to our own audiences" and attributed maintenance of this unpleasant reality to American lobbying against Canadian efforts to change it. His description of this "difficult situation" that has been "tolerated too long" was uncharacteristically blunt. It is quoted in Brian Milner, "Masse Promises Changes in Film, But Industry People Expected More," *Globe and Mail*, September 12, 1989. See also Chris Dafoe, "Battle Lines Drawn over Film Bill," *ibid.*, October 18, 1989.

13. Most of the country's cultural activists were not simply unhappy about any weakening of Canadian culture's institutional and policy position in the course of the free trade talks; they actively and persistently lobbied against anything that might lead to such weakening. Representatives of the Canadian Conference of the Arts, the Writers Union of Canada, and the Canadian publishing and broadcasting industries met with government officials; a special organization—the Cultural Industries' Alliance—was formed; large, sometimes full-page, advertisements signed by prominent actors, writers, broadcasters, and dramatists were published in daily papers; and writer Robertson Davies took the matter up with a Scottish audience and the readers of the *Times Literary Supplement*. Not all such figures held the same dark view. Writer Mordecai Richler and painters Alex Colville and Christopher Pratt favored the initiative. But those who were displeased by the unfolding of events were noisy and vociferous in the extreme. See Richard Cleroux, "Do Not Sell Out Culture, Free Trade Meeting Told," *Globe and Mail*, November 27, 1985; John Partridge, "Cultural Sovereignty Already Destroyed, Alliance Charges," *ibid.*, July 28, 1988; "A Foreign Power Has Control of Michelle's Mind 725 Hours a Year," *ibid.*, June 21, 1988; "The Mulroney-Reagan Trade Deal Will . . ." *ibid.*, November 19, 1988; Robertson Davies, "Keeping the US Out of Canada," *Times Literary Supplement*, No. 4461, October 6, 1988, pp. 1070, 1080; and John Bentley Mays, "'Untitled': An Artistic Search for Meaning in the Free Trade Debate," *Globe and Mail*, June 11, 1988.

14. In their efforts to create room for Canadian content, some Canadians are beginning to look beyond the quota system for broadcast programming that has been in existence for decades. The broadcasting bill of October 1989 proposes to stimulate Canadian programming through a system of fines and penalties rather than the draconian—and therefore impractical—method of suspending licenses; but—apart from a few analysts who take a more or less explicitly "market" view of culture—most commentators remain convinced that the price of adopting a free market position for culture would be unacceptably high: there is, they think, no way to make the requirements of national survival consistent with the establishment and maintenance of a *laissez-faire* policy in cultural products.

Indeed, they argue, as economic forces carry the country closer to the continental economic integration of which the free trade agreement is an expression, a separate Canadian culture has become a steadily more important component of a separate Canadian nation. "Independent cultural industries by Canadians for Canadian audiences," insist bodies such as the Cultural Industries' Alliance, are essential to the

future of the country, and since, in those bodies' view, such industries can exist only with government support, that support is also essential. Maintaining the capacity to provide it thus becomes—here the circle of argument closes with what for most Canadians is an utterly persuasive finality—an interest that, being vital, cannot be dropped, qualified, or set aside. See Bruce Feldthusen, "Awakening from the National Broadcasting Dream: Rethinking Television Regulation for National Cultural Goals," in Frank E. Manning and David H. Flaherty, eds., *The Beaver Bites Back: American Popular Culture in Canada* (Chicago: Lyceum Books, forthcoming); Paul Koring, "Bill Widens Definition of Broadcasting," *Globe and Mail*, October 13, 1989; John Kettle, "Interview with Robert A. Russel" (a Canadian communications executive, who argues that "the difference between business and entertainment is disappearing"), *Executive* 28 (August–September 1981): 11; Stephen Brooks, *Public Policy in Canada: An Introduction* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1989), 299 ("the distinction between 'economic' and 'cultural' is largely artificial"); Steven Globerman and Aidan Vining, "Canadian Culture under Free Trade: Should Canadian-U.S. Trade Liberalization Extend to Culture?" *Canadian Business Review* 13 (Summer 1986): 18–22; statement by Cultural Industries' Alliance, quoted in Partridge, "Cultural Sovereignty."

15. Unbound by anything like the chains of position, circumstance, or reasoning that hold Canadians in thrall, Americans did not even see Sony's purchase of Columbia Pictures as an event to be reacted to in cultural rather than economic terms. Perceived, to be sure, as a shattering blow—viewed, indeed, as involving a piece of "America's soul"—its chief significance was nonetheless held to relate to what it meant for America's waning economic power. There was simply no sense that what had happened would have an impact—negative or positive—on American culture as such. For a representative sample of that reaction, see *Newsweek* magazine's cover story "Japan Invades Hollywood," October 9, 1989, pp. 62–72.

16. Kenneth E. Boulding, "Placing a Value on the Arts," Keynote Address at the 1986 World Conference on the Arts, Politics, and Business, "Support for the Arts: Philanthropy or Investment?" University of British Columbia, July 22, 1986.

17. For Webster's views on an "American" language, see his *Dissertations on the English Language* (Boston, 1789). Barlow's epic poem *The Columbiad* (Philadelphia, 1808) sums up his understanding of the relationship between nationality, self-consciousness, and culture. For the classic U.S. statement of the cultural nationalist position, see Emerson's *The American Scholar* (Boston, 1837). A still very useful discussion of these and

related matters is to be found in Russel Blaine Nye, *The Cultural Life of the New Nation, 1776–1830* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1963), esp. chap. 2, “The Foundations of an American Faith,” 29–53.

18. John Quincy Adams, wrote Richard Hofstadter, “was the last nineteenth-century occupant of the White House who . . . believed that fostering the arts might properly be a function of the federal government” (*Anti-Intellectualism in American Life* [New York: Vintage Books, 1966], 158).

19. A. Feld, M. O’Hare, and J. M. D. Schuster, *Patrons Despite Themselves: Taxpayers and Arts Policy* (New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1983).

20. United States International Communications Agency, United States Embassy, Ottawa, “Highlights from an Address of Secretary of State Alexander M. Haig, Jr.,” December 29, 1981, 1.

21. Herbert I. Schiller, *Mass Communication and American Empire: Communication and Cultural Domination* (White Plains, N.Y.: International Arts and Sciences Press, 1976); Donald R. Browne, *International Radio Broadcasting: The Limits of the Limitless Medium* (New York: Praeger, 1982); Kevin V. Mulcahy, “Cultural Diplomacy: Foreign Policy and the Exchange Programs,” in Kevin Mulcahy and C. P. Swaim, eds., *Public Policy and the Arts* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1982), 269–301; James L. Tyson, *U.S. International Broadcasting and National Security* (New York: Ramapo Press, 1983).

22. Mulcahy and Swain, eds., *Public Policy and the Arts*. See particularly D. Cheatwood, “The Private Muse in the Public World,” 91–110.

23. Lipsey, “Sovereignty.”

24. New broadcasting legislation proposes to give government regulatory agencies the authority to insist on Canadian content in “on-demand” television and video rental shops; the government has affirmed its intention to promote Canadian ownership in the publishing sector; new postal rates—one U.S. official once called the postal issue “a running sore” in U.S.-Canada relations—are likely to maintain the Canadian practice of making lower rates available to periodicals published in Canada; and new film distribution legislation will strengthen the position of Canadian film distributors in the Canadian market. See Paul Koring, “Bill Widens Definition of Broadcasting,” *Globe and Mail*, October 13, 1989; Dan Westell, “Masse Reaffirms Vows to Toughen Publishing Policy,” *ibid.*, March 11, 1989; Jennifer Lewington, “Ottawa Book Policy Target of Quiet Attack by Congress Veteran,” *ibid.*, March 18, 1989; Giles Gherson, “New Trade Feud Brews over Magazine Postage,” *Financial Post*, December 2, 1987; and Chris Dafoe, “Battle Lines Drawn over Film Bill,” *Globe and Mail*, October 18, 1989. For the special

difficulties the province of Quebec faces in the area of film distribution, see Matthew Fraser, "Quebec Searches for Way to Battle U.S. Film Goliath," *ibid.*, May 14, 1988, and Stephen Godfrey, "New Quebec Film Regulations Spark Protest from U.S. Studio," *ibid.*, April 14, 1989. Other possible sources of difficulty concern violations by U.S. periodicals of Canadian tariff and tax provisions governing their presence in Canada and the way the federal government's proposed Goods and Services Tax may enhance the position of U.S. magazines in the Canadian market. See Catherine Keachie, "The Split-Run Rule," *CPPA Newsletter*, No. 128, p. 2, and Canadian Magazine Publishers' Association, "Canadian Magazines and the Proposed Goods and Services Tax: A Submission to the House of Commons Standing Committee on Finance," September 15, 1989. See esp. pp. 7-10, "Unfair Advantage to U.S. Periodicals under the GST System."

25. Isaiah A. Litvak and Christopher J. Maule, "Bill C-58 and the Regulation of Periodicals in Canada," *International Journal* 36 (Winter 1980-81): 70-90.

26. Quoted in Christopher Waddell, "U.S. Senators Support Free Trade Deal," *Globe and Mail*, December 10, 1986.

27. "Confidential Briefing Paper."

28. Jean Murray Cole, "Keeping the Mind Alive: Literary Leanings in the Fur Trade," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 16 (Summer 1981): 87-93.

29. Isaac Hildreth's Government House, Halifax, 1800, for example, was designed in the Regency manner, while John Merrick's Province House, built there after 1811, was in the Palladian tradition, which, notes Nathalie Clerk, made it attractive to British travelers, who "were naturally responsive to an architecture that reminded them of familiar models" (Anthony Adamson, Alice Alison, Eric Arthur, and William Goulding, eds., *Historic Architecture of Canada* [Ottawa: Royal Architectural Institute of Canada, 1966], Plate 5; Nathalie Clerk, *Palladian Style in Canadian Architecture* [Ottawa: Parks Canada, 1984], 26-27).

30. Y. S. Bains, "Shakespeare on the Canadian Stage: The First Sixty Years," *Canadian Drama* 8 (Spring 1982): 66-73.

31. Harry Piers, "Artists in Nova Scotia," *Collections of the Nova Scotian Historical Society* 18 (1914): 110.

32. Thomas Cary, *Abram's Plains: A Poem*, ed. D. M. R. Bentley (London, Ont.: Canadian Poetry Press, 1986).

33. For others, see Mary Lu MacDonald, "Some Notes on the Montreal Literary Scene in the Mid-1820s," *Canadian Poetry* 5 (Fall-Winter 1979): 29-40.

34. Peter Ennals and Deryck Holdsworth, "Vernacular Architecture and the Cultural Landscape of the Maritime Provinces—a Reconnaissance," *Acadiensis* 10 (Spring 1981): 86–106.
35. Neil McDonald, "Egerton Ryerson and the School as an Agent of Political Socialization," in Neil McDonald and A. Chaiton, eds., *Egerton Ryerson and His Times* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1978), 81–106; James H. Love, "Cultural Survival and Social Control: The Development of a Curriculum for Upper Canada's Common Schools in 1846," *Histoire Sociale/Social History* 15 (November 1982): 357–82; Bruce Curtis, "Schoolbooks and the Myth of Curricular Republicanism: The State and the Curriculum in Canada West, 1820–1850," *ibid.* 16 (November 1983): 305–30.
36. For a recent discussion of the *Literary Garland*, see Carole Gerson, *A Purer Taste: The Writing and Reading of Fiction in English in Nineteenth Century Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), 45–46.
37. Catherine Sheldrick Ross, ed., *Recovering Canada's First Novelist: Proceedings from the John Richardson Conference* (Erin, Ont.: Porcupine's Quill, 1984).
38. R. A. Davies, ed., *On Thomas Chandler Haliburton: Selected Criticism* (Ottawa: Tecumseh Press, 1979).
39. I. S. MacLaren, "Notes towards a Reconsideration of Paul Kane's Art and Prose," *Canadian Literature* 113–14 (Summer–Fall 1987): 179–205.
40. Suzanne Zeller, *Inventing Canada: Early Victorian Science and the Idea of a Transcontinental Nation* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987).
41. Bruce Curtis, *Building the Educational State in Canada West, 1836–1871* (London, Ont.: Althouse Press, 1989).
42. Allan Smith, "Old Ontario and the Emergence of a National Frame of Mind," in F. H. Armstrong et al., eds., *Aspects of Nineteenth Century Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974), 203–4.
43. For discussion of these matters see Allan Smith, "The Imported Image: American Publications and American Ideas in the Evolution of the English Canadian Mind, 1820–1900" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972), 133–200. See also George L. Parker, *The Beginnings of the Book Trade in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985), esp. chaps. 5 and 6.
44. Thomas D'Arcy McGee, "The Mental Outfit of the New Dominion," *Montreal Gazette*, November 5, 1867.
45. Henry J. Morgan, "Introduction," *Bibliotheca Canadensis: or, A Manual of Canadian Literature* (Ottawa: G. E. Desbarats, 1867), viii.

46. "Arthur Clappé," in Helmut Kallmann, Gilles Potvin, and Kenneth Winters, eds., *Encyclopedia of Music in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), 197–98. See also Jean Southworth, "Ottawa," *ibid.*, 718.
47. J. Russell Harper, *Painting in Canada: A History*, 2d ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977), 212.
48. J. G. Bourinot, "Canadian Materials for History, Poetry, and Romance," *New Dominion Monthly*, April 1871, 193–204.
49. "A Gossip about the First Dominion Art Exhibition. By an Unlearned Visitor," *Rose-Belford's Canadian Monthly* 4 (May 1880): 545.
50. Parker, *Beginnings of the Book Trade*.
51. "The Art Union Exhibition," *Canadian Monthly and National Review* 6 (July 1874): 85.
52. Henry J. Morgan, ed., *The Dominion Annual Register and Review* (Ottawa: Maclean, Roger and Co., 1879), 302.
53. Text of Lorne's talk at the Art Institute of Montreal, 1879, in J. E. Collins, *Canada under the Administration of Lord Lorne* (Toronto: Rose Publishing, 1884), Appendix E, p. 425.
54. G. Mercer Adam, "Literature, Nationality, and the Tariff," *Week* 7 (December 27, 1889): 59–60.
55. For the history of these matters to 1900, see Parker, *Beginnings of the Book Trade*. For comment on a critical phase of the copyright controversy, see P. B. Waite, "Sir John Thompson and Copyright, 1889–1894: Struggling to Break Free of Imperial Law," *Bulletin of Canadian Studies* 6 (Autumn 1983): 36–49.
56. James W. Bell, "The Future of Canada," *Week* 6 (July 26, 1889): 539.
57. Sara Jeannette Duncan, "American Influence on Canadian Thought," *ibid.* 4 (July 7, 1887): 518.
58. "The Future of Canadian Literature, No. 2," *Canadian Magazine* 18 (February 1902): 387.
59. A. D. Gilbert, "On the Road to New York: The Protective Impulse and the English Canadian Cultural Identity, 1896–1914," *Dalhousie Review* 58 (Autumn 1978): 412.
60. *Ibid.*
61. A copy of Nobbs's statement, its reach much broader than its title—"Proposals with Regard to State Aid for Art Education in Canada"—suggests, is in the Sir Edmund Walker Papers, Fisher Rare Book Room, Robarts Library, University of Toronto, Box 22, Report to Agriculture Minister Sidney Fisher, May 4, 1907, pp. 3–4. I owe this reference

to Maria Tippett. Her book *Making Culture: English Canadian Institutions and the Arts before the Massey Commission* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990) sheds light on many of the issues dealt with here.

62. M. C. Urquhart and K. A. H. Buckley, eds., *Historical Statistics of Canada* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, and Toronto: Macmillan, 1965), 14.

63. Margaret Prang, "The Origins of Public Broadcasting in Canada," *Canadian Historical Review* 46 (March 1965): 2–3.

64. Douglas L. Cole, "Artists, Patrons, and Public: An Inquiry into the Success of the Group of Seven," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 13 (Summer 1978): 69–78.

65. Books on painting, poetry anthologies, and, above all, histories of literature were conspicuously present in this area. See Newton McTavish, *The Fine Arts in Canada* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1925); F. B. Houser, *A Canadian Art Movement: The Story of the Group of Seven* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1926); Nathaniel A. Benson, ed., *Modern Canadian Poetry* (Ottawa: Graphic Publishers, 1930); Archibald MacMechan, *Headwaters of Canadian Literature* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1924); J. D. Logan and D. G. French, *Highways of Canadian Literature* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1924); Lionel Stevenson, *Appraisals of Canadian Literature* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1926); Lorne Pierce, *Outline of Canadian Literature* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1927); and V. B. Rhodenizer, *Handbook of Canadian Literature* (Ottawa: Graphic Publishers, 1930).

66. M. Vipond, "The Canadian Authors' Association of the 1920s: A Case Study in Cultural Nationalism," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 15 (Spring 1980): 68–79.

67. See, in particular, Sir Ernest MacMillan's *Two Sketches for Strings Based on French-Canadian Airs* (1927), his *Six Bergerettes du Bas Canada* (1928), his *Three Indian Songs of the West Coast* (1928), and his *Three French Canadian Sea Songs* (1930). Approximately seventy of his transpositions of West Coast Indian music were published in V. Garfield, P. Wingert, and M. Barbeau, *The Tsimshian: Their Arts and Music* (New York: J. J. Augustin, 1951).

68. For the resolution of the copyright problem arrived at in 1921, see R. A. Shields, "Imperial Policy and the Canadian Copyright Act of 1889," *Dalhousie Review* 60 (Winter 1980–81): 634–58, esp. 655–56.

69. "Technical limitations," notes Frank W. Peers, "on the number of available frequencies necessitated intervention by the state." See his *The Politics of Canadian Broadcasting, 1920–1951* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969), 12. The federal government first appeared on the

scene in 1913 when the Radiotelegraph Act was passed. By 1922 radio broadcasting was under the authority of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and a complex web of regulations was in existence (*ibid.*, 15, 16).

70. Maria Tippett, *Art at the Service of War: Canada, Art, and the Great War* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984).

71. Peter Morris, *Embattled Shadows: A History of Canadian Cinema, 1895–1939* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978), 59.

72. Juliet Thelma Pollard, "Government Bureaucracy in Action: A History of Cinema in Canada, 1896–1941" (M.A. thesis, University of British Columbia, 1979), 45–46.

73. Betty Lee, *Love and Whiskey: The Story of the Dominion Drama Festival* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973).

74. Samuel Moffett, *The Americanization of Canada* (1907; rpt. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), Introduction by Allan Smith.

75. Archibald MacMechan, "Canada as a Vassal State," *Canadian Historical Review* 1 (December 1920): 350, 347.

76. Graham Spry to Brooke Claxton, October 6, 1930, Alan Plaunt Papers, University of British Columbia Library, quoted in Prang "Origins of Public Broadcasting," 9.

77. By 1925 there were six hundred stations in the U.S. as against forty-four in Canada. "What if"—Frank W. Peers paraphrased the question in the minds of many of the forty-four—"Canadians chose to listen to the American stations, and ignore their own?" (Peers, *Politics of Canadian Broadcasting*, 13). For a look at the filmmakers' similar problems, see Morris, *Embattled Shadows*, 175–77.

78. See H. F. Angus, ed., *Canada and Her Great Neighbor: Sociological Surveys of Opinions and Attitudes in Canada Concerning the United States* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1938), esp. 124–40.

79. Never explicitly articulated but always present in such anxious utterances as that made by *Saturday Night* editor B. K. Sandwell, when in 1928 he pronounced "the true Canadian type" to be "a small town type" whose passing from the scene would coincide with emergence of a society—urban and "American"—quite unlikely to have much sympathy for the values Sandwell preferred and in relation to which he and others like him could offer guidance. See B. K. Sandwell, "Only the Rich Should Write Novels," *Saturday Night* 43 (October 6, 1928): 2, cited in Vipond, "Canadian Authors' Association," 73.

80. "A national radio system," asserted Graham Spry, is nothing less than "a majestic instrument of national unity and national culture." See

his "A Case for Nationalized Broadcasting," *Queen's Quarterly* 38 (Winter 1931): 169.

81. Graham Spry, "Brief on Behalf of the Canadian Radio League Presented to the House of Commons' Special Committee on Radio Broadcasting in 1932," Canada, House of Commons, *Proceedings and Report of the Special Committee on Radio Broadcasting* (1932), 565, quoted in Prang, "Origins of Public Broadcasting," 28.

82. A point insisted upon by W. E. Euler, minister of trade and commerce, when he introduced the bill establishing the National Film Board. See Pollard, "Government Bureaucracy in Action," 109, n. 152.

83. Martyn Howe, "The Pictures," *Dalhousie Review* 16 (October 1936): 290–99, and his "Motion Picture Art," *Canadian Forum* 16 (March 1937): 12–13.

84. James Lysyshyn, *A Brief History: The National Film Board of Canada* (Ottawa: NFB Publications, 1970), 3.

85. See Claude Bissell, *The Imperial Canadian: Vincent Massey in Office* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), 198–99.

86. Sir Robert Borden, *Canada in the Commonwealth: From Conflict to Cooperation* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1929); J. W. Dafoe, *Canada: An American Nation* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1935).

87. J. M. Gibbon, *Canadian Mosaic: The Making of a Northern Nation* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1938).

88. Northrop Frye, "Canada and Its Poetry," *Canadian Forum* 23 (December 1943): 207–10.

89. Donald Creighton, *The Commercial Empire of the St. Lawrence, 1760–1850* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1937).

90. The multicultural idea eventually got "official" recognition, the northern theme was amplified by popular historians—Pierre Berton, Peter C. Newman—as well as by commentators such as Margaret Atwood and Gaile McGregor, and Creighton himself produced a number of books—and even, toward the end of his life, a novel—intended to bring before an ever larger audience the argument that Canada, having been created not in defiance of geography but with its help, was as naturally and solidly based as any society could be. See Allan Smith, "Metaphor and Nationality in North America," *Canadian Historical Review* 51 (September 1970): 247–75; Allan Smith, "National Images and National Maintenance: The Ascendancy of the Ethnic Idea in North America," *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 14 (June 1981): 227–57; Margaret Atwood, *Survival: A Thematic Guide to Canadian Literature* (Toronto: Anansi, 1972); Gaile McGregor, *The Wacousta Syndrome: Ex-*

plorations in the Canadian Landscape (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985); Pierre Berton, *The Mysterious North* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1956); Pierre Berton, *Klondike: The Life and Death of the Last Great Gold Rush* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1958); Pierre Berton, *Drifting Home* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1973); Peter C. Newman, *Caesars of the Wilderness* (Markham, Ont.: Viking, 1985); Peter C. Newman, *Company of Adventurers* (Markham, Ont.: Viking, 1985); Donald Creighton, *Dominion of the North* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1944); Donald Creighton, *John A. Macdonald: The Young Politician* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1951); Donald Creighton, *John A. Macdonald: The Old Chieftain* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1955); Donald Creighton, *The Road to Confederation* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1964); Donald Creighton, *Canada's First Century, 1867–1967* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1970); Donald Creighton, *The Forked Road: Canada, 1939–1957* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976); Donald Creighton, *The Passionate Observer: Selected Writings* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1980); and the novel, Donald Creighton, *The Takeover* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978).

91. Maria Tippett, *Lest We Forget* (London: London Regional Art and History Museums, 1989), Part I: "The Great War," 9–24; Part II: "The Second World War," 25–41.

92. For the CBC's International Service, see "Le service international de Radio-Canada," *Affaires Exterieures* 5, no. 10 (1953): 295–99, and David Ellis, *Evolution of the Canadian Broadcasting System: Objectives and Realities, 1928–1968* (Ottawa: Department of Communications, 1979). For a memoir by a staffer of how the service worked, see Dick Halhead, *Radio: The Remote Years* (Scarborough, Ont.: The Author, 1981), 52–56. For the Musicana Festival, see Eric McLean, "Exporting Canadian Music," *Montreal Star*, November 19, 1977. For the Toronto Symphony in China, see "Toronto Symphony" in Kallmann, Potvin, and Winters, eds., *Encyclopedia of Music in Canada*, 926.

93. Frank W. Peers, *The Public Eye: Television and the Politics of Canadian Broadcasting, 1952–1968* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1979), esp. 55–91.

94. *Ibid.*, esp. 283–304.

95. "The commission," observes Massey's biographer, "was overwhelmed with briefs" (Bissell, *Imperial Canadian*, 211). For the arts and culture community's continued activity during the 1950s, note the recollection of dramatist and onetime president of the Canadian Arts Council Herman Voaden: "For six more years [1951–57] we had to continue the lobbying" Frances K. Smith Papers, Box 3, File 6, Document J, Queen's University Archives, transcribed from tape recording

of discussion at the Toronto Branch of the Canadian Authors' Association at the Toronto Public Library on Friday, April 5, 1968. I am grateful to Maria Tippett for supplying me with this reference.

96. The commission was certainly mindful of the threat. "American influences on Canadian life," it noted in a representative remark, "to say the least are impressive . . . a vast and disproportionate amount of material coming from a single alien source may stifle rather than stimulate our own creative effort . . . national independence . . . would be nothing but an empty shell without a vigorous and distinctive national life" (Canada, *Report of the Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters, and Sciences, 1949–51* [Ottawa: King's Printer, 1951], 18).

97. In introducing the legislation to establish the council, Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent stressed its nation-consolidating, American-resisting role, making pointed reference to the way confederation had brought entities "often inclined to the south rather than eastward and westward . . . together," and associating the council's projected function in developing a national "spirit" and a national "spiritual strength" with that fundamental process of national consolidation (Canada, House of Commons *Debates*, January 18, 1957, p. 392).

98. Canada, *Report of the Royal Commission on Publications* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1961).

99. Canada, *Report of the Committee on Broadcasting* (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1965).

100. Canada, Special Senate Committee on Mass Media, *Report*, 3 vols. (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1970).

101. Litvak and Maule, "Bill C-58"; John Meisel, "Escaping Extinction: Cultural Defence of an undefended Border," *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory* 10 (Spring 1986): 248–65; Stephen Brooks, "Cultural Policy: Communications and Culture," in his *Public Policy in Canada: An Introduction* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1989), 297–323.

102. For comment on the character of and the work done under the auspices of the CFDC and Telefilm, see Martin Knelman, *Home Movies: Tales from the Canadian Film World* (Toronto: Key Porter Books, 1987). See also David Clandfield, *Canadian Film* (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1967), 87–89, 109–11.

103. For the campaign the private broadcasters mounted to bend the CRTC to their will—they were even able to get the president of their association appointed as its chairman—see the polemical but informative book by Herschel Hardin, *Closed Circuits: The Sell-Out of Canadian Television* (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1985).

104. These, naturally, were not the terms in which the case was made. Pleas for continued support tended to rest on the ground—it had provided the original *raison d'être* for the programs now in danger—that infrastructure was necessary if Canadian films dealing with Canadian subjects were to be produced, that that infrastructure, once in place, had to be preserved, and that the best way to do this was to keep it employed, even if doing so meant making American films. “Once”—film critic Martin Knelman paraphrases the case of those who argued in these terms—“we had a few hits under our belts, things would go better for everybody. Our actors, technicians, and writers would be employed, and there would be a market for many different kinds of movies.” The claim that, as National Film Board Commissioner James de B. Domville put it in 1981, “foreign [i.e., U.S.] markets are the solution” to the problem of creating a viable film industry in Canada that would deal with Canadian subjects was, indeed, a plausible one—if one did not look too closely at the work actually done. It certainly provided the rationale for the film companies’ protests of government moves to reduce the benefits to which they had become so accustomed. See, for example, the film industry’s telex to the prime minister, the minister of finance, and the minister of communications, November 25, 1981. Martin Knelman, *This Is Where We Came In: The Career and Character of Canadian Film* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977), 97; James de B. Domville, “Domestic Market Key to Dollars,” *Filmworld* 55 (April 15–May 15, 1981): 3; “Telex to the Prime Minister,” *Film and TV World* 4 (December 15, 1981–January 15, 1982): 1, 9.

105. Though it can be admitted that what government agencies have chosen to regard as “Canadian concerns” have increasingly reflected the fact that Canada is more of a private enterprise society than it thinks. See the article on this subject by John Meisel, “Fanning the Air: The Canadian State and Broadcasting,” *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, forthcoming.

106. Paul Audley, *Canada’s Cultural Industries: Broadcasting, Publishing, Records, and Film* (Toronto: James Lorimer, 1983), 257.

107. *Ibid.*, 301.

108. Salem Alaton, “A New Generation Sets the Cameras Rolling: Canada’s Vigorous Commercial Film Industry Has the NFB Casting Itself in an Updated Role,” *Globe and Mail*, April 29, 1989.

109. It was, thought film historian David Clandfield, particularly important to note that commercial filmmaking played a central role in providing work for “directors resting between TV assignments and more prestigious literary adaptations” (Clandfield, *Canadian Film*, 109).

110. Litvak and Maule, "Bill C-58," 83.
111. Ritchie Yorke, *Axes, Chops, and Hot Licks: The Canadian Rock Music Scene*, Introduction by Pierre Juneau (Edmonton: Hurtig, 1971).
112. For example, *Goin' Down the Road* (1970); *The Rowdyman* (1972); *The Hard Part Begins* (1974); *The Apprenticeship of Duddy Kravitz* (1974); *Why Shoot the Teacher* (1977); *Les Plouffe* (1981); *The Wars* (1983); *Joshua Then and Now* (1985); *I've Heard the Mermaids Singing* (1987); and *Bye Bye Blues* (1989).
113. Audley, *Canada's Cultural Industries*, 26.
114. George Woodcock, "The Provinces Become Patrons," in his *Strange Bedfellows: The State and the Arts in Canada* (Vancouver: Douglas and McIntyre, 1985), 83–90.
115. Bernard Ostry, "Can Culture Survive the Broadcast Battles?" *Globe and Mail*, June 5, 1989. See also Ostry's *The Cultural Connection: An Essay on Culture and Government Policy in Canada* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978).
116. Bronwen Drainie, "How Truly Painful Will the Taxman's Bite Be to the Arts?" *Globe and Mail*, April 22, 1989. See also John Meisel and Jean Van Loon, "Calculating the Bush Garden: Cultural Policy in Canada," in Milton C. Cummings, Jr., and Richard S. Katz, eds., *The Patron State: Government and the Arts in Europe, North America, and Japan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), esp. 306–8.

Call for Papers

Authors wishing to contribute to *Canadian-American Public Policy* should submit short proposals, two to three single-spaced, typewritten pages in length, plus an outline. Papers should deal with topical policy issues in the following areas of concern in Canadian-American relations: business and economics, natural resources, cultural issues, and international relations. Final manuscripts should not exceed eighty typewritten pages in length. Address all correspondence to: Kevin Archer, Canadian-American Center, University of Maine, 154 College Avenue, Orono, Maine 04469 U.S.A. (207/581-4220). Please include telephone and FAX numbers.

Canadian-American Public Policy

*Occasional papers on
a wide range of issues in U.S.-Canadian relations*

Rapidly growing commercial ties between Canada and the U.S. are raising complex new policy issues in both countries concerning trade, investment, energy, the environment, resources management, cultural politics, and foreign affairs. Published four times a year on an occasional schedule, *Canadian-American Public Policy* will keep you abreast of these issues with informed, timely, and objective analysis by leading experts in both countries. Subscribe now to be certain not to miss any important issues.

Please enter my subscription to *Canadian-American Public Policy*. (Individuals must include payment or credit card authorization with order. Canadian checks and money orders in Canadian currency are welcome.) One year: \$20.00 U.S., \$25.00 Canada and foreign. Two years: \$37.50 U.S., \$45.00 Canada and foreign.

Payment enclosed: \$ _____.

Please charge to: _____ VISA _____ MasterCard.

Card number: _____

Expiration date: _____

Signature: _____

Name (please print or type): _____

Address: _____

City/State or Province: _____

Postal code or Zip: _____

Please return to:

The University of Maine Press
51 PICS Building • Orono, Maine 04469-0150 U.S.A. • (207) 581-1408

ISSN 1047-1073

Canadian-American Public Policy

*Occasional papers on
a wide range of issues in U.S.-Canadian relations*

To be featured in forthcoming issues:

William Diebold, Jr.
on the future of U.S.-Canadian business relations

Murray G. Smith
Institute for Research on Public Policy, Ottawa
on subsidies and the bilateral relationship

Joel Sokolsky
Royal Military College
on current defense issues in the Canadian-
American relationship

Thomas R. Waggener
University of Washington
on forestry and the free trade agreement

Now available:

"Canada-U.S. Relations in the Bush Era"

Joseph T. Jockel
CAPP #1: April 1990

"Transboundary Air Quality Relations: The Canada-U.S. Experience"

John E. Carroll
CAPP #2: July 1990



BORDERLANDS Monograph Series

**The United States and Canada:
Borderlands Reflections.**
Lauren McKinsey and Victor Konrad, \$4.00

Canada as a Borderlands Society.
Roger Gibbins, \$3.00

**Values and Institutions in Canada and the United States:
North American Cultures.** Seymour Martin Lipset, \$5.00

The Border as Fiction. Clark Blaise
The Borderlands and Borderlines. Russell Brown, \$5.00

Crossing the Border :
The Canada-United States Boundary.
Christopher Merrett,
Niagara Falls.
Patrick McGreevy, \$5.00

CANADIAN-AMERICAN CENTER
Canada House, 154 College Avenue
University of Maine Orono, Maine 04469
207/581-4220 207/581-4223 Fax