



DEPARTMENT FOR CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT

Government Response to the  
Culture, Media and Sport Select Committee  
Report on Theatre (HC 254-1)  
Session 2004-2005

*Presented to Parliament by the  
Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport  
by Command of Her Majesty  
July 2005*

**© Crown Copyright 2005**

The text in this document (excluding the Royal Arms and departmental logos) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium providing that it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the document specified.

Any enquiries relating to the copyright in this document should be addressed to The Licensing Division, HMSO, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich, NR3 1BQ. Fax: 01603 723000 or e-mail: [licensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:licensing@cabinet-office.x.gsi.gov.uk)

# GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO THE CULTURE, MEDIA AND SPORT SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT ON THEATRE (HC 254-1) SESSION 2004-05

## Introduction

The Government welcomes the Committee's Fifth Report, and is pleased to be able to present its response to the Committee, and outline how we intend to take action, where appropriate, on the recommendations made. Our response also outlines work that we are already doing in the areas highlighted by the report.

## Conclusions and Recommendations

- **(1) If a theatre, renovated and refurbished with the public's money to be fit for purpose for future generations, changes use then it should be axiomatic that the full amount of lottery money absorbed by that building is repaid. The conditions of this repayment must be set down in black and white so there can be no repetition of the Wembley Stadium 'handshake' debacle. In addition, we believe that if such a theatre is sold within 10 years of lottery-funded renovation then the Lottery should benefit to some degree. (Paragraph 25)**

1. The Government notes the support and interest of the Committee and many in the wider sector for the West End, and in particular the Committee's remark that it would be disappointing "not to receive an outline conclusion on the West End's request" as part of our response.

2. We recognise the unique role and value of the West End theatres in the country's cultural life. The West End contains over 40 theatres, the vast majority of which are owned and managed by commercial operators and do not, therefore, receive public subsidy. The Theatres' Trust report "Act Now!", published in 2003, highlighted the problems facing these theatres. The report estimated that £250 million would need to be spent on renovations to the West End theatres over the next 15 years to ensure that they continue to adapt to meet the needs of 21st century audiences.

3. The Government shares the concern of the Theatres' Trust, and others who gave evidence to the Committee, that this unique part of our cultural heritage and "substantial national asset" should not disappear due to neglect. To that end, DCMS has set up a Working Group to examine the issues and bring interested parties together.

4. The Working Group has met several times with interested parties to explore some of the issues raised by the *Act Now!* report and by the industry's subsequent proposals to set up a charitable trust to oversee any project work and ensure proper transparency and accountability.

5. We accept the Committee's recommendation that if a theatre renovated with public money changes use it should be axiomatic that the full amount of lottery money absorbed by that building should be repaid. We understand capital grant awards made by ACE are subject to a funding agreement. The agreement includes a condition that, if there is a failure to use the money for the purposes it was awarded then the grant is repayable. This requirement is a matter of contract and is applicable forever. The contract is also backed up with a charge which enables a swifter resolution than would be possible through the Courts. We would expect the same to be true of any funding that is received by the West End theatres, from any lottery source. We are pleased that the industry has already recognised that this should be the case and has agreed to take steps to safeguard any lottery investment. This will of course be "set down in black and white."

- **(2) The Office of Fair Trading recommended that theatre advertising be required: to include the face value of the ticket; to indicate that additional fees may apply and could vary depending upon the sales channel and ticket seller used; and to indicate where tickets could be purchased at face value. We agree. A complaisant theatre-going public has for too long accepted this blatant rip-off and it is time it was brought to an end. (Paragraph 29)**

6. We agree with the recommendations of both the Committee and the Office of Fair Trading, it is in the public interest and the interest of those in the industry to give consumers as much information as possible about the ticket they are buying in order to allow them to make an independent choice.

7. We also note the evidence given by the National Theatre and West End theatre groups. We accept that charges are often necessary to cover the costs of ticket sales operations and agree that without the additional capacity provided by these secondary sellers, there would be less access to theatre because fewer tickets would be available.

8. However, the Government is also concerned about the number of theatre tickets whose sale does not comply with current legislation. Ticket touting is an issue for theatre, the arts, sport and the creative industries. We have been, and will be, speaking to the major sporting and arts bodies to find out what the problems are and whether this warrants any further Government intervention.

- **(3) We recommend that the DCMS and the lottery distributors should give consideration to how the balance of benefits in that relationship might be shifted in favour of subsidised theatre as part of a deal with commercial operators over capital investment in infrastructure; extracting more ‘bang’ for public ‘bucks’ from commercial transfers of productions that originate in the subsidised theatre sector (with all the risks shouldered therein). (Paragraph 31)**

9. We agree that any public money invested in the West End must see continued and sustainable return for the public and the Working Party is looking into the ways we can best achieve this. While the Working Party is principally concerned with the future of the West End’s buildings, the Government is involved because of the enormous public benefit produced by the West End. This benefit is based not just on the heritage represented by the theatres or the economic impact of the West End on the national economy (although these are both important) but also on the artistic benefit of the West End to the industry and to the wider public. We will be working to ensure that all these benefits are maximised for the benefit of those working in the industry and the wider public.

10. We note the evidence from both the subsidised and commercial sectors which highlights the important role that can be played by the West End in transferring productions from the subsidised sector. These partnerships can originate solely in the subsidised sector, or can involve commercial producers in co productions. These interactions are mutually beneficial and provide benefits for theatre goers, who may have more opportunities to see a production because of these relationships.

11. We would also highlight the work of ACE in this area, and in particular, their publication “*Relationships between the subsidised and commercial sectors*” which provides advice and support for theatre producers entering into these types of arrangements.

- **(4) West End commercial theatre has made a case for public investment in its infrastructure but it has failed to back this up so far with a convincing commitment to accountability during the process nor a return for the wider public. This is not a good start. In addition, we believe that the ‘West End’ initiative needs to embrace the Old Vic (if another solution is not found for its maintenance issues) as this theatre fits the profile set out in the Act Now! report: namely that it is theatrically significant, it is not subsidised, it is in urgent need and it is a national treasure. (Paragraph 33)**

12. The West End's commercial theatre has made a strong case for public investment in its infrastructure through the Act Now report and subsequently. The West End has a powerful economic and artistic impact on the country as a whole, and people throughout the country, not just in London, benefit from this through touring productions, tourism, the additional investment in the sector and trips to the West End itself. We therefore feel that there is already a strong argument that the maintenance of the West End (as a whole) will be a return for the wider public, not just the operators and producers involved in the business of West End theatre.

13. We agree that there needs to be a commitment for accountability during the process. It is likely that some funding will come from lottery bodies, which will mean that any mechanisms through which the renovations will be funded will have to meet the same requirements for accountability and transparency as any other body or individual applying for lottery funding. The Working Group are happy that the industry recognises this need and will put in place the necessary measures.

14. We agree that the Old Vic is a "national treasure". It is also a member of the Society of London Theatre (SOLT) – one of the members of the Working Group. We understand that SOLT are currently talking to the Old Vic about their inclusion in the West End initiative and are happy for them to be included.

- **(5) We conclude that West End commercial theatre's most compelling arguments rest on grounds of heritage and economic impact. Therefore we believe that the Heritage Lottery Fund, the GLA and London Development Agency should be the major partners in responding to the West End's call. The Arts Council England should take a back seat, contributing to the structure of the funding package but reserving the bulk of its pressured capital resources for non-commercial theatre which itself has very pressing needs (Paragraph 34)**

15. While we agree that there are strong heritage and economic arguments for the maintenance of the West End, we would refute the idea that the artistic arguments are less important and should therefore "take a back seat". We note ACE's comments that they "welcomed" the opportunity to be involved in the work of the Working Group and we feel that this is right.

16. The Working Group have had two positive meetings with ACE and intend to follow these up with further meetings in the future.

17. In particular we note the concerns of Equity and others that the renovation of backstage areas in the West End was necessary to make them fit for purpose for actors in the twenty first century. We agree that this is an important issue where ACE have a significant interest and therefore it is right that they should continue to be involved in the discussions.

- **(6) We note the Arts Minister's valedictory remarks on this topic: "This is probably a bit demob happy, but I personally would be disappointed if the efforts we had put in to the West End Theatre forum came to naught, but I just do not know - the Lottery distributors have a lot of pressures on their resource." (Paragraph 35)**

18. All Lottery distributors make individual grant decisions independently of Government and it has always been the case that grants are awarded on a competitive basis, to the best applications. The ongoing success of the lottery in encouraging a greater number of applications for grants has increased pressure on distributors' resources. The outcome of the division of shares for the next licence period could affect the amounts available to individual distributors.

- **(7) We believe that new public amenities, such as libraries and theatres, are legitimate planning gains to which local authorities should aspire via Section 106 agreements. However, there was little evidence of this route having been used to develop new theatre buildings with the exception of Sir Peter Hall's new Rose of Kingston Theatre. We recommend that the DCMS, in cooperation with the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, make a report to Parliament on the use made of this legislative provision to secure arts and other cultural amenities to improve people's quality of life. (Paragraph 37)**

19. We note the evidence given to the Committee and in particular we recognise the important role that local authorities can play in safeguarding theatres and cultural buildings. We also note the important role played by the Theatres' Trust, one of the Department's advisory public bodies, who are a statutory consultee on all planning applications which could affect theatres.

20. We recognise the role that Section 106 agreements can play in securing arts and cultural amenities for local areas to improve the quality of life, and will be considering the impact of this legislation as part of the Regeneration Development Forum, which will be looking at a wide range of issues around culture and regeneration and how we can maximise the benefits of using culture in regeneration.

- **(8) We recommend that the Government announces the scale, shape and share of the distribution of National Lottery funds for good causes as soon as possible and certainly by the time a response to this Report is due. We recommend that the arts remain one of the good causes – believing there to be strong public support for this – and that the Arts Council remains a distributor of a significant size. (Paragraph 43)**

21. The Government is currently preparing to consult on the share of the distribution of National Lottery funds and will announce its decision on the shares for the good causes as a result of this.

22. The timescale for the announcement for the division of shares for the National Lottery from 2009 is as follows:

- Public Consultation – September 2005 to February 2006
- Analysis of consultation – February 2006
- Decision of shares for the good causes – June 2006

23. We have confirmed that the good causes will remain the same as at present. No other good causes will be added as part of this consultation and we do not propose any changes to distributors. The consultation and analysis will inform a decision on what percentage share each good cause will receive.

- **(9) The evidence presented to us suggests that now is the time for the Arts Council to re-focus its lottery capital programme towards the provision of assistance to publicly-funded, as well as not-for-profit, theatres for the maintenance of their buildings; consolidation is needed not further expansion. (Paragraph 50)**

24. All lottery decisions are made independently of Government and grants are awarded competitively to the best applications. While we note the evidence given to the Committee about the maintenance of theatres (including theatres in the amateur sector) these are issues for ACE. Lottery funding is available to all those who meet the criteria, regardless of whether they are in the subsidised or amateur sector.

- **(10) It is ten years since re-development of the RST was first conceived. It is high time the RSC took action before its lottery award is completely eroded by inflation. We trust that the Arts Council England will take all necessary steps to assay the robustness of the RSC's latest plan before handing over any funds. We shall follow progress with interest. (Paragraph 54)**

25. We agree that the RSC's capital project, as with all capital projects should be subject to scrutiny to ensure the proper use of necessary funds. While the Government has no power to intervene in the process of lottery funding, we have received assurances from ACE that appropriate steps have been taken, and will continue to be taken, to ensure the robustness of the RSC's plan.

26. We note ACE's assurances to the Committee that a thorough review process was undertaken before confirming the allocation. At present, the award agreement has not yet been issued. However, the application was assessed by a team of external assessors drawn together because of their individual expertise. The application was assessed against the eight Lottery criteria, which cover not just the proposed building but also all aspects of the organisation and how it will be affected by the capital project.

27. Although the project is still at quite an early stage, a Build Monitor has already been appointed to the project. He attends project meetings and reports to the Arts Council on a monthly basis in a standard format. Any problems raised can then be dealt with quickly. Other expert advice will be sought as and when appropriate. All designs and contracts are submitted to ACE for comment.

28. In common with all Arts Council capital projects, payment is only made on the recommendation of the Build Monitor, and against submitted certified invoices and/or architects' certificates.

- **(11) We believe that the overall case for substantial public investment in the theatre in this country is over-whelming and we note the evidence presented of high levels of support for this investment amongst the public. (Paragraph 65)**

29. We agree. The Select Committee's enquiry and the evidence it produced was a tribute to the vibrancy of theatre in this country. In 2003 25% of English adults attended a play or drama, and with the exception of film, theatre performances were the most commonly attended arts events in the country.

- **(12) We believe that the arms length principle of distributing grant-in-aid and Lottery resources to the arts is important as well as practical. Fortunately we see no prospect of the Government seeking to replicate the steps taken by the National Assembly for Wales. However, this does not absolve the Arts Council England from a duty to account for its policies and performance; and its responsibility to put forward a robust case when challenged constructively from whatever quarter. (Paragraph 67)**

30. We agree that the principle of distributing grant-in-aid and Lottery resources at arm's length from Government is important, both practically and in principle. The Government is able to provide a strategic direction and guidance for funding through our Funding Agreement and PSA targets and ACE has a responsibility to account for the policies it puts in place in light of these agreements.

31. We agree that ACE has a duty to account for its policies and performance, not just to Parliament, but also to its customers and to the wider public. ACE has recognised this duty to accountability and since restructuring they have endeavoured to make their procedures as open and transparent as possible. They have already made changes to ensure that more guidance and advice is provided to applicants and this process is currently under review as part of ongoing research. ACE are committed to seeking and responding to feedback from clients as part of this research.

32. ACE also welcomes the opportunity to discuss its policies and performance with any interested party. They evaluate their policies and gather evidence to show what has been delivered through them and expect to share this and draw on it in making the case for the arts and generating wider debate.

- **(13) We share the concern expressed by the Independent Theatre Council, and by some of the theatres who gave evidence to us, that the Arts Council seems to be entrenched in its existing funding programme. We believe that a more dynamic approach is needed in rewarding new entrants, and existing theatre groups, who have innovative ideas while being far more critical of those recipients of funding who have failed to develop their original potential or to fulfil their commitments (Paragraph 75)**

33. While we recognise the importance of the arm's length principle, which means that Government should never attempt to intervene in individual funding decisions, we recognise the concerns of the Committee and those who gave evidence that ACE needs to maintain a dynamic approach to its funding programme to reward and maintain success while being able to provide support for new organisations.

34. The additional funding received as a result of the 2001 Theatre Review meant that the theatre portfolio could be expanded. 36 organisations were brought onto the RFO portfolio in London – including 10 venues receiving 3 year funding for artistic programming, and 18 companies who received substantial core funding.

35. ACE's recent three year funding announcement demonstrates how seriously they take this responsibility to continue to maintain and refresh their portfolio. ACE now has a robust process for reviewing their portfolio of Regularly Funded Organisations (RFOs) across the system which they are now putting in to practise and have a clearer vision of where they think the arts should be in the future.

36 The recent announcement of the RFO portfolio for 2005/06 – 07/08 has seen over 40 new theatre organisations brought into the RFO portfolio despite a 7% fall in the number of theatre RFOs. This means that new theatre RFOs make up nearly 20% of the theatre portfolio – well over 10% of the entire RFO portfolio.

- **(14) We were concerned at evidence that government at national, regional or local level, had not done any serious work to assess the real economic impacts of such investments. Funding is a major problem for theatres, and other arts bodies, and the economic regeneration argument is a very strong one in securing increased investment in the arts as the examples given above show. However, very little work seems to have been accomplished to produce the hard facts necessary to reinforce this case. We note some moves towards recognition of the unique contribution of arts investment to revitalising urban communities as part of what DCMS calls its “culture and regeneration agenda”. We recommend that the Department commissions a study of progress with this agenda so far and reports to Parliament on the potential for further benefits from a far more strategic approach to investing in the arts infrastructure as a catalyst for urban regeneration. (Paragraph 82)**



37. As previously noted, the DCMS is setting up a Development Forum to take forward the findings of the “Culture at the Heart of Regeneration” consultation. One of the undertakings from that process was to strengthen the evidence base for the tangible benefits of including culture in the regeneration process, and this will have particular relevance for the new Growth Areas and Market Renewal Areas.

- **(15) It is a scandal that one of the nation’s key cultural activities is in such a state that, at least in part, it relies on professional performers and technicians to pay such a high price by earning such low wages. It is a tribute to the power of theatre that so many of them will do so, but we believe that drama colleges and theatre companies should make a concerted effort to improve financial support and advice for actors and backstage staff alike. (Paragraph 86)**

38. We recognise the extraordinary commitment and capacity of those working in the theatre industry to accept low wages in order to pursue their careers. We agree this is no way to develop theatre as a viable career choice for future generations and we note the commitment of Equity and others to improving the situation for performers and those working in the industry. In particular, we note the continuing support that Equity provides to performers, including providing a range of financial, legal and welfare support.

39. Government has no direct control over the wages that the industry pays its staff but through the extra investment secured as a result of the Theatre Review and the 2002 Spending Review, conditions and rates of pay for the industry are beginning to improve.

40. Recent research from Equity shows that wages for performers working in subsidised repertory theatre have increased by an average of 12% between 2001/02 and 2003/04. The number of weeks being worked by a performer has also increased, by as much as 19.3% in the largest theatres. The increase in work and wages has been calculated by Equity to mean that the amount spent on actor pay has increased by 38% in two years.

- **(16) We believe that, as in sport, consideration should be given to the public policy gains that can be demonstrated as a result of participation in drama and a strategic approach to the funding of grassroots, or community, theatre should be developed. This should take place as a partnership between the sector, Arts Council England, regional theatres, local government and schools. As a first step, proposals for a National Drama Association – with public funding – to bring the amateur sector together should be properly formulated and given serious consideration. A further initiative might be the development of local arts forums, including theatre and amateur theatre, aimed at maximising the use of local arts expertise and facilities for the benefit of the community. (Paragraph 91)**

41. We note the evidence given to the Committee by the voluntary drama sector and recognise the importance of the voluntary sector as a whole. The Government is committed to working with the voluntary sector, and harnessing the expertise and skills they have, to create stronger and healthier communities.

42. HM Treasury published a Cross Cutting Review (CCR) in 2002 setting out our commitment to working with the voluntary sector. *The Role of the Voluntary and Community Sector in Service Delivery* recommended the need for improved partnership working between government departments and the VCS, along with increased awareness and implementation of the Government’s Compact (which sets out a framework for partnership working between the Government and the voluntary and community sector).

43. As part of our response to the Cross Cutting Review we have recently undertaken a consultation on “A Giving Culture: Getting the best out of the relationship between the VCS and DCMS”, which provides a strategic overview of the engagement of the VCS with DCMS and how this can be maximised in the future.

44. We note the work of the large amateur drama organisations and their proposals for a National Drama Association and we understand that they have recently commissioned some research into the likely organisation and scope of such an association. While any decision about public funding would be made by ACE, we understand that they currently play a role in facilitating a relationship with the sector and are engaging with the sector’s current research into the possible scope and role of a National Drama Association. We understand that this is an ongoing relationship for ACE with the amateur sector and that dialogue will continue once they have seen the research that has been commissioned.

45 We note the Committee’s interest in the possibility of setting up local arts forums. While this is an issue for individual local authorities we understand from the sector that these can be successful where there is commitment from a local authority to pursue a local arts agenda with the voluntary sector.

- **(17) Mr Hytner said: “We did not expect or feel we deserved a huge raise. I think we were disappointed that a commitment was not made to keep us up with inflation ... cash standstill is effectively a cut. And a cut seems to us to be a mistake.” We agree. (Paragraph 103)**

46. While it is acknowledged that SR04 represented a tough settlement for the arts, it must be noted that funding for the arts from 1997 to 2004/5 shows an increase of over 60% in real terms. There is a further increase of 12% between 2004/5 and 2005/6. By allowing the Arts Council increased flexibility in budget setting and removing some ring-fencing of funds, the DCMS has enabled them to give above inflation increases to some of their regularly funded organisations, and inflationary increases to the majority of them, including the National Theatre.

- **(18) Given the announcement of an overall funding cut in real terms, the Government and the Arts Council need a far more effective communications strategy if avoidable anxieties are not to be raised within particular art forms. (Paragraph 105)**

47. We agree that it is neither helpful to arts organisations nor beneficial to public perceptions of the arts if anxieties are raised within any artforms. However, it should be noted that the media was more interested in early reports of funding cuts than in reporting the measured and flexible way in which the Arts Council and DCMS worked together to ensure that the majority of arts organisations did not experience a cut in real terms. We will endeavour to develop more robust communication strategies for future Spending Reviews.

- **(19) Sustainable efficiency savings by public bodies must always be sought with vigour. However, it seems invidious for the DCMS to press the Arts Council for such savings on the grounds that the money saved can then to go direct to the arts; only to reduce the Council’s grant-in-aid by roughly the same amount a couple of years later. No matter what the allocation to specific art forms, the Arts Council’s efforts to increase efficiency have been rewarded with an equivalent real terms cut in baseline funding. (Paragraph 110)**

48. The Government grant to the Arts Council has increased by 69% in real terms between 1997/98 and the 2005/06 level of £412m, which will be sustained over the 2004 spending review period.

49. DCMS worked hard to achieve this level of funding in a very tight spending review.

50. It should be recognised that the Arts Council's efficiency savings are part of the wider cross-Governmental Efficiency Programme. The Programme includes all Government Bodies and aims to make savings of over £20bn in 2007/08, which will be released to front-line services.

51. As a part of the Gershon review, DCMS is required to make efficiency savings amounting to £262m by 2007/08. As c.95% of DCMS' budget goes out to other bodies, the Arts Council – and other NDPBs – have been asked to make efficiency savings to contribute to the Department targets. The Programme aims to make organisations and processes leaner and fitter for purpose - diverting money away from the back office and putting it into front-line delivery. All efficiency savings will be retained by the Arts Council to be recycled into front-line delivery, such as increased grants to their portfolio of Regularly Funded Organisations.

52. We are confident that we can work with the Arts Council in order for them to continue to deliver world class arts provision within their existing budgets.

- **(20) Theatre is important to the economic life of the country and generates a significant return for the Exchequer as well as showcasing the UK to the world. The commercial theatre sector often rests on work that originates, is developed, tested and proven within the subsidised sector. (Paragraph 112)**

53. We agree. It is clear that both the subsidised and commercial theatre sectors are important to the economic life of the UK. As the Arts Council's Economic Impact Study of Theatre has shown, theatre can have a significant impact on both the local and the national economy by generating economic activity.

54. We also recognise, and note the role of theatre in showcasing the UK's creative industries to the rest of the world. This does not just mean the impact of theatre (and particularly London's West End) on tourism, but also the well documented success of some of the UK's theatrical exports, which includes the work of our national and regional companies, as well as the West End productions that London has become famous for.

55. We note the evidence from the Committee that work in the commercial sector often originates or is developed in the subsidised sector. We recognise the symbiotic relationship between the commercial and subsidised sectors, not only for the development of work but also for the training and experience of many of the actors, directors, writers and technical staff that are vital to the existence and health of the industry as a whole.

56. However, this represents a small measure of the economic impact that theatre may have. We need a real understanding of creativity and the creative industries if we are to really harness their economic power and use them to enhance the UK's competitive edge. We are starting to make inroads into this area. Sir George Cox is currently leading a DTI sponsored investigation about the ways that creativity can improve the productivity of small and medium sized businesses and James Purnell, the Minister for the Creative Industries recently launched a debate about how Britain can become the world's creative hub – using our demonstrable successes in the creative industries (which of course include the arts) to our competitive advantage.

- **(21) The investment made since 2002 – and the resulting virtuous circle of better productions and bigger audiences – needs to be protected and built upon. A policy of stop-go-stop, eschewed by the Treasury in macro-economic terms of 'boom and bust', is not a prudent approach to the long term investment in the arts to which the Government claims to be committed. (Paragraph 113)**

57. As previously noted, the flexibility allowed to the Arts Council in its budgeting arrangements has resulted in the majority of its portfolio of organisations receiving inflationary or above inflationary increases over the period of the Spending Review 2004. However, it is recognised that this is not sustainable without increased investment. In advance of SR06, we will be working closely with the Arts Council and the broader cultural sector to develop coherent arguments for the value of arts, for the public value that they deliver and for the benefits that accrue and multiply as a result of a relatively modest amount of subsidy.

- **(22) The Government needs to re-evaluate its allocation of resources to the arts, taking a long term view, to ensure that real terms cuts are avoided where no compelling arguments or evidence are presented for their necessity. In our view no such arguments have been made. The Government should re-consider and find the £34 million needed to keep the Arts Council's funding in line with inflation over the period of the 2004 spending settlement. (Paragraph 114)**

58. The DCMS was disappointed at being unable to increase its year-on-year allocations to the arts, but pleased that all but a few arts organisations were given an inflationary increase. It also welcomes the additional funds that were made available to the arts through the Chancellor's budget announcement of the Cultural Leadership Fund (£12m), through the Department's Quality and Innovation Fund (£6m) and through the Treasury's Invest to Save budget.









Published by TSO (The Stationery Office) and available from:

**Online**

[www.tso.co.uk/bookshop](http://www.tso.co.uk/bookshop)

**Mail, Telephone, Fax & E-mail**

TSO

PO Box 29, Norwich NR3 1GN

Telephone orders/General enquiries: 0870 600 5522

Order through the Parliamentary Hotline Lo-call 0845 7 023474

Fax orders: 0870 600 5533

E-mail: [book.orders@tso.co.uk](mailto:book.orders@tso.co.uk)

Textphone 0870 240 3701

**TSO Shops**

123 Kingsway, London WC2B 6PQ

020 7242 6393 Fax 020 7242 6394

68-69 Bull Street, Birmingham B4 6AD

0121 236 9696 Fax 0121 236 9699

9-21 Princess Street, Manchester M60 8AS

0161 834 7201 Fax 0161 833 0634

16 Arthur Street, Belfast BT1 4GD

028 9023 8451 Fax 028 9023 5401

18-19 High Street, Cardiff CF10 1PT

029 2039 5548 Fax 029 2038 4347

71 Lothian Road, Edinburgh EH3 9AZ

0870 606 5566 Fax 0870 606 5588

**TSO Accredited Agents**

(See Yellow Pages)

*and through good booksellers*

ISBN 0-10-166442-7



9 780101 664424