

most substantial, of course, being Internal Affairs. The discussion paper identified several weaknesses in the current situation: lack of coordination in arts and cultural activities, poor policy-advice flows, and a lack of coordinated advice to Government.²⁰ The paper drew attention to the Australian, Swedish, and Canadian models, in which one agency combined responsibility for arts, sport, and in a couple of cases the country's national library as well. In Canada, surveillance over Broadcasting was also included in the Ministry. Several countries also accommodated heritage and conservation matters under this one umbrella agency.

The responses in 1989 to the New Zealand discussion paper were interesting; perhaps 'distressing' would be a more accurate word. A few voices were heard in support of an umbrella Ministry, but only a handful took a broad view; most dealt, according to the analysts, with the 'specific needs of their own organisation'. The Hillary Commission wanted to stay outside the proposed Ministry, and Broadcasting adopted a 'feet off my grass' approach; the National Library and the New Zealand Library Association wanted the National Library outside the proposed Ministry, an opinion advanced also by the New Zealand Book Council. The Music Federation and the Auckland Philharmonia wanted a Ministry with a funding role only. There was an awful lot of what might be called a New Zealand disease: 'you-give-me-the-money-but-keep-at-arms'-length'.²¹ The exercise told us little more than that all change, however well-intentioned and however necessary, will always be opposed by existing bureaucracies who are uncertain about their role in any new dispensation, and are therefore reluctant to exercise their imaginations for the wider good.

Enthusiasm for the initial proposal waned. A Ministry of Cultural Affairs with a rather vague brief was established in 1991. The Symphony Orchestra, the Film Commission, and the Film Archive were brought under its aegis, and the Ministry was given an important role in the construction of the Museum of New Zealand. A structure with potential — but still rather empty in my view — now exists within which a comprehensive approach to arts and culture could be built. In 1991, however, the new Minister resiled from any comprehensive approach to arts and culture. What complicated matters, and almost certainly influenced him, was that, for the first time in New Zealand history, the Minister of Arts and the Minister of Internal Affairs — who by statute is Chairman of the New Zealand Lottery Board — were two different people. This separation has caused even more diffuse artistic links to develop; most importantly, there has been less access by those with an interest in culture to the honeypot that has drawn so many bees around it since Joe Heenan's time.

Some effort at reform persisted, however. A new review was announced in 1991 and a discussion paper released. This one focused only on the Queen Elizabeth the Second Arts Council. A new Act — the Arts Council of New Zealand Act — was finally passed in June 1994. It fined down the former structure. The Literary Fund was formally brought into the Arts Council (or Creative New Zealand, as someone curiously seems to have dubbed it recently). It has taken over responsibility for the