

PARACHUTE

revue d'art contemporain / contemporary art magazine

SEMINAR: INTERNATIONAL ART MARKET DEVELOPMENT

May 22 2008

Long Synthesis

Chantal Pontbriand: Global art market

I am very pleased about the quality of participants in this seminar. We have some of the most important galleries from Toronto and Montreal, and some of our VIP guests from the IKT Congress this weekend. This is really a unique occasion to be together and to discuss what many consider the main issue in the contemporary art world at the present time, that is, the development of the international art market. It will be a chance for us to gather very diverse perspectives, since we have several countries around the table, and I think that's a rare occasion. This is an opportunity that came up through my discussions in preparing the IKT Congress with different government departments. Heritage Canada, represented today by Jane Sadler, which is our Canadian Ministry of Culture, came up with the proposition that we could do a focus group on the development of the international art market. I thought it was an opportunity not to be missed. I am very happy to see that everyone I proposed it to were also happy to attend.

Agenda: I will give an introduction and then the participants will be asked to introduce themselves. I will then ask our 3 int'l guests to give us a small overview of what the market is like in their respective country or area of the world (the main factors that are influential, the problems if there are any, etc.). Then, a general discussion will follow in which I would very much appreciate strong participation from all of our 10 gallery directors, to help us understand the particularity of Canada within the global market. We also have the chance to have 2 curators of corporate collections, very important ones in Canada: the National Bank of Canada and the Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec, which is one of the primary banking organizations of the province of Quebec.

I would like first to summarize the briefing paper we sent you and introduce the parameters of this discussion. First I will talk about the necessity of positioning any country in the context of the development of the international art market. For me it is not just a question of positioning Canada. I think each country has its specific issues, its specific problems in dealing with this huge market, which constitutes incredible opportunities for artists especially, but also for people in business, such as gallery directors. It also touches upon museums, of course, and all other types of institutions. It is really something that I see as going far beyond the question of economy, because I think there are also political and ethical considerations related to this subject.

Why is the global art market so prominent today? One consideration is the increase of global wealth, the expansion of global networks, and especially its expansion not only in the East-West dynamic which until the 20th century was very much limited to Europe and North America. I remember when we started PARACHUTE, for example, it was already innovative to do a magazine that would put North America in relationship with Europe and vice-versa, and then insert Canada into all of that. But now we are in a position where all continents are involved, and Asia is a very strong player. China has the largest art market at the present time, which was not the case twenty years ago. Also, the Middle East and South America both have very strong art markets.

I think the biennials and the art fairs are extremely influential in the development of the art market. Of course, traditionally the museums and the galleries have been influential, and are becoming even more so as some galleries now have international holdings, like for example, Gagosian, which has different galleries in different parts of the world. So that's a new factor that influences. There's also the strong place that contemporary art has taken in the art market, which was not the case ten years ago. In many auctions now, contemporary art generates more revenue and more interests than anything before it. That is really a new phenomenon. And especially the Asian market, the Indian market: they have a lot of important collectors now in contemporary art. There's also the development of the resale market, which is getting stronger and stronger and which poses certain problems. And then there is what I call a kind of nascent event market, which is interesting, because parallel to fairs, for example, you get these autonomous programs that don't have anything directly to do with sales, but have to do with thinking about art. And so I think we are bound to relate mechanisms that enable us to think about art and sales. For example, the art conversations program at the Basel art fair and the global art talks in Dubai, are a new phenomenon also, and one can imagine eventually even a new type of exhibition directly related to art fairs. So where are the borders? Where are we going with that?

And then there's this other great phenomenon, tourism, which has taken on such importance at the end of the 20th century and even more now. What is the place of art in that? I think the fact that certain cities - Enrico, you were talking about Luxembourg the other day, which is very small city - are building these huge museums. Well it has to do not only with art but also with tourism.

Just a few words about the local art market, Canada, since we're here this morning. I think we must have in the background how contemporary art came into existence in Canada. To make a very complicated story short, I think we can set a very important date in the 1950's when the Canada Arts Council was created. The Canada Arts Council helped to nourish the development of innovative art practices in Canada. And the direct result of that, to be concrete, is that we came up with people like Jeff Wall and Rodney Graham, who were very clearly the result of that Canadian system. And they are really only the tiny point of a big iceberg, because conceptual art and innovative practices in video, performance, installation, etc., could really be carried on through the help of the Canada Arts Council. This was not through the assistance of private art galleries, which could not necessarily deal with these innovative art practices in the 50's and 60's and 70' and sometimes even now. It is still difficult but I will let our colleagues talk about that. On top of the Canada Council, the particularity of Canada is the number of artist organizations that were set up, starting in the 1960's, and we

will see a very interesting exhibition about this phenomenon at the Concordia art gallery, which is called Documentary Protocols. It's about the history of autonomous artist organizations that started in the 1960's in Canada, often with the collaboration and the encouragement of important American colleagues like Dan Graham, people around EAT, Sol Le Witt, etc. There was a kind of international proximity between people that wanted to do different types of work and had a different type of attitude in art making. Now, just in the province of Quebec you have 60 of these organizations, which are thriving on very small budgets, and often they are exhibition places as well as production centres. During this weekend, the IKT members will visit some of these places, along with commercial galleries and museums.

I think the art magazines have played an important part as well, not only in Canada but also in the world, in making a larger public interested in contemporary art, especially helping to understand it by developing new modes of criticism, new modes of presentation, etc.

In terms of private galleries, the Montreal situation is very strange. There are certainly more galleries than there were in the 1960's, but we've also had a mixture of galleries dealing with local artists, and galleries that exhibit artists from elsewhere. It is still a difficult situation - but I would prefer that our colleagues here from Montreal galleries tell us about that. Fairs and biennials in Canada are almost non-existent; we have one fair in Toronto and one biennial in Montreal, and the biennial in Montreal has almost no budget. As I often say, it's not like we are a part of the G7. But I think they merit encouragement, and we hope that things will go better for them in the future. So there are no major art events in Canada that could bring international attention to Canada, in the way that the Istanbul Biennial brings international attention to the Middle East, for example. We have on the other hand, very good art schools. In Montreal alone we have two major universities out of 4 that have visual arts schools; these are very important departments with 1000 students, PhD's even. It's also the case for Laval University, and Ottawa has a major visual arts department as well.

Art stars: Sometimes I feel that it's a bit sad that people think that we have only the Vancouver people in Canada. But I must say that on the international front most people only know Jeff Wall, Rodney Graham, Ken Lum and a few others. This is not a normal situation given the quantity of very good artists that are here. And then, we are starting to have production companies - that's a new phenomenon also. People like Oliafur Eliasson, who function really like companies, with 10, 20, 30 people working with them. These artists play a kind of new economic role in our societies. In Montreal we have one, Rafael Lozano-Hemmer, who happens to be Mexican. He lives in Montreal, operates out of Montreal and has ten people working for him. This is a new phenomenon that I'm not sure we are very conscious of anywhere in the world right now, because these artists who work this way are still very few.

Enrico Lunghi: I will talk about a very small country, which doesn't compare in size to Canada. It is particular because the art market in Luxembourg has absolutely no weight in comparison to the international scene. However, what is interesting in Luxembourg is that it reflects a lot of things happening everywhere in the world; even things that happen in China or New York have some repercussions in Luxembourg. In terms of the art market, and the art scene, and so on, this very small but

cosmopolitan place that is Luxembourg (Luxembourg as a city has 80,000 inhabitants, and the whole country has 480,000 inhabitants) we have something like 7 or 8 serious art galleries of contemporary art. 3 of these are regularly in international art fairs, which for a city of 80,000 inhabitants is quite good. And we have Casino Luxembourg, which has nothing to do with the casino; it is an art centre that deals with producing a lot of shows with especially young artists. Also, since almost two years ago we have MUDAM, which is a contemporary art museum. Because there is no big collection of modern art in Luxembourg, everything is focused on contemporary art.

Today, the Prime Minister Jean Claude Juncker will give the state of the nation address in Luxembourg, where he will talk about the new fiscal system in Luxembourg that will be introduced to change the sponsorship system. At the moment, we have no rules or legislation in favour of sponsoring, especially of contemporary art, but also other things, because Luxembourg has, like a lot of other European countries, this tradition of having the state deal with culture. But this is changing now. Two weeks ago, there was big Congress in Luxembourg, organized by the Bank of Luxembourg, about the new philanthropy, and there were a lot of bankers and international speakers talking about how it works in their countries, and what should be done in Luxembourg to improve the participation of the private sector in education, health care, etc. So you see even in a small country like Luxembourg things are changing a lot.

We are faced with the problem that, while state money for public institutions is not decreasing, proportionally it is decreasing because there are more and more institutions in Luxembourg now. The MUDAM came, of course, and some others, and so while the global budget is the same we have more actors, and we are forced more and more to find private finance. This can be okay, I do not have a problem with that, but of course, in a small country where you have the biggest company of the world in steel and 180 international banks, it is frustrating that all of them have no interest in representing themselves in Luxembourg. They have their clients in Germany, France, U.S, China, Saudi Arabia, etc. so they don't need to represent themselves in Luxembourg. Everybody is always telling me, "Oh you must be lucky you have all these banks," but it is difficult and rare to receive funding from a bank for a show, not only for Casino Luxembourg, but even for the MUDAM. So it's really hard.

I spoke with someone from the Bank of Luxembourg who organized a congress about the new philanthropy, and he said that even a small bank like us (he calls himself a small bank) can have 600,000 euros easily for people who want to give money for new philanthropy. And I said, "Oh fantastic, is that for contemporary art?" and he looked at me and said, "Oh no, that's for social things, for education, etc". Culture is the smallest part and contemporary art is always nonexistent in this model. This is just to say that as public finance becomes rare, we cannot necessarily turn to the private sector to help us in this situation.

However, I would like to say very generally, as a public institution, that I am very happy that the art market is developing. There are more and more auction houses in Luxembourg, but the level is, I would say, still non-existing. Last week I got information that a new one is coming, which means that something is happening, even if small. Which means that the market is still growing. This is one point. The other thing is that we have very good contacts with the private art galleries. About ten years

ago, we at Casino Luxembourg started giving information about the private galleries with our shows. Because we think it's good to collaborate. The art market is important, since it allows the art and the artist to live. I have no problem with that, but I have to say that with the rare resources of public funds, the problem that we face all the time as a public institution is that we want to have artists in a non-interested way. We don't care if this artist sells or not, it is not our problem; we just want to make a good show for the artist. However, the better the show, the better the artists can sell something, and once their prices go up it becomes impossible for us to work with them. So sometimes the art market destroys the work of the public institutions because it just makes it impossible for public institutions to work with artists that they promoted until then. And still today, even as Chantal said, the art economy is growing and maybe becomes the leading thing, but I think that most of the artists are still interested in showing in public institutions because its effects are more long-term. I mean the art market, we all have to agree, tends to push artists for some time and then soon after nobody cares about them anymore, which is not the way it works in most public institutions. So I think the long-term is still a concern for us. I still believe in that, but it is difficult, especially when newspapers focus on artists who are a big deal, as opposed to other artists. I would say then that art dealers and art galleries should help to balance and not just push for selling and increasing the prices of artists, because long-term, to have prices growing very fast, is not necessarily the best thing for the market.

Rhéal Lanthier: Enrico, you said that once some artists have grown a lot and become very expensive, you can't work with them anymore. Why can't you work with them anymore? I don't understand.

Enrico Lunghi: This is a very simple thing. First, the insurance prices. If I have to insure or transport a piece where the insurance prices keep getting higher, I just can't do it. We often ask the artists or the galleries to make the difference between the market price of a piece and the reproduction price. If it is something like photography that could be normally reproduced, we ask, "If something happens, why put 50,000 euro and not 2,000, so that if something happens we can just redo the photograph?" Paying 50,000 euro in insurance just makes everything difficult. The crates become so huge and so expensive, and then we say, "Ok let's just work with young artists, or with other artists," and so on.

Rhéal Lanthier: But the galleries are not receptive to these demands?

Enrico Lunghi: Some yes, some no. It's very individual. I absolutely don't blame the galleries. I just want to say that it's good to collaborate in those ways, because when we have to face big prices as a public institution, it is just impossible.

Jessica Bradley: Can I add something to that, which is not really just a financial issue. I'll give you a concrete example. I was working on an exhibition that included Rachel Whiteread at a time when she was with a very small gallery in London. During the two years we were working on the small group exhibition, she went to Anthony d'Offay. So, in the first visit I had with her we just met in the studio and talked. In the second visit, she asked me to come to her house, and lo and behold, the nice guy in the Prada suit from Anthony d'Offay is standing there. And then as we went over the list of works, I knew things were shifting because when this kind of gallery is

shaping a career, what does the Art Gallery of Ontario in Toronto mean? Even if the other 2 artists in the show were very, very important artists - now, not so much then. So, you also have to deal with those politics, as a museum and as a curator. You know that she needed her career managed. Rachel - and they're not all like that - was very clear and in front of this guy said, "No no, that piece is not going to Japan, I promised it to Jessica for that show." It doesn't always work that way. So this is another layer of the complexity.

Pierre-François Ouellete: Well, because we were talking about markets, I would be curious if Monsieur Lunghi could talk to us about collecting in Luxembourg. In terms of the collections, are the museums that you are referring to, which are being built in Luxembourg, also collecting institutions? What's the dynamic with that issue of collecting?

Enrico Lunghi: Luxembourg is very small, and I always have the feeling that it is not relevant for the global discussions. But I think it is still an interesting place. There is what we call in Luxembourg and in Belgium the Doctors' Collection. Doctors and lawyers were the main collectors of modern art in the 50's and 60's, especially from Ecole de Paris and places like this. It was for quite a long time very closed. For instance, Riopelle, who is from here, is well represented in Luxembourg collections, because he is part of this period. It changed a lot at the end of the 1990's, not because of the Casino Luxembourg, but parallel to the development of the Casino the interest in contemporary art grew a lot, and more and more people began collecting very contemporary art. The MUDAM, of course, collects contemporary art as well. So in only a few years, I would say in less than 2 decades, the situation of contemporary art changed a lot. It's like Chantal said: today, contemporary art is one of the biggest parts of what is happening in the shows and in collecting. So it's really a changing situation. What we don't have, and this is paradoxical in terms of what I said before about all of the banks in Luxembourg, are corporate collections. Of course, there is the Deutsche Bank, which has some nice works, but they are from the mother Deutsche Bank in Frankfurt. So the corporate collection comes from outside. The only exception is if by chance there is one director of the section in Luxembourg who is really into contemporary art - which I can say out of 180 directors, it's only 1 or 2 every 5 years. Such a director might have an interest in doing something local, on the scene. Luxembourg is not a country of high society; you don't have people like Pinault or Ludwig, who have these big collections. Luxembourg is a medium-sized company, because the country is so small. The private collecting is quite well diffused. You don't have these big collections, but I would also say that proportionally, the interest in art and contemporary art is probably bigger in Luxembourg than in Paris or in London because 7% or 8 % of people are interested in it.

Chantal Pontbriand: It is true of Belgium also.

Enrico Lunghi: Belgium is a little bit like this, yes, but they have bigger collections of course.

Saskia Bos: Which is the opposite of the Netherlands - it's public / private money.

Catherine Grenier: In France now the ministry of culture is very concerned about the development of the art market. Actually in France in the 1990's the art market was

sustained locally by the creation of the Fiac and the French museums, but now it's not working anymore. And in the global art market France is not a very important place anymore. Based on the results of auction sales, France is now after China, but more than that, far after the United States and the UK. And French artists are almost non-existent in the global art market. So the Ministry of Culture, Christine Albanel, has asked Martin Béthenod, the director of Fiac, to propose some solutions to this art market problem. And among his proposals were several new tax policies, especially measures for the auction houses and for the collectors. For example, a tax deduction on the importation of artworks. But this must be negotiated with the European Community, and we can see that this kind of input from the Ministry of Culture has limitations because we are in the European Community. She has proposed to expand tax deductions for the acquisition of art, as well as donations. She has also proposed several new policies in favour of the French auction market, as well as an interest-free loan for small collectors to collect contemporary art. And these decisions, if all of them go through, reinforce quite important laws on tax deductions that were introduced in France a few years ago; for example, on donations, as well as the possibility to pay your taxes with artworks, and even contemporary artworks. So I think France will now have a very good situation in terms of tax deduction and art market policies.

In addition to that, we have the Salon des Antiquaires, which is a very important fair, and the Fiac, of course, which is getting better and better. In 2007, there were more than 100 international galleries at Fiac, and 70 French galleries. So the quality of the Fiac has considerably increased, and last year, it drew a lot of international collectors. We also see the development of the art market through other smaller fairs; for example, we now have three fairs for drawing, one for photography, and one fair for very young artists run by a young gallery. So this is good, I think, and the situation is really moving. Of course, we also have in France, as you know, very important collectors now, such as François Pinault and Bernard Arnault, and most of them want to open their own spaces. Not François Pinault, because he decided not to make his own foundation in France, but Bernard Arnault, who is building a museum that will be built by Frank Gehry, and Antoine de Galbert, who opened La Maison Rouge - a very interesting private place in Paris. We also have corporate foundations that want to open their own places, like the Fondation Ricard. Some important galleries open their own spaces too; for example, Yvon Lambert has his own museum, not in Paris, but in Avignon. We also have some important galleries in Paris now; Yvon Lambert is one, of course, as well as the old one, Chantal Crouzel. There is also Emmanuel Perotin, who has a great gallery now with an international gallery. And of course a few, but not enough, international galleries are there, such as Marion Goodman. We would like to have some more, actually.

One of the most important problems remains the lack of visibility of the French art scene, of its institutions and its artists. And this is, I think, a real issue. Because to have an important, flourishing market, you need to have a real living art scene. You also need to have international collectors and galleries coming to visit, and to support artists, you need to have international artists accepted to live in France. The market is not only a question of tax deductions and financial policies. It's also linked with all contexts. For example, a few years ago, Pinault and Arnault, who are the owners of the two most important auction houses in France, Christie's and Phillips, didn't really give an impulse to the French market. Therefore, better than an art market strategy,

or next to an art market strategy, France must develop its art activity and art strategy. By creating attractive events, for example, which is what the Minister of Culture tried to do in creating this new event Monumenta at the Grand Palais. This year it is with Richard Serra, and it has attracted a lot of interest. Also, by reinforcing the work of the key institutions, like the Centre Pompidou, the Museum of the Ville de Paris, the Palais de Tokyo, etc. and also promoting a general movement in all the disciplines of art. Also, all of the projects of the Louvre, the New City of Architecture, the New City for Fashion, etc. So all of this should, I think, participate in a new situation.

We also have the feeling that France must really promote its own art scene. And this is why the Centre Pompidou has the project to create this new exhibition place that will be called the Centre Pompidou Alma (because it is in the Centre Alma), which will be a place for visual art and design. This centre will have an international program, but with a strong emphasis on artists, not only French, living in France. And this place, which is in the same building as the Palais de Tokyo, and in front of the Museum of Paris, can become a very preeminent place for contemporary art in Europe. And I think it is quite important to have all of these different attractive places for art, not only contemporary art, to attract the collector, to attract the gallery, to attract the public.

We have the chance in France to have a very, very good frequentation of the contemporary art exhibition. To give you an example, the Louise Bourgeois show in the Centre Pompidou, which is not finished yet, will have had more than 250,000 people at the end of the exhibition, which is quite impressive. Because we have another show just next to it on art and the spiritual, and everyday we have more than 3000 people for this other show. So the two shows are attracting more than 6000 people a day, and this is for contemporary art. So this is a very strong situation, compared to I think all the other countries, even the Tate Modern. For the moment, we are trying to think about it, trying to restore something, not to come back to the old idea of France, but just to be a serious partner in the global situation right now.

Saskia Bos: I have a direct question. You were saying that there was quite some support for galleries and for the whole structure, for collectors, but is it only if you collect French art? Or is it also a measure available if you have an international collection, or an international presentation at your gallery?

Catherine Grenier: No, it's also international.

Saskia Bos: So it's not limited to Frenchness.

Catherine Grenier: No, it's not limited to French art, and there is even a new tax deduction for foreign artists who want to come and live in Paris for 3 years, who don't pay taxes.

Saskia Bos: So that is very recent, because its old policy, 10 or 15 years ago, used to be very France-oriented. And I think it is wonderful to hear that it is opening up for artists who can settle there.

Catherine Grenier: In a way we try to work more on French artists, for example, by developing an exhibition policy, such as the program at the Centre Pompidou. We really want to work on the promotion of the French art scene, but also to become attractive to foreign artists. And I think the consideration of the art market can't be reduced to French art, because of course this is not the main point. It will never be the main point if we are in the global situation, so we try to reinforce the importance of French artists in this global market, but in helping the market by itself. That's the sense of all these measures that the Minister of Culture is to take, to reinforce the structure by itself and not only to help French artists.

Saskia Bos: And does this also go for presentations of French art? Are they getting more internationally connected? For example, the export of an international presentation?

Catherine Grenier: Do you think of **Afar???**

Saskia Bos: Yes, old Afar??.

Catherine Grenier: Old Afar, who is now Culture France. He is still remaining the same, I think. Helping French policies, trying to open to an international context, also trying not to become the loud belt of the French state coming into the country, pushing his artists, and trying to be more in partnership with the country as well. But still focused on the exportation of French art. Next to Culture France, the Ministry of Culture tried to implement new things, and also the main institutions like Centre Pompidou and others are asked to participate.

Chantal Pontbriand: I noticed in France that an artist who resides in France is very quickly considered a French artist. That is very interesting. For example, Anri Sala, who came from Albania, and so many people from Morocco and Algeria, who have been living in France even though they were not born there, even if they came only for their studies. If these artists stay there for a few years, they are easily supported by Culture France, and are considered French artists. This is a tradition in France, but not in Canada.

Enrico Lunghi: I have a direct question about visibility. I think it is very interesting that now there will be these new places opened by collectors, like the Maison Rouge, a very interesting place, but - and this is a question I ask to myself - it will probably not be avoidable that there are some places with figures like Centre Pompidou. 250 000 visitors for Louise Bourgeois, and for a lot of other shows there you have these big figures as well. And yet you have more and more other places that would be happy with 20, 30 thousand visitors, or even less. For me, it is very important that the situation allows for more diversity, so that small places do not disappear, even though of course they will never attract this large amount of people. Some places can make more efforts toward the artists, to the artists' work, production, some others more toward the presentation and so on, and this diversity of support can be very interesting, and can create very nice collaborations between artists. I always say that it is really interesting to be in a show where there are 3000 people a day, but I prefer to be in a show where there are only 5 people so that I can see the show. I'm always a little bit split over this. I think it is really good that a lot of people see Louise

Bourgeois, I am really happy about it, but it's not a quality thing. When there are 3000 people in a show, you don't see the show, you see the people.

Catherine Grenier: I think, first, we need to have both. What I was trying to say was that in France, there is a particular interest among the people for contemporary art.

Chantal Pontbriand: Maybe that can help nurture a stronger art market: if there's more interest, you can get more people to consider buying art to be a good thing.

Catherine Grenier: I gave you the numbers of the Centre Pompidou, but I'm now working also in the Palais de Tokyo, and the Palais de Tokyo by itself (I don't know exactly the numbers) attracts a lot of people. We are doing very innovative exhibitions, so we have a context that is quite good. Perhaps it's not so good in the Fiac, but they are doing a very good job. So we have all these networks in France. For some years, the state helped so much the FRAC, the Art Centre, etc., but the institution did not get very much help. The Centre Pompidou has had the same budget for something like 10 years now, so we have been forced to find our budget outside of the state. It's not always easy, because we also have big costs. But what you say is right - to have a real position in the global art market, we need to have both. And in France, sometimes, we have the problem that we give a lot of money to a lot of people, and we don't really stress some of the key figure artists. It's not like in other countries, like in Germany or in Great Britain, where they really promoted their important, key figure artists. In France, not at all, we didn't do that. And perhaps we are too far away from this kind of position and we need now to do both, to promote important international French figures, and also to help the small institutions. La Maison Rouge, for example, is a small institution, and they are doing a good job and are becoming very important now.

Saskia Bos: But you know why I think Maison Rouge is so interesting, as opposed to the many Pinaults and others; that it has the nerve to show other people's collections. It's not about boosting the ego of one strong collector, who would say, "This is me and more of me," etc. This is a house that is devoted to private collections from other countries; it could be a German collection from Hamburg being shown in Paris, like the Falkenberg collection. I think that is amazing, because what I usually find with private support or with public support is that it's always so narrow-minded. Whereas it's beautiful if we can get subsidies going that are European, which promote transport of European or Pan American art, or whatever bigger unit than the country itself. This really expands support structures across borders, and I think that's needed. Nobody is talking enough about that.

Catherine Grenier: What is very interesting in Maison Rouge is that they are very specific, these private collectors; they don't try to do the same job as the state institutions. They make something about the question of the eye of the collector.

Saskia Bos: It's a niche that they thought about and that they do very consistently.

Enrico Lunghi: It's diverse and I think that is very good.

Saskia Bos: Yes, and it's trans-national.

Chantal Pontbriand: It emphasizes the position of the collectors, which is very important.

Saskia Bos: I have a question here about this whole setup - for which I give all my compliments to you, Chantal, that you could get all of these here people around one table. This sort of group I wouldn't see in New York and I wouldn't see in Amsterdam either, because it is bringing everyone to the table from both private and public institutions. I think that is really interesting. But at the same time, I would like to know what is your agenda, in the sense that if you had set up a meeting in New York, not at Cooper Union, but at places like Dia, you would imagine that there is something at stake, that we were talking about the National Endowment for the Arts. Is there something at stake here that we, as foreigners, should know about?

Chantal Pontbriand: I think what is at stake here is the opportunity for artists to make a profession of their art, which seems to be a possibility for a lot of artists (because we all know a lot of names), but the economic situation of many artists except maybe the top range is really very bad. I think that, while it is important not to let the art market perform in an entirely free-rolling way, it is also important to encourage discussions, to identify patterns, and to develop strategies for encouraging a stronger economy for the arts. I think this is a discussion that we can have here in Canada, but we can also have it in France, and in other countries in Europe. I have a colleague in Paris who is very concerned about the relationship between art and the economy. She finds this exercise that we're doing this morning quite unique, and would like to do it in Paris.

Saskia Bos: But the aim is to mobilize more people?

Chantal Pontbriand: Yes, and just the fact that we will be doing a synthesis of this discussion indicates that we will be encouraging further thoughts about this subject, and engaging others who have the power to implement different types of solutions. So this is the basic agenda.

Saskia Bos: I'm not questioning the relevance of this meeting. I'm just saying is there something specific here that we have to know?

Chantal Pontbriand: But there's nothing precise to talk about today because there's really so little existing, particularly in Canada, which has not yet developed a policy for the development of the art market (the way Christine Albanel has just developed one in France).

Saskia Bos: Well, in the Netherlands we have had such a policy for many years. But it's been going down, in a way. So, as I see the Netherlands (albeit from a distance), they are developing a sort of jealousy towards markets like the UK or the US. When I'm in the US, they say, "What, that fantastic structure... but why don't you stimulate your government to keep all of those things. You're not going to give that away. Why don't you just support your government," which I'm not in the position to do anymore. In Holland at the moment, for example, they are only talking about tax breaks, about how to get more collectors involved. And also, "Why don't we have another Biennial?" This is also a question. But we don't really need another art fair, and one of the reasons there isn't an important art fair is because there were always too many

subsidies. So you know, it's the snake biting its own tail. And it's regarded as a closed system of subsidies that has isolated the art market over the years, as opposed to Belgium, which is only private money. Because there weren't ever any public institutions there, so as a reaction - the burghers of Flanders, the big collectors in Flanders from the textile industry, they took over the responsibility of supporting the arts, seeing themselves as the Medici of our era, and they did that very well. In Holland, that doesn't exist because the museums were so excellent. And most people in the 60's and 70's in Holland would say that the museums are there for our public collections. But what you say is very true, Catherine, there is no money in those public collections at the moment; the state museum in Amsterdam is not able to collect in an interesting way because they simply don't have the support. They say that sponsor money is around one million euros from a bank (the IMG bank), and this may be the same for the Reichs museum - one million, which is the same amount that is given to the Formula One races. But that's another kind of visibility - that's a visibility that's on every TV continuously with logos, etc. We obviously do things differently in the arts. Given the fact that there is not so much public support any longer for collecting, or for artists in long-term subsidies, Holland is looking outwards, and is in an identity-crisis. Its public services used to be ideal, with health care, art for the public, everything was there, but that changed in the 80's. Now, in the beginning of this 21st century, everybody is in a sort of identity crisis, looking to the UK, to the US, where, as I've said, they're saying, "You're crazy, you have the best system in the world and you should not be break it down." So I think it's a strange situation; books have come out recently about how we need new art patrons and philanthropists, and how can we attract those to the Netherlands, where, of course, the tax system is still tough. People pay 51% - 52% taxes and there is no tax break for collecting. There is a very complicated system that you can go to, but it's not there yet. It's not comparable to what you did in France with donations.

Catherine Grenier: There are 60% tax deductions in France.

Saskia Bos: That's impressive, and that made the Musée de Picasso possible. So, these things are in discussion, but they're not mis-en-place, and the biggest contrast for Holland would be Belgium, where the opposite is true. To simplify, for everything I say about Holland the opposite would be true of Belgium.

Chantal Pontbriand: And New York?

Saskia Bos: Well, New York is of course crying over the breakdown of the NEA, which was already happening in the 80's, and then in the 90's again. So it isn't in a really strong position in terms of public money. Everybody is racing after the same private people. And if you are Creative Tongue, which is a wonderful institution that does public projects, or if you are MOMA or if you are the MET, or DIA - everybody has a capital campaign. Our school has a capital campaign for a new building. So all that money, first of all, goes into new buildings; it's all brick and mortar, as they say, and not so much programming. And secondly, it's all the same people who are sought after, and the people who are supposed to give money have their hierarchies. They'd rather give it to the museum and to the Modern and to PS1, although they are one now. And then far lower in the hierarchies you have the artist's spaces, which have a really difficult time. All of the alternative spaces have a really difficult time living on the very small, incidental funds that are available. So it's a complex situation with a

very strong hierarchy and little public money. And all the benefits and events - I mean, you work 24 hours a day on that, because all the evenings are devoted to the dinners and the benefits and the donors. I hear that from my former colleague, Dionne Debault, who left the TATE for that reason, who was so sick of it. Coming from the Netherlands, not knowing about the big world, he comes to the Tate and then gets daily briefings from two people sitting on both sides of him, saying, "Okay, now you will be sitting with him and then with her, etc." Now he's working for a private collector. There is a lot of mental pressure on the person who just likes to work with artists, likes to have the good situation that you get in the Netherlands. You're speaking about the same thing, Enrico. It's about these machines, Pompidou and Tate are machines where you have to deliver this amount, and I think it's very true what you said, that with the amount of people coming to such an event, the question becomes: what is the quality of that experience?

Paul Petro: I just want to take your words on mental pressure, because I really feel like that's an impetus for us all being here today. I feel like we're reflecting on the climate, which I think Tim Griffin captured in April's Artforum. We exist in a furiously market-driven artworld now. We can go back to the earlier 1980's when the auctions were a relatively closed system, where art was being wholesaled. And then the media started looking at these numbers, and the Report on Business section in the Globe and Mail, our national newspaper, started to report that these economies were growing, and we get more collectors going there, and it became this spectacle of commerce to a point now where we have this parallel universe that we're working in. We have what happened in the auctions this past week, capturing huge figures, and then we have everybody else. So we have a global situation where collectors are going to art fairs elsewhere, and the art fairs are starting to replace museums on a certain kind of level, but it's also feeding the social appetite, and so they're going elsewhere and they're collecting, and then they're coming back with their trophies.

Saskia Bos: But also the party quality of it: the event quality, disguised as intellectual events by the way, decorated with symposia.

Paul Petro: Therefore, by going to work for a private collection, you're feeding the animal and so the whole gist of things, as I see it, is the idea of thinking globally but acting locally. And it's a transition, and it will happen, but it's going to take more time, and who can have more patience than a gallery owner existing in a smaller domestic primary world?

Saskia Bos: And still putting all his money in, and energy.

Paul Petro: Without necessarily jumping onto the art fair bandwagon and pimping your culture elsewhere.

Saskia Bos: But I think the most important thing for the artist is what you're talking about, that patient person who is there for him or her.

Paul Petro: But it takes mechanisms like the museum sector, which I feel fails at a certain point, where curators don't have the financing at their disposal to do more travel. I mean it's taken 30 years, more, for Suzy Lake, a photo-based artist, to get into something like Wack, which is a PS1 show. And here we are, we've known about

her for years, decades, and now the international market is suddenly opening up to her. And it's radicalizing her whole project. In a good way, I want to see more of that. It's really the idea of museums in Canada partnering with museums outside of Canada, and it's changing, touring, bringing that sensibility, so that collectors can come back to the museum and have a real experience. We need to ask: What does the world want from art right now? It's this level of questioning.

Saskia Bos: And are there interesting exchanges of Canadian museums with European museums, for example? Is that active?

Jessica Bradley: I wanted to talk about where I am now, what I'm doing now. I could not just totally endorse what you're saying. I think all of us have seen our potential collectors going off for a great weekend and parties, and we all know about it, this kind of visible competitive consumption, in a shopping centre, essentially. It seems impossible to imagine that you can even look at art in these places, unless you already have a trained eye, and then when you do look at it you have no context for it. But anyway, that's the way it is.

Saskia Bos: Spotting, not looking, was Robert Storr's qualification of it.

Jessica Bradley: Yes, but there's not much more to be said about that, except maybe later as we discuss how we can counteract that. Obviously as gallerists, yes, we have to be there for the long term, for our artists. We have to believe totally in them, because we're not going to make any money. That's not why you do it. Some people do it for that reason, and maybe they find things they can sell, but it takes time, and art is slow, and we are working in a period, all of us, whether you're a curator, critic, artist, which is fast. All of us in the gallery business have the experience of the client who comes in with the blackberry and wants everything fast, and the fact is that they want the knowledge, but what they're getting is information. There's a big difference between knowledge and information. That's another topic. But I simply want to respond very quickly to a few things that Catherine said and that you've said, Saskia and Enrico, because although we're all in what seem to be radically different countries and situations, there were a couple of things that really struck me that are so common. I'll start with the French situation. You spoke about France, Catherine, of the tradition of this kind of dispersal and decentralization of support, very good support, from the FRAC network, etc. It seems that now there's a kind of rebalancing going on, in terms of what you give to that network but also how you advance French artists - not just French artists but an international market. And this interests me a lot in terms of the Canadian situation because I think we have had this wonder of the Canada Council. And I would have to say that this semi arms-length organization, in relation to the rest of the government, is miles ahead. But what has not changed there in the 20 or 30 years that I've known it is, instead of consolidating and supporting those artists who really are showing that they are out there and being recognized internationally, the pie has been cut up into tinier and tinier pieces. So there are crumbs going out all over the country and any curator who does the Venice Biennale has to pay to make up hundreds and hundreds of thousands of dollars missing from the budget they will get through the Canada Council. And with our present government, with its arm in foreign affairs and international trade, all of those funds are going down. And then you have artists like Jeff Wall or Rodney Graham, all those people who, when those of us who were curators at the time knew they were being

recognized, couldn't go and be in those events without begging for a puny little travel grant to get there. Is it any wonder that once they took off they were shown elsewhere? And of course the second thing is that they don't have galleries in Canada because by then, as mentioned before, their prices have gotten so high that even a museum in Canada cannot buy their work.

And that brings me to Saskia's comment on this kind of isolation through subsidizing which can happen. I think this has happened here, if you follow the history of Canada very carefully. This has happened despite this wonderful explosion of work in what I would call until recently relatively non-saleable media, like performance, like video, like large-scale installations - there is no question that Canadian art has done incredible things and been recognized here and there for that. But what I would call the grant-culture mentality has also worked against this. I think there's a new generation of artists who know that, although it's nice to get a grant here and there, it simply isn't a way to advance. And I should also mention that the Canada Council Art Bank, which was my first job, was based on the Dutch Art Bank. This was another way of supporting the nonexistent market in Canada, to the extent that it became a market. So that's a dangerous thing.

I will give you an example of what I would call the subsidized inertia that can happen, which really works against a market culture and which like it or not we have to work in now. I was at a conference a few years ago, as a curator speaking, and someone said to me, "Well, we got a really good grant, and we did this great publication, but we don't know why we can't get our publication any further." And I said, "Did you ever think of distribution?" And they said, "We can't afford to distribute." And then someone else said, "Well, what are we going to do with all of those boxes of catalogues in the basement of various institutions?" And someone said, "Well, it's not a problem, we didn't have to pay for them anyway."

Then I want to pass along a story about the job of all us, not just curators, although many of my own reasons for leaving my last large institution job, although I certainly wasn't director, were very similar. This comes back to your briefing about the social implications of what's going on; art as partying, art as fashion, etc. The people who really need to give their time to it are not allowed to anymore because the fundraising activities are so intense, where you go out 2 or 3 times a night, 2 of them to catch the exhibitions that you should be seeing that are opening in your own city, and then to arrive on time for the dinner. This is a very familiar story. And that takes me in a circle back to the new kind of collector, and the tax situation, which is slightly different. In Canada, we have an excellent donation system. If you can get a cultural properties certification, it is very good. But as the funding in the museums goes down, how are collections built, even in the major ones? Without exception, and I know now as a seller of 2 institutions in this country, they're built on donation. Well, having been a curator who spent many long nights preparing the tax forms for millions of dollars for the patrons of the museum, when I couldn't make decisions about excellent works at a time when they were affordable, I'm aware of what this does to the actual public institution leadership in collecting. So you get this kind of snake eating its tail thing there too, where there is no leadership in institutions, which could actually promote and invigorate our domestic market. Both nationally and internationally.

Rhéal Lanthier: Well, I think in Canada one of the major problems is that a lot of the government institutions do not respect a simple law called offer and demand. I think we have done a lot of things to increase offer but nothing really to increase demand. Museums don't even have a budget to buy, but we pay artists to produce. Artist studios are shrinking year after year, and artists are forced to store their art because there is no market out there to take it. I think it's terrible. As dealers, we are in a situation where, even if we do present avant-garde art, or very edgy art, no one is there to buy it. And we are expected to produce museum quality work, but there is no museum to buy it. So, who then is going to buy it? I think France is now realizing that supporting is important - you can't just offer, increase the numbers of venues, of shows, etc., without trying to increase the public for it. Here in Quebec, the dealers only represent 35% of the market. If only 35% of the art market is controlled by the dealers, then that means that 65% is controlled by other people, mostly artists who sell directly to institutions or museums. How can we go to art fairs, how can we promote our artists, without income? If we don't have enough of a strong local market, we can't go and play the big game on the international art scene. And because there is no demand, the prices for the art here are much lower than the international market. So when you want to go and do a fair, if your artwork is worth only \$8,000 or \$9,000 a piece, even if you sell 10 of them, you are still in a deficit.

Jessica Bradley: Besides, the buyer might not think it's very important if it's only 8000 dollars. That's the new kind of collector.

Rhéal Lanthier: Just to give you an example, the price for an average piece bought by a Quebec institution for a Quebec piece was \$8,380 in 2004, and the average prices paid for an international artist or one from outside of Quebec was \$54,433. It's very hard as a dealer to think that you can even jump onto the international wagon when you don't even have a local market to support you. And when you don't even control the local market, when all of the money is going elsewhere. I think here we have developed a lot of support for artists, and a lot of them are now selling directly to institutions, but the thing the artists don't do is keep some money for promotion. And that's what galleries are for, to do promotion. But a lot of the dealers, a lot of the institutions, and even private collectors now are trying to avoid galleries, saying, "Well, I can get a better deal with the artist." And yes, they do. But the part that is taken away is the part that should be going to promotion and export and all of that.

Saskia Bos: There was an interesting remark in that article you mentioned in Artforum, the roundtable discussion, about the idea that maybe the displaced system of today for promotion is being in a collection. And that being in a collection, especially in Miami nowadays during the Miami Basel open houses, or during the Armory show in New York when all of those private houses open up to show their collections, that that is the best displaced system there is for an artist. Just to be there.

Pierre-François Ouellette: We are always talking about the international market in the singular, but I think we have to understand that we're dealing with a multiplicity of phenomena. There are different points, especially looking back at history. For example, Germany and in France in the 1980's actually collected some important Canadian artists, and by owning art, they also paid attention to their long-term career. Genevieve Cadieux is one example. Right now we do not have the same

impact on public institutions that collect. There are some cases, however. I think it would be interesting to look at recent case studies, not the Jeff Walls, not the Rodney Grahams, but for example, and I'm thinking with Paul Petro here, what happened with **paul pie?** Or what happened to Damian Moppett during the Fiac, when Yvon Lambert was opening a show of his work? And so there are some phenomena that should be examined to see how the whole network works, because it's not network but networks. There are the public institutions, but there's also the private collecting, the flagship collectors, and then there's the small fish who are enthralled by what they're reading about the market. So I think we have to realize that we're talking about very multiple and complex markets, and not one, singular international market.

Coming back to Ms. Bos' comment and Ms. Grenier's: During the last Miami Basel, France made a concerted effort and I would like to know what impact this concerted effort had in Miami? The Rosa de la Cruz collection opened a government sponsored show of important French artists, there were two shows at different museums, and there were leaflets about France in America during that weekend. It was everywhere. I was told stories about the parties that went around these openings. So it is very good to pour out all of this money, but what is the impact for the curators who have been traveling to Miami? For the collectors? It would be interesting to be able to follow up, to see what kind impact this type of concerted effort can have.

Stephen Bulger: That was a pretty remarkable figure that you threw out, Rhéal, about the average price. Does that include historical and contemporary, or is that just contemporary?

Rhéal Lanthier: It was contemporary. It was about the work bought in 2003.

Saskia Bos: Remarkable because low? Why?

Stephen Bulger: It is just remarkable how low the average was of a work by Canadian artists.

Rhéal Lanthier: It was a comparison between Quebec artists and artists from outside Quebec, which includes Canadian artists. The total artwork bought was 1,259, 1036 were bought in Quebec, and 123 bought outside Quebec. People were willing to pay more for artists from outside of Quebec.

Jo-Ann Kane: I think you put your finger on it, in saying that all the artists here, because we don't have a market, tend to sell at a lower price. As a collector for a corporate collection, if I want to buy an Ian Wallace, I know that I will have to spend \$50,000, but if I want to buy an artist here in Montreal, for \$50,000 I can buy from a lot of artists. So that's what those figures say; outside of Quebec the prices are higher, but here everything is lower.

Rhéal Lanthier: But you can read a lot into this information. First, we support a lot of artists, and so we keep the offer alive. But maybe we support too many artists, so none of them can make a good living out of it.

Chantal Pontbriand: The art schools encourage that as well, and also the artist centres.

Rhéal Lanthier: The art centres multiply the offers. There are also the Quebec grants and the Canadian grants, which support a lot of artists, but these artists are not necessarily capable of making a living. Multiplying the number of artists means that they will have to share the demand. Moreover, the government intervenes a lot in terms of offer, but very little in terms of demand. For example, the budget to support the Quebec private galleries is 265,000, and it's been the same budget since 1985. But the support for the art centres is about 5 or 6 million. So there's a big difference. And it's the same thing with the Canada Arts Council. For all galleries across Canada, the budget is about 200,000, and only around 20 Canadian galleries can actually expect to receive something.

Marie-Justine Snider: We meet a lot of potential new collectors, and they're terrified when they see the whole system. I find that a lot of collectors are scared to start collecting, because they don't know how to collect, and they're overwhelmed by something that we find overwhelming as well. And they go to art fairs but they don't buy, they just go there instead of going to museums. So I think there are a lot of people that could help Montreal, Quebec, and Canada, but they're really scared and they don't know how to start. I understand why they are scared and intimidated, and how fairs do not educate them.

Saskia Bos: In New York, there are a lot of people who jump into that niche and help collectors collect, a lot of young people trying to get into that kind of advising. Does that happen here?

Jessica Bradley: Yes it does, and it's an interesting phenomenon, at least in Toronto. I don't know about here. I guess I find it somewhat ironic that collectors are now advising collectors. So someone who was a lawyer 24/7 for the last 30 years is suddenly a consultant. There are at least 3 of those.

Paul Petro: And there are collectors who become consultants. They're dealing with other markets outside of Canada, not with Canadian culture any longer. They dropped that, donated their works, and moved on.

Jessica Bradley: So the consultant thing is very risky. And then of course there is another brand of consultants altogether, who are glorified decorators. But that's a different problem.

Chantal Pontbriand: I think it's interesting to see these crossovers, between the classic professions like the collector, the gallery director, the art historian, etc. Here in Montreal there is one gallery that was just opened by a collector. These kinds of shifts are interesting.

Paul Petro: They're not even collections, they're portfolios that they're enriched by loaning. They do not even donate anymore. They're just loaning to the institution.

Pat Feheley: I'm going to be self-serving. Working both with the Art Association of Canada, and also Heritage Canada, I spend a lot of time fact-finding among Canadian dealers in particular; how they feel about exporting, what's important about exporting, etc. Among the small amount of government support for art dealers and

getting art abroad, we've identified art fairs, but we've also identified the importance of museum exhibitions for Canadians outside of Canada. So for instance, in my own gallery the only time that I have successfully got partnerships with American or with European commercial galleries has been when those artists have been part of either a project or a Documenta or something happening in Europe. We continue to push Heritage Canada and others to fund what they call an inbound mission, which is to say curators from various European museums to come to Canada. We do this in order to see if we can actually get them to showcase Canadian artists, which will then assist us in turn to export the works of those artists. I didn't hear any of the presentations today ask whether there is any hope for that. For instance, in France's new plan, is there an interest in showing non-French artists, or international art? Enrico, you mentioned 3 Luxembourg galleries that regularly show at art fairs. Do they primarily show their own artists, or do they show international artists, or do they mix the content?

Enrico Lunghi: A mix. There are not so many artists from Luxembourg in galleries, and a lot of artists from Luxembourg don't live in Luxembourg, but in Paris, Milan, Berlin, etc. These galleries then show a mix of these things, but when they do solo shows most of the time it's of international artists. Very often they don't promote Luxembourg artists not known on the international scene. They take international artists instead.

Pat Feheley: It's interesting to see the different techniques, because very often Canadian galleries will mix the two, to get more interest in Canadian artists.

Catherine Grenier: I will answer the question about Miami from Pierre-François. The Miami French events were most of them in celebration of the reenactment of our Pompidou American Foundation. We needed very strongly to start again this foundation, because even at the Centre Pompidou we could no longer afford anymore to buy American artists. And the effects have been quite good. And we are not dealing with only contemporary art, but also with modern art. Our budget hasn't improved for 10 years now, which, for the international situation right now, is almost nothing.

Saskia Bos: That's what I meant with the Stedelijk Museum. I think in Amsterdam it's exactly that same situation; it doesn't grow with the prices that grow everywhere. So that's a lost battle at the moment, unless you bring in patronage within the museum again. Do you have that at the Pompidou? Do you have private patronage to support works? Sometimes in Holland two museums now will buy one work. Two museums and they split it up. The Bill Viola installation was bought by two museums.

Catherine Grenier: It's very difficult. We did that twice and actually it's quite difficult. Because you are not the real owner, you are only a part owner.

Enrico Lunghi: The MUDAM also collaborates with the Centre Pompidou and other institutions to co-produce a piece by an artist. We have to share the production of big works because one museum cannot do it anymore.

Saskia Bos: With film, it's always been co-producing. This idea comes from film. But co-production doesn't even mean co-ownership; you still need to buy it.

---- LUNCH BREAK ----

Enrico Lunghi: I had the chance to work twice with a Canadian curator. I did a show in 1999 or 2000 with Marie-Josée Jean, who is a curator. We worked together on an international show. For the Casino, it's very important that we try to include Luxembourg artists, although again the number is limited, and then, we tend to include them only because they fit in the show. There is no pressure to show particularly Luxembourg artists. We had this pressure, but we said no, that's our option, we only show artists when they are interesting enough for us. And when I worked with Canadian curators, we did shows with Canadian contemporary artists. There were 6 or 7 artists from Canada and Quebec, but included in an international show. For us, it was important. Of course, it always depends - you have to meet people to work with them, because I don't like to look at a catalogue and say, "I want this one and this one." It's not because it's an artist that everybody talks about that I'm interested in working with him or her. I'm happy with others. Again, IKT is a good place to meet people. First, it's good to see old friends again, to exchange ideas and experiences with our members, but it's also very important to look at local scenes. Last year we were in Vaduz, on the border between Austria and Switzerland. Of course, some people know these places, but who goes to Vaduz. Going with IKT there, we got to know the people there, got to know that they are doing a really good job even if they are out of the mainstream. Because it's not so easy to go there, like it is to go to Paris or Berlin. The same goes for here in Montreal. It's a question of meeting people, and having the need or the pleasure to work with them. It's a very important part.

Chantal Pontbriand: If I may add to what you said, Enrico, I think developing social contacts and networks between curators and their counterparts in other countries is really the main issue. And it's also the main issue for artists. I don't think artists realize how important artist circuits can be, for introducing them to other artist circuits than local ones can be important for them, to help circulation internationally. Take the example of Jeff Wall. Jeff Wall was introduced in Europe through Dan Graham, which was the beginning of this whole incredible career that Jeff has had up until now. But he encouraged himself; he was not passive in this situation. He remains today a very active participant in the development of his own career. And when you look at most major artists, like Richard Serra, Matthew Barney, they're all incredible self-promoting individuals.

Pat Feheley: I think, whether you are an art dealer or an artist, that kind of networking is key. Simply put, whether you are a dealer or an artist, you need to get out there, and there are only so many ways to do it. Where does the interest come from? It's very much a circuit.

Jessica Bradley: I think artists that do show in international galleries are also our great resources. Most of the artists that I work with are born after 1970, and they are the generation that is out there a lot. 3 of them have lived part of the year in Berlin, as well as all of the other places where art is gathered. There, they meet artists, and those artists say, "What is going on in Canada?" Or they meet curators. I'd just like to add this to these layers and layers that we've talked about. One layer that didn't come up is residencies. Where do residencies fit into these layers, which help to create a market through contacts? When someone goes home, when someone meets a

curator there, that's something in terms of Canadian government support. What goes on with residencies here makes a huge difference; good residencies that people could apply to, that want to apply to, from the outside. Canada is not as uninteresting as our governmental and tourist image of it is, where actually 80% of the population lives in urban centres. And yes, we do have that nature brute and all of that, and that's wonderful. So why not do something with that? We all know artists who can take other artists on a northern canoe trip if that's what they're into.

Paul Petro: If we want to look at cultural tourism, we can take the Toronto Art Fair as an example. This is something that I would really like to see developed further. It's an opportunity for curators from elsewhere to come to Toronto, to see a big range of what's happening in Canada. And there's a new organizer for it now. It's also a great city, not only for curators but for collectors as well. It's a beautiful city to visit, with the hotels, the restaurants, the cultural life there, and then, the fair itself is set up quite well.

Chantal Pontbriand: Do they have a budget to invite collectors? For example, the Loop Videoart Fair in Barcelona, where you go often Pierre-François, has a budget to invite collectors.

Paul Petro: A small budget, but not like ARCO and others. It remains to be seen how the new organizers are going to approach this question.

Joyce Yahouda: The best example is Miami Basel, which brings 500 collectors and pays for everything, including the transport, etc. That's how good private funding works.

Jessica Bradley: They did their studies very well. They used to be Art Miami, and then began asking how to make this an important place to come, I mean, besides the beach. They were very smart in their research.

Jane Sadler: UBS gives money. It has a branch called Private Investment Banking, where they consult with their clients to buy artworks. So for them, when they pay for all of the expenses, they know they will manage their money eventually. It's a great marketing idea, and it brings more power into the market as well.

Pierre-François Ouellette: I'm wondering, since we have some curators around the table: how much do they enjoy being 'encadré' during their visits?

Saskia Bos: Curators are not 'encadré', collectors are 'encadré'. The landscape has changed already.

Enrico Lunghi: It's very seldom that you are invited as curators. It's very nice to be invited, because every curator has to survive as well, but because you are not invited you escape being 'encadré'. You escape the frames as much as possible.

Saskia Bos: You know what the best thing is, in answer to your question Pierre-François, the best thing is to get invited to a conference, where you do your thing and you're not bound by anything. And then at the same time you get the chance to see a lot of stuff.

Chantal Pontbriand: This is exactly what I told the Heritage Canada people, when we were talking about this meeting. I said, “You know, we cannot think that things really happen formally. Things really happen informally. Along the edges.”

Saskia Bos: Also, because there are no strings attached. You come for the conference and you are also in the middle of a very interesting landscape. Of course you’re going to look at it. But if you’re invited to do that only, and you don’t contribute yourself to anything, you feel ‘encadré’. That’s the difference. If you do something real, it feels more real.

Stephen Bulger: One thing I wanted to bring up is that it seems like there are some public institutions in Canada, like the Canadian Museum of Contemporary Photography, which has an exhibition policy running counter to opening up an international dialogue. That is, they’ll openly show an exhibit of work made by Canadians, and I think they have the largest acquisitions budget in Canada for Canadian contemporary photography, but their mandate is not to share that work with other institutions. I find that makes it very difficult to develop international partnerships, when you have a large collection like that, which just remains in Ottawa for the people in Ottawa.

Jessica Bradley: And the problem is bigger than that for the artists that they do show. Because when you have that mandate and the staff has been there a long time, what is their international knowledge? What is the measure of what they are showing? How do they introduce those artists to other ideas and other artists? So you’re absolutely right, that policy becomes a dead end. A lot of money going to a dead end.

Stephen Bulger: Well, it’s there to promote the acquisition of Canadian photography, which is a good idea. But then I think it just tends to ghettoize it.

André Laroche: That’s what we’ve been trying to do with our gallery, to initiate relationships that gradually interest ourselves in other people, so they will in turn be interested in what we do. And I think it’s the same for any practice, for any field of activity. You have to create human bonds, and that generates into a business relationship. You then take it from there. We feel like one of the too few who try to bring new ideas to the galleries, so that other artists can see, explore other venues, etc. I think that it’s going to take us to a new position.

Chantal Pontbriand: You’re part of what I call a new generation of galleries in Montreal - with Donald Browne, Pierre-François Ouellette who is still relatively new - I have observed a different way of looking at things, at art. Even Rhéal has initiated another way of doing things that did not exist in the city before. So there are new models that are emerging, different ways of organizing oneself, of promoting oneself here and elsewhere in the world. Why have you done this? Why is it this way?

Pierre-François Ouellette: When you talk to any dealer, from anywhere in the world, I don’t think their first concern is about the national identity of the artists. It’s about the quality of the work that is being presented. And I think that’s the goal: to present good artists, and good artists will speak in any language if they have something important to say. So I think that limiting ourselves to a local economy does a disservice to the artist. We should be out there. When you look at the quality of art

being produced in Canada, there should be more art stars. The question is how do you get these people to move on, and how do you get the networking going, so that they can be recognized. I think that the effort that we're all doing to present outside of Canada is one way. The same goes for the artist-run centres, the museums, the programs that are bringing people over to Canada, hoping that they cross paths, and hoping that more and more exchange will be made possible. When we raised the question about international artists here in Canada, we have to realize that because of the local economy, it is very difficult to promise those artists that they will be able to sell, or have an impact on their career, as they could have in New York or elsewhere. So we are at a fiscal disadvantage. André, you are trying very hard to bring some New York photographer in, whose prices start at 5 times what standard prices are here in Montreal. So you are fighting also to develop this savoir-vivre.

André Laroche: Yes, maybe we sell 30% in Montreal, but we just sold something to a Parisian couple that came to the gallery after going to the MAC. So you know, there's a real synergy, like a chain. I find that we can all hope to reach success with partners. It's a collaboration where you must choose the right collaborators, the right artists. There are many ingredients to the sauce. But I think to take off, we really need to open up and reach the next level; I feel we're ready as a culture to open up.

Jessica Bradley: I totally agree with you. It's only 3 years that I'm in the business, so even with everything I knew - and let me assure you, I went in with my eyes open - I'm doing all of that, in a small market, in this country. For example, you're going to have a really hard time collaborating with another gallery in Canada because they all are looking at the same market. I have clients in Vancouver, Montreal and Toronto. Leaving that aside, I do actually collaborate with a couple of galleries. New York becomes another problem. I have very good relations there, and I show at least one artist from New York, but then I have clients who never bother to look at anything in Toronto and go and buy that artist in New York. So let's not even open that can of worms. But it is also the reality, and I feel very strongly about it in my own way of looking at what I do now; I am absolutely still trying to have this mix. That's why I called my gallery Jessica Bradley Art and Projects, just to confuse everyone. I don't only have a roster of artists who I'm passionately committed to, but I'll do a project like the Michael Snow / Jonathan Monk project, because it was such an interesting thing to insert into that context. But with such a show you just cover the expenses and keep moving. It's not like you're going to sell \$50,000.

Joyce Yahouda: Just to add to what Pierre-François was saying: in my experience I have sometimes found very good artists that I would like to bring, but I have to promise to sell 25% or 30% of their work. And they tell me, "Why Montreal? Do you have that many clients there?" And many times I can't get the artists I would like to get. The galleries don't accept to give the artists without a guarantee that I can sell their work.

Pierre-François Ouellette: When we talk about art fairs, we also have to realize that the competition to get into art fairs is getting more and more difficult. You now have curators sitting on vetting committees. For example, every year before Volta and Basel I send an email out to my artists saying, "Do you know anyone who is on the committee?" Because if you just send in a dossier and they don't know who is sending it, this vetting committee will not even look at the dossier. They have 500 galleries

that they are looking at, with 5 slides each, and so they need name recognition. That is happening more and more. There is also an entrepreneurship now in the art fairs, and at art fairs everybody has advisors. Like Photo Miami, for example: they have 2 curators, one of whom is Canadian, so we've been lucky when presenting dossiers, because that curator knows our dossiers. There are a number of parallel secrets. We can dream as much as we want of going to the Armory Show. But we're not even talking about the financial aspect. Some of the strategies are getting to know the parallel fair system, which is an invitational art fair system. You cannot apply, but have to be known by certain people to get an invitation. Another aspect is trying to understand how the new economy of art fairs work, so we can bring people who have an influence, in order to make sure that we can get in if we want to get in. Because I believe strongly that all of the artists represented here by these ten gallery directors are excellent artists that merit international exposure. On top of this, we need editorial content, because if we don't have editorial content in the regional newspapers, in the art magazines, etc. we are not being read. So one question is: how do you get editorial content?

--- (end of recording: the following is based on my own notes)

Stephen Bulger: In terms of grants, the government privileges younger Canadian artists. This makes it more and more difficult for senior artists to get grants.

Pat Feheley: Another export priority must be helping galleries with publications.

Jessica Bradley: I have a question about advertising. How do you prioritize your money as a gallery? Do ads compare to attending fairs?

Susan Hobbs: I've been putting a full colour image in Artforum for 3 years now. As a result, I've had to drop all Canadian advertising. But there is a broader readership of Artforum; I would give up fairs before I would give up the magazine.

Catherine Grenier: In France, it is not about getting French artists or French curators in Germany, but the reverse: to get German curators, German artists and dealers to come to France and spend money there. I think another problem is that curators are yearning to travel, but there is no budget, even at Centre Pompidou. When you travel, you get to know artists, their milieu, etc. and that is valuable. I don't go to fairs. I went to Basel last year for one hour, only to meet people. It is not necessary for museums to go to fairs.

Enrico Lunghi: The American Art Foundation, for example, gives grants worldwide to young curators. They receive 10,000\$, no report required. There is need for time to speak with artists, not necessarily to invite them to do a show, but just to meet them. This is difficult to have, and art fairs are not the best place to do this kind of meeting. The situation is global, but also very circumscribed. It seems that nowadays a long-term focus, or long-term relations are not necessary. Visible results are desired, and events become very important.

Saskia Bos: There is the Mondrian Foundation in Holland, which has recently been trying to direct travel to new routes, such as Lebanon, China, etc. How in Canada can you take part in these travels? It is not only about Canadian art, however. There is a

need to be international, to have an interconnectedness. Canada has trouble with this kind of denationalizing. In France they understand that, and in Holland too.

Chantal Pontbriand: Canada is multicultural and open, yet at the same time very protective in relation to other countries. Part of it stems from an anti-American stance, which is especially economic. To give you an example: the magazine PARACHUTE could no longer get help from Heritage Canada because it addressed itself internationally. There is a fear in Canada of losing Canadian content. To receive funding, 80% of the content must be Canadian-authored.

Saskia Bos: This is overprotective!

Jane Sadler: But it is meant to protect Canadian authors.

Chantal Pontbriand: There is a certain attitude behind Canadian ways of functioning. In the 1960's and 1970's, Canada hosted more European artists than even New York City. It was very open to those artists at a time when no one was paying attention. The political system here needs change, and we are giving it reasons to.

Saskia Bos: It must be marketed differently.

Chantal Pontbriand: I am truly amazed at the result of this IKT conference here in Montreal, which is one of biggest IKT has ever had.