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CHAPTER I

THE ORIGINS OF THE OTAGO MUSEUM

When measured against the antiquity of many civilisations, the museum movement is a comparatively recent development; yet museums are today an accepted part of the cultural life of most communities. They are of widely differing character and serve a great variety of purposes. Nearly all nations have their own national museums which, in most instances, are supplemented in the provincial centres by museums of a rather more local character. A great many of these museums have, as their basis, a general display ranging over a very wide and varied field; others are noted for their specialisation in one restricted field only. Many have been founded consequent upon the presentation to a nation of large private collections; some have been founded as a direct result of the desire to keep together displays which have been mounted at industrial exhibitions staged at various times in a great many corners of the globe. Yet, despite the wide variety and nature of these museums they all have one thing in common - they provide a repository and exhibition centre for interesting and valuable material illustrating the antiquities, natural history, social history, art and material culture of an immense number of past and present civilisations.
The collecting habit was well established in the British Isles by the time New Zealand's first colonies were established. There were, thus, among the original colonists, a number of people interested in science who looked with favour on any proposal to establish museums in the new country, not only as repositories for material brought from the old country, but also to preserve Maori material culture, the artefacts of which were then readily obtainable. The origins of the Nelson Museum can, in fact, be traced back to a decision made on board ship during the voyage to New Zealand in 1841. Individuals, too, played their part. In the New Plymouth Colony William Devenish, who arrived in 1841 and took up land under Spain's Award, developed an interest in collecting Maori artefacts after discovering two hinuau pounders, one complete, the other damaged, while tilling his land. These he later presented to the New Plymouth Mechanics' Institute and they now form part of the collections in the New Plymouth Museum. Further south F.B.D. Mantell, Commissioner for the Extinguishment of Native Titles in the South Island and later Commissioner for Crown Lands for Otago, was the first European to open a Moa-hunter site systematically, at Awamoa in 1848. His collections are now in the Auckland Museum.

2. Dr. H.D. Skinner's grandfather.
The promotion of education was an intimate part of the scheme upon which the Otago settlement was founded and specific provision was made in the scheme for "religious ordinances, schools and a college." Though not specifically mentioned, it seems probable that the first settlers brought with them the desire to establish a museum to complement these plans. The idea was certainly present a little over three years later when, in June 1851, the Dunedin Mechanics' Institute, "the most important of several movements," was founded. Included on its committee were the Rev. Thomas Burns, John McGlashan, James Macandrew and Captain William Gargill, all of whom played a large part in the development of education in the early days of the colony. The Institute's stated objectives were the promotion of public lectures and classes covering a wide range of subjects and the provision of a library, reading room and a museum. Commenting on the Institute's formation, the Otago Witness said, "We know of few things which, if properly carried out, is (sic) more likely to be beneficial to the community; affording to all, and especially to young men, a place of resort, and innocent and intellectual recreation after their daily engagement."

2. Dunedin Athenaeum and Mechanics' Institution, Minute Book, Vol 1, 13 May 1859 'Preamble'.
3. T.M. Hocken, Contributions to the Early History of New Zealand (Otago), p.130.
4. O.W., 5 Jul 1851.
5. Ibid.
Although lectures were delivered fairly regularly during the winter months of each year, the Institute itself languished until, in 1859, it was superseded by the present Athenaeum and Mechanics' Institute, a society with objectives which differed little from those of its predecessor.¹

Until the 1860's the whole concept of a museum for Dunedin was rather nebulous. In January 1862, however, W. Lauder Lindsay, an eminent Scottish botanist who was then visiting the colony, lectured to the Y.M.C.A. on 'The Place and Power of Natural History in Colonisation,'² an address which, while probably no more than a concrete expression of an attitude already in the minds of many settlers, did undoubtedly stimulate and crystallise opinion, both public and private. Lindsay regarded a museum of local or provincial natural history as the cheapest way of making natural sciences available to the general public. Little trouble and little cost would be incurred, he said, if such a museum contained as its nucleus "a collection of rocks, minerals, plants and animals of Otago."³ He claimed that during his time in Otago he had met many people who favoured the establishment of a provincial museum, provided proper management...

¹ Otago Colonist, 8 Oct 1858 and 15 Oct 1858; Athenaeum Minutes, Vol 1, 13 May 1859
³ Ibid, p. 20
of the institution could be guaranteed. Most colonists, however, were of the opinion that such a museum should be established and maintained by the Provincial Government, but felt that it was not likely to take the initiative. "A museum," said Lindsay, "may appear to many of you a formidable undertaking and one that may well be delayed while so many institutions of more immediate importance must be established."¹ He argued, however, that since a museum was as much an educational institution as were the schools of the Province, the colonists should pursue the matter themselves, regardless of any assistance which might or might not be forthcoming from the Government. While stressing the necessity of a competent curator to organise such a museum, he commented that, "Dr. Hector's presence might legitimately be taken advantage of in establishing the nucleus of the mineralogical and geological sections of the Provincial Museum."²

Towards the end of 1861, the Otago Province was being swept along on the crest of the gold rushes which had, virtually overnight, transformed a tiny sluggish township into a thriving, prosperous and rapidly expanding community. At the time of Gabriel Read's discovery, the Provincial Government was considering the appointment of a trained geologist to undertake a survey of the mineral resources of the Province.³ Read's find gave final proof of the

¹ Ibid.
² Ibid., p.26. John McGlashan had already urged this in a letter published in the Otago Colonist on 18 Oct 1861 — see Appendix A.
³ OPC., VP., Sess. XII, 19 Jun 1861.
desirability of such an appointment and, in November 1861, the Government decided in favour of Dr. James Hector, a man of considerable and varied talents who had recently completed over three years of exploration and survey in British Columbia. As part of his contract, Hector was to "furnish at the completion of the survey specimens of all minerals descriptive of the results of the investigation...of the mineralogical formation of the province."1 This, coupled with the instruction to purchase a set of typical mineral specimens before leaving London, clearly indicates that the Provincial Government's intention was not to provide a nucleus for a provincial museum, but rather to establish a more specialised geological and mineralogical museum for the benefit of miners and others requiring such information.2 This intention was reinforced in 1865 by Superintendent J. Hyde Harris who, while expressing a desire to see the collections retained "in the Province as provincial property,"3 wrote that Hector's survey and collection would "form an important part of the Geological Survey of New Zealand."4

Hector commenced his survey in April 1862, soon after his arrival in the colony, and after a mere five months was able to report that "the accumulation of minerals, rocks and

3. OPC, Corres. 4268. Harris to Colonial Secretary, 15 Mar 1865
4. Ibid.
fossils, has already reached over 500 specimens so that the nucleus (sic) of a collection for a museum is rapidly forming.\(^1\) By this time he had begun to see the possibilities of enlarging and broadening the Provincial Government's proposals and of founding a museum which was truly representative of the natural history of the Province. After urging the Government to interest itself in the flora and fauna of the Province, the Report continued,

"Were there a proper place for its display, and a person appointed whose time might be wholly devoted to the management and arrangement of such a collection, I feel sure that valuable and interesting local specimens would be contributed by many in the Province, while I have the promise of liberal contributions and exchange of New Zealand specimens from collectors at home."\(^2\)

This plea and, perhaps, the display of his collections at the small Exhibition held in Dunedin in December 1862 stirred the conscience of the Government into granting £400 for the construction of a temporary museum to be attached to the Geological Department.\(^3\) Little, if any, positive move towards its erection seems to have been made, however, for

\(^{2}\) \textit{Ibid.}
\(^{3}\) \textit{Ibid.}, p.51
in his Geological Survey Report, forwarded to the Provincial Council in April 1864, Hector observed that,

"although as yet, no accommodation has been provided for the arrangement and display of specimens, a varied collection has been accumulated and roughly catalogued in connection with the Geological survey of the Province, and it is greatly to be desired that a properly furnished Museum be speedily erected for their reception. ...... At present they are lodged in one of the Barrack Rooms, and are not only difficult of access for the purpose of reference ...... but are also liable to damage. The erection of cases has, however, been commenced and by the time a proper building can be supplied there will be a well-arranged though small collection to occupy it." ¹

The 'small collection' now totalled 2375 of which over 2000 had derived from Otago. In addition Hector recorded that Buchanan, a botanist on his staff, had developed a collection representative of Otago's flora totalling some 4500 specimens, a set of 650 being retained for the museum, while the rest were forwarded to Sir Joseph Hooker, the eminent botanist, for more detailed study.

About the middle of 1863, a small Industrial Exhibition was held in connection with an Anglican Church bazaar and met with conspicuous success. Soon afterwards, the Central Government acceded to the proposals of a group of Dunedin business men led by Dr. Alfred Eccles and appointed 15

1. OPC, W, Sess.XVIII, pp. 92 -6. 'Geological Survey Report.'
Commissioners to organise and hold a New Zealand Exhibition, the first of its kind in the colonies, in Dunedin towards the end of 1864. The Commissioners - Major J.L.C. Richardson, Thomas Dick, T.B. Gillies, J. Paterson, E.B. Cargill, W. Mason, R.B. Martin, James Rattray, R. Clapcott, R.S. Cantrell, Julius Vogel, J. Cargill, W.H. Reynolds, Hector and Eccles - were all very prominent men, both in Otago and in New Zealand political and business circles and they sought to promote interest in New Zealand by exhibiting manufactures, minerals and other articles representative of the colony's resources and industries. Exhibits were sought, also, from other parts of the Empire and much interest was added to the Exhibition by such notable stands as the collection of aboriginal weapons sent by the Australian colonies, the display of raw products, fibres and woods, paper, teas, brassware, textile manufactures and photographs and drawings representative of the material culture of India and supplied by the Indian Department of the Imperial Government; and a collection of minerals and floral specimens from Ireland and Northern Europe forwarded by Lauder Lindsay "first for exhibition and 2ndly for any permanent museum in Otago."

The Exhibition was eventually opened to the public on 12 January 1865 in a building built specially for the purpose and situated fronting Great King Street between Fredrick and Hanover Streets, and during the next four months it was visited by more than 30,000 people. Naturally the Otago

---

1. Minute Book of Exhibition Commissioners, Vol I, 22 Jun 1864
stand was by far the largest and formed a focal point for the great majority of visitors. Central to this display was Hector's collection which now consisted of over 5000 items. "There is no department of the Exhibition," said the Otago Daily Times commenting on the geological display, "which is more thoroughly arranged or which is calculated to afford more pleasurable instruction." When, finally, the Commissioners closed the Exhibition doors for the last time, the Otago Daily Times probably voiced the sentiments of the great bulk of Dunedin's inhabitants when it expressed profound regret at the imminent dispersal of the exhibits.

The disposal of the displays following the closing of the Exhibition was the subject of rather complicated and protracted negotiations. From the outset the Commissioners, despite their strong Otago affiliations, favoured the establishment of a permanent colonial museum in London in order to advertise New Zealand as well as illustrate its resources. True, towards the end of the Exhibition, Vogel

1. 13 Feb 1865.
2. 6 May 1865
3. Minutes of Exhibition Commissioners, Vol. I, 21 Sept 1863 and 23 Nov 1864. On 1 Dec 1864 the O.D.T. reported that Eccles had written to the Colonial Secretary stressing the importance of a Colonial Museum in London and requesting that an appropriation of £3000 be set aside to purchase exhibits for this purpose at the close of the Exhibition - the Colonial Secretary replied that the Government "was not in a position to vote a sum for the purchase of specimens for a Colonial Museum in London."
did, rather belatedly, attempt to persuade the Commissioners to recommend that the Otago Provincial Government should secure specimens and other material on display, "to form the nucleus of a museum."¹ Hector however, who had by this time been appointed by the Central Government to undertake a geological survey of the whole of New Zealand, strongly opposed Vogel's motion by arguing that,

"at present the General Government alone were (sic) prepared to secure exhibits which it might be desirable to secure for a Colonial Museum and in the event of dividing such exhibits by the Provincial Government also becoming a purchaser there would be an impediment to the completion of the Geological survey of New Zealand which had been commenced and which must be (completed ?) in New Zealand. At present they were only at the threshold of information and it was necessary to have the most complete collection of specimens, fossils etc., in one place."²

Clearly, Hector's primary concern was to complete the geological survey of the whole colony and, in order to do this properly, he considered it necessary to take with him to Wellington at least the geological specimens already collected by his Department. Hector's arguments confirmed the Commissioners in their opinion and Vogel's motion was withdrawn.

Hector had, in fact, already suggested to the Provincial Government that the collection remain under his control, at

1. Ibid., Vol II, 26 Apr 1865.
2. Ibid.
least until his Department had completed classifying the specimens\(^1\) and, for their part, the Superintendent and Provincial Executive, realizing that Hector's collection would "form an important part of the Geological Survey of New Zealand,"\(^2\) were prepared to accede to the request. In a letter to the Colonial Secretary, however, Harris pointed out that since Otago had already taken the initiative in undertaking a geological survey of its resources, the Central Government should either reimburse it for moneys already expended or, alternatively, exempt it from the payment of any contribution towards the surveys to be undertaken in other parts of the colony. At the same time, he expressed the opinion that Hector's "extensive and valuable" collections should remain in the Province as provincial property.\(^3\) In reply, Weld, the Premier and Colonial Secretary, stated that the Central Government would willingly place Hector's collections in the Colonial Museum currently being established in Wellington, but could not oppose their retention by the Otago Province if this was the wish of the Council. He did suggest that duplicate specimens might be passed over to the Colonial Museum, a step which would assist the advancement of the New Zealand survey. On the major point at issue however,

\[\begin{align*}
1. & \text{OPC, Corres. 4268. Hector to Provincial Secretary,} \\
& \text{7 Mar 1865} \\
2. & \text{Ibid., Harris to Colonial Secretary, 15 Mar 1865} \\
3. & \text{Ibid.}
\end{align*}\]
the Central Government refused to countenance any suggestion that it should compensate the Otago Provincial Government for its already partially completed survey, either by reimbursement or exemption from future costs.\(^1\) As a result, Harris refused to co-operate with the Central Government. In a letter to Major Richardson, then Postmaster-General in the Weld Government, the attitude of the Provincial Government was made abundantly clear:

"The footing upon which the General Government propose to place the Geological Department is not considered by the Provincial Government to be equitable to this Province. I cannot therefore feel it to be my duty at present to concede the request of the Colonial Secretary to divide a valuable property which has been acquired by the Province at a considerable cost towards which the General Government decline to contribute."\(^2\)

Thus, rather fortuitously perhaps, Hector's collection remained in Otago and was later to form one of the bases of the Otago Provincial Museum.

Throughout the whole period of the disposal of the collections, the Provincial Council showed a marked reluctance to take any initiative in acquiring exhibits which might be used as the nucleus of a provincial museum.

---

1. \textit{Ibid.}, Weld to Harris, 29 Mar 1865.
2. \textit{Ibid.}, Harris to Richardson, 25 April 1865.
Possibly the fear of over-committing itself financially at a time when revenue from the goldfields was declining and the future was uncertain was responsible for this reluctance which materially inhibited the acquisition of exhibits. The fate of the Indian collection will suffice to illustrate this point. The specimens had been given, "in the hope that, as one of the results of the forthcoming Exhibition, they may assist to form the nucleus of a local museum if such does not already exist."¹ Clearly, the intention was that they were to be presented at the conclusion of the Exhibition to a New Zealand Colonial Museum or, if such a museum did not currently exist, to assist in its foundation, and from the outset, this was the interpretation placed on the communication by the Commissioners.² Nevertheless, when the disposal of the collection was considered, the Commissioners deferred a request from the Colonial Secretary to forward it to the Colonial Museum in Wellington, "to see what may be done towards a museum in Otago."³ They were in fact, now prepared to present the various collections (including the Indian display) at their disposal to the Otago Province for inclusion in a Provincial Museum, on the condition that a guarantee was given to them that they would be housed in a "proper building", access to which should be freely available.

¹. O.D.T., 23 Nov 1864.
². Minutes of Exhibition Commissioners, Vol I, 18 Nov 1864.
to the public. 1 When, at their next meeting, the Commissioners were informed that the Provincial Government had no funds available to erect "a building of any description" and were therefore prepared to accept the Commissioners' offer only if there were no conditions attached, the latter resolved, "that the Indian collection and all exhibits the property of the Commissioners... be presented to the New Zealand Museum and that the goods be immediately packed up." 2 Individual Provincial Executive and Council members may well have favoured the establishment of a provincial museum but collectively they were not prepared, as Lindsey had observed nearly four years before, "to take the initiative." 3

It was left to the Otago Local Committee of the New Zealand Exhibition to acquire such collections as they could at the end of the Exhibition and bring pressure to bear on the Provincial Executive to take those steps necessary to preserve and store the acquisitions until the time arrived when a museum could be established on a solid foundation.

Soon after the Central Government had appointed the Commission to organise the Exhibition, Local Committees, supplemented by smaller District Committees, were established in every Province. In Otago, a huge Local Committee of 85 was set up 4 (to which others, totalling

1. Ibid, 9 Aug 1865.
2. Ibid, 7 Sept 1865.
3. See above, pp. 4 - 5.
52 in all, were subsequently added), although attendance at the weekly meetings seldom exceeded twelve or fourteen stalwarts, the most notable of whom were Drs. Fredrick Hall Richardson (Chairman), E.W. Alexander and E. Hulme, and Messrs J.S. Webb (Secretary) and Arthur Beverly (Treasurer). Their function was to organise and arrange the exhibits of the Otago Bay, a task which, according to newspaper reports, was very successfully accomplished.

Long before the Exhibition opened, the question of the ultimate disposal of the exhibits exercised the minds of the Committee and, following the receipt of a letter from the Manuherakiha District Committee inquiring about this matter, the following policy-formulating resolution, moved by Webb, was adopted:

"That it is expected that all models and articles of a similar character which may be exhibited by District Committees, the cost of which has been defrayed out of public subscriptions and subsidies from the funds of this Committee, remain at the disposal of this Committee at the close of the Exhibition, to be appropriated towards the foundation of a Provincial Museum."  

Three days after the Exhibition was closed, the Otago Local Committee was called together to deal with several matters of which "the most important will be the project of a permanent Provincial Museum." At this meeting Webb and Beverly were appointed trustees for all property belonging to the Local

1. O.D.T., 13 Feb 1865.
3. Ibid, 8 May 1865.
Committee, "which is intended to form part of the contemplated Provincial Museum."¹ Almost immediately these two set about trying to persuade the Provincial Government to appoint a small group of men to act as trustees in order that the current situation might be advantageously exploited. In a letter to Superintendent Harris² urging that such a body be established, Beverly and Webb listed three groups of collections still awaiting final disposal, namely Hector's geological collection, the Indian collection and objects currently in the hands of the Otago Local Committee but which were to be handed over as soon as "the contemplated museum" was established. After stressing the fact that conditional promises of large additions to the collections had been made subject to guarantees for their storage and display, a situation which, in their opinion, underlined the necessity for the immediate organisation of a museum, the letter continued,

"We are under the impression that the inability of the Government to make a suitable financial provision for the formation and maintenance of the museum has hitherto prevented your House from moving in this matter. We therefore, respectfully urge that if as your Honour indicated to us, a portion of the annexes of the Exhibition Building can be temporarily devoted to the reception of the Museum, energetic Trustees might conserve and increase this museum in such housing without calling on the Government for

¹. Ibid, 10 May 1865.
². OPC Corres. 4522. Trustees to Superintendent, 8 Jun 1865.
any pecuniary assistance. But at the present moment the real necessity is to give to the museum even a nominal existence before the opportunity of securing the objects we have referred to passes away."

The Athenaeum of which Webb was secretary added its support. At Webb’s instigation its committee passed a resolution for subsequent transmission to the Provincial Superintendent expressing "regret that many valuable illustrations of the Natural and Industrial products of other countries which have formed part of the recent Exhibition are likely to be removed from the Province in the absence of any organised museum to which they can be presented," and stressing, "the desirability of some steps being taken promptly to prevent such a loss to the Province at whose cost the Exhibition has been promoted."¹ The whole issue was kept before the Provincial Government in another letter from the trustees requesting permission to house the Local Committee’s exhibits in the Exhibition building, "until the decision of the Government in reference to a provincial museum is made known to us."²

Faced with this mounting pressure, the Provincial Government finally determined to act. On July 4, they

---

¹ Athenaeum Minute Book, Vol I, 12 June 1865. Webb also wrote to Harris on 19 June (OPC. Corres. 4522) recommending that the composition of the group of Trustees be as follows: 2 members of the Medical Profession (he suggested Hulme and T.M. Hocken), 1 or 2 of the Royal Commissioners, 1 representative of the Provincial Government, and 1 (he suggested Beverly) to represent the Local Exhibition Committee.

² OPC. Corres. 4522/11, Trustees to Superintendent, 26 Jun 1865 (NOTE: some confusion as to numbering exists in letters classified 4522, until 12 July 1865 – c/f Appendix B.)
agreed to approach Fredrick Hall Richardson, Alexander (who declined and was replaced by Hulme, the Provincial Surgeon), and Beverly and ask them to act as a committee "to organise a Provincial Museum." ¹ All willingly accepted the Trust although both Hulme and Beverly, perhaps as a result of their previous association with Richardson as Chairman of the Local Exhibition Committee, expressed reservations over his appointment. ² Beverly also rendered his acceptance conditional upon there being "no difficulty in the way of granting funds to carry it out properly." ³ Their appointment, "as trustees for the purpose of organising a Provincial Museum," was gazetted on July 19, 1865. ⁴

If those who had been agitating for the Provincial Government to take positive action to proceed to the establishment of a Provincial Museum now felt that only a short time would elapse before its doors could be opened to the public, they were shortly to be greatly disillusioned. Hulme's post as Provincial Surgeon left him with very little time to devote to the work of organising the institution and the undoubted friction existing between Richardson and the other members of the committee resulted in everything falling

¹ Noted on letter from Trustees of 8 June 1865. See Appendix B.
² Beverly wrote, 12 Jul (GFC. Corres 452/7) "At the same time I should certainly have been more satisfied if either Dr. Alexander or Dr. Hocken had been named in place of Dr. Richardson." Hulme wrote (GFC. Corres. 4522/5) 14 Jul, ".... I have objections to Mr Richardson which I waive in consideration of the importance of forming a museum and acting with so scientific a person as Mr. Beverly."
³ GFC. Corres. 4522/5. Beverly to Provincial Secretary, 12 July 1865 (c/f p. 19 fn. 2)
⁴ GFC. Gazette, Vol. IX, No. 374, p. 161
on Beverly's shoulders. Certainly, he did his best.

Between the time of his appointment and the end of August 1865, he had Hector's collections passed over to the care of the Trustees, 1 asked for and received Government approval to remove and store, at their expense, all exhibits acquired pending a decision as to where the Museum was to be opened; 2 arranged for storage of the exhibits in "a very ugly iron store" in Great King Street opposite the Exhibition Building, and considered the question of a building to house the Museum by suggesting to the Provincial Executive that it should be connected to a Public Library. 3 However, after he had requested possession of the Indian collection from the Exhibition Commissioners only to find that the Provincial Government was not prepared to accept financial responsibility for its proper housing, 4 Beverly apparently decided that he would do nothing more to establish the Museum until such time as the Provincial Government was prepared to assist it financially, at least until it was firmly on its feet. 5

Collections for display there certainly were, but with no building in which to house them, little could be accomplished.

1. See Appendix B, entries 17 and 18.

2. Ibid., entries 11 and 12. The sum (totalling £90) was actually paid by Beverly himself and he was not reimbursed until June 1866.

3. OPC. Executive Council Minutes, Vol. IV, 22 Aug 1865. Note: receipt of the letter is recorded here but the letter itself is missing and has not been recorded in the relevant section of the Letter Register, (OPC. 9/4) — see Appendix B. We may however, accept its authenticity since it is in keeping with Beverly's thinking.

4. See above, p. 15.

5. Ibid. This accounts for the two-and-a-half year gap in entry 4522, Letter Register, (OPC. 9/4). See Appendix B.
Certainly the Exhibition Building lay empty but the Provincial Council had, during its first session in 1865, resolved to convert it for use as a Public Hospital. There was considerable opposition to this decision on the grounds that the low-lying and swampy nature of the ground would hinder rather than assist patients' recovery and, in September, a petition opposing the building's use as a hospital circulated Dunedin. Adopting a positive approach, the petitioners suggested that the building might be "advantageously devoted" to displaying the collections at present being stored pending the establishment of a Provincial Museum or, alternatively, used as a library, Supreme Court, Public Hall, Registry, or, in a few years' time, a University.\(^1\) Since the Provincial Executive still favoured the building's use as a hospital, it declined to accept the petition and it was left to Haggitt, the Provincial Solicitor, acting in a private capacity to introduce it in the Provincial Council where, after a cursory discussion, it was rejected.\(^2\) Although the petitioners' prime consideration was to prevent the use of the Exhibition building as a hospital, its presentation, with the list of alternative uses to which the building could be put, brought the whole question of accommodation for the museum to the fore. A week later on the motion of James Macandrew, a select committee was

---

2. O.L.T., 22 Nov 1865.
set up to consider the possibility of using the 'New Post Office' building which was at that time being constructed for the Central Government, as a City Hall and Provincial Museum. The report indicated that the building was far larger than the present requirements of a Post Office dictated and the committee recommended that the City Council use one side of the vacant floor for their offices and a City Hall, while the remaining apartments could well be used to house "a Provincial Museum", a Public Reference Library and a Reading Room. As a solution to the problem of providing accommodation for the Museum this was ideal and the Provincial Council accepted it with alacrity. The report was forwarded to the Superintendent along with a request to him to take the necessary action to have the building transferred to the control of the Provincial Government, so that the recommendations of the report might be implemented.

Although the Provincial Council had decided in principle to convert the 'New Post Office' building to these alternative uses, nearly two-and-a-half years were to elapse before any further positive action was taken. The building itself,

1. Ibid, 29 Nov 1865. Macandrew's motion was actually modified, the terms of reference being merely a general inquiry into alternative uses for the building. When the select committee reported however, its findings were in accord with the original motion.

2. OPC, App., VP, Sess.XXI 'Report of Select Committee III' p.3

3. OPC, VP, Sess.XXI, p. 38, 7 Dec 1865.
begun in November 1864, was not completed until the last days of 1867. No effort, either, had been made to have the building transferred to the Provincial Council's control. Finally, in 1866, perhaps in desperation, a group of Dunedin citizens, interested in the museum's future, approached Harris, then Solicitor-General in Stafford's Government, who obtained permission for the collections to be displayed in the building, although it remained the property of the Central Government. 1 It seems probable, although no records (if there ever were any) have survived, that this same group reminded Superintendent Macandrew of his obligation in terms of the Provincial Council's 1865 decision, for, soon after authority to occupy rooms in the 'New Post Office' building had been obtained, he nominated an Otago Museum Committee comprising Drs. Hulme and Alexander, Captain Thomas Fraser, Messrs. Beverly, Beale (or Beal), John Hislop, and R.M. Robertson, plus the Superintendent and Provincial Secretary and the Mayor of Dunedin. In a letter 2 to these gentlemen notifying them of their appointment and requesting their acceptance, Macandrew clearly indicated that although collections forming the nucleus of the museum were being held by the Government, 3

2. OPC, Corres. 4522/19 to 27. Macandrew to Nominees, 2 Apr 1868. See Appendix C.
3. Ibid. Macandrew appears to be either unaware of, or has forgotten, the existence of the Committee of Trustees.
a museum as such was not regarded as having already been founded. Those appointed to the committee also accepted this as being the position, a typical reply being that from Robertson, who acknowledged receipt of Macandrew's letter "regarding the establishing of a Museum in Otago."¹

The Museum Committee held its first meeting in Macandrew's office on 1 July 1868,² at which a sub-committee with Beverly as convener was set up to arrange for the classification and display of the material at the committee's disposal and for the opening of the Museum to the public. The Provincial Council had recently authorised, once again, the use of a portion of the 'New Post Office' building for the Museum³ so Beverly and his sub-committee were able to make an immediate start.⁴ On July 11, the Otago Witness reported that "a commencement has been made towards the realisation of an Otago Museum.....Many cases were, yesterday removed to the New Post Office." A month later the Otago Daily Times, in a preview designed to stir public interest, described in considerable detail the three main rooms - botanical, mineralogical (the largest of the three and containing both Hector's and Lindsay's collections.

1. Ibid, 4522/32. Robertson to Macandrew, 3 Apr 1868.
2. O.D.T., 2 Jul 1868.
3. O.P.C., VP., Sess. XXIV, p. 128.
4. c/f G.E. Thompson, op cit, p. 262.
as well as material illustrating the Otago Gold Rushes) and zoological — of the developing Museum before concluding:

"There is very much to be collected before Otago will have such a Museum as ought to exist here, and especially as regards what may be called the Industry and Art section. But if we have written enough to create interest as to what is, and what may soon be studied by all, our present purpose will be answered; for the creation of such an interest will be the best first step of what our Museum should be." ¹

On 15 September 1868, after three years of frustrations, interminable delays and false starts, followed by two-and-a-half months of intensive preparation, the Otago Museum opened its doors to the public for the first time.

The whole concept of a Provincial Museum for Otago had thus evolved over a period of years, almost as long in fact as the settlement itself had been in existence. Momentum had increased steadily throughout the 1860's at a time when society itself, no doubt spurred on by the prosperity brought about by the gold rushes, was seeking to accept responsibility for the establishment of those educational and cultural pursuits which form integral refinements of maturing societies. The 1865 Exhibition, at which the results of Hector's geological survey were displayed along with numerous other exhibits of local and general interest, focussed attention on the possibilities of using such collections as the basis of a museum which, by expansion and diversification, would

¹ O.D.T., 8 Aug 1868.
in time become a truly provincial institution. Credit for the achievement of this ideal lies not with the Provincial Executive or Council (who, during the entire period when the Museum was being established were unwilling to take any initiative, perhaps because of a reluctance to commit themselves financially at a time when goldfields revenue was dropping fairly rapidly), but with those stalwarts of the Otago Local Exhibition Committee, notably Arthur Beverly and J.S. Webb. Of the two, Beverly was probably the more knowledgeable in these matters, a fact which undoubtedly won him a place on both the Trustees' Committee and the Museum Committee of 1868, where his time and knowledge were put to good account in the preparation of the exhibits for display. Nevertheless, Webb had rendered a valuable service in keeping the project constantly in front of the Provincial authorities during those critical months immediately following the closing of the Exhibition and, if we are to accept his own claims at face value, he was instrumental in retaining for the museum nearly all of the non-governmental collections in the possession of the trustees. Undoubtedly his inclusion on the Museum Committee would have materially strengthened that body but, in July 1868 this was of minor importance; the main issue at stake now was whether or not the Provincial Government, after clearly indicating

1. Q.W., 3 Dec 1868.
its willingness to establish an Otago Provincial Museum as a physical reality, would match public interest in the Museum by accepting full responsibility for this decision and provide adequate financial and other assistance to justify the support of the population at large.

1. See O.W., 8 Dec 1868; also O.W. 11 Jul 1868, and O.D.T., 8 Aug 1868, 8 Sept 1868 and 7 Oct 1868.
CHAPTER II

THE ERA OF PROVINCIAL ADMINISTRATION

The men who, in 1868, formed the Otago Museum Committee, were all prominent in local political, professional and cultural circles. Macandrew and Vogel sat on the Committee by virtue of their offices of Superintendent and Provincial Secretary respectively, Drs. Hulme and Alexander brought with them the prestige and influence of the Medical Profession in Otago while Hislop, Secretary of the Otago Education Board and one of the colony's foremost educational administrators, provided an important link with education. Beverly, like Hulme, had been a member of the abortive committee of 1865. As one dedicated to the advancement of scientific knowledge, it was to him that the Museum Committee naturally turned when the question of preparing the museum collections for display was raised. Of Fraser, Beale and Robertson rather less is known; the appointment of the first two to assist Beverly in setting up the collections does, however, suggest that they possessed some knowledge of natural history, geology or zoology which could be turned to good account. The names of the original committee also included the Mayor of Dunedin in his official capacity, but since no reply to Macandrew's invitation to serve on the committee seems to have been received from him, it appears that his name was subsequently

1. See Appendix B., entries 19 - 34.
dealt, the vacant position being taken by W.D. Murison whose first recorded contact with the committee was his attendance at the first Committee meeting on 1 July 1868. Murison was a runholder of very varied and accomplished pursuits, not the least of which was an intense interest in natural history. He was thus very well equipped to make a positive contribution to the development of the infant museum. As a group, these men represented a fairly broad cross-section of contemporary Otago society but, apart from Beverly and possibly Murison, they were, unfortunately, interested and well-intentioned amateurs with little specific knowledge of the requirements necessary for the establishment of the museum on firm foundations. At a time when the development of cultural institutions such as the Museum depended so much on men who were prepared to give a great deal of their time, knowledge and skill, without remuneration, this was a severe handicap. Soon after the decision to establish the museum became generally known, for instance, a B.L. Holmes offered his services as curator, an offer which Macandrew dismissed with the terse comment that there was "no necessity for such an officer." 1 The most notable omission from the committee was, of course, Fredrick Hall Richardson, the third Trustee of the 1865 committee.

Described by Fulton2 as a great botanist but a man with a

1. GPC. Corres. 4522/36. Holmes to Macandrew, 12 June 1868. Holmes had heard of the decision to establish a museum from Julius Von Haast, the Canterbury Provincial Geologist.

rather fussy temperament and many eccentricities, he possessed attributes which could have been used to great advantage in developing the museum. But Macandrew had evidently taken heed of the earlier opposition to him and, sacrificing scientific knowledge for harmony, eliminated him from consideration.

Our knowledge of the work accomplished by this committee is very thin indeed. That it did meet, even if infrequently cannot be doubted, but no Minute Book or correspondence appear to have survived the passage of time and, apart from its inaugural meeting on 1 July 1868, few of its meetings were deemed sufficiently newsworthy for reports to appear in the local newspapers. From the outset, however, its activities were severely handicapped by lack of finance. Apart from a grant of £4500 which was set aside (and ultimately never used) for alterations to the 'New Post Office' on the understanding that it was to be used as a "college, museum and City Council Chambers", at no time did the Provincial Government's grant to the museum exceed £600 a year. For the first three years of the museum's existence, in fact, the grant was a meagre £200 a year and at its first meeting the Museum Committee, recognising that such a small grant could not possibly cover

1. See above, p. 19, fn. 2.
2. C.D.T., 11 June 1868.
3. See Appendix E.
the necessary expenditure likely to be incurred, resolved to supplement the grant by appealing for public subscriptions.\textsuperscript{1} The success of this appeal or of the concurrent attempt to persuade some wealthy settler to purchase a collection of all known birds which had been offered to the museum for £1500\textsuperscript{2} is not recorded. Worse was to follow. Declining Government revenue, both from goldfields and land sales, forced on an already prudent Government a policy of retrenchment and, for the financial years 1871-2 and 1872-3, the £200 grant to the museum was halved. There can be little wonder then that there is no evidence of activity on the part of the Museum Committee, a situation which ultimately brought forth some very trenchant comment from the \textit{Otago Witness}\textsuperscript{3} in an editorial which, if not written by Marison, at this time editor of the \textit{Otago Daily Times}, was certainly inspired by him:

"...although we have in Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin some very good industrial collections and some very good collections in certain departments of Natural History it is impossible to say that the museums at all those places are being conducted in such a manner as to give unqualified satisfaction.

"Turning to Otago it is very sad to find that, possibly from a variety of causes, the Museum at Dunedin has almost come to a standstill."

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{O.D.T.}, 2 July 1868.
\textsuperscript{2} \textit{Ibid}.
\textsuperscript{3} \textit{O.W.}, 6 Feb 1873.
After decrying the Provincial Government's grant of "the munificent sum of £100" towards the museum's maintenance, the editorial continued:

"...although it may very reasonably be contended that a few hundred pounds should be annually placed at the disposal of the Managers of the Museum we are far from thinking that the expenditure of such a sum will remedy the defects which exist in its management."

The editorial expressed considerable concern at the apparent lack of discrimination in accepting material for display, suggested that Dr J.G. Black (under whose control it was presumed the Museum had been placed since he was Professor of Natural Science at the University of Otago) should be assisted in this by a small committee and concluded:

"If life, however, is to be infused into its management, the Provincial Government must release their control over it and place it for the future in the charge of some person or persons who will see to its collections being increased upon some approved method. With the expenditure of a little money, and with efficient management, the Otago Museum would soon become a credit instead of a subject of reproach to the Community."

This well directed prod was not without effect, the grant for 1873-4 being raised to £250, but before the Provincial Council's action is considered, the relationship between the Museum and the University of Otago must be outlined.

The decision to establish a University in Dunedin was made in 1867 and the University of Otago was incorporated by
a Provincial Ordinance of May 1869. The building still referred to as the 'New Post Office' even though it now housed the Provincial Museum was considered to be ideally suited to University purposes and, in January 1869, formal agreement had been reached for its transfer to the Provincial Government for this use, the whole property being formally vested in the University Council in April 1871.1 Thus, from the very beginning, because both institutions were housed under the same roof, there was a close link between them. In July 1870 Hislop, Secretary to the University Council and a member of the Museum Committee, had seen the possibilities of even closer cooperation between the two institutions. The New Zealand University Act, 1870,2 had provided £3000 a year for the establishment of "fellowships, scholarships, prizes... ...and towards providing a library for the same." In a letter to Macandrew, Hislop made the following comment about this clause of the proposed Act:

"I can think of only one trifling improvement, viz: the insertion of the words 'and museum' after the word 'library' at the end of line 13, page 4."3

The University Council had, in fact, previously expressed a similar opinion. In their first half-yearly report to the Superintendent, they sought temporary financial assistance from the Provincial Government to establish a chair of

Natural Science and at the same time suggested "that the Provincial Museum...might very conveniently and advantageously be incorporated with the University and placed more immediately under the charge of the Professor of Natural Science."¹ A deputation from the University Council met with Macandrew to discuss this proposal but, although Macandrew favoured it, the Provincial Council rejected it outright. The Otago Daily Times roundly condemned this rejection in an editorial which showed that, even at this early stage, its opinion tended towards the closer association of the University and Museum.

"The study of Practical Science being thus established," wrote the editor, "the transfer of the Museum to the University would naturally follow. This is a consideration of great importance. The Museum should not stand alone. Attached to the University, its means of usefulness would be at once enlarged. It should not only represent the natural products of the province, but type selections from all over the world should be gathered within its walls....Thus conducted, the museum might become at once the foundation stone of a School of Mines as well as a source of great and varied interest to the public."²

Perhaps the Provincial Government's conscience was pricked by this for ten days later it offered to pay half the salary of a Professor of Mineralogy and Agricultural Chemistry,³ an offer which enabled the University Council to appoint

---

2. O.D.T., 3 Jun 1870
3. OPC. Corres 10646/10, Superintendent to Chancellor, 13 Jun 1870.
Professor Black to the position in February 1871. The University Council clearly expected that he would also be appointed curator of the Museum for Hislop, when notifying him of his appointment, forwarded him a list of the contents of "our museum."  

In July 1873, a matter of months after the editorial in the Otago Witness on the management of the Museum, the Provincial Council was stirred out of its lethargy by the presentation of two petitions relating to the Museum's financial position and management. The first, presented on 3 July by Major John Richardson, a former Superintendent of the Province and currently a member of the Legislative Council and Chancellor of the University of Otago, prayed, "That the Otago Museum be placed in that position which the Province demands it should occupy." This petition contained one signature only, that of a John Richardson, settler. Probably it was the Major himself petitioning as a private citizen on a question in which he was obviously extremely interested. The second was presented five days later on behalf of the Otago Museum Committee and requested that the Provincial Council give favourable consideration to the whole question of the maintenance of the Museum to enable the petitioners "to promote its usefulness." Both petitions were

---
1. OUC. Minutes, Vol I, 22 Feb 1871.
3. OPC. VP., Sess XXXII, 1873 - Abstract of Petitions.
4. C.L.T., 9 July 1873
taken together and, on 15 July, were referred to the Private Petitions Committee for report. Unfortunately, since neither of the petitions has survived, their exact contents must remain unknown to us. The Private Petitions Committee forwarded them to Professor Black for his opinion and although this was given, it seems highly likely that the petitions themselves were not returned.\(^1\) The Committee's report, tabled on 24 July, does, however, indicate that both petitions not only requested increased financial assistance but also urged that the Museum be placed more directly under the control of the University authorities. Probably Black was named as a possible curator; certainly there were, in Dunedin people who regarded him as a logical choice, while others held the opinion that he was already in charge.\(^2\)

His opinion, expressed when the Private Petitions Committee forwarded the petitions for his comment, certainly formed the basis of the recommendations brought down. The Private Petitions Committee reported\(^3\) that "justice has not been done to the Museum by the voting of the very small annual amount that has been voted," and recommended that the Government should arrange with the Museum Committee to have the management of the Museum transferred to the University Council.

---

1. The records of the Private Petitions Committee housed in the National Archives, Wellington, indicate that they were forwarded to Black but neither his report nor the petitions are in the box along with the rest of the records. These are the only petitions of the Session which are not stored here.

2. See *G.M.*, 8 Feb 1873. See above p. 32

in which case, it was understood, Black would undertake responsibility for it. The Committee also recommended that if control was taken over by the University, an additional £500 should be placed on the Supplementary Estimates. The Committee's recommendations were agreed to, and John McNeil, on behalf of Richardson, moved that the Superintendent be requested "to place the sum of £500 on the Supplementary Estimates to pay past liabilities and to provide for the judicious increase and arrangement of the museum."¹ Although an amendment to cut this grant by half was heavily defeated, the Provincial Executive and Council must have been greatly relieved at the possibility of relinquishing control, with relatively little cost to themselves, over an institution which had become an encumbrance and a liability to them. Certainly, two further grants, one of £500 and one of £600² were made by the Provincial Council in the years immediately following, and although that body did deal with such matters as the appointment of a new Committee of Management and the siting and financing of a permanent Museum building, effective control had, in fact, passed to the University.

The formation of the new Committee of Management which followed soon after, was the subject of discussions between Murison and Alexander, representing the first Museum Committee, and the University Council. At a meeting held in the University Library in October 1873, it was announced that

---

¹ O.D.T. 25 July 1873
² Following a request from the Museum Committee for an increase in the grant.
the Committee appointed in 1868 was to be dissolved and trustees appointed in its place. The University Council expressed its satisfaction with any Committee the Provincial Executive chose to appoint but, "at the same time trust that the Executive will instruct such committee to make the museum available to the utmost extent for the purpose of the University." It seems that the University Council wanted full use of all available facilities while also evading, as far as possible, the responsibility for their maintenance.

The new Committee of Management appointed by the Provincial Executive consisted of four members, Murison, Beale, Beverley and Alexander, who had been members of the previous committee along with Professor Black and Fredrick Woolaston Hutton, newly appointed Provincial geologist in whose hands they placed the direct charge of the Museum. Hutton already commanded a reputation as a brilliant scientist and the Provincial Executive suggested that his talents could well be used with advantage to start a geology class at the University. This suggestion was readily accepted and thus another link between the


2. OPC, Minutes, Vol I, 17 Oct 1873 - this request was granted (see OPC., Corres. 4522/51, Provincial Secretary to Chancellor, 27 Oct 1873.)

3. OPC. Corres. 11559/48. Provincial Secretary to Registrar, 6 Oct 1873.
University and Museum was forged, a link which Major Richardson, the Chancellor, did much to promote and strengthen. He had been active in securing the greatly increased grant from the Provincial Council and, once it was approved, had pressed for the money to be handed to the University Council in order that it might be used to advantage in the improvement of the Museum's appearance.

"I need not point out," he wrote to the Provincial Treasurer, "that it would be desirable in view of His Excellency's visit at the close of the year that the museum of Otago should not present a very unfavourable contrast with that of Wellington and Canterbury." 1

The appointment of the new Committee of Management and the Provincial Executive's request for them to co-operate fully with the University also met with his approval. He wrote:

"I may further state my great gratification at learning from your letter that the proposed arrangements respecting the museum are of such a character as will afford the public the means of constantly visiting it and at the same time will remove the slur which has been so justly attached to the Province of neglecting one of the most effective means of encouraging science." 2

Richardson, more than any other man, had realised the very definite advantages to both the University and education in general which could accrue from such an association and he

---

1. OPG. Corres. 1159/50. Richardson to Provincial Treasurer, 6 Oct 1873.
determined to make it as close and as fruitful as possible.

Perusal of the Minute Book of the Second Committee of Management reveals that little business of major importance was considered. Of the 39 meetings held between November 1873 and October 1877, 14 were adjourned for lack of a quorum and many others were attended only by the bare minimum of three. Two items are, however, worthy of discussion. The problem of providing adequate finance was to plague this committee as it had its predecessor. Soon after the committee's formation, Murison, the Chairman, sought an increase of £100 in the Provincial Government's grant to the Museum, a request which was acceded to during the 1875-76 financial year. This, however, made no material difference to the Museum's position so, in August 1875, Murison wrote to Macandrew requesting him to use his influence to obtain an endowment for the Museum which would yield an annual income of at least £1200. Macandrew, at that time in Wellington, made no apparent effort to meet the request; he was too busily engaged in fighting Vogel's proposal to abolish the Provinces to pursue this matter, although he was instrumental in having museums included alongside police, gaols, harbours, hospitals and schools in the Abolition Bill clause which provided for the expenditure of these institutions to be borne by the con-

1. Museum Committee Minutes, 7 May 1874.
2. Ibid., 9 Aug 1875.
solidated fund until other more equitable arrangements could be made.\textsuperscript{1}

The one other issue of major importance with which the committee concerned itself was the question of the future control of the Museum after the abolition of the Provinces. When it became obvious that this would happen, the committee informed all Otago members in the House of Representatives that the Museum would "form a necessary adjunct to the Chair of Natural Science in the local University and that \ldots in future the control of the museum should be vested in the Council of the Otago University."\textsuperscript{2} This was the inevitable result of the actions of the Provincial and University Councils during preceding years, and it might well have eventuated even if consideration of the whole question had not been precipitated by the passage of the Act. Since 1873 the interest of the University Council in the Museum had been much more closely defined. In a letter to the Provincial Superintendent in March 1874, Richardson informed him of the University Council's desire to use the whole of the then University building for University purposes and requested the removal of the School of Art and the Museum, "should the Government not

\textsuperscript{1} \textit{NZ. Stat.} 1875, 39 Vic No. 21. \textit{Abolition of the Provinces Act}, 1875. For the debate see \textit{N.Z.P.D.}, Vol XVIII, pp. 555-6 and \textit{O.D.T.}, 24 Sep 1875.

\textsuperscript{2} Museum Committee Minutes, 5 Sept 1876. Note: the establishment of a Chair of Natural Science was currently under consideration by the University Council.
deem it expedient to place it in some measure under the University authorities."¹ To this, Macandrew replied:

"As respects the Museum, I may say that practically it has for some time been under the control of the University authorities and there is no desire on the part of the Government to remove it therefrom - at the same time as it is likely that under the Curatorship of Capt. Hutton there will be a large accession to the contents of the museum - the present accommodation will soon be too limited, in which case it will be necessary to procure a building elsewhere."²

The growth of the collections during the past few months had, in fact, already made the provision of a larger and more suitable building an urgent necessity and shortly after, the Otago Witness expressed the hope "that the Provincial Council during its coming session will vote a liberal sum in order that a suitable building may be procured.....To exhibit the specimens at present in the museum a larger building is an absolute necessity."³

Hutton, too, commented adversely on the temporary nature of the museum accommodation and, after describing the many recent acquisitions, many of which he was unable to set up because of the cramped conditions, expressed the hope that a permanent museum building would be erected in the

¹. O&C, Corres 11559/6¹, Richardson to Macandrew, 10 Mar 1874.  
². Ibid., 11559/6², Macandrew to Richardson, 26 Mar 1874.  
³. 11 Apr 1874.
near future. Once again, through pressure of public opinion, a reluctant Provincial Government was forced to act. At the opening of the next session of the Provincial Council on 29 April 1874 Macandrew, during the course of his address as Superintendent, gave notice that during the session the Council were to be asked to vote sufficient money to erect a suitable building to house the Geological Survey Department, the Museum and the proposed School of Mines. During the ensuing months, several existing buildings and sites where buildings might be erected were considered. One suggestion was that the Old Supreme Court Building which boasted a large central hall, well-lighted from above, should be used but the Deputy Provincial Superintendent considered it to be too valuable for this purpose and the eventual decision was in favour of the erection of a new building. In June 1874 Hutton suggested that the unoccupied ground opposite the Botanical Gardens by the Leith Stream appeared to be the most satisfactory site, to which suggestion the Provincial Executive agreed. The University Council were, however, appalled by the suggestion for it meant the virtual severance of the link between the two institutions which they had taken such great pains to forge from the beginning. Richardson, whose

1. OIC, App. VP., Sess XXXIII p. 79.
2. O.D.T. 30 Apr 1874
3. OIC Correspondence, 1522/52 Hutton to Provincial Secretary, 23 Jun 1874.
intense interest in the future of the Museum has already been noted, was at this time in Wellington on parliamentary business but was kept fully informed of the situation which, he realised, required delicate handling. In a telegram to Dr D.M. Stuart, the Vice-Chancellor, sometime during July, he suggested a possible line of approach. "We have no control over museum question," he cabled, "beyond suggestions (sic) that its removal to a distance would cripple the exertions of the Professors." The whole matter was fully discussed at the next University Council meeting at which a Deputation was appointed to meet with the Deputy Superintendent and express their opinion that such a move would be "injurious to the University inasmuch as it was necessary that the Museum (needs to) be close to the University and that if removed to the site proposed it would simply be a place more for amusement than for the acquisition of knowledge." Hutton, too, had obviously been kept well-informed of the University Council's opinion for, five weeks after his first recommendation for a site, he wrote to the Provincial Secretary urging the erection of the Museum on a reserve in Great King Street known as the 'Chinamen's Garden' because it was "closer to the University."  

1. OUC. Corres. Ser. 1/4. Richardson to Registrar, 7 July 1874.  
2. Q.B.P., 8 Aug 1874.  
3. OUC. Corres., 4522/53. Hutton to Provincial Secretary, 31 Jul 1874.
Added weight was given to this suggestion by a Deputation to the Deputy Superintendent from the Otago Institute, which had been founded in 1869 and whose Articles of Incorporation linked it very closely to the Museum. Thus, when the University Council's Deputation met the Deputy Superintendent, the latter commented that, while the site near the Leith appeared to be the most suitable one for the Museum building, he had no objection to the selection of another. This was done and, by the middle of October, the 'Chinamen's Garden' in Great King Street had been settled upon as the new site. Once again during the course of a few years the University Council had, by its interest and action, influenced decisively the history of the Otago Museum. It is interesting to note that six months later the University Council again used this argument of 'nearness', this time to secure for itself its present site close to the Museum instead of the old Cemetery Reserve as was proposed. Thus, as the 1870's progressed, the University Council had come to have an ever increasing say in the administration of the Museum and it was only natural for the Museum Committee to suggest that the situation which was implicitly recognised in practice be regularised in law.

When the Otago Members of Parliament received Murison's

1. O.D.T., 5 Aug 1874. For the Otago Institute's formation and rules see, O.D.T., 5 Jul 1869 and 3 Aug 1869.
2. O.D.T., 8 Aug 1874.
3. O.P.C. Corres., 1616q. Vice Chancellor to Superintendent, 17 Apr 1875.
Circular Letter, they were no doubt reminded of his request to Macandrew the previous year to seek an endowment for the Otago Museum. During the debate on Macandrew's proposal to include museums along with other provincial institutions to be financed by the Central Government after abolition, Charles Bowen, Minister of Justice, who agreed in principle with the suggestion, said:

"All the Government propose to do for the present is to prevent these establishments from falling into decay. The Government will provide the necessary funds to maintain them...in the hope that very soon we shall be able to provide some means for bringing these institutions under a better system of organisation than that under which they now exist."¹

In 1876 the Otago Museum was struggling along without any grant from the Provincial Government. Perhaps the Otago Members of Parliament considered this to be a suitable occasion to seek some means of providing it with adequate financial support: perhaps they merely saw the situation as an opportunity to make a last-ditch stand against the abolition of the Provinces by sheeting home the huge costs with which they felt the Central Government would be faced once abolition had become effective. Whatever the reason, Stout grasped the opportunity and, on 21 September, moved, "an Address......requesting...... provision be made for the maintenance of the Otago Museum

¹. NZPD., Vol XVIII p. 556.
by a permanent endowment of Crown Lands; or, failing such endowment, the placing of the sum of £2000 on the Estimates for the maintenance of the said museum."\(^1\) The Government was, by this proposal, placed in a very awkward position. If Stout's motion was approved by the House, they would inevitably be faced with requests for such endowments or grants from all like institutions, a situation which could well be a severe embarrassment to any Government. Yet, to reject the motion outright would probably result in the demise of the institution and, at the same time, bring forth howls of wrath from a Province which had consistently opposed abolition on the grounds that they were better equipped to provide for their local needs than the Central Government. Clearly, time for the Government to formulate an equitable solution had to be gained and when Stout's motion came forward for discussion Atkinson, the Premier, forestalled any debate by giving an undertaking that, if it was withdrawn, the Government would provide temporarily for the Museum by making its maintenance for the following six months a charge on the Otago Provincial Land Fund. Next Session, he said, such questions could be considered on their merits.\(^2\) The offer was accepted. The Otago Museum remained open, while the Central Government gained

---

1. *JHR.*, 1876, p. 207.
much needed time to prepare a satisfactory solution to the whole problem.

As far as the Otago Museum was concerned, the solution was provided by the passage of the 'Otago Museum and Dunedin Athenaeum Act', 1877. This Act, "to provide for the Maintenance and Management of the Otago Museum and for the endowment of the Dunedin Athenaeum," the preamble of which stressed the provincial origins of the Museum and the need for making adequate provision for its maintenance now that the provincial institutions no longer existed, vested all buildings, exhibits and other property connected with the Museum in the University of Otago to be held "in Trust for a museum." Two schedules to the Act vested various lands in the University, the first pertaining to the land on which the Museum building was situated; the second endowing the Museum and Athenaeum with the Lamb Hill Estate, 11,000 acres of pastoral lands situated in rugged hill country to the south east of Middlemarch. The first £700 p.a. in rents and profits from the endowment were to be set aside solely for Museum purposes; all income above this figure was to be apportioned between the two bodies, nine-tenths going to the Museum and one-tenth to the Athenaeum. 1

---

1. N.Z. Stat. (Local) 1877, 41 Vic No. 56, passim.
When the Bill was first introduced, the Hon. Fredrick Whitaker, the Attorney General, announced that although the Government had consented to its introduction, they did not pledge themselves to approve of it in any way. Nevertheless it was not until the Bill's Second Reading in the Legislative Council that it was debated, and even then only briefly. The Bill's provisions were generally favoured, the main point at issue being the manner in which the Museum was to be financed. Objections were voiced to the principle of endowing such institutions at public expense, but the general feeling was that endowments were the only practical alternative to annual parliamentary grants similar to that received by the Otago Museum at the time of the abolition of the Provinces. W.B.D. Mantell, the mover of the Second Reading Debate, summed up the position succinctly when he said that "it would be a good thing if the Otago Museum were permanently endowed so that it would not be compelled annually to ask for funds from Parliament." On 29 November 1877, two months after its introduction into the House of Representatives, the Bill became law.

While the Act was generally applauded as a sound and logical solution to a tricky problem, it did not altogether escape criticism. The Evening Star, in a long and

---

1. ODT, 18 Sep 1877.
3. ES, 13 Oct 1877. The full text of the editorial can be found in Appendix D.
remarkably prophetic editorial published while the measure was still before the House, attacked it on three grounds - the inadequacy of the immediate financial provision for the Museum, the absence of any limitation on the University Council in its future administration of the Trust, and, finally, the unnatural association of the Museum and the Dunedin Athenaeum for the purpose of sharing the revenue from the pastoral endowment. With regard to the first point of criticism, it was argued that since the immediate revenue would only permit the Museum to be maintained "in something like its present form," the legislation took the continued appointment of a University Professor as the Museum's Curator too much for granted. To remedy this, the article recommended that the estimated income should be amended "to include an allowance for the curator."

Secondly, in view of the University Council's seeming inability "to gain public confidence in the management of its own affairs," it questioned its suitability as Trustee and urged that the Council,

"...should be strictly bound to keep the Museum...a public institution, or we may find it drift into the position of a mere appanage to the University, enjoyed by the public, not of right, but of favour."

Finally, the newspaper held that, since the Museum and the Athenaeum had little in common, the two institutions should be endowed separately so that the Museum could receive the entire revenue from the Lamb Hill Estate. These pleas, however, fell on deaf ears and the measure was passed in
the form first proposed.

Nevertheless, despite this criticism, the passage of the Act was certainly to the Museum's advantage. Since the Abolition Act had come into force, its very existence had been in jeopardy\(^1\) because there was no guarantee that grants from the Central Government would continue to be forthcoming on an annual basis. The Act secured for the institution that continuity of management which, it was hoped, would make constructive and progressive development possible. The endowment lands, too, while not providing an income as large as that sought by the second Management Committee over two years earlier,\(^2\) had, for the first time, given the Museum a reasonably adequate income which was entirely independent of the caprice of either local or Central Government. It was also reasonable to expect that the annual return from the endowment would increase with the increasing value of pastoral lands, a trend which, in 1877 still appeared to be a reasonable prospect.\(^3\) Further, its association with the University, ensured the Museum that its Curators would be scholars of considerable repute and, consequently, its reputation should be very much enhanced.

The University, which formally took the Museum over

---

2. See above, p. 140.
3. \textit{MS.}, 13 Oct 1877 - See Appendix D.
on 18 December 1877, also appeared to gain handsomely. The forging of the link between the two institutions which the Council, led by Major (now, Sir John) Richardson, had sought to create during the previous eight years had now been completed. In return for administering the Trust placed upon it, the University would have free and unlimited access to all collections housed in the Museum, a situation of very great advantage to those teachers whose subjects could be related directly to the Museum's exhibits. Further, it would be advantageous to the University (and, to a lesser extent, the Museum) to be able to accommodate the Professor of Natural Science and his Department in the Museum's basement. The Museum was sufficiently close to the University to justify such a decision and this would enable the Council to finance University development in other equally-important directions. The dark clouds of financial depression were barely looming over the horizon and both the University Council and all those who were deeply and genuinely interested in the Museum's welfare looked forward in anticipation to a long and fruitful period of co-operation between the two institutions which would be of inestimable benefit to both.
CHAPTER III

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION I: MANAGEMENT

Although the abolition of the Provincial Governments had ushered in a new era in New Zealand's history, a further fourteen months were to elapse before the winds of change were felt by the Otago Museum. Since no specific provision for its maintenance had been made at the time of abolition, the Committee of Management, appointed in 1873, continued in office. Meetings, seven in all, were held at regular intervals between November 1876 and October 1877 and, although its decisions were of little consequence in themselves, the mere presence of such a committee did provide an important link between the old and the new orders which smoothed considerably the eventual transfer of authority to the University Council. Although the Council recognised that the events of the previous years had made a transfer of this nature the only possible and, indeed, logical solution to the administrative problem precipitated by abolition, it was not willing to assume formal responsibility for the Museum's maintenance until the provision of permanent and adequate finance had been assured, as promised, by the Central Government. Meanwhile, in February 1877, the Council appointed F. W. Hutton, whose post as Provincial Geologist had disappeared with the abolition of the provinces, to the newly-endowed Chair of
Natural Science. At the same time he was appointed, "Curator of the Museum so (sic) soon as the charge of that Institution is handed to the University." 1 At this time Hutton was still a member of the Committee of Management and, throughout 1877, he continued to discharge his duties as Museum Curator. It was largely as a result of his efforts that the Otago Museum continued to remain open to the public during this transitional period. 2

When in December 1877, the University Council formally accepted the Trust vested in it, it proceeded immediately to the appointment of a committee - Mr R.G. Chapman (the Chancellor), the Rev E.L. Stanford and Dr Robert Burns - to administer the affairs of the Museum. 3

As future events were to show, the vesting of the Museum in the University Council was, in one sense, unfortunate. No one doubted that considerable benefits to both University and Museum should result from this more intimate association but, whereas the affairs of the Museum had been, until this time, supervised by a small but dedicated committee whose sole task had been to ensure the continued progress of the institution, the University Council soon came to look upon the Museum as a mere department (and, at that, a relatively minor one) of a

1. OUC Minutes, Vol I, 13 Feb 1877.
2. O.D.T., 12 Dec 1877.
much larger establishment. Inevitably, the interests and activities of the members of the University Council were spread over a much broader field than those of the earlier Museum Committees and this resulted in insufficient attention being given to the planned development of the Museum as distinct from routine maintenance. The degree of importance attached to the Museum by the University Council can be gauged from the fact that, until the formation of the Committee of Management in 1930, reports of the Council’s Museum Committee were, more often than not, attached as mere appendages to the reports of other Council Committees; nor was there any separate correspondence file for the Museum until that date.

Although the University Council’s Museum Committee officially guided the destinies of the Otago Museum for the subsequent fifty years, its existence was at best, very intermittent and, on many occasions, its presence was actually more nominal than real. Even during the earliest years when Hutton devoted nearly half of his available time each week to Museum work because it was "part of the University work just as much as lecturing,"

1. AJHR 1879, H 1 'Report of the Royal Commission of the University of New Zealand,' p. 336.

2. Ibid, p. 337. For a full discussion of the financial situation, see below, Chap. IV, pp. 100 – 3.
appointed its own Museum Committee, and the Hearing of the 'Royal Commission of the University of New Zealand' in April 1879, a period of time when one would have expected that Committee to have familiarised itself with the activities of its new acquisition, it met on two occasions only.¹ At times, its deliberations were linked with those of another committee. From 1893 till 1908, for example, it was associated with the Council's Committee which administered the Professorial residences and, between 1918 and 1922, it was linked with the Library Committee. During both of these periods Museum administration was largely incidental to those Committees' main functions. This was also largely true of the 1880's. Although a Museum Committee, as such, did exist, it was also charged with the general oversight of the University's Biology Department.² Since the Biology Department was housed in the Museum basement this was not an unnatural combination; nevertheless, during these years, the Museum Committee appeared to concern itself rather more with improvements to the Biology Department than with the development of the Museum.³ Between 1878 and 1930, decisions relating to the Museum's administration were also made by the University Council itself at its

---

1. Ibid.
2. See CUC Minutes, Vol I, 12 Nov 1884. On this occasion the Museum Committee recommended that the Council purchase a number of microscopes for the Biology Department.
3. See CUC Minutes, Vol II, 8 Jul 1885. The Museum Committee was here asked to consider what extensions could be made to the Biology Department's accommodation in the Museum basement.
regular meetings, or by its Finance or Works Committees. On occasions, even though a Museum Committee had been appointed, it was ignored. Again, particularly between 1909 and 1918, and after 1922, when no Museum Committee existed at all (probably because the University Council considered the incidence of Museum business to be too slight to warrant the appointment of such a committee) this was the only way in which matters affecting the Museum could be attended to. There is no suggestion that the University Council was, by the manner of its administration of the Museum during these years, deliberately negligent of the Trust placed in it. On the contrary, within the financial limits imposed upon it by dint of circumstance, and at some not inconsiderable cost to itself,¹ the Trustees had ensured that the assets, both buildings and exhibits, had been reasonably satisfactorily maintained. But the fulfilment of the letter of the Trust was not, in itself, sufficient. The survival of an institution such as the Otago Museum depended primarily upon its continued advancement towards some clearly preconceived goal. It was to the great discredit of the University as an institution of higher learning that, at no stage during these fifty years, was any real attempt made to define the Otago Museum’s role within the local community or to plan its ordered development with a definite end in view.

¹ See below, Chap IV, p. 102
In part, the responsibility for such a situation must lie also with the Museum's Curators. From the outset, the University Council had recognised the mutual advantages of appointing its Professor of Biology as the Curator of the Museum. Between 1880 and 1937, the dual position was held successively by two extremely able and distinguished scholars - Drs T. J. Parker (from 1880 till 1898) and W. E. (later, Sir William) Benham who was Curator from 1898 till 1937 - both of whom made an important contribution to the development of the Museum's character. As curators, both could (and should) have given a lead to the University Council by making known the Museum's requirements and indicating the avenues along which it could be developed. As Professors of Biology and, first and foremost, teachers of that subject, their exertions were, however, concentrated on their students rather than on the Museum which they both came to regard as "a valuable adjunct to University work." Of the two, Parker was probably the more sympathetic Curator for, although the display techniques he used were already somewhat antiquated, he did understand rather better than his successor, the value of a museum in helping to educate the general public. It was during his term as Curator,

1. Replacing title of "Professor of Natural Science", in 1880.
2. Hutton had resigned his chair in 1878 upon his appointment to the Chair of Natural History at Canterbury University College.
3. AJHR, 1910, E7. 'University of Otago, Annual Report'; see also E.S., 13 June 1925.
for example, that the Museum was, for the first time, opened to the public during the mornings.\(^1\) Benham, however, throughout the long period of his Curatorship, made it all too clear that the Museum was very much of secondary importance to his Biology classes. Within three months of his arrival in May 1898, he had closed the Museum to the public in the mornings to allow his students to work in the building without being disturbed by visitors. In his letter to the University Council he requested that "this be made general practice to enable the work of the Museum to be carried on without interruption."\(^2\) The request, the tenor of which clearly indicated that Benham regarded the teaching of Biology as the Museum's main function, was agreed to without dissent.\(^3\) Whilst, outwardly, Benham appeared to be no less interested in the fortunes of the Museum than his predecessor had been,\(^4\) his correspondence with the University Council on a number of occasions during his term as Curator clearly indicated where his real interests lay. In 1923, for instance, he wrote suggesting that the Zoology Department should be removed to a separate building and that H.D. Skinner, the University's Lecturer in

---

1. OUC Minutes, Vol II, 3 Jun 1895.
2. OUC Corres. Ser. 2/1, Benham to Registrar, 18 Aug 1898.
Anthropology and also Assistant Curator at the Museum, be placed in charge. Again, in 1929, he stressed the need to separate the dual position of Professor of Biology and Curator of the Museum and recommended that this should be achieved by the erection of a new Zoology building completely divorced from the Museum. Even after his retirement at the end of 1936 he continued to make it very plain that, in his opinion, the Biology Department "should have preference as a teaching Department, over a Museum." The University Council, however, while admitting the obvious advantages which would result from such a step, was, clearly, not prepared to erect a building for the Biology Department while the Museum basement was still eminently suited to its needs. Though the judgement is, perhaps, rather harsh, there is an element of truth in Skinner's assertion that, for Benham, everything was completely secondary to his ambition and determination to win a Fellowship of the Royal Society. Thus, while both Parker and Benham had, by their scholarship, brought considerable honour to the name of the Otago Museum, their appointment as Curators had been very much to the detriment of its progress as a public institution.

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/69, Benham to Registrar, 24 Oct 1923.
3. Ibid, Ser. 5/253, Benham to University Council, 5 May 1937. (this letter was written from London).
4. OUC Minutes, Vol IX, 29 Oct 1929 (Finance Committee Report)
5. Interview with Dr H.D. Skinner, 16 Dec 1965.
During the 1920's, indications that a new era in the Museum's history was in the offing began to manifest themselves in increased interest in the Museum as a public institution. The seeds of this change had really been sown much earlier. The University's apparent lack of interest was not, fortunately for the Museum, reflected in the activities of a small but enthusiastic group of philanthropists — Sir Fredrick Chapman, Rev. T.M. Hocken, Bendix Hallenstein, Professor G.H.F. Ulrich, and Adolph Moritzon to name but a few¹ — to whom nearly all progress between 1880 and 1920 was due. In the early 1920's these men were joined by one who was to become the Museum's greatest benefactor. It was indeed fortunate that, at a time when the University Council's policy towards the Otago Museum was, for all practical purposes, non-existent, a philanthropist steeped in the culture of the Old World and fascinated by that of the New, a man with faith in the future of the Otago Museum as a cultural centre of the Antipodes, should become intimately associated with the Museum and its staff. Willi Fels, C.M.G., ² one of the last survivors of an era of private philanthropy, saw only too clearly that the institution's future lay, not

¹ For a complete list of benefactors see, Otago Museum Report for the Years 1961 and 1962, pp. 27-8.
² He was Bendix Hallenstein's son-in-law.
with the University of Otago, but with the people of the Otago Province from whose soil the Museum had sprung.\(^1\)

While Fels is probably remembered best for monetary gifts and his contributions of ethnographic material, he was, nevertheless, intensely interested in the Museum's overall development and for more than twenty years, many of them as Chairman of the Museum's Committee of Management, the creation of which was largely the result of his efforts, he sought to broaden the base upon which the Museum had rested for so long. That this did not eventuate until some years after his death in 1946 is of little consequence; his efforts had inspired others to seek this same end, the culmination of which was the passage, in 1955, of the 'Otago Museum Trust Board Act.'\(^2\)

Throughout his life Fels was an avid collector. His classical education in Germany had led on naturally to an intense interest in, and the systematic collection of, Greek and Roman coins, a field in which he became an acknowledged expert.\(^3\) Nevertheless, his interests were much broader than this and his private collections extended over the vast Polynesian and Oriental culture areas as well.

---

1. c/f H.D. Skinner (Interview, 16 Dec 1965) who claims to be the originator of this idea. Skinner is adamant that Fels "acknowledged the validity of (his) argument." Since Fels and Skinner were the closest of friends for nearly thirty years, it is obvious that each must have greatly influenced the ideas of the other.

2. See below, Chap. V.

3. During the last years of his life he spent a great deal of his time arranging and cataloguing the coins in the Otago Museum. See H.D. Skinner, Willi Fels, C.M.G., 1858 - 1946 (Dunedin, 1946) p.10.
as the Ancient World. Never afraid to seek advice on the authenticity of any unfamiliar material submitted to him, he developed an acute sense of what was good and what was not. His original intention had been to pass his collections on to his only son, Harold, but after Harold's death in action during World War I, he decided that they should be handed over to the local community for permanent preservation.¹ What better place was there to house them than the Otago Museum? In 1920, therefore, Fels established the Ethnology Fund which now bears his name. Its income was to be used to help extend the Museum's infant ethnological collections.² Four years later, Fels made the first of many gifts - Oriental arms and Maori artefacts - from his own collections.³

Before the establishment of the Ethnology Fund, however, Fels had sought to secure for the Museum the services of a scientifically trained man capable of taking charge of an Ethnological Department and developing it to the greatest possible extent. In August 1918 the University Council had discussed a recommendation that Anthropology should be introduced as a teaching subject.⁴ In order to encourage the Council to make a favourable decision, Fels, who was always

². OUC Minutes, Vol VII, 15 Jun 1920. Initial purchases were to be made in the fields of New Zealand and Polynesian ethnology.
³. *E.S.*, 16 Jul 1924.
⁴. OUC Minutes, Vol VI, 20 Aug 1918.
very quick to seize an opportunity such as this, offered to contribute £200 a year for five years towards the salary of a specialist in Polynesian and Melanesian Anthropology if one could be appointed. Fels was, of course, well aware that the most likely candidate was H.D. Skinner, the son of one of his close friends, who had just completed his M.A. Degree in Anthropology at Cambridge University.

Although Skinner's association with the Otago Museum had dated back to 1912 when, for six months during Benham's absence overseas, he had acted as Curator, it was his appointment, in December 1918, which marked the beginning of a new chapter in the development of the institution. His studies in England between 1915 and 1918 had brought him into close personal contact with many of the greatest anthropologists of the day and this had helped establish friendships which were later to be used to advantage in developing the Museum's ethnological and classical collections. Skinner's interest lay, first and foremost, with the Museum as an institution devoted to the advancement of science in its own right rather than as a mere appendage to the University's teaching of Biology and Anthropology.\(^2\)

From the date of his appointment, for the first time in its history, the Museum actively began to disseminate knowledge

to the surrounding community.\textsuperscript{1} To Skinner, the progress of a museum was synonymous with the growth of its collections and, during his long association with the Otago Museum, the size of its collections, particularly in the related fields of anthropology and archaeology, multiplied rapidly. But, most important of all, his appointment brought him into extremely close contact with Willi Fels and, together, in the years which followed, they sought to arrest the Museum's continuing decline and to develop the institution to the point where the standard of its collections, research and scholarship earned world-wide recognition and acclamation.\textsuperscript{2}

In the years which followed, Benham remained Curator of the Museum but he concerned himself increasingly with his teaching duties and delegated both the routine administration and the greater part of the development work of the Museum to Skinner. It is obvious that their views on the purpose and functions of a museum differed greatly and, because of this, the relationship between the two was, at times, rather strained,\textsuperscript{3} but during this critical period, Skinner's closer identification with the Museum was to prove decisive.

\textsuperscript{1} It was Skinner who, in 1919, first introduced the idea of encouraging classes of school children to attend the Museum for lessons in Natural History. Also, during 1919, he gave a series of public lectures on ethnology and in 1925 he was instrumental in forming a local "Friends of the Museum Association" along similar lines to that in existence at the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

\textsuperscript{2} Freeman,\textit{ op cit},\textit{ passim}.

\textsuperscript{3} The difference between their attitudes actually reached its climax in 1941 when Benham protested at changes made by Skinner. See OJC Corres, Ser, 6/322, Benham to Chancellor, 22 Oct 1941 and\textit{ Ibid}, Skinner to Chancellor, 14 Nov 1941.
The transfer, by Fels, of his collections soon created a need for additional gallery space in which to display the recent acquisitions. This need had been accentuated by the demolition, in 1923, of the South Annexe which had been described by Parker some thirty years previously as:

"a hideous wood and iron erection which will, I hope, continue to be an eyesore to the citizens of Dunedin until they are patriotic enough to replace it by a permanent structure."¹

In fact, the only permanent addition to the Museum buildings since the original wing had been erected, was built in 1910 when, as a result of the gift of a valuable historical library and ethnological collection which belonged to Dr T.M. Hocken, the Wing which bears his name was erected with finance raised by subscriptions, both public and private. Since the amount of money available had been insufficient to erect the Wing as originally planned, only two floors, instead of three, had been built and now, fifteen years later, accommodation for exhibits was again at a premium. The need for additional accommodation was first outlined at a meeting of a number of Dunedin's leading citizens, held in the Museum in June 1925 and, soon after, Fels was instrumental in establishing a committee of influential Dunedin businessmen whose aim was to gather funds together, not only to build a South Wing on to the existing buildings (and thus complete the original plan), but also to establish

¹ T.J. Parker: 'The Otago University Museum' in The Otago University Review (Special Number) 1893.
an endowment fund to assist further development in the future. Within four years this Museum Extension Committee had raised over £31,000 which, with the Government's subsidy of £25,000, enabled the South Wing (named "Willi Fels") to be erected.¹

During the 1920's the University Council had continued to play but a very small part in the Museum's development. After 1922 the Ethnographic Committee, whose responsibility did not extend beyond the prudent administration of the recently endowed Ethnographic Fund, was the only Committee of the Council to be directly connected with Museum affairs, and, once again, routine administration was handled by the entire Council. On at least one occasion during these years the consideration of a relatively minor and rather routine matter resulted in the University Council's setting up a special sub-committee to consider the matter and report back to it.² Even although it was at its invitation and with its co-operation that the Museum Extension Committee was established, the Council appeared very reluctant indeed to encourage the erection of the proposed new wing, at least until the total amount of money available from all sources, was known.³ Only after considerable pressure had been exerted by interested parties and assurances had been received from two local members of Parliament⁴ that a Govern-

¹ Otago University Museum, Annual Reports, 1906-10 and 1925-30, passim.
² OUC, Minutes, Vol VIII, 20 April 1926.
³ Ibid, 17 Aug 1926.
⁴ W. Downie Stewart and T.K. (later, Sir Thomas) Sidey, both of whom were also members of the University Council.
ment grant would be forthcoming, did the University Council agree to co-operate with the Extension Committee through a combined sub-committee of the two bodies but, even then, its delegates were, "not empowered to commit the Council in any way."  

In 1928 the administration of the Otago Museum was no more clearly defined than it had been for some years past. There were no indications forthcoming from the University Council that, even with the erection of the Museum extension, it would show any greater interest in the Museum's future than it had in its past. By this time it was obvious that a substantial surplus would be available for investment and the Museum Extension Committee considered that since the surplus had resulted from donations by the local community, those who had shown an interest in this project should have at least some voice, not only in their investment and its administration, but also in the future development of the institution itself. Consequently, pursuing a suggestion which almost certainly emanated from Fels, the Museum Extension Committee proposed that a Board of Management be set up to exercise general control over Museum affairs and to advise the Council on the expenditure of funds which belonged to the Museum.

For the University Council, whose administration of

2. Ibid, 21 Sept 1926.
3. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/138, Benham (Secretary of Extension Committee) to University Council, 3 Nov 1928.
the Museum had been, for years, in a state of impasse, the proposal to establish a Board of Management under the overall supervision, but outside the framework of the Council itself, must have been a godsend. For years they had been either unwilling or unable to deal adequately with the affairs of the Museum; now, a group of influential men whose interest in the institution's future development was undoubted, suggested that they, along with representatives of the University Council and Dunedin City Council, should shoulder the responsibility for the future administration of the Museum under the general supervision of the University Council itself. Yet, even after its own Finance Committee's favourable recommendation, it hesitated. Why it did so will probably never be known, but it was not until the middle of May 1929, and then only after a letter from Benham, in which the Council was asked to appoint a Board of Management, that the Council finally acted. Once again the question was referred to its Finance Committee which, this time, was instructed to consider the proposed Committee's composition and powers. In its report, adopted by the Council in July 1929, the Committee's composition followed closely the pattern previously suggested by the Extension Committee. There were to be nine members - five, including the Chancellor.

---

1. OUC Committee Reports, Vol V, 29 Jan 1929 (Finance)
2. OUC Correspondence, Ser. 5/138, Benham (Secretary) to Registrar, 22 Apr 1929.
3. OUC Minutes, Vol IX, 21 May 1929.
and Vice-Chancellor, \(^1\) to represent the University, three to represent interested citizens, \(^2\) and one to represent the Dunedin City Council. \(^3\) The powers delegated to it were extremely sweeping indeed and covered every aspect of the Museum's administration - investment of the surplus building funds, general management, staffing, general care and control of the Museum and its exhibits, and "such other matters as the Committee may think desirable," - subject, of course to the overriding approval of the University Council. \(^4\)

Nevertheless, Fels was obviously not entirely happy with the proposed composition of the Committee which gave the University a dominant voice. On August 3, he wrote recommending that the total membership of the Committee be raised to twelve by the addition of two more representatives appointed by the Dunedin City Council and one further representative of the University Council itself. His comments favouring additional City Council representation are worth recording since, for the first time, he outlined unequivocally the path he considered the Museum should follow in the future. Fels wrote:

"I think it is most important to keep the Mayor and City Council permanently and practically interested

\(^1\) Since 1946 the persons holding this position have been known as 'Pro-Chancellors'. The term 'Vice Chancellor' is now used to designate the University's chief administrative officer.

\(^2\) Initially these members were to be appointed by the Extension Committee but, after its dissolution, they were to be elected from the Association of Friends.

\(^3\) OUC Corres. Ser. 5/143, Chapman to Skinner, 16 Jul 1929

\(^4\) Ibid.
in the Museum. As you know, the City Council contributed £5000 to the building fund and, for some years, £200 annually for the upkeep of the Museum. On considering this you will admit that they are the chief supporters of the Museum and we should try to keep their interest alive by making them feel that the Museum is not only an Otago University institution but a civic one, not only offering a great attraction to the inhabitants of our town but to any visitors from New Zealand and abroad. Such a showplace as our Museum will be should deserve the full support of our civic authorities. The more popular we can make the Museum the better it will be for the institution.”

A few days later, after consultation with Sidey, the Chancellor, Fels amended his previous recommendations by deleting his proposal for an additional University Council representative and replacing it with the suggestion that the Otago Institute should have one representative. After due consideration, Fels' suggestions, as amended by him, were adopted and, at the same time, another member, to be appointed by the New Zealand Government, was added. These additions were of fundamental importance, for, although the University Council still retained overall responsibility for the Museum's well-being, immediate control was now to be handed to a body on which non-University interests were clearly dominant. The

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/146, Fels to Chancellor, 3 Aug 1929.
2. Ibid., Ser. 5/253, Registrar to Sir Percy Sargood, 20 Jan 1927. This letter was in answer to a query from Sir Percy and outlines the negotiations which took place during the months of July to September, 1929.
formation of the Museum’s Committee of Management thus marked an important forward step in the growth of the Otago Museum. Once again, after more than fifty years, the Museum’s progress was the responsibility of a Committee of influential citizens who represented a broad cross-section of interested organisations within the local community. While it would be too much to suggest that these outside bodies were, at last, beginning to recognise the Museum as a civic responsibility, it does mark the beginning of an age when public support for the Museum was more earnestly sought than at any previous time in its history. When a second representative of the Otago Institute was added to the Committee of Management in 1935,¹ the balance of the Committee was swung even more decisively in favour of non-University interests, and the notion that the progress of the Otago Museum might, in fact, be better served if its administration was divorced entirely from the University of Otago, began to be voiced.²

When the Museum Committee met for the first time, on 17 October 1930, it elected Willi Fels as its first Chairman.³

1. OUC Minutes, Vol XI, 16 Apr 1935. Note: in 1934 the Otago Institute changed its name to the Royal Society of New Zealand (Otago Branch).


3. The original membership of the Committee was as follows —
   Representing the University of Otago:
   Representing the Dunedin City Council:
   R.S. Black (Mayor), H.L. Tapley, and J.J. Clark.
   Representing the Association of Friends of the Museum:
   Willi Fels, G. Crow and Jas. Begg.
   Representing the New Zealand Government:
   F.G.A. Stuckey.
   Representing the Otago Institute:
   S. Angel.
The formation of the Committee had been, in a very real sense, a triumph for his policy of redirecting the responsibility for the Museum’s welfare back to the local community, and his election as Chairman was a fitting reward for one who had striven so earnestly over the previous decade to improve and enrich the Museum’s collections and to establish a broad base upon which it could flourish.

Throughout the next sixteen years Fels’ presence on the Committee, whether as Chairman or just a representative of the Association of Friends, dominated its actions. The University Council, too, gave considerable weight to his opinion when issues affecting the Museum were discussed. In 1936, for instance, soon after the Council had received Benham’s resignation from the dual position of Biology Professor and Museum Curator, it decided to advertise the vacant Chair immediately, but to defer any consideration of an appointment to the Curatorship until Fels, who was then overseas, had returned and could be consulted on the appointment.¹

Although Fels always held that the Museum Committee was simply a continuation of the Committee which had managed the Museum between 1873 and 1877,² during the first few years it met infrequently and was concerned, almost exclusively, with the institution’s financial affairs. Benham saw this as the Committee’s only function.³ Indeed, it took its duties

³. OUG Corres. Ser. 5/322, Skinner to Chancellor, 14 Nov 1941.
very seriously, and, from the outset, sought to define the relationship between the Museum and University much more precisely than had ever been attempted before. Nowhere was this more true than in the realm of finance, where the Museum Committee always strove to ensure that the University paid at least a reasonable share of the running expenses incurred jointly by the Museum and the Department of Biology.¹

This attitude tended to highlight what was almost certainly the major difference between the two bodies. While the University Council continued to regard the Museum as a relatively small part of the University's activities, the Museum Committee, within the limits which had been imposed on them by the Council, sought, increasingly, to make the administration of the Museum as independent as possible.²

After Bonham's retirement at the beginning of 1937, the Museum Committee began to extend its activities to embrace the entire field of the Museum's administration. The first outward indication of such a change was to be seen in the greatly increased frequency with which the Committee met. Until June 1937, it had met infrequently and irregularly;³ after this date it met regularly each month. Further, according to Skinner,⁴ Fels was "mortal

---

¹ MCM Minutes, Vol I, 4 Oct 1932 and 26 Oct 1932. A subcommittee of the two bodies developed a formula for the accurate apportionment of the joint expenses.
² For financial details, see below, Chap IV, pp. 103 - 12
³ Usually two or three times a year.
⁴ Interview, 16 Dec 1965.
afraid" of Benham and thus, while Benham was still Curator, he was unwilling to challenge him on any but the most in-
consequential matters. After Skinner had been appointed Curator, however, Fels and he worked together in close
co-operation to develop the Museum and broaden its support. It is impossible, today, to tell just what major decisions
affecting the Museum's future resulted from friendly and informal discussions between these two men, but many such
discussions undoubtedly did take place and the Museum be-
came a much more progressive institution as a result of
them.

One striking illustration of the change which took
place is to be found in the manner of Skinner's appointment
as Curator. Staffing had been one of the items included
in the list of powers originally delegated to the Museum
Committee but the terms of reference were so ill-defined
and Benham's direction of the Committee so rigid, that any
consideration of staffing in general and appointments in
particular had been rather nebulous. A mere fortnight
after Benham's departure for England, however, Fels wrote
to the University Council expressing his concern at what
he considered to be an unwarranted delay in the appointment
of a successor. Although he recommended Skinner for the
position, the Council appointed him in an acting capacity

---

1. Altered to "Director" later the same year. See, MCM Minutes
2. OUG Corres. Ser. 5/253, Fels to Chapman, 12 Nov 1936.
only, while it sought, from the Museum Committee, its views on the terms to be attached to a permanent appointment. Fels, who had been informed that any recommendation for appointment must originate with the Museum Committee, was undeterred by the rebuff and, at the Committee's next meeting a few days later, he secured their endorsement of his recommendation. Although the sequence of events is, in itself, significant, the real importance of the incident lies in the indication that Fels was beginning to dominate and direct the Museum Committee's thinking and, in so doing, was furthering his belief that the University should have less say in the administration of the Museum, and the local community, rather more. Certainly, the propriety of his actions raised doubts in the mind of at least one member of the Museum Committee. Sir Percy Sargood, who had not long before been appointed the Government's representative on the Committee, telephoned the Registrar to find out exactly with what powers the Committee had been vested. The reply, which outlined the negotiations preceding the formation of the Committee as well as listing its functions, confirmed the legality of the proceedings. Henceforth, the Museum Committee initiated all appointments and sought formal

2. Ibid, Corres, Ser. 5/253, Chapman to Fels, 19 Nov 1936.
approval, only, from the University Council. Despite this freedom, however, financial stringency dictated that the Museum remain grossly understaffed, especially when compared with the museums in the other main centres.¹

A further illustration of the manner in which the Museum Committee sought to extend and redirect its activities, is to be found in the way it gained public approval for another addition to the Museum buildings. Although this fell within the purview of the Committee, no one could have envisaged such a possibility in 1929. Nevertheless, by the early 1940’s, the galleries were again becoming overcrowded and thoughts began to turn to the problem of additional accommodation. Here again, Fels was several jumps ahead of anyone else. Back in 1934 he had inaugurated a new Otago Museum Building Extension Fund² to which he, personally, contributed regularly during the ensuing years. At a public meeting, called in October 1943 to discuss ways of permanently commemorating the Province’s first hundred years, Fels proposed the erection of a new wing as a Centennial Memorial.³ The suggestion was taken up and developed by the Museum Committee, gained widespread support from many quarters,⁴ and, in August

---

1. In 1952, comparative staffing figures were as follows:—
   Otago Museum — 2 part-time attendants
   Canterbury Museum — 8 full-time attendants
   Dominion Museum — 19 full-time attendants
   Auckland Museum — 13 full-time attendants

2. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/205, Chapman to Fels, 24 May 1934.
1946, was adopted by the Province's Centennial Committee. Although the total funds available were not sufficiently large to offset the steep rise in building costs in the post-war years, and thus some considerable time was to elapse before the plan finally came to fruition, the Museum Committee's action had helped pave the way for the Otago Province to reassume full responsibility for its Museum.

With the passage of time, the Museum Committee tended to become increasingly independent of the University Council. While the members of the Museum Committee recognised that total separation of the two institutions would, in the long run, be to the Museum's advantage, a difference of opinion arose between the Committee and the Director of the Museum as to the best timing of such a move. F.M. Hanan, the Museum Committee's Chairman, favoured almost total separation immediately, and a resolution;

"That the University be approached as to the powers and status of this committee and that it be asked to give power to the committee to manage and control the Museum, its personnel, property and material subject to the overriding control of the University,"

which embodied this view was passed unanimously by the Committee. Skinner, on the other hand, argued that this should not eventuate until the overriding problem of providing adequate finance had been satisfactorily settled.  

From a letter written by H.P. Kidson,¹ addressed to both the Chancellor and Registrar and marked 'private', it is abundantly clear that a marked divergence of opinion had developed between them. Kidson's opinion on the whole issue had been sought and, in this letter he made it quite clear that,

"If the Museum Committee's motion was an attempt on anyone's part to get better hold over Skinner no action should be taken on it, nor do I think the committee as a whole would want it, if they thought for a moment it was aimed at that. ............I think the Council should side-step any attempt at defining the functions of the Museum Committee or the status of the Director."²

In a second letter, written privately to the Registrar and included with the first, Kidson turned his attention to the wider issue of separation. In this letter he wrote:

"...but if it is, as I assume it is, again a feeler concerning the Council's attitude towards giving the Museum Committee complete independence I think it should be treated seriously........I think the Council should retire from Museum control before it has to assume far greater responsibilities."³

His official opinion, which the University Council had asked for, was, however, a much more conservative statement. In

1. A member of the University Council and Museum Committee.
2. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/468, Kidson to Chancellor and Registrar, 10 May 1948.
3. Ibid, Kidson to Registrar, 10 May 1948.
his third letter of the day, this time addressed to the University Council, he wrote:

"I cannot see how the Council, while it retains its responsibility for the control of the Museum could give the Museum Management Committee any freer hand than it does at present. There is now a pretty generous absence of interference and a willingness to be guided by the Committee on the part of the University Council.......nor do I think it worthwhile for the Museum Committee to press for any halfway scheme. Any major benefits to the Museum could come only from complete independence."  

The University Council agreed and, at its next meeting, decided that,

"in view of the fact that the Council has already agreed in principle to the separation of the Museum from the University's control, and since the present arrangement for the conduct of the institution is working satisfactorily, 'that the Council does not think it advisable that any alteration in this arrangement should be made until separation actually takes place'."

Such a resolution was, however, unacceptable to the Museum Committee which claimed that, since Hanan's report outlining the issues involved had not been made available to the Council, the reasons for the request had not been made clear.  

Subsequently a deputation from the Museum Committee met with

1. Ibid, Kidson to University Council, 10 May 1948.  
the University Council to discuss the issue. Hanan claimed that, since, for some years past, the Museum Committee had handled all Museum affairs other than the financial transactions, the Committee was merely seeking legal confirmation of what already existed in fact. After due consideration of Hanan's memorandum (which included a thinly-veiled threat) the Council acceded to the request. At its meeting on 17 August, the following resolution was passed:

"The Council appreciates the excellent services being rendered by the Museum Committee and expresses confidence in its Chairman & members. The Council agrees to grant the Committee the powers asked for in the motion adopted as Item 13 of the Minutes of the Museum Committee on 13/h/48; but with this proviso: as the Director of the Museum is the specialist in his domain, and as he was appointed by the University Council in the first instance he shall also be responsible to the Council, to which, in the event of any serious misunderstanding arising between the Museum Committee and himself, he shall have the right of direct access. However, the Council trusts that this will never be necessary. Henceforth the Museum Committee will be known as the Management Committee of the Otago Museum. The Council also expresses its confidence in the Director of the Museum."  

1. Ibid, Hanan: 'Memorandum in support of the Committee's request.' 15 Jun 1948.  
2. Hanan, ibid, "If the Management Committee is not to have the limited powers sought, then the University Council itself will be obliged to take a much livelier interest in the work."  
3. OUC Minutes, Vol XIV, 17 Aug 1948. The second part of the resolution which referred to Skinner, was included because, following his difference with Hanan, he had asked the University Council to clarify his position.
Such a step was rather more than a mere confirmation of the powers delegated to the Committee when it was first formed in 1929. The resolution gave the Museum Committee complete control over all aspects of the administration of the Museum (apart from the Director) including the routine administration of its financial affairs. Although this had not been specifically granted in 1929, the Museum Committee had, for some years, managed the Museum’s finances itself and thus, this apparent extension of the Committee’s functions was no more than an official acknowledgement of a situation which had been effective for some time past. Recognition of this fact was, however, another step along the road towards complete autonomy.

After 1930, the University Council had actually played very little part in the administration of the Otago Museum. That the Council was extremely relieved to have the administrative responsibility for the Museum lifted from its shoulders, there can be no doubt and its acceptance of the Extension Committee’s proposal to form a Committee of Management was certainly in the Museum’s best interests for its members had many contacts within the local community which were used to the Museum’s advantage. But, most important of all, the establishment of the Committee proved to be the first vital step in the transfer of the Museum Trust from the University back to the Otago Province. Despite this, however, the University Council was very
reluctant indeed to divest itself of the Trust it had for so long regarded as an imposition, and it was not until 1951, after the Government had refused to recognise Museum staff in the future, for the purposes of calculating salary grants, that the University agreed to support the establishment of a Museum Trust Board to which the total responsibility for the Museum's administration would be transferred.
CHAPTER IV

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION II: FINANCE

Between the years 1878 and 1956 one single recurring theme dominates the history of the Otago Museum. The inadequacy of the financial provision was a continuing problem and, at no stage during these seventy-eight years, was the Museum's ordinary revenue sufficiently bountiful to permit its development to proceed unhindered. The endowment lands, for which such high hopes had been entertained, unfortunately proved to be a great disappointment. While land values generally increased during the period, those of the run country either remained static or even declined. After 1930 the income from the endowment lands was supplemented by interest earned from investment of the Museum's surplus building fund but even this was only sufficient to balance the books for a few years. At times, the University Council and, later, the Museum Committee sought to offset the continually-increasing maintenance costs by appealing to nearby local bodies to support the institution with annual grants but their efforts were very piecemeal and their success, limited. Only during the last decade of the period was a truly concerted effort made to place the Museum's finances on a sound footing.
When the University Council assumed control of the Museum in December 1877, the institution's financial state was far from healthy. From the time of its foundation in 1868, its development had been greatly handicapped by the Provincial Council's parsimonious attitude. Although the Council had provided a permanent home for the Museum's collections at a cost of £12,500, it had failed to recognise that such a gesture was, in itself, insufficient to establish the Museum firmly as a cultural force in the community. The two Museum Committees had certainly received small annual grants from that body but these, particularly during the first few years, quickly proved to be totally inadequate for even the routine maintenance of the initial collections and, at no time, could any provision be made for expansion. In the years immediately preceding the abolition of the Provinces, the annual grant had been substantially increased, but after 1875 no grant at all was received and when the University took over the Museum's administration, the Museum accounts showed a deficit of nearly £300. The Museum's plight was, indeed, a very sorry one. In order to keep the institution open during the eighteen or more months it was without any source of income, F.W. Hutton had paid a number of its liabilities out of his own pocket, and Edward Jennings, the Museum's taxidermist, had forgone his salary for nearly

1. See Appendix E.

2. O.D.F. 12 Dec 1877. (copy of letter, Hutton to Registrar, 4 Dec 1877).
six months.¹ Worse was to follow for, shortly after the University Council had formally accepted the Trust, Hutton was forced to seek its permission to raise, by private subscription, a fund to provide, "urgently needed bottles and cases for preserving reptiles, fishes, insects and plants."² It was obvious that, if the University was to honour the obligations of the Trust vested in it by the 'Otago Museum Act, 1877,' the Council would have to guarantee the Museum’s immediate expenses out of its own resources until more permanent arrangements could be completed. At this time, however, the University Council’s own financial reserves were diminishing with alarming rapidity,³ a fact which made it extremely difficult for the Council to be as generous as it might otherwise have been.

It was obvious from Hutton’s resume,⁴ that immediate and positive action was necessary if the Museum was not to be forced to close its doors. Naturally, the University Council did not wish this to happen and it referred the Museum’s current financial position to its newly appointed Museum

---

1. Ibid.

2. OUC Minutes, Vol I, 14 May 1878. Subscriptions totalling £240 (of which the Dunedin City Council contributed £100) are recorded in an Appendix to Hutton’s Museum Report for 1878/9 which is filed inside the Minute Book of the Second Museum Committee, 1875-77 and is held in the Museum.

3. See, AJHR, H1b, H1c, E3, E6 'University of Otago Annual Reports' 1878-82.

4. O.D.T., 12 Dec 1877.
Committee for consideration. Although the Committee met shortly after it had been appointed, precisely what action it recommended is not at all clear. Certainly, Hutton was reimbursed for his out-of-pocket expenses incurred during the transition period and Jennings was paid his arrears of salary. But if, as seems highly probable, Hutton had sought an interim grant from them to maintain the Museum until the revenue from the endowment lands became available, the Committee either ignored or rejected his request for, in June 1878, the Council acceded to such a request and, without apparent reference to its Museum Committee, made a grant of £500 for the Museum's maintenance. Evidently this was regarded as a temporary loan only, and was made on the understanding that it would be repaid once revenue from the endowment became available. At first sight, this appears to be an unnecessarily harsh decision but there can be no doubt that the University Council, at this time beset with pressing financial problems of its own, was hard-pressed to make any provision for the Museum at all. In March 1879, shortly

2. AJHR, 1879, H1, 'Report of the Royal Commission of the University of New Zealand,' p. 338.
3. OUC Minutes, Vol I, 8 June 1878. Hutton's letter to the University Council (21 May 1878) requesting this cannot, unfortunately, be located.
4. AJHR, 1879 - 81, 'University of Otago, Annual Reports'. In 1879 the Council's accounts showed a deficit of £646 and this rose to £4183 two years later.
after the endowment had been finally leased, the Council increased the amount allowed for the Museum’s maintenance to £600 a year, while keeping all revenue above this figure to recoup itself for its earlier advances.\(^1\) An income of £600 was, of course, no more than the Museum had received from the Provincial Council back in 1875, and Hutton, whose relations with a section of the University Council were far from cordial,\(^2\) bitterly condemned its niggardly approach. While giving evidence before the ’Royal Commission of the University of New Zealand’, Hutton was asked if he considered the amount of money available for the Museum to be sufficient "to keep the Museum in an efficient state."

"It is sufficient," he replied, "to keep the Museum; it is not sufficient for an enlargement. It is not sufficient to buy the cases and specimens to keep it going. It is just sufficient to prevent things going to the bad. I have always said I could keep up the Museum for £600 a year - just keep it up.\(^3\)

The censure was, in fact, much too harsh. Although the amount allowed was insufficient to permit any development to proceed, the University Council, by its action in advancing money to the Museum in spite of its own precarious financial position, had ensured that the institution remained open. Under the circumstances, its action in reimbursing itself

---

for these extraordinary expenses once the revenue earmarked exclusively for Museum purposes became available, is quite understandable. ¹

When the proponents of the 1877 Act had furnished the Museum with a pastoral endowment, they did so in the firm belief that such a provision would guarantee the institution a regular and adequate income which would be entirely sufficient for its needs in the years to come. In 1877 this appeared sound, since prices for both land and wool were comparatively high and it was confidently expected that further increases in the value of these two commodities would offset any future increases in maintenance costs. This, however, was not to be, for the University Council did not finally lease the run until the end of 1878 and, by this time, the effects of the world-wide depression were being reflected in declining wool receipts and this, in turn, heralded a severe drop in land values. In view of this, the Council could consider itself very fortunate indeed to secure an annual rental of £916 for a term of fourteen years. ² The first rental payment was not finally received until May 1879, but before this, however, the University Council's delay in leasing the run had been condemned by Hatton. In his evidence before the Royal Commission he stated that on his return from

¹ The advances were repaid in full by April 1882. See OUC Minutes, Vol I, 9 May 1882.
² AJHR, 1880, H1c, 'University of Otago, Annual Report,' 1880.
Sydney about the end of April 1878,

"...I found that no steps at all had been taken towards leasing the endowments. (sic) Dr Stuart, about a week after I returned, came to the Museum and gave the taxidermist notice of dismissal. That, however, was not carried out. I repeatedly went to the Registrar and pointed out that the endowments (sic) ought to be leased at once, and that no time should be lost, but nothing was done until the date I have mentioned." (December 1878)

Despite Hutton's assertion, the University Council's hands were tied. Although the original lease of the endowment had expired at the beginning of 1878, 'The Land Act, 1877' had extended the lease until March 1879. Once again, Hutton's viewpoint was all too obviously influenced by his relationship with the University Council in general and, in particular, Dr Stuart, with whom he had been at loggerheads since an altercation in 1877 over his action in opening the Museum to the public on Sundays.

Hutton also cattigated the Council for failing to take the steps necessary to recover losses in rent (estimated, by him, to be about £1000) for the period between January 1878 and May 1879. On this occasion his criticism was much more valid. That the Museum was legally entitled to seek compensation for loss of rent during this period was implicitly

2. N.Z. Stat., 1877. 41 Vic No. 29.
admitted by the Central Government which did make one payment, of £119 in lieu of rents due. But the University Council, by now without the services of Sir John Richardson, the Museum's greatest advocate, made no real effort to recoup the loss. It had already come to regard the Museum as a small section of its Natural Science Department and, while subsequent events showed that even had the arrears in rent been collected, little improvement in the Museum's solvency would have resulted, the Council had, by its apathy, shown that the Museum's requirements would be considered only in relation to the overall pattern of the University's development.

Although the endowment's annual rental was, at first, £916 a year, not all of this amount was available for the Museum. The 'Otago Museum Act, 1877', had also endowed the Dunedin Athenaeum and Mechanics' Institute by providing that, when the endowment rental exceeded £700 a year, one-tenth of the total revenue was to be paid to it. Initially, the Museum's share was £825 a year and while this should have been sufficient to cover routine maintenance, there was no surplus revenue which could be used to develop the collections. Further, the weakness inherent in the pastoral endowment became very apparent during the depression of the 1880's as the University Council experienced increasing difficulty in securing payment of the rents due. Without doubt, this had resulted from what Orbell, lessee of the Museum endowment, had stated.

referred to as "the unprecedented fall in all kinds of station produce,"¹ which had resulted in countless bankruptcies in many parts of the colony during this period. Throughout the 1880's, applications for reductions in the endowment rental came before the University Council with monotonous regularity. At first, the Council was totally unsympathetic towards the request,² but, after the Government announced its intention of establishing a Commission to enquire into the condition of its own pastoral tenants, it modified its attitude and authorised a temporary postponement of approximately one-quarter of the total rent due.³ A year later, in July 1887, approval was given by the Governor-in-Council for the University Council to reduce the rental of the Museum endowment by £150.⁴ In his Annual Report for 1887-8, the Chancellor of the University of Otago noted that the University's revenue had shrunk considerably as a result of the reduction in endowment rentals "which the Council felt constrained to make in its interests."⁵ The reductions made, however, went only a short distance towards easing the lessees' burden. In

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 4/2. Orbell to Registrar, 12 Apr 1886.
2. Ibid., Minutes, Vol II, 26 Nov 1885. "Resolved, 'That the Finance Committee be instructed to take legal proceedings in the event of the rent of any of the runs not being paid when due,'" and, Ibid, 11 Jan 1886, "Resolved, 'to exhaust all legal remedies towards their (i.e. endowment holders) being compelled to fulfill their obligations.'"
3. Ibid., 14 July 1886.
4. Ibid., 13 July 1887.
5. AJHR, 1888, E6. 'University of Otago, Annual Report.'
October 1887, only three months after a rental reduction had been granted, Orbell felt that his economic circumstances warranted an application for a further reduction in rent.¹

When the endowment lease expired in 1893, the University Council, in the rather forlorn hope of obtaining an increased rental, offered the sale of the lease in two blocks, each of about 5,500 acres. The highest offer was, however, only £616 a year - considerably below that received even under the amended terms of the previous lease. Although there was no possible alternative, acceptance of this offer meant that the Dunedin Athenaeum would not receive any revenue from its portion of the endowment for the next ten years. The reduced income meant also, that the Museum's finances were more straitened than ever before and this, accompanied by rising costs, made it a relatively simple matter to forecast correctly that it would "be difficult to properly support the Museum with the present revenue."² The University's financial position was little better than of the Museum and, thus, it was in no position to increase its financial support for the institution, even if it had desired to do so.

If the University Council hoped that the rental had reached its lowest point, they were soon to be disillusioned. No sooner had the new lease been taken up than the by now all too familiar pattern of requests for reductions in rental came

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 4/1. Orbell to Mansford (Registrar), 15 Oct 1887.
2. AJHR., 1893, E6. 'University of Otago, Annual Report'.
before the Council, and, "owing to the universal drop in the value of pastoral lands," \(^1\) the rental of the Museum endowment was reduced, by stages, to £550 a year. Even after the Council considered that the depression conditions had ended,\(^2\) they met with no success whatsoever in their efforts to obtain full payment of the agreed rental.

During the 1890's the endowment income was supplemented, for a short time, by the lease of mining rights for a gold-bearing quartz reef which had been discovered in the southwestern corner of the property. Initially, prospects of a rich strike appeared bright,\(^3\) but the optimism engendered by this additional source of revenue was shortlived. After four years of mixed results, the return from the workings did not justify any further expenditure on the project, and, in 1901, the mining lease was surrendered back to the University Council and the mining area to the sheep and the rabbits.

By 1900 the trend to intensive mixed farming and dairying at the expense of large-area sheep runs, was firmly established. The popularity of extensive pastoralism had waned markedly with the opening of the North Island's rich agricultural lowlands, a change which manifested itself when the University Council sought to rela the Museum endowment run in 1903.

1. AJHR., 1901, B6. 'University of Otago, Annual Report.'
3. Ibid., Vol II, 1 Mar 1897; also, AJHR., 1900, E7.

University of Otago, Annual Report.
At first the lease was auctioned but after it failed to secure even one bid, tenders were called and, eventually, the property was re-let for £400 a year, less than half the figure originally obtained. Faced with the rather frightening prospect of further rental reductions in the future on all its endowment properties, the University Council sought refuge in a legislative measure designed to forestall such an eventuality. By the 'Otago University Reserves Act, 1904,' \(^1\) all of the University's endowment lands were vested, for administrative purposes, in a Land Board and the Government undertook to guarantee a uniform minimum revenue from them by compensating the University for any future shrinkages in rents. The Act did, however, explicitly state that any subsidies of this nature were to be recouped from subsequent increases. The nadir, however, had been reached. By 1917, it was obvious that the land values of run country were again rising and, in 1920, when the Museum endowment was, once more, re-let, the much more satisfactory figure of £878 (of which the Museum received £770) was obtained. Thereafter, until the passage of the 'Land Act, 1948,' \(^2\) the rental income remained static.

The Museum authorities no longer hold the Lamb Hill Estate as an endowment reserve. The 1948 Act had formulated a new policy for calculating the rentals of pastoral

---

2. *Ibid.*, 12 Geo VI, No. 64.
estates based on the Land Settlement Board's determination of a reasonable carrying capacity for each run. The form of lease had been altered from Pastoral Run Licence to Pastoral Lease and this new form carried with it much more stringent restrictions on use of runs so designated and thus, considerably reduced their rental value. The lease of the Museum endowment had originally expired in February 1944, but, under Section 25 of the 'Reserves and other Lands Disposal Act, 1941,' it was extended until February 1949 at the existing rental, although provision was made for adjustment if the rental, upon re-lease, differed from this. When the new formula was finally applied to the Museum endowment in 1953, the rental for the run dropped to £655. Since a considerable credit had accrued during these nine years, the Museum faced the prospect of receiving no income at all for the next three years. The position was further complicated by the fact that the Athenaeum (which benefited from the endowment only if the total rental exceeded £700) had received some £770 more than it was really entitled to, but any attempt by the University to secure repayment would seriously embarrass that institution. In view of this,

2. Since Land Settlement was a more pressing problem, the existing lease was again extended by Section 15 of the 'Reserves and other Lands Disposal Bill, 1947'. *NZ Stat.* 11 Geo. VI No. 54.
3. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/598. 'Explanatory Note on 'Reserves and Other Lands Disposal Bill, 1954.'
the Commissioner of Crown Lands, after top level consultations with the Ministers of Lands and Finance, offered to resume possession of the Lamb Hill estate in return for a capital sum which, if invested at the interest rate then prevailing, would produce approximately the same revenue as the rents had produced in recent years.\textsuperscript{1} Gratefully, the University Council, acting on the recommendation of its Museum Committee, surrendered the endowment in return for a lump sum of £21,400,\textsuperscript{2} which, since the current unimproved value was only £18,000,\textsuperscript{3} was a fairly generous offer.

In 1877, the concept of making permanent provision for the Museum through a pastoral endowment had appeared a very sound policy. Unfortunately, however, the advocates of such a proposal had not envisaged that changing trends in New Zealand's pattern of farming would result in a major reduction in the real value of run properties which had either remained static or, in some cases, dropped markedly, as land values generally increased. The revenue from the Museum endowment, which was, in 1879, barely adequate for the Museum's needs, soon proved to be totally inadequate in the face of ever-rising costs.\textsuperscript{4} As the years

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Ibid.}, Commissioner of Crown Lands to Registrar, 9 Jun 1954.
\item \textit{Ibid.}, Minutes, Vol XVI, 27 Jul 1954. The capital sum was divided between the Museum (£19,250) and the Athenaeum (£2,140).
\item Government Roll Valuation, 31/1/52, Nos. 2783/157 and 2783/158.
\item See below, p. 117
\end{enumerate}
passed and expenditure increased, the University Council found itself forced to seek alternative sources of revenue if it wanted the doors of the Museum to remain open. In such a situation, any expansion at all was entirely out of the question as far as the University Council was concerned, and all development which did take place was the product of the interest and influence of the small group of benefactors to whose active interest in the institution, both the University and the local community owe a very great debt.

Shortly after the Fels Wing was opened in 1930, the surplus money in the building account was invested to provide the Museum with an additional permanent source of revenue for its maintenance and development. According to the Otago Daily Times this new endowment would "relieve the University of a burden which it has had to carry for many years." Unfortunately, however, although the Museum's total assured income had been almost trebled as a result of the investments, the considerable additional expenditure incurred as a result of the extension meant that the Museum's financial position was actually little better than before. Between 1930 and the early 1950's the overall financial position showed a marked deterioration as a consequence of the lower interest rates offered at the time of reinvestment soon after the end of World War II and the inflationary trends

2. O.D.T., 16 Oct 1930.
which resulted in the real value of money declining by some 44 1/2% in a period of less than twenty-five years.¹

In some quarters the true nature of the problem facing the Museum was clearly recognised. When the notion of adding a further wing to the Museum was first proposed as a provincial Centennial Memorial in 1943, A.H. Allen, the Mayor of Dunedin, suggested that a total fund of at least £200,000 would be needed to both build and endow such a memorial "so that it did not become a liability on future generations."²

This precarious position of the Museum's finances was, in reality, no new experience. From the very beginning of its administration, the University Council had sought desperately to contain the Museum's expenditure within the financial limits imposed by the endowment income and, for the first ten years, its efforts in this direction were tolerably successful.³ Since, however, this was the Museum's sole guaranteed source of revenue, the continued reductions in rental soon ended any possibility that planned development would take place under the University's auspices. For its part, the

¹ See Appendix F for a long-term, linked series, retail (all groups) price index.
² OUC Corres. Ser. 5/356, Fels: 'Centennial Memorial - Otago Museum Extension from King Street to Cumberland Street' 11 Nov 1943.
³ See Ibid, Minutes, Vol I, 9 May 1882, where it was reported that the advances made to the Museum from University reserves prior to the lease of the Museum endowment had been repaid and that the Museum Account showed a credit of £36.15.0.
University Council, which was facing extreme financial problems of its own, soon came to regard the Museum Trust as a financial liability rather than as an asset.

When the University Council first accepted responsibility for the Museum’s administration, the salary of the Professor of Natural Science and Curator of the Museum was paid entirely out of University funds. In 1882, however, the Council, bearing in mind the stringent measures it had been forced to implement in order to reduce its own mounting overdraft, decided that £100 of Professor Parker’s salary should be paid out of the Museum’s Account. Because he considered that the Museum’s allowance was already inadequate, Parker protested strongly at this step, but to no avail.

Four years later a further £200 was paid from the Museum Account, and the transfer was accompanied by a corresponding reduction in the amount available for maintenance. At the same time, the Council’s Museum Committee was directed to ascertain “what further reduction (if any) may be made in the annual expenditure pending the financial position of the University improving.” Although economies were made in a number of directions, the Museum Account whose £200 accounted for nearly 20% of the total reduction effected, bore the brunt of the savings. There was

2. Ibid., 19 Sep 1882.
3. Ibid., Vol II, 11 Jan 1886.
4. Ibid.
little consolation for Parker to be found in the University Council's expression of regret at having, of necessity, to curtail the funds available for general Museum expenditure. Reluctantly, Parker co-operated although, in 1888, when he was informed that a paltry £106 was available for maintenance after the deductions for salaries had been made, he remarked:

"I will do my best to make this sum cover the expenses of the year but I must say that it is totally inadequate as repairs to the buildings (always a large item), coal, gas and other unavoidable expenses have to be paid out of it."\(^2\)

Throughout the 1890's the policy of rigid economy continued. In 1895, Parker was informed that "a continuance of the most rigid economy in the expenditure on the Museum is absolutely necessary,"\(^3\) and, in 1898, shortly after his arrival in New Zealand, Professor Benham was informed that the amount of money available for the Museum's maintenance represented the difference between the Museum's endowment income and the amount spent from this revenue on salaries for the Curator, taxidermist and janitor - at this time, a mere £35 a year plus a variable sum from the lease of the

---

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 3/2, Mansford to Parker, 29 Jan 1886.
2. Ibid., Ser. 1/12, Parker to Mansford, 25 Jun 1888.
3. Ibid., Ser. 3/3, Hamilton to Parker, 7 May 1895.
Five years later, after further reductions in the endowment income and the continuing unsatisfactory nature of the University's own financial position, Benham was instructed:

"You will not rely in future on any fixed allowance for the Museum and......you will submit any proposal for expenditure at the monthly meeting of the (House and Museum) committee."  

Continued economy, however, was not, in itself, sufficient to prevent the Museum Account from becoming overdrawn. By 1888 the Museum's finances had deteriorated to the point where the University Council found itself forced to subsidise the institution by a grant from its own limited general reserves in order to keep the account solvent. Although the Council always regarded such transfers as a purely temporary expedient which would be repaid when better times returned, the amount and frequency of the transfer gradually increased as the gap between income and expenditure became greater. By 1899 the transfer had become an annual event and, by 1924, the accumulated deficit had reached £1434. That the Museum was entitled to some payment from the University's own funds

---

1. Ibid., Ser. 3/4, Hamilton to Benham, 2 Aug 1898. The salaries listed in this letter were as follows:—
   Curator £250 (with £350 from the Biology Department)
   Taxidermist £175
   Janitor £90

2. Ibid., Ser. 3/4. Hamilton to Benham, 9 Sep 1903.

3. See Appendix F for a tabulated summary of the changing trends in the Museum's income and expenditure.
cannot now be doubted, but, at this time, the University Council clearly regarded the transfers as an unwarranted drain on its own slender resources. In 1907, primarily as a result of this drain, it had sought financial assistance from the Government to supplement the endowment revenue.

"It is right to point out," wrote the Chancellor in his Annual Report, "that the Museum is a considerable tax on the Council's finance and that the revenue received as an equivalent for the rent of the Museum endowment... is not sufficient to meet the annual expenditure." ²

In 1908, and again, in 1909, when he stated that, "The provision made for the upkeep of the Museum is quite inadequate and I call attention to the Museum Account which shows year by year a transfer from the University funds towards the maintenance of the Museum," ³ he pressed for financial assistance but the plea fell on deaf ears. Almost certainly, the Government of the day concurred with the universally accepted view that the institution was the proper responsibility of the University of Otago and, thus, its maintenance should not be a charge on the taxpayer.

Soon after the formation of the Museum Committee, its Chairman, Willi Fels, sought to make the University Council

---

1. See below, pp. 107 - 8
2. AJHR., 1907, E7. 'University of Otago, Annual Report.'
3. Ibid., 1909, E7.
more aware of its responsibility towards the Museum. He
saw that the Museum's primary requirement was a fund, en-
tirely divorced from the maintenance account, which could
be used exclusively for development purposes and he hoped
to provide this by persuading the Council to accept total
responsibility for Benham's salary. That body, however,
was not so generously inclined, although it did offer to
eliminate over £400 of the current deficit and to pay the
Anthropology class fees into the Museum Account if the
Committee agreed to the payment, from it, of Skinner's
total salary. To Fels, such a suggestion was completely
unacceptable. Since the recommendations of the Museum
Committee were based on what he considered to be the
minimum available revenue, Fels trenchantly condemned
the Council's attitude:

"The Museum," he wrote to the Registrar, "cannot
continue on a hand to mouth existence as now
recommended by the University Council. I mean
by this that there should be an annual surplus
of receipts above expenditure at the disposal
of the Management Committee or otherwise."

If Fels failed in his bid to persuade the University
Council to adopt a more generous attitude towards the
Museum, he did, at least, compel a full consideration

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/168, Chapman to Skinner, 17 Sep 1931;
   MCM Minutes, Vol I, 10 Nov 1931.
2. Ibid., 23 Jun 1931.
of the financial relationship between the two institutions. Until 1931, no attempt had been made by the Council to differentiate between the expenses of the Museum and the Biology Department housed within its walls. But now, with a committee appointed solely to administer the Museum and plan for its future development, feeling hardened towards a fair apportionment of the relative expenses of the two institutions to ensure that any future Museum income would be devoted entirely to the Museum. The basis of such a division, covering electricity, gas, water and coal (collectively the greatest drain on Museum revenue outside salaries), was set out in a letter written by Benham, and, though amended at some points (more often than not, to the University's advantage), was adopted. There can be little doubt that the Museum Committee welcomed this decision as a move in the direction of greater autonomy for the Museum, but the division actually worked to the Museum's disadvantage. In the years which followed, the Committee found that its payments in this field rose substantially and, financially, it was forced to work on an even more restricted budget. On occasions, the division also gave rise to some friction between the University Council and its Museum Committee. In 1942,

for example, when Fels raised the question of the payment of Skinner's salary while he was on military service, he contended that,

"The £620 (of £800) paid to Dr Skinner from Museum funds have absolutely no connection with University finance, and are under the control of the Museum Committee which decides on all Museum salaries and simply refers its decisions to the University Council for confirmation as it acts as Trustee for the Museum."¹

While this interpretation of the relationship existing between the Museum Committee on the one hand and the University Council on the other, was completely consistent with his endeavours to make the former body as autonomous as possible, the notion, thus expressed, proved to be totally unacceptable to the University Council. The Council's attitude was clearly outlined by W. J. Morrell, the University's Chancellor and a man who had always regarded the Museum as an integral part of the University itself.² The separation of the Museum Committee from the Council had caused considerable misapprehension, he wrote, but, although the £620 was paid out of the Museum Account, this "is also an account of the University Council all members of the Museum Staff are undoubtedly employees of the Council."³

¹ OUC Corres. Ser. 5/338, Fels to Chapman, 12 Feb 1942.
³ OUC Corres. Ser. 5/338, Morrell to Fels, 12 Mar 1942.
The University Council's belief that the Museum was an integral part of the University had, in fact, been generally accepted for nearly sixty years. During this time the University had benefited considerably from the joint association. Even before the Council had officially assumed control, its classes in Natural Science had been held within the Museum's precincts, and, after 1877, the housing of the Natural Science and (subsequently) Biology Departments in the Museum where an unequalled collection of material for teaching and research was stored, was a natural development of this early association. The appointment of Curators who were firstly teachers of Biology and who regarded the Museum as "an adjunct" to their teaching activities, helped confirm the Council in this belief and it was not until 1939, when Skinner sought clarification from J.M. Paterson, the University's solicitor, that anyone thought to question the University's right to use the Museum's facilities without making some financial contribution for them. Paterson's opinion, which was based on a clearly established principle of Trustee Law that no Trustee may make a profit out of any Trust vested in it, recorded that:

"...it is a distinct breach of trust for the University to make any use of the Museum property, which it holds in trust that would entitle enable it to make a profit, or save it expending its own funds. I can accordingly see no justification
whatever for the University using rooms in the Museum for purely University classes..."\(^1\)

That fact that the Museum was not incorporated (and, therefore, had no legal existence) did not, in his opinion, alter the situation whereby the Museum was entitled to claim "damages for use and occupation."\(^2\) Consequently, the Council agreed to rectify the somewhat anomalous situation by contributing £100 a year to the Museum Account in lieu of rent for the facilities it was using.\(^3\) This, in itself, was woefully small recompense for the use made of the Museum's facilities over very many years but it was compensated, in part, by the fact that the University Council no longer continued to draw the Museum Committee's attention to the series of transfers it had made to the Museum Account in the past. The payment was doubled in 1947,\(^4\) but only after strong representations had been made by F.M. Hanan, the Museum Committee's Chairman, who suggested that two shillings and sixpence per square foot would not be too great a price to pay for the 5000 square feet occupied by the University's Biology and Botany Departments and the "free, unrestricted access to

---

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/307 'Copy of Opinion by J.M. Paterson', (undated). The original, dated 31 Aug 1939, is to be found in a collection of miscellaneous papers housed in the Museum.

2. Ibid.

3. OUC Committees' Reports (Finance), Vol VIII, 25 Mar 1941.

4. MCM Minutes, Vol I, 10 Sep 1946.
all Museum material required for teaching."¹

Despite this and some small increases from other sources,² the Museum's finances continued to deteriorate and it was becoming increasingly apparent that, unless some way of substantially increasing the Museum's revenue was found within a short time, the possibility of the institution having to close its doors could not be discounted. Although the University Council remained reluctant to surrender its Trust it had no option but to do so after it had been informed by the Minister of Education, through the University Grants Committee, that the Government was no longer prepared to recognise the Museum staff for the purposes of University grants. For some years past, the Council had paid, out of the Government grant received for its Botany Department, a portion of the Museum attendants' salaries for work undertaken by them in the Botany Department itself. R.S. Aitken, the University's Vice-Chancellor, aptly summed up the situation when he wrote:

"This decision would make it impossible for the University to continue payment to the Museum Account of the amount previously transferred from the University for salary purposes."³

Undoubtedly influenced by the fact that the museums in both Auckland and Christchurch were financed largely through local body support, the Government had clearly indicated

¹ OUC Corres. Ser. 5/421, Hanan to Chapman, 8 Aug 1946.
² See below, pp. 112 - 17
³ MCM Minutes, Vol II, 12 Feb 1952.
that it felt that the Otago Museum should be financed in
a similar manner. Moves in this direction were, in fact,
already afoot when the Government's change in policy was
announced and thus, the decision, which placed the Univer-
sity of Otago in a position in which it could no longer
afford to continue as the Museum's Trustee, actually
accelerated, rather than initiated, the complete separation
of the two institutions.

Meanwhile, as a result of the Museum's parlous financial
situation, the University Council had decided to make a
special grant to it, of £1000 a year for the next three
years.1 Although the Council's rather belated generosity
was gratefully accepted, the initial moves for such a grant
had, once again, come from the Museum Committee. After
learning that a new system of block grants to University
Departments would preclude any future monetary contribution
to the Museum,2 the Museum Committee determined to broach,
once more, the whole question of the rental for the Museum
property "used by the University for which the Committee
felt an inadequate payment was (being) made."3 In a
definitive Memorandum encompassing the entire issue of
Museum finance, Hanan expressed grave concern for the
institution's current financial position, the income of

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/534, Aitken to Deans of Faculties,
   8 Feb 1951.
2. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/519, Aitken to Hanan, 29 Nov 1949.
which compared most unfavourably with that of the other metropolitan museums. He pointed out that, although grants from nearby local bodies realised about £2000 a year, there appeared to be little prospect of any further increase in revenue from any existing source other than from the University’s Arts Account. The Museum, he continued, was grossly understaffed as a consequence of the inadequate finance and this, in turn, was reflected in the almost total lack of recent publications originating from within the Museum. Further, the University’s contribution to the maintenance of the Museum buildings was very meagre, particularly when considered against the use made of them by the Departments of Biology, Zoology, Anthropology, Classics and Home Science. After pointing out that the University was currently using 11,000 square feet of floor space for which it paid a paltry £200 a year, the report appealed "for a substantial increase in the University’s contribution" towards the upkeep of the institution.

The *Otago Daily Times* added its support to the Museum Committee’s claim. In an editorial, the paper pointed out that the University Council’s,

---

1. See below, pp. 112 - 17 for a full discussion of this aspect of Museum revenue.

"annual contribution scarcely represents a low rental for the facilities freely used. . . . . . . The University's responsibility to enlarge its grant. . . . . . . . is clear."¹

At the same time, however, the paper also argued that there was a,

"need beyond this for local bodies in Otago to accept or recognise more generously, an obligation to assist a very worthy institution, which is visited by town and country people and is performing an essential educational function in this province."²

In the face of pressure such as this, the University Council was persuaded to approve the recommendation of its Finance Committee and made the £1000 grant. The Council, however, informed the Museum Committee that it expected that that body would renew its efforts to secure additional permanent revenue from Government and local body sources, and, if such efforts were successful, the Council would feel free to reconsider the payment of any grant not taken up.³

Local body support for the Museum had, in fact, been solicited on a number of occasions during the previous seventy years. During the 1880's the University Council had attempted, unsuccessfully, to persuade Parliament to

---

¹ O.D.T., 28 Sep 1950.
² Ibid.
grant rate exemption to the University of Otago.\footnote{1} Parker held very strong views on this matter and, in 1893, he wrote:

"One thing about the Museum should, I think, be widely known. It is the only indoor place of public resort in the City; it is open every day of the year; and it costs the ratepayers not one penny, being supported by a landed endowment, which at the present day yields a smaller income than it did when first set apart for its purpose sixteen years ago. If these facts were borne in mind, I hardly think the citizens of Dunedin would consent to receive so large a slice of its woefully diminished income in the shape of rates."\footnote{2}

Despite this, the University Council appears to have made no effort to follow up its Museum Committee's suggestion to seek the remission of the Municipal rates from the Dunedin City Council because the Museum was "a place of public resort."\footnote{3} Rates continued to be paid until somewhere around the turn of the century, after which, for a period, water rates only, were charged.\footnote{4}

\begin{enumerate}
\item OUC Corres. Ser. 3/2. Chancellor to Premier, 8 Mar 1887. It was here pointed out that the Dunedin City Council had not adopted the 'Rating Act, 1882' which exempted scholastic buildings "not carried on for pecuniary gain or profit," from rate payments. The Museum's rate at this time was £31. 5. 0.
\item T.J. Parker: 'The Otago University Museum,' in The Otago University Review (Special Number), 1893. p. 32
\item OUC Minutes, Vol II, 3 Jul 1893. A search of OUC. Corres. ser. 3/3, and the Dunedin City Council Records, fails to reveal that any action, at all, was taken on the recommendation.
\item Ibid., Vol III, 2 and 21 Oct 1901; Ibid., 1 Aug 1904.
\end{enumerate}
In February 1910, Benham urged the University Council to enlist the assistance of the Dunedin City Council "in the upkeep of the Museum as a public institution."\(^1\) The approach which followed was successful and, for the next five years, an annual grant of £75 was made - £50 for the upkeep of the Museum and £25 for the Hocken Library. When, in 1919, the grant for the previous year had not been received, the vulnerability of this method of financing the Museum was clearly illustrated. Benham urged that the grants continue\(^2\) but the City Council's Finance Committee declared that no such provision had been made in the estimates,\(^3\) a decision reinforced by the City Council itself, when it ruled that the request should be declined since it had already decided to make no grants other than those provided in the estimates for the current year.\(^4\) This decision was symptomatic of things to come. Although grants of this nature were received from time to time and eventually became a major source of the Museum's revenue,\(^5\) the University Council had already discovered that such an income could not be guaranteed from year to year and, on a number of occasions, projects even of a very

---

5. See Appendix F.
minor nature, had to be left in abeyance until money became available from some alternative source.

The University Council again appealed to the Dunedin City Council in 1922, and that body reinstated its grant and increased it to £200. From this date, the grant was made nearly every year and its size was steadily increased to help offset rising costs and to assist the Museum authorities to adequately maintain the ever-growing collections. In 1937, the grant was raised to £750; in 1946, to £1000; in 1949, to £1500 and, during the last two years of the University Council's administration, reached £2000 a year.¹

The Museum Accounts for the early 1940's show, clearly, that the institution's revenue was barely sufficient to cover its liabilities,² and, as expenditure spiralled, approaches were made to other local bodies situated within a reasonable distance of the Museum. These appeals, the first of which was made in 1940, were based on two grounds - local patriotism, and assistance in providing improved facilities for the education of the many thousands of children who were now using the Museum under the general direction of the Museum Education Officer, who had been first appointed in 1937 as a result of a Carnegie Corporation

¹. Ibid.
². See, Annual Reports of the Otago Museum, 1940-45.
grant for the purpose.\(^1\) With the country at war, however, the timing of the appeal was inopportune and its success limited. Of the eleven local and ad hoc bodies approached,\(^2\) only two contributed,\(^3\) and seven did not even bother to reply. A second appeal three years later, met with an even poorer response although it should be noted that the St. Kilda Borough Council, which advised the Museum Committee of its willingness to donate £5,\(^4\) increased its contribution to £75 after a few of their number had been conducted around the institution.\(^5\)

While this limited success in securing grants from local bodies was thankfully acknowledged, the Museum Committee was only too well aware of the fact that it had received no firm guarantee of a grant on an annual basis. Consequently, appeals had to be renewed each year and, on occasions, when the Museum Committee felt that certain local bodies could, perhaps, contribute more freely, it set about the time-consuming task of preparing a special case to reinforce its general appeal. By 1948, a full-scale assault in search of financial support had, again, to be mounted. In addition to an appeal to the Dunedin

---

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/286. 'Memorandum for Members of the Sub-Committee set up to consider the Financial and Structural Needs of the Otago Museum' (1939)

2. MCM Minutes, Vol I, 11 Jun 1940.

3. Ibid., 10 Sep 1940; 11 Feb 1941.

4. Ibid., 7 Dec 1943.

5. Ibid., 12 Jul 1944.
City Council for an increase in its grant, approaches were made to the boroughs of St. Kilda, Port Chalmers, Mosgiel, Balclutha and Oamaru, and to the Otago Harbour Board. But, although revenue from grants more than quadrupled as a result, the basic problem of providing the Museum with a guaranteed source of income adequate for its steady development, had not been solved. Nor had the increased grants materially improved the Museum's overall financial position for, if the University's special £1000 grant is discounted, the institution's general running expenses were still several hundred pounds in excess of its income.\(^1\) The seriousness of the situation was underlined by the Museum Committee when, in a summary of its financial position, in 1952, it recorded that it,

"...has not been able to finance even the appointments it has already authorised. The staff at present paid by the Committee is not sufficient to maintain an appropriate display of the existing collections and is certainly not able to bring about any further developments in this work."\(^2\)

Throughout the entire period of the University's administration, the salaries of the Museum’s skeleton staff had absorbed a sizeable proportion of the institution's total income. Apart from a short period around the turn

1. In 1952, the Museum's total income (excluding the University's special grant) totalled £3541 while expenditure (including £3389 for salaries) amounted to £4620. See MCM Minutes, Vol II, 14 Oct 1952, 'Comprehensive Statement on Finance.'

2. MCM Minutes, Vol II, 17 Jun 1952
of the century, the proportion of revenue expended on salaries remained relatively constant at about 7½%, but the total amount of money required for salary payments rose steeply and continually. The Museum’s staff was always totally inadequate for its needs, a deficiency which is accentuated when it is remembered that at no stage was the position of Curator a full-time one. What little revenue remained was soon absorbed in such routine items as coal, gas, electricity, and secretarial expenses, and maintenance was strictly limited to the absolute essentials. Truly, if ever a cultural institution was managed on the proverbial shoestring, it was the Otago Museum.

Another impasse had, in fact, been reached. For many years now, the Museum Committee had been hard pressed even to maintain the Museum out of the limited finance available and all major development had been solely dependent on the efforts of those individuals who had aroused public interest and support. But, by now, the era of the rich philanthropist had passed. If the Otago Museum was to maintain, in the future, its reputation as "the finest Museum for a town the size of Dunedin anywhere in the World,"¹ an alternative and considerably larger source of revenue, upon which the Museum authorities could depend and which would not be subject to serious devaluation during times of inflation, had to be

¹. E.S. 25 Jul 1944. Interview with Major F.M. Markham, Past-President of the Museums’ Association of Great Britain.
found very soon. Since 1868, the Museum's income had been quite inadequate and, although the Government of the day, by endowing it with a pastoral run, had sought to make the institution independent of any need for additional revenue, the most significant factor of the more recent years was the steady decline in the real value of the endowment\textsuperscript{1} while, in the same period, revenue from voluntary grants increased to nearly 63\% of the total income.\textsuperscript{2} In spite of the increase in voluntary grants, the fundamental problem remained and the vulnerability of such grants to the whims of each local body was a major factor in the eventual decision of the Museum Committee to seek legislative authority to strike a rate on properties throughout the province.

During their seventy-eight year association, the Museum had served the University well. By providing accommodation for the University's Biology classes and by making available for teaching purposes the immense and extremely valuable collections of biological and ethnological material, it had added greatly to the University's reputation in these fields. In return, the University, while not, perhaps, contributing as much financially as her use of these facilities indicated, or assisting its development to the limit of her capacity, had provided

\textsuperscript{1} In 1953 endowment revenue accounted for only 14\% of total revenue.

\textsuperscript{2} See Appendix F.
"the Museum (with) a curator of some scientific standing,"¹ had maintained it during a long period of economic distress which would have otherwise permanently crippled the institution, and (indirectly) had guided its destinies through the period of its greatest progress. Each institution had, in fact, made a valuable contribution to the wellbeing of the other, a contribution which makes it impossible and, indeed unnecessary to try to evaluate any intangible debts which might have been incurred.

¹. Parker: op cit., p. 31.
CHAPTER V.

THE OTAGO MUSEUM TRUST BOARD ACT.

In October 1952, a 'Comprehensive Statement on Finance',¹ prepared at the request of the Museum Committee, sketched in stark relief the precarious position of the Otago Museum's finances. The Report indicated all too clearly that while the Museum's income had reached the record figure of £3,541, the expenditure on absolute essentials during this same period had risen to £4,620. Since there seemed to be little prospect of materially increasing the Museum's revenue from existing sources, it was apparent to all concerned that if the Otago Museum was to survive as a public institution, its finances would have to be placed on a decidedly more secure footing than hitherto. While the University Council was still extremely reluctant to surrender the Trust with all its attendant advantages, it recognised that the recent ruling of the Minister of Education² which would effectively prevent it from supporting the Museum by grants from its Arts and General Account in the future, meant that, financially, the Council would be unable to continue as Trustee for very much longer. As the University Council and its Museum Committee together searched for a new means of securing the institution's financial position, their attention turned increasingly to—

¹. MCM Minutes, Vol II, October 1952.
². See above, Chap. IV, pp. 109-10 for a full discussion of this decision and its implications.
wards the idea of establishing an ad hoc authority vested with power to finance the Otago Museum through the imposition of a small levy on provincial property.

A number of factors other than the University Council's inability to maintain its existing contribution towards the upkeep of the Museum had influenced this decision. During the previous twenty or so years, the activities of the Museum had been extended progressively far beyond the precincts of the building itself. The Association of Friends, formed back in 1926, had brought the institution into direct contact with the local community for the first time in more than fifty years. The next decade had seen the establishment of the Museum Education Service which, by 1950, was able to report an annual attendance at the Museum of well over 30,000 pupils from schools, both urban and rural.¹ In more recent years this service had been extended out to the country districts themselves by the establishment of a loan case system for the circulation of Museum material. Nor was this activity confined to the schools. In 1952 the Museum Education Service, in co-operation with the Otago University's Adult Education Department,² placed cases, some of which had been specially prepared, on display in the Oamaru Public Library.³ If this "re-development of the old organic connection" with the

¹. Otago Museum, Annual Report, 1950 p.10
². Now known as the Department of University Extension.
³. MCM Minutes, Vol II. 8 Jul 1952.
community was, in itself, sufficient justification for seeking authority to finance the Museum by striking a small rate, added weight had been given to this argument in 1946, when the Province's Centennial Committee adopted the planned Museum extension as its Centennial Memorial, a decision which would inevitably throw a much greater strain on the institution's already meagre resources in the future. Eight years later, while the debate on the proposed Act was at its height, the Otago Daily Times recognised the measure as "desirable and even necessary as a consequence of the adoption of the Public Memorial scheme." Furthermore, the undue dependence on the goodwill of nearby Local bodies had begun to produce mild criticism from some of them. For instance, in 1952, the Otago Harbour Board, which had previously made three grants totalling £200, agreed to make a further contribution of £100, 

"...but only on the distinct understanding that the University or the Museum Committee makes an approach to all other local bodies in the Otago district for regular financial support. The Board feels that only in this way can the expenses of the Museum be satisfactorily met."

In the same year a deputation from the Museum Committee which met with the Mayor, Deputy Mayor and Town Clerk of Dunedin, was advised to make an immediate approach to Otago local bodies and

1. Otago Museum, Annual Report, 1945. The words are Fels'.
2. See above, Chap. III pp. 77-78.
4. OUC Corres. Ser 5/558. Secretary, Otago Harbour Board to Hayward, 16 May 1952.
prepare the ground for the introduction of legislation to authorize the local bodies to levy a small rate for the upkeep of the Museum.\textsuperscript{1} It was obvious that those few local authorities which had supported the Museum financially during recent years, would not be as willing to do so in the future unless the mounting financial burden was spread more equitably throughout the entire area which benefited from the Museum's activities. Then, too, the Museum authorities could point to the precedents established by the Auckland and Canterbury Metropolitan Museums, both of which were financed through a rate levied by Trust Boards which had been set up to administer them.

An editorial entitled 'Financing the Museum' which appeared in the \textit{Otago Daily Times}\textsuperscript{2} placed its finger squarely on one of the main reasons why authority to strike a rate had not been sought previously. It observed that rating was,

"the recognised method of financing public institutions, but the fact that the Otago Museum is a University and not a municipal institution has, up to the present, precluded the success of any move to secure rate finance for its upkeep."

This assumption was, of course, quite wrong, but the long and very close identification of the Otago Museum with the University of Otago was now hampering the institution's progress. The claim that the Museum was "a University and not a municipal

\begin{flushleft}
1. MGM Minutes Vol II, 10 Jun 1952.
\end{flushleft}
institution" was believed by its provincial origins and by two legal opinions \(^1\) but the distinction between them had become so blurred with the passage of time that the editorial opinion had accurately reflected the generally accepted view of the local community. The title 'Otago University Museum' had, in fact, come into general use only a short time after the institution had passed into the trust of the University. Undoubtedly ignorance played a major part in this alteration. It is quite clear that Parker, who was appointed Curator only two years after the University Council assumed control, always believed that this was the correct title \(^2\) and by the time Benham was appointed in 1898, the practice was firmly established. \(^3\) For his part, Benham never doubted that the title was correct and in the records of the subsequent forty years, numerous references to the 'Otago University Museum' are to be found. \(^4\) It was not until 1942 that a ruling as to the legally correct title was finally sought. Evidently, J.M. Paterson's earlier opinion \(^5\) raised doubts in the minds of

---

1. See above, Chap. IV, pp. 107-8 and below, pp. 126-7

2. See, Nature, Vol. XXV (February 1882) to LVII (April 1898). In various issues, none in all, Parker contributed a series of articles entitled 'Notes from the Otago University Museum', the first of which was dated at Dunedin on 3 November 1881.

3. The earliest letterhead, 'Otago University Museum', still extant, is dated 27 April 1888; the University's Annual Report for 1890 refers to "the Museum of the University", and an article, written by Alfred Reynolds and published in the Otago Witness on 8 June 1893, was titled 'Otago University Museum'.


5. See above, Chap IV, pp. 107-8.
Fels and Skinner which culminated in the latter's asking the University Council to determine whether the institution should be known as the 'Otago University Museum' or, simply, the 'Otago Museum'. Unable to given an immediate ruling, the University Council requested W.J. Morrell, the Chancellor, to investigate the position and report back. Morrell had always assumed that the Museum was an integral part of the University and his "careful examination of early minutes of the Council, University Calendars and other material" confirmed him in his opinion.

"During half a century at least," he wrote, "the general funds of the University made a substantial contribution to the Museum expenditure. The Museum has always been regarded not as an (other ?) or independent institution committed to the University's care, but as an integral and valuable department of the University which has felt pride in its work and in the progress made often under considerable difficulties. The (connection ?) of the Museum with the University has, in fact, well justified the transfer made 65 years ago, & the title then adopted. The Council, I submit, has no alternative but to reply to Dr Skinner's enquiry that the correct title of the institution is 'The Otago University Museum',".

The University Council was, however, not as certain as Morrell and, in March 1943, it sought confirmation from its solicitors.

1. OUC Minutes, Vol XIII, 8 Dec 1942.
2. Ibid
4. Ibid., (appended in pencil).
who, after studying the legal aspects of the question, advised it that the title, 'Otago University Museum' was *ultra vires* under the Act of 1877.\(^1\) Accordingly, the Council had no option other than to rule,

"that the original and legally correct title 'The Otago Museum' only be employed in all official documents and publications."\(^2\)

Nonetheless, old-established habits die hard. Although the Council's decision had confirmed the propriety of Fels' efforts to redirect responsibility for the Otago Museum back to the people of the Province, most still continued to regard the Museum as the sole responsibility of the University of Otago.

There were occasions, it is true, when the Otago Museum was recognised as a civic as well as a University responsibility. The magnificence of Fels' early gifts encouraged the *Otago Daily Times* to write in 1924, that the Museum "depends on the people of Otago and Southland to support it,"\(^3\) and fifteen months later, when the Museum Extension Committee opened its appeal for contributions, the *Evening Star* held that the "unrestricted privilege of entrance.....involves a corresponding obligation on the part of the community."\(^4\) The same paper later expressed approval of the Dunedin City Council's grant of £5000 towards the building fund with the words: "the Museum is a

---

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/359. Ramsay and Haggitt to Registrar, 21 May 1943.
4. *E.S.*, 26 Feb 1926.
Dunedin and an Otago institution; it is not a national one." 

At this time, however, suggestions for active and continuous community support were, at best, very vague, and it was left to the newly formed Association of Friends and the Otago Institute to stimulate what public interest they could. Closer co-operation between the Institute and the Museum was sought by the Museum Committee in 1934 when a joint committee of the two bodies agreed that such a step would give the Museum a more corporate life, extend the educational facilities of both institutions, provide for increased public financial support, and help fulfil the ideal expressed in the Markham Report that,

"the Museum should be a meeting place for various clubs and societies, an encouragement to all seekers after knowledge, and an educational centre for the town and province."

The Institute, however, feared that its identity would become submerged in the University of Otago and its Council suggested that their common interests would be best served if the University Council handed over the trusteeship of the Museum to a new body to be known as the 'Museum and Royal Society of Otago'. Nothing came of the suggestion however, because the University Council was unwilling to divest itself of the trust, and the question of a separate controlling authority for the Museum was not raised again until 1947 when a sub-committee, convened by

1. Ibid., 11 Mar 1926.
3. Ibid., 17 Dec 1934.
H.P. Kidson, investigated the proposal and recommended that,
"the Museum Committee should ask the Council to
consider what its policy would be to a request that
its trust be handed over to a separate controlling
body."¹

While the University Council viewed the suggestion with
cautions, it finally concurred, in principle, with the proposal.²
The next year the Museum Committee succeeded in obtaining a
much more precise definition of its functions,³ a move which
confirmed its increasing independence from the University
Council. As the state of the Museum's finances became more
and more precarious, the greater became the Museum Committee's
determination to establish a separate controlling authority
financed through a small levy imposed on provincial property
and, on a number of occasions, it made a detailed study of the
recently enacted 'Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act'. In
December 1949, Hanan, the Committee's Chairman, directed
attention to the financial problems which would inevitably
result from the erection of the Centennial Wing.⁴ The cost
of managing this new addition would, he said, fall entirely
on the Museum Committee's limited funds and that,
"is beyond our resources. Knowing that many public
bodies would no doubt like to take a part of the ad-
ministrative costs of the Centennial Memorial, probably

¹. Ibid., 11 Mar 1947.
². OUC Minutes, Vol XIV, 18 May 1948.
³. See Above, Chap III, pp. 78-82.
⁴. E.S. 20 Dec 1949.
schemes somewhat similar to those adopted in Canterbury and Auckland for the imposition of a small rate might be sought. The local bodies concerned will, of course, be approached when the appropriate time arrives, so that we will be assured that the buildings are a worthy memorial to the pioneers."

Thus, although no concrete proposal to establish a rating authority had yet been made, the trend of events was moving relentlessly towards this solution of the Museum's problem. When plans to establish an Otago Museum Trust Board were finally formulated in 1953 the Museum Committee's activities had assumed a new level of importance.

The preliminary steps towards this goal were, in fact, taken during the second half of 1952. In May of that year the Museum Committee appointed a sub-committee of three (Skinner, Dr Angus Ross, then Senior Lecturer in History at the University and, from July 1951, one of the University Council's representatives on the Museum Committee, and L. Lockerbie, the Museum Education Officer) to prepare a report on the functions of the Otago Museum and the extent of its need for increased financial assistance in future years.¹

The importance of this decision can hardly be underestimated for, in its final form, the sub-committee's report became the 'Comprehensive Statement on Finance' previously referred to and it was subsequently adopted as the basis for planning the financial requirements of the Trust Board.² The sub-committee

2. Ibid., 10 Mar 1953.
indicated that a five-fold increase in assured income was essential if the existing collections were to be properly maintained in the future and the developments which had been planned were to be pursued. After receiving the report, the Museum Committee sought, once more, the University Council's views on the future control of the Museum if some form of rating was adopted to finance the institution.¹ For its part, the Council was still rather less than enthusiastic, and although it conceded that,

"if the finances of the Museum should be strengthened by the rating of Local Authorities the Council would be willing to reconstruct the Museum Committee in such a way as to give fuller representation to those authorities,"

it, nevertheless, held that "the Museum with the Hocken Library, should continue to be vested in the University."² Copies of the report were also forwarded to the Dunedin City Council and, during a subsequent meeting between representatives of the Museum Committee and the City Council's Finance Committee, the possibility of rate finance for the Museum received considerable attention and encouragement.³

At its first meeting for 1953, the Museum Committee de-

1. Ibid., 14 Oct 1952.
2. Ibid.
cided, finally, to seek authority to finance the Museum through a rate struck on provincial property.\(^1\) Another sub-committee, comprising H. Walden Fitzgerald,\(^2\) E.J. Anderson, J.C. Begg, M. Connelly, L.M. Sattherwaite, and Drs Skinner and Ross, was established to consider the preparation of a draft Bill for submission to Parliament. The University Council was advised of the Museum Committee's decision and, after it was informed that if rating was to be used to finance the Museum "some public or semi-public body must be invested by Statute with rating powers to that end,"\(^3\) it agreed to the drafting of the Bill provided,

"all existing University rights with regard to teaching and demonstration in Arts and Science subjects and in relation to the housing of the Hocken Library, the Botany and Zoology Departments, are preserved under the Act. These rights should include the right to remove the Hocken Library collection when desired by the University."\(^4\)

This requirement on the part of the University was later to become one of the minor bones of contention with the local authorities.

Between 10 February and 10 March 1953, the sub-committee met three times and its recommendations form the genesis of the

---

1. MCM Minutes, Vol II, 10 Feb 1953.
2. Chairman of the Museum Committee since April 1952.
Otago Museum Trust Board Bill. These fall into three distinct categories - finance, control, and the relationship of the University to the Museum. By basing its calculations on the 'Comprehensive Statement on Finance', the sub-committee estimated the Museum's immediate financial requirements at £11,550, and this, they thought, would rise to about £15,750 once the Centennial Wing was erected. It therefore suggested that rating income should be based on a uniform figure of one-thirtieth of a penny in the £ on the capital valuation of all rateable land in the Otago Province. While on current values it was recognised that such a figure would yield some £13,400, it was emphasised that the Museum's requirements could and would be met by striking a much lower figure than this maximum in the years before the Centennial Wing was opened. Recognising that the authority to rate would result in a demand by local bodies for a much greater say in the institution's management, the sub-committee advocated the formation of a separate controlling authority on which rating and non-rating interests would have equal representation. A Board of twelve was recommended consisting of three representatives from each of the Dunedin City Council, the boroughs and counties outside Dunedin City and the University Council, two from the Association of Friends and one from the Royal Society. In deference to the University Council's wishes, a definite statement safeguarding the University's existing rights with regard to the use of

1. The difference of £2,000 between this and the eventual estimate of £15,750 was to be met out of endowment revenue and interests on existing investments.
available facilities and material, was to be included. These were to be the principal provisions of the Bill; the routine requirements of the legislation, the sub-committee considered, should follow closely the pattern set by the 'Canterbury Museum Trust Board Act, 1947'. After considering these proposals, the Museum Committee, in April 1953, gave the University's solicitors, Ramsey, Haggitt and Robertson, the green light to draft a Bill incorporating these recommendations, a task which was completed by 28 May.

The Museum Committee next turned its attention to deciding on the most tactful yet effective method of introducing the affected local bodies to its proposed legislation. The sub-committee had originally suggested that members of the Museum Committee should travel through the Province and address each local body separately, but while the Museum Committee thought the idea had merit, few members appeared willing to devote the time required and they felt that the Committee's interests would best be served if representatives of each local body concerned were invited to meet with it in Dunedin. As the negotiations progressed, it became increasingly obvious that initial lobbying would have undoubtedly speeded up acceptance of the measure.

2. Ibid., 14 Apr 1953.
3. Ibid., 28 May 1953 - sub-committee's report.
4. Ibid., 10 Mar 1953 - sub-committee's report.
5. Ibid., 14 Apr 1953.
The Museum Committee, however, finally settled for a luncheon meeting to be held in the Museum, to which two representatives from each of the local bodies outside Dunedin, the Mayor, Town Clerk and the Dunedin City Council's Finance Committee, and local M.P.'s were invited. To provide a solid basis for discussion, copies of the draft legislation were forwarded to all local authorities during the first half of June along with a circular letter explaining the reasons behind the proposal. Despite the Museum Committee's instruction to the solicitors to take "the necessary preliminary steps" to have the Bill introduced in Parliament during the forthcoming session, its intentions were quite clear, and at no stage was there any intention of ignoring the views of participating local bodies. Certainly, the approval of the Dunedin City Council, whose contribution under the terms of the proposed legislation would account for more than half the total income, had been obtained before drafting had commenced, but this was a necessary preliminary, for failure to gain its support would have made the proposal impracticable.

What the Museum Committee had not anticipated was the

1. The circular letter is, unfortunately, undated but OUC Corres. Ser. 5/576 includes a letter from Hayward to all local M.P.'s which enclosed a copy of the circular "I have sent to local bodies regarding a proposed new Bill to provide for the vesting of the Museum in a new Museum Trust Board, and to make provision for finance for the Board." This letter is dated 13 June 1953. Further, the Minute Book of the Port Chalmers Borough Council records that the proposal was discussed by it at its meeting on 22 June 1953.

2. RHR File 5427, 'Otago Museum Trust Board Bill'. Hayward to solicitors, 3 Jun 1953.

nature and extent of the opposition to its proposals. Initial reactions were, with few exceptions, far from favourable. The Otago Daily Times, while agreeing that provincial support for the Otago Museum was an "inevitable" and "thoroughly sound" step, launched a strong wave of criticism at the suggested composition of the Trust Board which it regarded as "most unsatisfactory".

"This would mean," the editorial continued, "that the rating authorities would have no more than equal representation with what might be described as the academic authorities and, in certain circumstances, could be outvoted by them. This is quite wrong, and no local body should accept such a constitution. If the board is to be a rating authority, control must be exercised by representatives of the ratepayers and no departure from this principle should be recognised."\(^1\)

To secure the interests of the ratepayers, the paper suggested that the representation of both the University Council and the Association of Friends should be reduced to one.\(^2\) Counties and boroughs took up the cry and expressed opinions ranging from extreme caution to downright indignation and opposition. W.G. Caldwell, a member of the Bruce County Council, said, "We are perturbed because more and more people are being empowered to rate."\(^3\) The Clutha County Council queried the equal representation granted to non-rating authorities and argued that since Dunedin residents would derive more benefit from the Museum,

---

2. Ibid.
3. Ibid., 26 Jun 1953.
they should pay proportionately more.¹ The Alexandra Borough Council resolved to oppose the proposal in its entirety;² the Cromwell Borough Council also decided to oppose the Bill on the grounds "that the purpose to benefit is not one which is a Ratepayers' responsibility to maintain entirely but is one which is for Taxpayers;³ and Oamaru's Mayor, M.F.E. Cooney described it as,

"a pernicious class tax to supply the Community with the service....The Minister (of Education) decided against this and as a result the Museum people hit upon the bright idea of rating the people of Otago. Why should the ratepayers alone be asked to contribute towards this community service?"⁴

Of all the initial reactions publicly recorded before the meeting of local body representatives which was held on 31 July, only that of the Milton Borough Council was firmly in favour of the measure.⁵

In the face of this criticism, the Museum Committee itself again considered the draft Bill at length at its July meeting.⁶ The Committee conceded that the proposed composition of the Trust Board would probably have to be amended in favour of rating representation and it tentatively decided to achieve this by

---

1. Ibid., 2 Jul 1953.
2. Ibid., 10 Jul 1953.
3. CBC Minutes, 6 Jul 1953.
4. Continued recognition of Museum staff for calculating salary grants of the Otago University.
reducing the University Council's representation from three
to two and that of the Association of Friends from two to one.
Further as a result of a recommendation from a northern Museum,1
the addition of one person to represent the Otago Education
Board, a move which would help gain the Education Department's
support for the Museum Education Service, was proposed. Al-
though the University Council, to whom the suggestions were
referred, was far from happy with them, it approved the con-
cession to local body opinion, "if such demands are raised and
have to be met."2

As far as the Museum Committee was concerned, the meeting
with local body representatives on 31 July was very inconclusive
indeed. After the representatives had been conducted around
the display galleries and had become acquainted with the
institution's other, less obvious functions, the Committee's
proposals for supporting the Museum financially on a provincial
basis were outlined in some detail by Ross and James Begg.3 In
appealing for local body support Ross, the Museum Committee's
principal speaker, pointed out that although the University
Council had never been under any legal obligation to maintain
the Museum out of its own funds, it had made substantial contrib-
utions in recent years and these had been instrumental in keep-
ing the institution open to the public. He also stressed that

1. Almost certainly, the Canterbury Museum.
3. Begg was a representative of the Association of Friends on
   the Museum Committee.
no direct Government or Education Department grant had ever been made to help maintain the Museum; in fact, the precedents established by the parliamentary Acts setting up Trust Boards for both the Auckland and Canterbury metropolitan museums, clearly indicated that the Government considered each of these institutions to be a local and provincial responsibility. Since the Museum had been a free public institution from the time of its foundation, Ross argued that to charge admission at this stage would be a retrograde step and thus the only feasible solution to the Museum's problem was the draft Bill which had been circulated. ¹ But, although the Museum Committee obviously hoped to secure the local bodies' acceptance of its proposals, many of the representatives present had been directed by their respective councils to oppose the measure and they were thus not in a position to vote on the issues involved. As a result, no decision other than to refer the proposed amendments back to their respective Councils for consideration, was made. In order to placate opposition, Fitzgerald, in his opening remarks, had announced the Museum Committee's intention of amending the proposed composition of the Trust Board to give ratepayer representatives a clear majority ² and the effect of this was to redirect and concentrate criticism on the proposal to finance  

1. O.D.T., 1 Aug 1953.  
2. RHR File 4527, 'Notes of Meeting, 31/7/53.' Fitzgerald's announcement was rather more indefinite than the decision previously made by the Museum Committee. He announced that the amendment would be made either by increasing by one, the number of Trust Board members to be elected by the local bodies, or decreasing by one, the number to be appointed by non-paying bodies.
the institution through the imposition of a small rate. The fact that Fitzgerald had made quite a feature of the Museum Committee's acceptance of another proposed amendment which would allow levies to be paid, if desired, from local body funds, was largely ignored as the meeting debated the rating issue. Two clearly defined groupings, separated by a third and much smaller body of opinion, soon emerged. The first group (generally located reasonably near to Dunedin), while reluctant to concur with any suggestion to extend the authority to rate, realised that this was the only certain way of guaranteeing the Museum an adequate income. One of the Green Island Borough Council representatives synthesised the views of this group when he said that, although his Council was reluctant to add a further burden to ratepayers' already considerable commitments, it was prepared to support the Bill for the good of the community. The second group was formed of those Councils which were implacably opposed to any additional rating, no matter how small. The opposition of this group, led by the Borough Councils of Cromwell and Oamaru, was to prove a major obstacle to the eventual passage of the legislation. Between these two was a third group, a group whose views were best expressed by F.S. Thompson, a representative of the Tusapka County

2. F.G. Dunn, the Mayor of Cromwell, expressed his Council's opposition "in principle" to granting an ad hoc authority the power to rate; M.F.E. Cooney, the Mayor of Oamaru, was very critical of the Dunedin City Council's action in agreeing to promote the Bill without first seeking the opinions of the other local authorities.
Council, when he said that although his County had sent its delegates to oppose the measure, "now I must endeavour to change (their) minds." This group tended to support those Councils who favoured the legislation but they felt, firstly, that one-thirtieth of a penny in the £ was too generous a figure for the Museum's needs and, secondly, that the distance from Dunedin should be taken into account when calculating the levy payable. Although motions to reduce the maximum rate to one-fiftieth of a penny in the £ \(^2\) and to replace uniform rating with a system of differential rating \(^3\) were proposed, the meeting considered them to be premature and they were subsequently withdrawn. Nevertheless, in its report of the meeting, the *Otago Daily Times* recorded that agreement appeared to have been reached on amending the rate to provide for a maximum levy of one-fiftieth of a penny in the £ with an initial maximum of one-sixtieth of a penny. When closing the meeting, Fitzgerald indicated that the Museum Committee would consider the views of the meeting at an early date and, in due course, convey the results of its deliberations to each local body. \(^4\)

Although the meeting was a major setback to the Museum Committee's immediate plans, evidence soon appeared that some slight progress had, in fact, been made. Certainly, the nature

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/576, Pencilled 'Notes of Meeting, 31/7/53'. Similar views were expressed by C.T. McCallum (Waikouaiti Borough Council) and T. Halliday (St Kilda Borough Council).

2. Moved by McCallum.

3. Moved by G. Ashcroft, Clerk of Clutha County.

4. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/576, pencilled 'Notes of Meeting, 31/7/53'; passim; also RHR File 4527, 'Notes on Meeting, 31/7/53' passim and O.D.T., 1 Aug 1953, passim.
and extent of local body opposition was now defined much more precisely than hitherto and, on that count alone, the Museum Committee had a much clearer picture of what would prove acceptable to the great majority. Some delegates, too, were obviously converted to the Museum Committee's case by what they saw and heard and they could be relied upon to try to win over their respective Councils. But, most important of all, was the suggestion, tentatively put forward by Geo. Ashcroft, Clerk of the Clutha County, to incorporate a system of differential rating into the Bill. Ashcroft was personally convinced that provincial support for the Otago Museum was a proper and logical step to take and, during the next two years, he played a major role in persuading first, the counties and later, a majority of the boroughs, to support this principle. By so doing, he removed one of the major stumbling blocks to the acceptance of the measure.

It was Ashcroft who now took the initiative. He had approved of the Museum Committee's action in presenting its proposal in the form of a draft Bill and, on 10 August, he wrote to Fitzgerald 1 to suggest four amendments which, he believed, would go a long way towards allaying local body fears. In the first place, he thought that the Trust Board should be given complete control over "its inheritance"; that is, that the University and the Otago Education Board should pay for the facilities it used and that the Board itself should con-

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/576, Ashcroft to Fitzgerald, 10 Aug 1953 - this was a personal letter and expressed Ashcroft's personal opinions.
trol the Museum's endowments. The substantial revenue which should then accrue would, he thought, enable rates to be kept at a much lower level and, more important, would avoid the situation inherent in the draft Bill where rates appeared to subsidise these services. Secondly, he argued that since rates could be justified only on the grounds of service rendered or benefit received, "where this can be differentiated there is a strong case for differential rating." With regard to the Trust Board's composition, Ashcroft held that more would be achieved by increasing the ratepayers' representation to seven, than by reducing non-ratepayer interests as had been suggested. Finally he raised the question of the Trust Board's power to borrow. The proposals suggested were, he said, much too sweeping and should therefore be limited by requiring the assent of each local authority before any application for a loan was made. Although personal, these helpful and constructive suggestions were to be of inestimable value in the struggle that lay ahead.

While Ashcroft's approach to the problem was a positive one, the same cannot be said of the attitude of many of the country boroughs. Much of their opposition stemmed from the position adopted by the Cromwell Borough Council which, at its meeting on 3 August, reaffirmed its earlier stand \(^1\) and, soon after, circulated its objections to all other local bodies whose support it solicited.\(^2\) Although it was sympathetic towards the

---

1. CBC Minutes, 3 Aug 1953.
2. Ibid., Corres. 'Otago Museum Trust Bill', Circular letter, 8 Aug 1953.
Museum Committee's predicament and was, therefore, willing to contribute voluntarily towards the institution's maintenance, the Council expressed its strong disapproval of the suggestion to finance the Museum through a rate which it considered to be "bad in principle." The Borough admitted that its contribution under the proposal was very small but contended that "a principle is a principle," and, in the light of a previous experience of rating by an ad hoc authority, it "does not propose to have another example foisted on to it."

Although the Cromwell Borough Council had no constructive alternatives to offer, it suggested that as the Museum was purely an educational and cultural institution, the responsibility for its maintenance should devolve on the taxpayer and not the ratepayer.

Approval for the Cromwell Borough Council's stand was widespread. By early September, the Borough Councils of Hampden, Kaitangata, Port Chalmers and Tapanui had informed the Cromwell Borough Council of their support; the Alexandra Borough Council expressed the fear that the proposed rate could become a burden if property values increased further and began to organise a meeting of the Central Otago local bodies so that united action

---

1. The Otago Catchment Board, established in 1941.
2. CBC Corres., Circular letter, 8 Aug 1953, passim.
3. Ibid., passim.
could be decided upon;¹ and the Oamaru Borough Council continued to be critical, not only of the measure itself but also of the Dunedin City Council's action in agreeing to the provisions of the draft Bill without first seeking the opinions of the rest of the local bodies concerned.² Not every borough, however, concurred with these views. The Green Island Borough Council continued to be "reluctantly in favour"³ and the Town Clerk of the Milton Borough wrote:

"My Council is in favour of the Bill and cannot agree that such an important matter should be left to the mercy of grants from the Councils of Otago."⁴

Meanwhile, the Museum Committee had again met and agreed to amend the draft Bill to eliminate the main objections raised at its meeting with the local body representatives. The composition of the Trust Board was altered in two ways. Confirmation of the previously suggested reductions in the representation accorded to both the University Council (from three to two) and the Association of Friends (from two to one) gave ratepayers' representatives a majority of six places to five even after the addition of one representative of the Otago Education Board. At the same time the borough and county representation was separated, one place being allotted to the boroughs and two to the counties. Although the reason for this decision is not clear, it seems likely that the Museum Committee was seeking to equate repre-

2. E.S., 14 Aug 1953.
3. CBC Corres., Town Clerk, Green Island to Town Clerk, Cromwell, 11 Sep 1953.
4. Ibid., Town Clerk, Milton to Town Clerk, Cromwell, 24 Aug 1953.
sentation on the Trust Board with the relative amount of their respective contributions. Perhaps, too, their different attitudes were already apparent and the Museum Committee felt that each group's interests would best be served by separate representation. The financial provisions of the draft Bill were also amended. Although the Museum Committee turned its back on Ashcroft's proposal to provide for a differential rate, it did agree to reduce the proposed maximum to one-fiftieth of a penny in the £ with an initial maximum of one-sixtieth of a penny. At the same time, however, the Museum Committee emphasised that fact that finance through rating was the only alternative to the Museum's eventual closure.\(^1\) At this stage, the Museum Committee obviously still entertained hopes of having the measure passed during 1953 for, when these amendments were conveyed to the solicitors on 24 August, instructions were also given to prepare the Bill for presentation to Parliament by J.G. Borne, M.P. for St. Kilda.\(^2\) The local bodies were also informed of the amendments, in a circular letter dated 31 August.\(^3\)

Further developments were not long coming. On 9 September, the Alexandra Borough Council convened its meeting of Central

---

1. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/576, Circular letter to Counties and Boroughs, passim. This is undated but the copy on the file of the Cromwell Borough Council is dated 31 Aug 1953.
3. See above, p. 146, fn 1.
Otago local bodies but they were divided on the issue.\textsuperscript{1} It was agreed, however, that more would be achieved if a more representative meeting was held and Cromwell undertook to arrange for a meeting of boroughs to be held in Dunedin on 24 September, the day the Counties Association planned to meet to formulate its attitude.\textsuperscript{2} Faced with the distinct possibility of united opposition to the draft Bill, Fitzgerald, on the morning of the two meetings, announced in the \textit{Otago Daily Times} that the Museum Committee no longer intended pressing for the passage of the Bill during the 1953 parliamentary session because only one-third of the local bodies circulated had bothered to reply to the Committee's circular of 31 August and this delay had made it very unlikely that Parliament would discuss it.\textsuperscript{3} From the Museum Committee's records, however, a much more important reason emerges. The Museum Committee was afraid that, with meetings of local body representatives being arranged, a combined vote of opposition placed on record would render the ultimate approval of the Bill by Parliament very much more difficult.\textsuperscript{4} Clearly, the superb timing of the announcement was calculated to forestall such an eventuality but, strange as it may seem, it appears extremely doubtful if
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any of those present at either of the meetings had noticed it.\footnote{CBC Corres. Town Clerk, Cromwell to all boroughs outside Dunedin, 28 Sep 1953. R.A. Farquhar (Town Clerk, Cromwell) wrote that the delay by the Museum Committee meant that a much fuller consideration could be given to the whole issue. "...it may be possible to arrive at some course of action which may permit an alternative method of finance, not in any manner associated with the form of rating." c/f O.D.T., 25 Sep 1953, where F.G. Dunn (Mayor of Cromwell) was reported to have said at the combined meeting of boroughs and counties that it was for the Museum Committee to produce alternative methods of raising finance. It was obvious from this that neither of these men had seen Fitzgerald's statement despite its location in a prominent part of the O.D.T.'s front page.}

Certainly, if some of the representatives had seen Fitzgerald's press statement, it played no significant part in their deliberations.

As it turned out, the Museum Committee gained handsomely from the meetings. At first the representatives of the boroughs and counties met separately and, at its meeting the boroughs wasted little time in passing, by seven votes to none with two abstentions, a motion objecting to the establishment of a Trust Board vested with authority to levy local bodies.\footnote{Ibid, 'Record of Proceedings of Meeting in Dunedin', 24 Sep 1953.}

When, later the same afternoon, the two meetings joined together, the counties announced that they were prepared to support the Museum Committee's draft Bill on an Otago basis, provided differential rating was included and the composition of the Trust Board was further amended to give rating authorities the more commanding majority of six places to three.\footnote{Ibid.}
and, towards the end of the combined meeting, he proposed the establishment of a joint committee comprising three representatives from each of Greater Dunedin,¹ the other boroughs, the counties and the Museum authorities, to discuss the proposals still further in an endeavour to arrive at a solution acceptable to all parties.² This decision by the counties' representatives to give qualified support to the Bill must have come as a very great shock to those present who were representing the boroughs, particularly the men from Cromwell, Alexandra, Naseby and Palmerston, whose Councils had opposed the whole proposition so strongly. Nevertheless, they determined to fight on and, on September 29, A.R. Farquhar, Cromwell’s Town Clerk, when commenting on the changed situation, wrote, "Our light is dim but not yet out."³ The same day he endeavoured to arrange for a meeting of the joint committee ⁴ but the Museum Committee replied that since it had allowed the Bill to lapse, there was little point in holding such a meeting at that stage, although further consultation would be possible in 1954 when the measure was reconsidered.⁵ The initiative had once again passed to the Museum Committee.

¹. Dunedin City and the Boroughs of West Harbour, Port Chalmers, St. Kilda and Green Island.
². CBC Corres. 'Record of Proceedings of Meeting in Dunedin.'
³. Ibid., Farquhar to Town Clerk, Palmerston, 29 Sep 1953.
⁴. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/576, Farquhar to Hayward, 29 Sep 1953.
⁵. Ibid., Hayward to Farquhar, 13 Oct 1953
For the next six months little was heard of the proposal but, during this period, the Museum's finances deteriorated even further as a result of the reduction in rental from the Lamb Hill Estate. The need to establish some form of rating authority became even more urgent and it is no surprise to find the Museum Committee, at its first meeting for 1954, authorising the preparation of a new draft of the Bill. A month later, this was approved and after the Dunedin City Council's approval had been secured, the draft Bill was forwarded to all local authorities along with an appeal for temporary grants to assist the Museum in its worsening financial position until the Bill finally became law. It is interesting to note in passing that, despite the professed willingness of several boroughs to make an annual grant to the Museum in preference to being levied, only two boroughs, Waikouaiti (£50) and Roxburgh (£5), saw fit to contribute.

This new draft was substantially the same as that agreed to by the Museum Committee in August 1953. The Board was to consist of eleven members - three appointed by the Dunedin City Council, one elected by the other boroughs, two elected by the counties, two appointed by the University Council, and one

1. See above, Chap IV, pp. 95-97.
3. Ibid., 13 Mar 1954.
5. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/598, Fitzgerald/Hayward to Local Bodies, 31 Mar 1954.
member appointed by each of the Association of Friends, the Royal Society and the Otago Education Board - of which the ratepayers' representatives were to be in the majority. The maximum rate was set at one-fiftieth of a penny in the £ and this was to be uniform over the whole rating area although provision was made for the levy to be paid out of ordinary funds if so desired. It is all too clear that little or no attention had been paid to the feelings expressed at the meeting of counties the previous September. Had differential rating been incorporated in the Bill at this stage it is just possible that the Museum Committee might have been able to hold out for its original request of one-thirtieth of a penny in the £; certainly, to have done so would have expedited the Bill's final passage, for most of 1954 was spent in reaching agreement with those local bodies who supported the Bill in principle but who demanded differential rating and this left too little time for the Museum Committee even to try to persuade those authorities who opposed the legislation to withdraw their opposition. The Museum Committee had however, decided upon its course of action and had presented its case to all interested parties. Attention must now be directed to the response of the local authorities to this new appeal for support.

When the Cromwell Borough Council received the new draft

Bill, its first action was to confirm its previous decision to oppose the legislation.\(^1\) At the same time, the Council decided to call for a meeting of the joint committee which had been proposed at the combined meeting of counties and boroughs the previous September.\(^2\) Representatives had still to be appointed and the Cromwell Borough Council moved to do just this \(^3\) but when it asked the Museum Committee to appoint its representatives for the meeting which was to be held in Dunedin on either 5 or 6 May, it met with a stinging rebuff. In a letter which was short and to the point, the Museum Committee curtly informed the Cromwell Borough Council that in its opinion, the prerogative of calling such a meeting rested with the Museum Committee alone. Further, while it was willing to discuss the matter with individual Borough Councils, the Museum Committee felt that no useful purpose would be served by meeting representatives from all local bodies once again.\(^4\) If the Museum Committee had thus hoped to prevent organised opposition to its proposals, the hope was a vain one. The Cromwell Borough Council was extremely annoyed by the Museum Committee's attitude and, egged on by the Alexandra Borough Council which wrote:

"It would appear from the letter received with the Bill that the sponsors of it have no intention of

---

\(^1\) CBC Minutes, 5 Apr 1954.
\(^2\) See above, p. 149.
\(^3\) CBC Corres, Farquhar to Town Clerk, Green Island, 8 Apr 1954.
\(^4\) Ibid., Hayward to Farquhar, 14 Apr 1954.
calling Local Body Representatives together to con-
sider it, and, if any combined protest is to be made,
the Local Bodies will have to move in the matter at
an early date,"¹

it circulated the other local bodies, advising them of its
continued opposition and inviting them to join it in its pro-
test.² In all, seven boroughs and two counties indicated
their support and seven of these - the boroughs of Alexandra,
Hampden, Naseby, Oamaru, and Port Chalmers and the Vincent
County ³ - sent representatives to Palmerston on 23 June where
a meeting, convened by the Cromwell Borough Council, was held.
Here, after a very cursory discussion, the meeting agreed
unanimously:

"That the Local Bodies here represented, agree to
oppose the Otago Museum Trust Board Bill, on the
principle 'that such a Board as proposed should
not have power to make and levy rates,'"⁴

and the Mayors of Cromwell (F.G. Dunn), Oamaru (M.F.E. Cooney),
and Naseby (W. O'Neill), were appointed to present their ob-
jections to the Parliamentary Local Bills Committee when it
met to consider the legislation.

Serious reservations to the measure were also voiced by

1. Ibid., Town Clerk, Alexandra to Farquhar, 7 Apr 1954.
2. Ibid., Circular letter to boroughs and counties, 30 Apr 1954.
3. The other two were the Kaitangata Borough Council and the
   Waitaki County Council.
4. CBC Corres., 'Record of Proceedings, 23/6/54,'
a number of other local authorities and, at the 1954 Counties' Conference, the delegates from the Otago counties met informally and authorised Ashcroft to convene another meeting of representatives of the local authorities outside greater Dunedin to enable them to discuss their future actions in the light of the Museum Committee's apparent disregard of their previous resolutions. Ashcroft called the meeting for July 15, and, aware of the fact that unless there was virtual unanimity among the local bodies, Parliament would postpone or even reject the Bill outright, he appealed for a full attendance so that any decisions reached at the meeting would reflect the wishes of all those bodies to be affected by the legislation. Unfortunately, because a number of boroughs declined to attend on the grounds that their action had already been determined, the meeting was not nearly as representative as Ashcroft would have liked. Still sixteen boroughs

1. Ibid., Town Clerk, Green Island to Farquhar, 13 May 1954, County Clerk, Tuapeka to Farquhar, 29 May 1954, and Town Clerk, Tapanui to Farquhar, 5 May 1954. The Green Island Borough Council advocated two amendments namely, that the University of Otago should be charged for the use of the facilities and that the Trust Board should be bound by the 'Local Bodies Loans Amendment Act, 1951'. Both Tapanui and Tuapeka indicated their support if differential rating was included.

2. See above, p. 148.

3. MCM Minutes, Vol II, 19 Jul 1954. (Ross's report of Meeting which he attended as an observer representing the Museum Committee).

4. CBC Corres., Ashcroft to Local Bodies, 5 Jul 1954.

5. Ibid., Farquhar to Ashcroft, 14 Jul 1954. Undoubtedly the boroughs of Oamaru, Hampden, Kaitangata and Naseby adopted the same attitude.
and counties\(^1\) were represented and, after discussion, they agreed, by twelve votes to four,\(^2\) to support the Museum financially in some way. Although McCallum, representing the Waikouaiti Borough Council, advocated levying a flat rate over the whole Province, it was Ashcroft, with a well-prepared and carefully delivered address favouring differential rating, who carried the day. Subsequently a sub-committee was established to formulate a basis for applying a differential rate and to enter into negotiations with the Museum Committee in an endeavour to reach agreement on the issue. Also discussed was the question of the Trust Board's composition and here again, the meeting confirmed the counties' earlier stand by advocating the reduction of the University Council's representation to one, a step which would give ratepayers' representatives a majority of six to four.\(^3\) Although it was suggested that the Bill's passage might be facilitated by the exclusion of some of the outlying districts,\(^4\) a clear majority

---

1. The boroughs of Balclutha, Lawrence, Roxburgh, Palmerston, Waikouaiti, Milton, Tapetui and Alexandra and the counties of Bruce, Clutha, Maniototo, Taieri, Tuapeka, Waihemo, Waikouaiti and Waitaki. The Dunedin City Council and the Museum Committee were also represented by observers.

2. MCM Minutes, Vol II, 19 Jul 1954 (Ross's report). Those for the proposal were: the boroughs of Waikouaiti, Roxburgh, Lawrence, Tapetui, Milton and Balclutha and the counties of Waihemo, Tuapeka, Bruce, Waikouaiti, Maniototo and Clutha. Those opposed were the boroughs of Alexandra and Palmerston and the counties of Waitaki and Taieri.

3. MCM Minutes, Vol II, 19 Jul 1954. Note that the meeting had now conceded Education Board representation on the Trust Board. The Museum Committee preferred to meet this problem by raising the number of ratepayers' representatives by one and, on 3 August, it advised Mrs McMillan, M.P. to amend the number of D.C.C. representatives from three to four "in view of the possible adoption of differential rating." (OUC Correspondence, Ser. 5/596, Hayward to McMillan)

4. Specifically Oamaru Borough and Waitaki County.
of those present were adamant that if the Museum was to be financed on a provincial basis, the whole Province had to be included.¹

Although the Otago Daily Times described the action of the delegates as a "surprise move" which showed a "praiseworthy breadth of vision,"² the resolutions passed at the meeting were little more than a confirmation of the position adopted by the counties at their meeting some ten months earlier. True, as a result of Ashcroft's solid groundwork and clear-cut leadership, the basis of agreement was now much wider than previously but opposition to the proposal was still too great for the Local Bills Committee to ignore and they referred it back to its promoters for further consideration.

Before the actual presentation of the Bill to Parliament is discussed, however, the last minute efforts to reach agreement on the rating issue must be outlined. At its meeting on July 19, the Museum Committee discussed Ross's report of the meeting of counties and boroughs and, in spite of its decided preference for a uniform rating system, finally accepted differential rating in principle and agreed to negotiate with Ashcroft's sub-committee to try to reach unanimity with it. Before negotiations of this nature could be commenced, however, the Museum Committee had, very obviously, to secure the support of

the Dunedin City Council, since a system of differential rating would inevitably throw the rating burden even more heavily on that city. The situation was a tricky one which required delicate handling, for the Dunedin City Council had made no secret of its preference for the uniform rate. Even with this knowledge, the task of persuading the City Council's Finance Committee to accept the principle of differential rating proved to be very much more difficult than even the Museum Committee had anticipated and, at one stage, the possibility that the Council's Finance Committee would completely withdraw its support for the measure could not be discounted. Eventually, however, qualified approval was obtained. What exactly caused the Finance Committee to change its mind is not altogether clear, but it seems fairly certain that the recently incorporated amendment to exempt the Museum property from local body rates played some part in the final decision. The Dunedin City Council was traditionally opposed to rating exemption and consistently argued that, since rates were a proper charge on property, these should be allowed for in estimates of expenditure. Its Finance Committee, however, finally agreed to recommend acceptance of the differential rating scheme to the Dunedin City Council but only on the condition that the proposal to exempt Museum property from local body

4. RHR File 4527, Solicitors to Hayward, 13 Jul 1954.
rates was withdrawn and that, for the first two years of the
Act's operation, the maximum levy would not exceed one-sixtyfifth
of a penny in the £.¹ The key figure in these negotiations
was undoubtedly Councillor M. Connelly who was both Chairman
of the City Council's Finance Committee and one of its repre-
sentatives on the Museum Committee. This latter condition
evidently resulted from his conviction that the City Council
should not contribute a greater sum during this period than
it would have been asked for under the former provision of
uniform rating at one-sixtieth of a penny in the £.² While
it would be too much to credit the University's solicitors with
remarkable foresight, their suggestion to exempt Museum property
from local body rates came at a very opportune time, for while
the City Council's Finance Committee refused to countenance
this proposal, there can be little doubt that its withdrawal
made that committee much more amenable to compromise on the
rating issue.

Before the City Council's decision could be transmitted
to the counties and boroughs and the final details of the differ-
rential factors to be applied hammered out, the Bill itself was
all but rejected by Parliament. Introduced in the House of
Representatives on August 13, it came before the Local Bills
Committee on the 25th where it met with a very mixed reception.

Ross, who had previously been asked by the Museum Committee to

2. Interviews with Ross (13 Sep 1966) and Connelly (18 Sep 1966).
   See also, MCM Minutes, Vol II, 14 Sep 1954, 'Report on
   Museum Trust Board Bill Negotiations.'
represent it in all matters connected with the Bill, appeared on its behalf and advanced a number of cogent arguments favouring the measure. Ashcroft, who was present to put forward the views of those local bodies which had indicated their approval of the Bill if it included differential rating, added his support. Two very strong objections were, however, lodged. Sir William Bodkin, M.P. for Central Otago and himself a member of the Local Bills Committee, appeared on behalf of the Alexandra Borough Council which objected on two grounds - generally, that ad hoc authorities should not be given any authority to levy rates and, specifically, that Alexandra was too great a distance from Dunedin to benefit from any association with the Museum. Also present to object were Dunn, Cooney and O'Neill who claimed to represent 36% of all the local authorities affected by the proposal. "On principle" they expressed total opposition to the principle of rating to finance the Otago Museum. Towards the end of the sitting, J.N. Massey, the Chairman of the Local Bills Committee, indicated that the views of the dissident group would have to be taken into account and it thus came as no real surprise when the Committee later

1. MCM Minutes, Vol II, 8 Jun 1954.
2. Ibid., 'The Case for the Bill, 1954.'
4. OUC Corres., Ser. 5/598. Town Clerk, Alexandra to Bodkin, 11 Aug 1954 - received by Museum Committee after request.
5. They claimed to represent the boroughs of Alexandra, Cromwell, Hampden, Kaitangata, Naseby, Omahau, Port Chalmers and the counties of Vincent and Waitaki.
6. CBC Corres., 'The Case against the Bill, 1954.'
recommended that the Bill should not be given its Second Reading.¹ Mrs McMillan later wrote that, "to initiate a discussion on the Second Reading of the Bill would have been a waste of time."²

The official reason for the Local Bills Committee's action was the seeming uncertainly of tenure which resulted from the delay in resurveying Block XXIX, on part of which the Museum buildings were situated. The additions and alterations to the Museum, combined with the changes which had taken place in the tenure of various portions on the block over the years, had confused the whole situation to such an extent that, in 1935, the Museum Committee sought clarification.³ The conclusions reached at this time are not recorded but evidently the Museum Committee was sufficiently satisfied to let the matter rest ⁴ and it was not until 1949 that the question was again raised. On this occasion, the Commissioner of Crown Lands proposed vesting parts of the Museum Reserve (as the block is commonly known) in the University Council and Otago Education Board.⁵ Although the University Council expressed general agreement with the proposal, it did not consider that a survey of the area was warranted ⁶ and the Dunedin City Council

---

¹ MCM Minutes, Vol II, 14 Sep 1954.
² OUC Corres. Ser. 5/598, McMillan to Hayward, 2 Sep 1954.
³ MCM Minutes, Vol I, 27 Nov 1935.
⁴ Ibid., 23 Nov 1936.
⁵ OUC Minutes, Vol XIV, 24 May 1949.
⁶ Ibid.
later concurred with this decision. In the next year, 1950, the Commissioner of Crown Lands decided not to continue with the plans to resurvey the block until the Police and Post and Telegraph Departments and the Otago Education Board had vacated the areas they were currently occupying. There the matter rested, although it was always tacitly understood that the Museum Trust Board "would merely succeed to the rights of the University Council and would stand in (its) place." Thus, it came as quite a shock to the Museum Committee to have the Bill referred back to it on such a technicality. Little wonder, then, that the Committee's first action was to have the situation regularised so that "no technicalities as regards the site should impede (the Bill's) passage." The survey was duly carried out, the results approved by the University Council in April 1955, and full legal title was accorded to the Museum authorities in the Second Schedule to the 'Otago Museum Trust Board Act, 1955.'

This, however, was little more than a very minor side issue. More important by far was Mrs McMillan's recommendation to "make some attempt to obtain, same way or other, more unanimity among the local authorities in the area involved."

1. Ibid., Corres. Ser. 5/497, Johnson (Town Clerk) to Hanan, 16 Dec 1949.
4. RHR File 4527. Solicitors to Director General of Lands, 8 Oct 1954.
5. OUC Minutes, Vol XVI, 26 Apr 1955.
6. N.Z. Stat 4 Eliz. II No. 6 (Local).
Here, in a nutshell, was the real reason behind the decision of the Local Bills Committee. While its action showed sympathy for the Museum Committee's predicament, it also clearly recognised that opposition from ten of the twenty-nine participating local bodies was "too great to be swept aside." The manner of the Bill's rejection provided the Museum Committee with a further opportunity of producing a new draft Bill acceptable to a much greater majority of the local authorities affected and, on this occasion, it wasted little time in coming to grips with the problems facing it.

When Ross summarised the position, as it stood after the Local Bills Committee's recommendation, he indicated two ways whereby a much greater degree of unanimity could be achieved. The Museum Committee, he said, should first revise the Bill to incorporate the proposed amendments on which both parties were agreed in principle and, once this had been satisfactorily completed, attempts should be made to reduce opposition to the proposal by making a concerted effort to win over those local bodies which might be converted.

Agreement on the amendments to be made was finally reached in November 1954, at a conference between Ross, Connelly, and A.C. Cameron, representing the Museum Committee, and the subcommittee which had been established the previous July by those local bodies which had accepted the principle of differential rating as advocated by Ashcroft. It was at this meeting that

3. See above, p. 155.
the differential factor subsequently incorporated in the 1955 draft, was ironed out.\textsuperscript{1} Those local bodies represented also confirmed their previous opposition to the exclusion of the local bodies which still opposed the legislation and, following Ross's lead, they agreed that a special effort must be made to try to breach the defences of the Oamaru Borough Council.\textsuperscript{2} Obviously, if this, the second largest urban area in Otago and one of the boroughs farthest from the Museum, could be persuaded to withdraw its opposition, other smaller

\textsuperscript{1} The following tables show the effects of the differential factor adopted.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{The amount of the levy payable per £1000 of capital value.}
\begin{tabular}{lccccccccccc}
\hline
Differential factor & 1.0 & 0.9 & 0.8 & 0.7 & 0.6 & 0.5 & 0.4 & 0.3 & 0.2 \\
\hline
Levy (at 1/65d in £) & 1/3 & 1/1\frac{1}{2} & 1/- & 10\frac{1}{2}d & 9d & 7\frac{1}{2}d & 6d & 4\frac{1}{2}d & 3d \\
Levy (at 1/50d in £) & 1/8 & 1/6 & 1/4 & 1/2 & 1/- & 10d & 8d & 6d & 4d \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{Examples of the cost to individual ratepayers each year in selected areas.}
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline
\textbf{LOCALITY} (Differential factor in brackets) & \textbf{PROPERTY VALUE} & \textbf{ANNUAL LEVY at 1/65d in £} & \textbf{ANNUAL LEVY at 1/50d in £} \\
\hline
Dunedin City (1.0) & £2,000 & 2/6 & 3/4 \\
& £5,000 & 6/3 & 8/4 \\
Oamaru Borough (0.6) & £2,000 & 1/6 & 2/- \\
& £5,000 & 3/9 & 5/- \\
 Cromwell Borough (0.4) & £2,000 & 1/- & 1/4 \\
& £5,000 & 2/6 & 3/4 \\
Vincent County (0.2) & £2,000 & 6d & 8d \\
& £5,000 & 1/3 & 1/8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

A complete list of the differential factors applied to all the contributing local authorities may be found in Appendix H.

\textsuperscript{2} MCM Minutes, Vol II, 18 Nov 1954.
local bodies situated closer to Dunedin might conceivably follow suit. But, with 1954 drawing to a close, little immediate progress could be expected, so the proposal was left in abeyance until the New Year.

The draft submitted to the local authorities by the Museum Committee in June 1955\(^1\) contained several amendments in addition to the inclusion of differential rating. The size of the Trust Board was increased from eleven to twelve, the additional seat being granted to the boroughs outside Dunedin which were now divided into two groups.\(^2\) While the University of Otago continued to enjoy freedom of access, the terms of entry and conditions of use were made "subject in all respects to the controlling authority of the Board," an amendment which undoubtedly eased the fear expressed by some local bodies that the University would continue to take an undue advantage of the available facilities after it had ceased to exercise direct control over the institution.\(^3\) The Board's borrowing powers were severely curtailed by the inclusion of a clause which expressly prevented it from levying a special rate as security for a loan, even with the consent of the contributing authorities. The Dunedin City Council's demand that

---

1. Ibid., 14 Jun 1955.

2. The two groups were as follows –
   (a) The Nearer Boroughs – St Kilda, Green Island, West Harbour, Mosgiel and Port Chalmers – all were on a differential factor of 1.0;
   (b) The Further Boroughs – Waikouaiti, Palmerston, Milton, Kaitangata, Balclutha, Lawrence, Hampden, Oamaru, Roxburgh, Tapanui, Naseby, Alexandra and Cromwell – whose differential factor ranged from 0.9 (for Waikouaiti) to 0.4 (for Cromwell).

3. c/f CEC Corres., Circular Letter from the Green Island Borough Council, 13 May 1954, advocating this amendment.
the maximum rate during the first two years of the Trust Board's existence be limited to one-sixtyfifth of a penny was also included. In fact, as Ashcroft later indicated, the Museum Committee had bent over backwards to satisfy the local authorities. "Every suggestion and comment," he wrote, "has been either incorporated or answered." It was clear that the Museum Committee would not and, indeed, could not go further to meet the demands of the local bodies than it had done in this draft. Its views were explained by Ross who said,

"While Dunedin will continue to bear the brunt of the financial burden, in view of the Museum's origins as a provincial institution - it was founded by the Otago Provincial Council with the full support of members from North and Central Otago - it seems only reasonable that a percentage of the burden should be borne by the outlying boroughs and counties."

Before the Museum Committee had finalised this draft however, it was forced to deal with another and totally unexpected complication. All of the Museum Committee's activities during the early part of the year had been conditioned by the assumption that the Bill would be introduced into Parliament during what they believed to be the second session of Parliament for 1955, which was set down to begin in July. The Committee's chagrin was thus very great indeed when it discovered that this

---

2. Ibid.
second session was merely a continuation of the one then in progress. ¹ As Ross explained to the University Council,² the Standing Orders of the House of Representatives require all Local Bills to be introduced within 42 days of the commencement of any session and, by the time the Museum Committee had discovered this, the time had all but elapsed.³ Advice from Wellington ⁴ indicated that the Committee's only course of action was to petition Parliament under Seal requesting the partial suspension of the Standing Orders to allow the Trust Board Bill to be introduced in the latter part of the session. The University Council hurriedly petitioned Parliament to permit the introduction of the Bill and, on 6 May, it was notified that its petition had been granted.⁵ Without doubt, both the University Council and the Museum Committee were very greatly relieved on receipt of this information for the Museum's finances were virtually non-existent and it was forecast that, by the end of 1955, a deficit of between £800 and £1,000 would have been incurred.⁶ Clearly, another year's delay at this critical stage would have been fatal to the Museum's future.

Once the draft Bill had been prepared, the Museum Committee directed its whole attention towards persuading the local authorities which were still opposing the legislation either to

¹ RHR File 4527. Solicitors to Clerk of the House of Representatives, 26 Apr 1955.
² OUC Minutes, Vol XVI, 3 May 1955.
³ The last day for introduction was 3 May 1955.
⁵ OUC Corres. Ser. 5/619. McMillan to Hayward, 6 May 1955 (Telegram)
give their support or, at least, to withdraw their opposition. Its first effort was directed north and, in June, the Committee agreed to send a deputation comprising Fitzgerald (who ultimately did not go), Ross and A.C. Cameron to meet the Waitaki County Council and the Oamaru Borough Council if they were prepared to accept it.\(^1\) Ross and Cameron were extremely well received by the Waitaki County Council and, as a result of the ensuing discussions, the Council pledged its support for the measure.\(^2\)

With the Oamaru Borough Council, the deputation was not so fortunate, although Ross managed to discuss the whole question with both Cooney and the Town Clerk. While Cooney was still very cagey and continued to express his unwillingness to be dictated to by the Mayor of Dunedin, these informal discussions had the desired effect for, at its next meeting, the Oamaru Borough Council withdrew its opposition.\(^3\) In North Otago, both Ross and Cameron were very well known and their personal contacts and influence undoubtedly played a major part in this first crucial breakthrough. Ashcroft's appeal soon after\(^4\) also helped persuade these two Councils and it certainly caused the Vincent County Council to withdraw its opposition. By the beginning of August, opposition to the Bill had been reduced to six small boroughs\(^5\) which, together, would contribute approx-

---

2. OUC Corres. Ser. 5/619, County Clerk, Waitaki to Hayward, 26 Jul 1955.
3. Ibid., Town Clerk, Oamaru to Hayward, 17 Aug 1955.
4. Ibid., Ashcroft to Chairmen and Mayors of all Territorial Local Authorities in Otago, 25 Jul 1955.
5. Cromwell, Alexandra, Port Chalmers, Kaitangata, Palmerston, Naseby.
imately ⅓ of the total revenue which would be available to the Museum under the provisions of the Bill.

Resistance now centred on Cromwell where, on August 1, the Borough Council resolved to proceed with its objection: "on the principle 'that it is wrong in principle for such an institution as the Museum to have powers to levy rates for its maintenance and development,'" and authorised Dunn to represent its views to the Local Bills Committee when it met. ¹ It was clear that, if success was to be guaranteed, some way had to be found to prevent this from happening and, on August 22, Ross and Sir Charles Hercus travelled to Cromwell in an eleventh-hour bid to persuade the Borough Council to rescind its earlier motion. Although the deputation undoubtedly would have welcomed Cromwell's active support had it been proffered, this was not actively sought and Ross, in an extremely hard-hitting address, attacked the Council's attitude of objecting "on principle" and, in so doing, jeopardising the very future of an institution which the overwhelming majority of local authorities were now prepared to support. His insistence that there was, in fact, no moral or ethical principle involved and that the proposed method of financing the Museum had already been approved by past governments, evidently had the desired effect for, later the same evening, the Cromwell Borough Council reversed its earlier decision. Exactly what was said after the deputation retired will probably never be known but the Council's Minutes at this point are, nevertheless,

¹ CBC Minutes, 1 Aug 1955.
extremely revealing and its decision is worth recording in full. It reads:

"After the Deputation withdrew, the Council discussed the matter very fully, and in view of the opinions of members His Worship the Mayor gave notice of his intention at the next meeting of Council, to move a motion rescinding the Council's resolution passed at the Ordinary Meeting held on the 1st August, last, which appointed the Mayor to appear before the Local Bills Committee, opposing the Bill."¹

What factors persuaded the Cromwell Borough Council to change its mind? While it is very difficult indeed to underestimate the importance of the Museum Committee's deputation which had undoubtedly made a considerable impact on the Councillors present, the Councillors themselves were already aware that, as a result of Ross's and Ashcroft's earlier actions, opposition to the Bill was already beginning to crack,² and this knowledge must certainly have influenced their final decision. It is possible that, taken separately, neither of these factors would have been sufficiently persuasive for the Council to change its mind; together, they worked to produce a decision which heralded the end of active opposition to the legislation and the climax of three years' arduous activity on the part of the Museum Committee.

¹. Ibid., 22 Aug 1955.
². Ibid., Corres., County Clerk, Waitaki to Farquhar, 25 Jul 1955; County Clerk, Vincent to Farquhar, 15 Aug 1955; Town Clerk, Camaru to Farquhar, 17 Aug 1955.
As a result of the Cromwell Borough Council's decision, opposition from the remaining refractory Boroughs soon crumbled. On August 23, Ross and Marcus held informal discussions with a number of the Alexandra Borough Councillors and these gave a verbal assurance that their opposition would be officially withdrawn at the next Council meeting.\(^1\) Opposition was now so insignificant that the Bill would probably have been passed by Parliament in spite of its presence. Nevertheless, the Museum Committee continued with its efforts to eliminate all opposition and, on August 29, one final appeal was addressed to the opposing boroughs\(^2\) which, along with the personal approaches and telephone conversations in the days following, had the desired effect. On the morning of 7 September, the day that the Bill was to be studied by the Local Bills Committee, Hayward was able to telephone Mrs McMillan to advise her that all opposition to the Bill had been withdrawn.\(^3\) J.H. George, M.P. for Otago Central who was to have stated the views of the Alexandra Borough Council, also savoured of the drama - he received a telegram from the Alexandra Town Clerk informing him of its decision to withdraw its opposition as he was on his way to the meeting of the Local Bills Committee.\(^4\) Ross, who again presented the Bill to the Committee, was delighted to be able to announce that all opposition had been withdrawn because this

---


2. OUG Corses. Ser. 5/619, Hayward to Town Clerks of Kaitangata, Palmerston, Port Chalmers and Naseby, 29 Aug 1955.

3. Ibid., noted, 7 Sep 1955.

meant that the measure was virtually assured of passing through all its stages in the House.

After these weeks of intensive activity, the passage of the Bill through Parliament was somewhat of an anti-climax. It had been introduced in the House on 12 August and its Second Reading a month later was little more than a formality. Mrs McMillan described the measure as,

"the unanimous decision of all local authorities.... (who)....wish the Otago Museum to continue to render the service for the Province in the future, as it has done in the past.....It is very pleasing to note that there is unanimity over the Bill amongst the 29 Local Bodies in the Otago Province. It does show that Otago is united in supporting anything which has to do with maintaining or improving amenities for its people."2

Although this commendation was, to say the least, extremely glib, she nevertheless neatly summed up the importance of its provisions with the words:

"...its passing will ensure guaranteed finance and and continuity to a worthwhile Otago Institution."3

During the debate Mrs McMillan was actively supported by all Otago M.P.'s with the exception of T.L. Hayman, M.P. for Waitski,4 and, on 17 October 1955, the Bill received Royal Assent.

3. **Ibid.**
4. J.G. Barnes (St Kilda), P.G. Connolly (Dunedin Central), W. Hudson (Mornington), J.A. Roy (Clutha), and J.H. George (Central Otago).
Apart from a few minor amendments recommended by the Local Bills Committee, the Act confirmed the provisions outlined in the third (1955) draft and the twelve Trust Board members — three appointed by the Dunedin City Council, one elected by the boroughs adjacent to Dunedin, one elected by the farther boroughs, two elected by the counties, two appointed by the University Council and one appointed by each of the Royal Society (Otago Branch), the Association of Friends and the Otago Education Board — were to take office on 1 April 1956. Probably the most striking omission from the Board was a representative of the New Zealand Government. The Museum Committee had tentatively considered such an appointment in 1953 but this had come to nought and, in view of the Government's implied attitude that the Museum was a provincial and not a national responsibility, the omission was justified. The final composition of the Trust Board reflected the safeguards demanded by the local authorities if they were to participate in financing the Museum and while this had meant that representation on the Board is slightly more widespread than originally envisaged, it cannot truthfully be claimed that this has always worked to the Museum's advantage. The Act's other major provisions — use of the Museum by the University, rating powers and borrowing powers — were also settled in favour of the local bodies. The use of the Museum by the University came not only under the

1. The most important of these was the requirement that the Trust Board could only levy, in any year, the amount of money it could use for maintenance and development in that year.


3. See below, Chap VI, pp. 192 – 94.
direct control of the Trust Board but also was made subject to satisfactory arrangements, financial and otherwise, between the two parties. The Board's maximum rate, one-fiftieth of a penny (with an initial maximum of one-sixtyfifth of a penny) in the £, was a sizeable reduction on the one-thirtieth of a penny in the £ originally sought and this reflected local body fears that, once established, the rate would climb until it became a burden too great to bear. Nevertheless, this curtailment has brought problems in its wake.¹ Finally, the proposed borrowing powers of the Board were so restricted by the specific exclusion of the right to levy a special rate as security for a loan, that this source of finance which could have been used for development, was virtually a closed door.²

The dominance of the local authorities during the two-and-a-half year period when the provisions of the Act were finalised was accentuated by the Museum Committee's concessions at almost every point. This does not imply criticism of the Committee's actions because, from the outset, it was bargaining from a position of extreme weakness which virtually forced it to bend over backwards in its efforts to reach agreement and unanimity with the local bodies. The Committee's efforts to find a solution satisfactory to all parties were, however, reflected in the final Act which bore little resemblance to the original proposals and the Otago Museum was thus placed in a much less secure position than the Museum Committee had hoped for.

¹ See below, Chap. VII, pp. 219 - 21.
² N.Z. Stat. 4 Eliz II, No. 6 (Local), passim.
Despite these criticisms, however, the 'Otago Museum Trust Board Act' was of considerable benefit to the institution. Although it had brought about the legal separation of the Otago Museum and the University of Otago after an intimate association extending over seventy-eight years, it had also saved the institution from almost certain closure. For the first time in many years the Museum's assured income, while not as large as had been hoped for, seemed to be sufficient to enable the new Trust Board to plan the appointment of the full-time scientific staff which the financial situation had, for some years past, made impossible. Furthermore, the Trust Board could look to the future with confidence and proceed with the planning of the proposed Centennial Wing, secure in the knowledge that it would be able to erect a memorial worthy of Otago's pioneers without its becoming a liability. The University Council also expressed its confidence in the Museum's future by making a special grant from its own limited funds to cover the deficit incurred during 1955 and this action enabled the Trust Board to commence its stewardship without any contingent liabilities.

The attitude of the County Councils was, throughout, extremely encouraging. After some initial scepticism to the proposals, the majority came down firmly in support of the institution. To a great extent, their attitude was moulded by Ashcroft, whose conviction in the worth of the cause and whose skilful guidance played no small part in the final result.

from the outset, the counties' representatives endeavoured to be as constructive as possible, both in their criticisms of the Museum Committee's proposals and in their own suggested amendments. The counties' approach to the whole problem was in marked contrast to that of the boroughs, especially those farthest from Dunedin, which admitted the value of the Museum to the community but opposed all suggestions put forward and yet offered no constructive alternative. Even when they were finally persuaded to withdraw their opposition at least five boroughs (and probably seven)\(^1\) still refused to support the Bill because they felt it was wrong in principle.

The Museum Committee's tenacity in the face of seemingly insurmountable odds was a tribute to its members' belief in the value of the Museum to the community. If one member of that committee were to be singled out for special mention, that person would be, without doubt, Dr Angus Ross. No praise can be too great for the work he undertook so willingly and his untiring efforts and unselfish actions, his "determination and resourcefulness,"\(^2\) earned the highest praise from all who were associated with him in his efforts to reach an equitable solution to the problem posed by the Museum's financial difficulties. The Museum Committee's eventual success was, in a very large measure, the result of his personal visits to the centres of

1. Cromwell, Kaitangata, Naseby, Palmerston and Oamaru all indicated that they disagreed with the measure in principle. Port Chalmers and Alexandra probably felt the same way.
opposition where he often reduced the opposition to fragments with his incisive and penetrating arguments. To him, more than any other single person, was the passage of the Act due.

A word of praise must also be handed to the two metropolita newspapers which, throughout the protracted negotiations, supported the Museum Committee's every effort. True, not every proposal put forward by the Committee found favour, but the papers' criticisms were just and their alternative proposals sound. Ross's practice of making his statements to the University Council and Museum Committee available to the press undoubtedly resulted in fuller publicity than was perhaps usual, but the newspapers nevertheless played no small part in educating public opinion to accept the idea of greater responsibility for the Museum ¹ and in making the community more aware of the service the Museum was providing for them.²

---

1. For example, see O.D.T. 26 Jul 1952, 2 Aug 1952, 21 Dec 1953, 6 Apr 1954 and 30 Apr 1955; and E.S., 21 Nov 1952 and 13 May 1955.

CHAPTER VI

TRUST BOARD CONTROL.

Since April 1956 the administration of the Otago Museum has been the responsibility of the Trust Board established under the Act of 1955. While the events of these last ten years are too close to the present day for an accurate evaluation of the Trust Board's contribution to the Museum's history to be made, there are, nevertheless, certain trends apparent which demand some appraisal if the importance of the Act itself, in the continuing development of the institution, is to be seen in its true perspective.

When the transfer of authority from the University Council took place, the Evening Star referred to the event as "a milestone in the history of one of the province's outstanding educational and recreational assets." Indeed, as a direct consequence of the passage of the 'Otago Museum Trust Board Act,' optimism for the Museum's future progress ran high. The financial difficulties which had beset the institution for so many years now appeared to be a thing of the past and all who were intimately connected with the Museum looked forward with anticipation to the long overdue reorganisation which the greatly increased income had made possible. The new Board would at last be able to advertise the Directorship of the Museum which had lain vacant since Skinner's retirement in 1952,\(^2\) and would

1. E.S., 11 Apr 1956.

2. Although Skinner officially retired at the end of 1952 he continued as Relieving Director until the end of July 1957 when he was succeeded by Dr R.R. Forster.
also be able to proceed to the erection of the long-delayed Centennial Wing, secure in the knowledge that the Museum’s revenue should be sufficient to enable the additional gallery space to be put to good account.

The composition of the Trust Board reflected both a fairly broad cross-section of the community represented and an encouraging blend of experience and inexperience as far as museum management was concerned. Those appointed or elected by the local authorities were H. Brown, M. Connelly and W.B. Taverner (representing the Dunedin City Council), W. Garton of Port Chalmers (representing the nearer boroughs), E.A. Hobbs of Alexandra (representing the more distant boroughs) and J.D. Lockett of Clinton and D.H. Scott, a member of the Waitaki County Council, who represented the counties. In addition to these men the University Council had appointed Professor G.R. Manton and Dr A. Ross, the Royal Society, Dr G.T.S. Baylis, the Otago Education Board, J.W. Armstrong, and the Association of Friends had appointed H. Walden Fitzgerald. Fitzgerald was Chairman of the retiring Museum Committee and, without hesitation, he was elected the Trust Board’s first Chairman.¹

No fewer than six of these – Fitzgerald, Brown, Connelly, Manton, Ross and Armstrong – had been members of the former Museum Committee while another member, Lockett, had been a member of the Museum’s attendant staff for a period of some fourteen months during 1951 and 1952. Such a body could therefore

¹. TB Minutes, Vol I, 10 Apr 1956.
confidently be expected to waste little time in coming to grips with the problems of maintenance, development and staffing, with which it was confronted.

Much of the Trust Board's work has been handled by a system of committees. At its first meeting on 10 April 1956, the Board appointed Finance, Works (ie. maintenance) and Purchasing Funds Committees to which were later added a Publications Committee (1962), an Education Service Committee (1962) whose purpose was to consider matters relating to both the Museum Education Service and the Museum's broader relationship with the adult population of Otago,¹ a special committee to organise the building extension project (1958-63) and, for a short time (1958-9), a Publicity Committee. The contribution made by the more important of these committees will be outlined later but it is worth noting here that appointments to these committees were not always confined to Trust Board members. There have been instances, particularly with appointments to the Purchasing Funds Committee, where the Board has exercised the powers granted to it under the Act and has appointed acknowledged experts to the committee to the considerable benefit of the Museum itself.²

As was the case with its predecessor, the Trust Board's major decisions have revolved around the question of Museum finance. Through the generosity of the University Council

---

1. Ibid., 14 Nov 1962.
which agreed to make one further grant to the Museum to eliminate the deficit which had accumulated during 1955, the Trust Board entered upon its duties free of any financial liabilities. Nevertheless, its immediate financial position was far from healthy because the first instalment of local body levies did not fall due for payment until 31 July 1956 so, until that date, financial accommodation had to be arranged. On 4 April, six days before the first Board meeting, Hayward, the Trust Board's interim secretary, asked the Dunedin City Council to consider making an advance of £1,000 to help the Board meet its immediate financial commitments. \(^1\) This advance, which was to be repaid from the City's first half-yearly instalment, was readily agreed to. \(^2\) The University Council also helped the Board over this very difficult period by agreeing to continue paying the salaries of the Museum staff from its own funds until the Trust Board was in a position to undertake this obligation at which time the advances would be repaid. \(^3\)

The Otago Museum Trust Board has had three main sources of revenue available to it - interest on Museum investments, rentals from Museum property, and local body levies. Income from investments can be dismissed fairly quickly. With the addition of the capital sum derived from the repossessions of

---

the Lamb Hill Estate by the Crown to the endowment established at the time the FeIa Wing was erected, investments totalled £47,128, a sum which provides the Museum with an annual income of slightly less than £2,000. Rentals, too, have remained fairly static. The principal lessee has, of course, been the University of Otago whose Botany and Anthropology Departments (and, until 1962, Zoology Department) continued to be housed in the Museum basements and whose staff and students continued to use the facilities available at the Museum. Initially, the University Council continued to rent the rooms at the previously agreed figure of £200 a year but, in March 1958, the Trust Board moved to set up a joint sub-committee of the Museum and University authorities to negotiate a new rental. This proposal originated with Connelly, Chairman of the Trust Board’s Finance Committee, who was convinced that every source of possible Museum revenue should be tapped to its fullest extent before the local body levies were struck. At the same time, Connelly sought and obtained a commercial valuation of the rooms being used by the University Departments. The report indicated that a fair commercial rental would be in the vicinity of three shillings and threepence a square foot, a figure which would

1. See above, Chap. IV, pp. 95–97.
2. See Appendix G.
4. Ibid.
return £2,388. The joint sub-committee, however, agreed to a rental of £600 a year and this was subsequently confirmed by the Trust Board. Although the terms of this new lease thus granted to the University Council appear to be very generous, the sub-committee had clearly taken into account the fact that the University was contributing to the Museum's wellbeing in a number of other ways which more than offset its advantage in this direction. Since 1962 the Museum's rental income has been supplemented by revenue accruing from the leasing of the two auditoria incorporated in the Centennial Wing. This has averaged a little over £200 a year and, together with the £600 paid by the University, rental income amounts to between £800 and £900 a year.

There appears to be little prospect of materially increasing this figure in the near future.

The Trust Board's most important source of revenue during the past ten years has undoubtedly come from the levies paid by local bodies. Not only do these provide the Board with the major portion of its income each year, but they are also the only source to which the Board has been able to turn when additional income has been required. The Trust Board has

1. Ibid., 'Minutes of Representatives of Otago University and Trust Board', 30 Apr 1958. At this time the sub-committee agreed to review this rental when the Zoology Department finally vacated the rooms it was using. Towards the end of 1962 the Zoology Department shifted to the building in Great King Street formerly occupied by the Dental School but the rental was left at £600 p.a. even though the area occupied by the University was halved.

2. See below, p.206-9 for a full discussion of the liaison between the University and Museum since 1956.

3. See Appendix G.
always shown itself to be extremely conscious of the initial opposition of a sizeable number of local authorities to the whole concept of financing the Museum through such levies and although the Trust Board Act set the maximum permissible levy at one-fiftieth of a penny in the £ (after an initial maximum of one-sixtyfifth of a penny) on the capital value of all rateable property in the province, the Board itself has always endeavoured to keep its demands from levies below this maximum. By including revenue from rents and investments in its General Account each year, although it was clearly under no legal obligation to do so, the Board succeeded in its endeavours until the 1961–62 financial years when the maximum levy was struck for the first time. This policy of frugality had serious repercussions particularly during the Board’s early years. In 1956, for example, the Board approved a total budget to £9,800 of which £7,800 was to come from local body levies. While the majority of local authorities forwarded their contributions promptly, nine of them – the boroughs of West Harbour, Port Chalmers, Balclutha, Waikouaiti and Roxburgh and the counties of Bruce, Waikouaiti, Peninsula and Tuapeka – whose combined contributions totalled more than £1,000 failed to do so until the very end of the Board’s financial year and even then payments were made only after

1. TB Corres., Finance. Ramsey, Haggitt and Robertson to Hayward (Trust Board Secretary), 6 Feb 1958.
2. See Appendix G.
4. See Appendix H.
the Board had reminded them of their obligation under the Act. Meanwhile, the Board kept trimming its expenditure to avoid a deficit and many projects which had been regarded as urgent were postponed as a result. It is perhaps significant that the total amount of the outstanding levies almost exactly equalled the ultimate surplus for the 1956-57 financial year; it is certainly a tribute to the Trust Board’s prudent management that, without this income, they were still able to meet their immediate commitments. The next financial year, 1957-58 saw the Board budget for a total expenditure of £11,675 yet strike a levy of one-seventyfifth of a penny on local authorities which produced only £8,703. This difference was made up from revenue from rents, investments and the surplus of £1,151 from the previous financial year. These estimates had, however, been pruned too finely. In spite of further retrenchment during the year, essential expenditure on maintenance and equipment resulted in an overall deficit in excess of £1,600. The Trust Board’s predicament in this year is aptly illustrated by a decision it made in connection with a Works Committee recommendation to replace the water.

1. TB Corres., Finance. The first notification of the levy struck was forwarded to all local bodies on 30 May 1956 and the reminder to those listed above, on 23 Mar 1957.


5. See Appendix G.
pipes and downpipes in the Fels Wing with copper at a cost of £168. Since the repairs were regarded as urgent the recommendation was approved but:

"The Board asked Dr Baylis (Chairman of the Works Committee) to arrange, if possible, to have this work done so that the account for it would not be due for payment until after the end of the financial year."\(^1\)

The lesson was well taken. The next financial year the Trust Board raised its levy to one-sixtieth of a penny in the £ and, by so doing, increased its total income by nearly 74%. While it is significant that in only one financial year, 1960-61, has the revenue from levies been sufficient by itself to meet the year's commitments, the Board has endeavoured to budget each year for a small surplus and, by carefully scrutinising every expense, it was successful in keeping within its self-imposed limits until the 1964-65 financial year.\(^2\)

In recent years the Board has been faced with increasing difficulty in trimming its expenditure to keep within the available income and its attention has gradually turned towards seeking means of supplementing its regular income. The opening of the Centennial Wing in March 1963 brought with it greatly increased running costs and, in October of that year when it appeared as though a deficit for the year might eventuate, the Trust Board's Finance Committee considered

---

2. See Appendix G.
whether an approach to the Dunedin City Council to seek the remission of local body rates should be made.\footnote{TB Finance Committee Minutes, Vol II, 4 Nov 1963.} Although the Committee held that because the Government was currently considering the whole question of local body rates, the time chosen was inopportune\footnote{Ibid.} the Board did not drop the idea completely.\footnote{TB Minutes, Vol I, 13 Nov 1963.} A year later the Museum's financial position had deteriorated to such an extent that the Board found itself forced to approach the Dunedin City Council to seek some financial relief. During this year the Museum buildings had been rewired and the electricity used by the University was metered separately from that used by the Museum proper for the first time in its long association. At this time it became abundantly clear that the University had, in fact, been heavily subsidising the Museum as far as electricity costs were concerned, for the Museum's power accounts jumped a fantastic \footnote{See Otago Museum, Report, for 1963-64, p. 26. Electricity and Fuel Oil expenses were £632 in 1963-64 and £2,247 in 1964-65.} immediately this alteration took effect. A deputation from the Board met the City Council's Electricity Committee on November 11, to plead the case for a reduced tariff. This was held by the Committee to be impossible but the City Council was sympathetic towards the Museum's predicament and offered temporary assistance in the form of a substantial rate remission for the current financial year.\footnote{TB Minutes, Vol II, 9 Dec 1964. See Appendix C.}
Soon after, however, the Trust Board was informed that,

"the rebate has been granted subject to your Board taking the necessary steps to obtain authority for an increase in the present maximum levy on contributing authorities."

Despite the parlous financial situation, the Trust Board still showed some semblance of pride. The Dunedin City Council's conditions were discussed at its meeting in February 1965 and the Board felt compelled to decline the City Council's offer. Apart from R.D.B. Paterson, one of the Dunedin City Council's representatives on the Trust Board, members felt that while such a step was the only final solution, strong opposition from a large majority of the local bodies affected would result from such a suggestion. For its part, the City Council evidently had second thoughts on the matter for, soon after the Board had notified the Council of its decision not to accept the offer of a remission of rates in view of the conditions laid down, Lucas, the Dunedin Town Clerk, wrote to Forster, Director of the Museum and Secretary to the Trust Board, to offer the proposed remission without conditions, although he did suggest that an approach might be made to the Otago Education Board for a monetary grant to assist in providing facilities for the Museum Education Service. While this remission was very welcome, it proved to be no more than a temporary expedient and a further deterioration in the

1. TB Corres., Electricity and Gas. Lucas to Simmons (Secretary to Trust Board), 16 Dec 1964.
3. TB Corres., Electricity and Gas. Lucas to Forster (Secretary to Trust Board), 24 Feb 1965.
Board's finances forced it, once again, to approach the Dunedin City Council. Again the City Council agreed to a remission of the greater portion of the rates, provided two specified conditions were fulfilled. The Trust Board was to prepare an amendment to its Act for presentation to Parliament during 1966 and further, it was to approach the other contributing authorities for a special grant to help meet its current deficit. This time the Board had little choice. It had already sought a grant from the Otago Education Board to help defray expenses which had been incurred in accommodating the Museum Education Service in the Centennial Wing and had drawn up a list of local companies which, it was hoped, would consider providing some financial assistance to help the future development of the institution. In fact, even before it had officially accepted the City Council's offer with its attendant conditions, the Board had met with representatives of the local bodies concerned, and had outlined its future requirements and appealed for their collective support for its proposal to amend the Act to provide for a maximum levy of one-thirtieth of a penny in the £.

1. Ibid., Forster to Lucas, 15 Sep 1965.
2. Ibid., Lucas to Forster, 8 Dec 1965.
3. TB Committee Reports, Education Service Committee, 8 Jun 1965
5. Ibid., 15 Dec 1965.
6. The meeting was held in the Museum on 1 Dec 1965. See, TB Museum Reports Vol II. Fitzgerald: 'The Future of the Otago Museum'. To proceed beyond this point would be impolitic since at the time of writing, no final decision has yet been reached.
The financial problems at present being faced by the Trust Board are not entirely of its own making. Despite its most earnest endeavours to limit the increases in its levies, these have risen steadily over the years and, at £20,112, are today slightly more than two-and-a-half times the total levy collected during the first year of its administration. This increase may be attributed to two principal factors. In the first place, the Trust Board itself has been faced with continually increasing costs. To a large extent, these have been brought about by the very necessary increases in the Museum’s scientific, preparatory and attendant staff, and the Board’s current salary bill for a staff twice the size of that of 1956, is, at £16,045, nearly three-and-a-half times bigger. Furthermore, the erection of the Centennial Wing, while doubling the existing gallery space, has involved the Board in a considerable additional outlay in its endeavours to keep faith with all who had contributed in some way towards its erection. Secondly, during the past ten years, the unprecedented increase in land values, particularly those in rural areas, inevitably has resulted in considerable increases in the total levy paid by local authorities even after the actual rate levied by the Trust Board had reached its maximum and then become static. 

3. See Appendix G.
4. See Appendix H.
As the total amount of the Trust Board's annual levy grew, the contributing local authorities began to view the trend with increasing apprehension. In 1958, soon after the Board had raised its levy from one-seventyfifth of a penny in the $ to one-sixtieth of a penny, the Oamaru Borough Council, whose levy had risen from $322 in 1956 to $569 in 1958, lodged a very strong protest at what it termed a very large increase. The very next year the Naseby Borough Council, whose levy had risen from $218.1 to $5.3.0 in four years, and the Vincent County Council, whose levy during the same period had increased by $26 to $100, both queried the seemingly steep rise. In 1961, the year that the maximum of one-fiftieth of a penny was levied for the first time, the Palmerston Borough Council and the Waihemo and Clutha County Councils all questioned the necessity for the increases.

In many cases these protests followed soon after the five-yearly revaluation of the land administered by the protesting local bodies, the effect of the revaluation being to

2. Ibid., Town Clerk, Naseby to Hayward, 6 Jun 1959.
3. Ibid., County Clerk, Vincent to Hayward, 2 Jun 1959.
4. Ibid., Town Clerk, Palmerston to Hayward, 9 Jun 1961. (Note: the borough's levy had risen from $29 in 1956 to $4.8 in 1961).
5. Ibid., County Clerk, Waihemo to Hayward, 24 May 1961. (Note: the county's levy had increased from $92 in 1956 to $163 in 1961).
6. Ibid., County Clerk, Clutha to Hayward, 15 Jun 1961. (Note: the County's levy increased from $214 in 1956 to $711 in 1961).
increase the amount contributed by the local authorities whose property was revalued, to a somewhat higher level than would normally have been the case. Nonetheless, some local bodies whose contributions had not been affected by revaluation saw fit to issue a word or two of caution. Even the Dunedin City Council, which had always been extremely sympathetic towards the Museum, advised the Board to hasten slowly. In May 1959, T.K.S. Sidey, Chairman of the City Council's Finance Committee appealed to the Board to endeavour to hold its expenditure to the existing rate of one-sixtieth of a penny in the £. Sidey's comments were supported by both metropolitan newspapers. The Otago Daily Times deplored the fact that a rate, once established, tended to increase and approved Sidey's "word of caution against lifting too rapidly to the statutory maximum." The Evening Star went even further a few days later when it wrote:

"The friendly word of warning given to the (Trust) board by Cr Sidey the other day advising it to try to bridle expenditure was a wise one. It is essential for the preservation of the Museum that it should have a regular and adequate source of revenue and a few years ago, after much opposition from the rural authorities throughout the province which were also

1. See Appendix H.

2. O.D.T. 13 May 1959. The appeal was made during the presentation of the City Council's financial estimates for the 1959-60 year. The Trust Board, which at this time had not decided upon its levy, eventually levied local bodies at the rate of one-fiftyeighth of a penny in the £.

3. Ibid.
to be rated, an agreement was negotiated. The understanding then reached must be preserved and fostered for the goodwill of the people of the province is most important."

The Trust Board itself had long recognised the necessity of keeping the contributing authorities adequately informed of its activities. At one of its earliest meetings it decided to circularise them from time to time to keep them in the picture. Unfortunately, however, this was seldom carried out and much of the later contact between the Board and the Local bodies resulted from the local bodies' protests at the increasing levies. On occasions, too, individual Board members addressed borough and county councils by invitation to outline the Board's policy and justify its decisions.

During the Trust Board's early years, those members who represented the rating bodies tended to approach the problem of Museum finance much more cautiously than did the other members. Certainly, one of the conditions demanded by local authorities as the price of their acceptance of the Trust Board Act had been their determination to place the ratepayers' representatives on the Board with a clear majority. It was perhaps, therefore, natural for them to try to curb expenditure as much as possible. Connelly, a man of very fixed ideas where finance was concerned, typified their

1. E.S., 16 May 1959.
4. Lockett, in particular, made a point of addressing many of the County Councils he represented. See E.S., 12 Jul 1958.
approach when he wrote:

"While there is no desire to hinder the... work of the Museum, every effort must be made to see that all amounts properly payable to the Trust are collected before the rate is increased."  

As Chairman of the Trust Board's Finance Committee, Connelly's influence was very great. There can be little doubt that he, more than any other member of the Board, was responsible for pegging the levy well below the maximum allowed under the Act for the first five years of the Board's existence. Lockett, Hobbs and, to a lesser extent, Garton, supported him when the financial affairs of the Board were under consideration. Lockett in particular, was extremely vehement in his opposition to any increase in both levies and Museum expenditure and he is known to have actively campaigned for re-election to the Board by repeatedly assuring the county councils that his sworn policy was to keep expenditure (and, therefore, levies) as low as possible.  

The Trust Board's current difficulties can, to some extent, be traced back to the attitudes of these men. By its action in keeping the local body levy as low as possible, the Board passed up a splendid opportunity of establishing a fund which could be used later for development purposes. Between 1956 and 1961 the Museum's day to day expenses could have been financed entirely out of local body levies. Had this policy been followed, all of the revenue from rents and investments could have been used for


2. No documentary evidence for this assertion is available but both Dr Forster (2 Sep 1966) and Dr Ross (5 Sep 1966) have independently confirmed it.
development at a later date although, the Board members as a whole were probably thankful that the policy of economy had prevailed when local body criticism began to be directed at them. Further, the local bodies themselves have tended to support the policy of frugality and their protests have been so much greater as a result. Strangely enough, in recent years this division between ratepayer and non-ratepayer representatives has been decidedly less apparent, although this may be due to the fact that the maximum permissible levy has been reached, rather than to a greater appreciation of the needs of a modern museum on the part of some of the ratepayers' representatives.

The most pressing problem facing the Trust Board in 1956 was, without doubt, the urgent need to appoint sufficient staff to permit the Museum to fulfil its role in the community. For many years the size of the staff at the Otago Museum compared very unfavourably with those in other New Zealand centres and it had long been recognised that it was totally inadequate for the task it had to do.¹ The absence of financial security had, however, prevented any additional appointments ² and it was not until after the Museum's income had been assured by the Trust Board Act that any serious consideration could be given to appointing sufficient staff to meet the increasing demands placed on the institution.

¹. MGM Minutes; Vol I, 13 Apr 1948 (Director's Report) and Vol II, 1 Jul 1952 ('Memorandum on Staffing.')
². Ibid., Vol I, 12 Jul 1949 and 9 Mar 1950.
In 1956 the Museum's staff comprised a Relieving Director, one Exhibition Officer, three full time and one part time attendants, two cleaners and one clerical assistant. The most pressing need was to appoint a Director to succeed Skinner. Skinner had actually retired in 1952 but had consented to continue as Relieving Director until the passage of the Trust Board Act made the appointment of a successor financially possible. The Board wasted little time. At its first meeting it decided to advertise the position throughout the world and, since it could offer a salary of between £1,800 and £2,000, it was able to attract over forty applicants. In December 1956 the Board agreed to offer the appointment to Dr Harry Hawthorn, a New Zealand-born anthropologist living in Canada. Hawthorn, however, declined the offer and the Board then offered the appointment to Dr R.R. Forster, a Zoologist who was Assistant Director of the Canterbury Museum. He accepted, but because he was studying in the United States of America on a Fulbright Research Fellowship, he did not finally take up his appointment until August 1957. Forster's work at the Canterbury Museum was highly regarded and his appointment was of considerable importance to the Otago Museum because, for the first time in more than twenty years, a Zoologist was a member of the Museum's staff. For the best part of forty years, the zoological collections had been largely neglected and it was confidently anticipated that Forster, with modern display techniques, would, in time, rejuvenate this department.

1. Interview, Dr R. Duff, 10 Sep 1965.
Attention now centred on the appointment of an anthropologist, who was almost as essential as a zoologist. In May 1956 the Trust Board had expressed its concurrence with a resolution passed by the former Museum Committee which held, "that the future welfare of the Museum can best be served by a continuation of the past fruitful collaboration with the University Teaching Departments. It therefore recommends to the Trust Board that all opportunities of making combined appointments of Museum and University Staff should be very carefully considered in the future."\(^1\)

and, in March 1957, consideration was given to making a joint appointment in anthropology.\(^2\) The Trust Board's Finance Committee set aside "an appropriate amount" for salary purposes\(^3\) and, soon after, the conditions of appointment were finalised with the University Council.\(^4\) After a short delay brought about by the Board's desire to consider Forster's views in this matter, the position was advertised and, in July 1958, P.W. Gathercole took up the appointment.\(^5\) Gathercole, an English anthropologist with considerable archaeological experience, was a member of the Museum staff for over three years, during which time he made a considerable contribution to the redevelopment of the Museum's displays. Perhaps his most notable contribution was the establishment of the

---

3. Ibid., Finance Committee Minutes Vol I, 4 Apr 1957.
4. TB Minutes Vol I, 10 Jul 1957.
Association of Friends' Hall of period furniture in the ground floor of the Hocken Wing.¹ When the University Council appointed him as full-time lecturer in Anthropology at the beginning of 1962, he was replaced by D.R. Simmons who was appointed full time as Assistant Keeper in Anthropology. The next year, Simmons' status was raised to that of Keeper.²

The Trust Board also aimed at improving the Display staff. Although it had appointed Miss Judith Weston to the position of Exhibition Officer in September 1956, it did not lose sight of the fact that, in order to mount effective displays, a fully qualified taxidermist and preparator was essential. Such an appointment was first considered in 1957 ³ but no positive steps were taken until mid-1958 when Miss Weston resigned. The improved financial situation enabled the Board to appoint both a taxidermist and preparator and an assistant preparator. The senior of the two positions went to P.J. O'Brien, a man with "outstanding qualifications and ability,"⁴ who had served in similar positions in Christchurch, Melbourne and Auckland before coming to Dunedin. His undoubted talents have been used to good effect in the development of new displays in the Otago Museum. In recent years he has developed the technique of preparing exhibits in fibre-

glass to a high level. The other position went to T.R. Beatson who had previously been a member of the Museum's staff. While a double appointment such as this could not, perhaps, be justified immediately, the Trust Board was clearly preparing for the eventual opening of the Centennial Wing, for much of the work undertaken by these two men has been directed towards the preparation of exhibits for display in this Wing. Additional display staff was engaged as the date of the opening of the Centennial Wing drew closer. 1

The large increase in the display galleries has also necessitated increased attendant and cleaning staff. Further, additional office staff was made necessary as a result of Hayward's decision to relinquish his position of Secretary to the Trust Board which he had held since the Board's inception. Since April 1962, the Board's secretarial duties have been undertaken by Forster and the Museum's office staff while the accounting duties have been placed in the hands of a firm of Dunedin Public Accountants. 2  Hayward's resignation had considerably broader implications than a mere change of personnel and these will be discussed later. 3

Since 1956, the Museum's staff has been virtually doubled. Of considerable significance is the fact that the Trust Board has followed very closely, indeed, the recommendations made by

1. Miss D.A. McHugh (Display Assistant from 4 Jan 1961) and L. Cowell (temporary Display Assistant).
Skinner back in 1952. 1 There can be no question but that the appointments made by the Board have been necessary for, even today, the number and distribution of the Museum's staff is considerably smaller than those to be found in the other metropolitan museums. It is a sobering thought, too, to note that the Museum staff has not been increased since 1962 despite an obvious need to further augment the scientific staff. Because of the Museum's stringent financial position, the Trust Board has deliberately refrained from further extending its scientific and preparatory staff with the obvious result that the Museum's progress has suffered to a certain extent. The appointment of a second zoologist is long overdue but, until additional finance becomes available, no such appointment can be made. 2

The Trust Board's other major preoccupation during its first years was the erection of the long-delayed Centennial Wing. Willi Fels had inaugurated the fund for this extension as far back as 1934 and, with other donations and bequests (of which that made by Adolph Moritzon was the most notable) plus contributions from the Otago Centennial Committee, some £90,000 was available to the Board when it assumed office. In 1946, the total cost of the proposed extension was estimated

1. MCM Minutes Vol II, 1 Jul 1952. Skinner: 'Memorandum on Staffing'. Skinner recommended a minimum scientific staff of two - a zoologist and an anthropologist, - a technician qualified in taxidermy, and a full-time secretary for the Museum office.

at £60,000 but, ten years later, this figure had risen to nearly £145,000. The Trust Board was thus faced with the problem of finding some way of bridging the gap between the money in hand and this latest estimate. Soon after its first meeting, the Trust Board studied the plans which had been drawn up some years previously, authorised the architects to revise them in the light of modern developments in Museum architecture, and decided to forward the amended sketches to the Government with a request for a grant of "somewhere in the vicinity of £50,000". The approach was delayed until the middle of 1957, but when it was eventually made through J.G. Barnes, M.P. for St. Kilda, the Government made a grant of £40,000 towards the completion of the project. Thus encouraged, the Board proceeded to have working drawings prepared and, towards the end of 1958, tenders for the erection of the Centennial Wing were called. Unfortunately, when these were opened, all were found to be considerably higher than the Board had anticipated. Two tenders, one for the erection of the building and another for the installation of the heating system, had been called for and the lowest combined tender came to slightly less than £150,000, to which had to be added about £17,000 for incidentals. In all, nearly £30,000

1. O.D.T., 7 Aug 1946.
2. TB Minutes Vol I, 14 Nov 1956.
3. Ibid., 11 Jun 1956.
4. Ibid., 14 Nov 1956.
either had to be found or saved if the project was to go ahead. At first the Board’s efforts were directed towards deleting some of the less essential items such as the lift, the immediate partitioning of the mezzanine floor, and the immediate installation of the central heating plant. On this basis the Board’s Finance Committee agreed to proceed even though a deficiency of nearly £8,500 still existed, and the two lowest tenderers were asked to revise their tenders in the light of the changes made. The contract was finally let to Fletcher Construction with a tender of £122,665. With incidentals added, the overall cost of the project was now estimated at £137,537. Construction finally commenced on 23 March 1959 and, after many delays, the building was completed in June 1962. In fairness to the contractors, however, it must be pointed out that most of the items which had been deferred were reinstated when it became clear that the additional finance would be available.

Once the contract had been let, the Trust Board turned its attention towards raising the additional money required to complete the building as originally envisaged. A number of suggestions were made, ranging from holding an Art Union to making individual approaches to possible donors, but the Board decided that, before any of the suggested methods were attempted, a further approach should be made to the Government.

1. Ibid., Finance Committee Minutes, Vol I, 23 Feb 1959.
3. Ibid., 23 Feb 1959.
This was made in August 1959 but W. (now Sir Walter) Nash, who was Prime Minister in the Labour Government then in office declined to assist on the grounds that the people of Otago should first be given an opportunity to contribute. Nash reiterated his previous decision in February 1960 when, at a conversazione held at the Museum, he was reported to have said, "Help yourselves before we will consider helping you." Trust Board members interpreted this statement to mean that a £ for £ subsidy on any monies raised locally would be available from government sources.

Meanwhile, the Trust Board had already begun to plan alternative methods of raising the necessary additional finance. Two of the previous suggestions - the soliciting of donations from local business firms in return for the privilege of attaching their names to Museum showcases and a general appeal to local bodies and private individuals for a special, non-recurring grant began to assume concrete forms. The preliminary planning towards holding a general appeal had already been taken by the time of Nash's visit and, in March 1960, a special Appeal Committee set up by the Board

---

1. Ibid., 12 Aug 1959.
2. Ibid., 16 Sep 1959.
3. C.P.T., 17 Feb 1960. c/f Fitzgerald (Otago Museum, Report, 1959-60) who records Nash's statement as, "If you help yourselves we will help you."
set about raising the money which was necessary to eliminate the deficiency. Under the chairmanship of Dr Angus Ross this committee, which included a number of prominent Dunedin businessmen in addition to the local body representatives on the Trust Board itself,¹ raised a total of £14,756 through the distribution of some 30,000 appeal leaflets to every household in the Province and by approaching a great many prominent individuals, business houses and local bodies. Among the more notable grants received were £1,000 from the Dunedin City Council,² £750 from the Dunedin Savings Bank and £500 from the Sargood Trust. The Otago Harbour Board was also approached and it agreed to make a grant of £500, payment of which was to be spread over the following three years.³ Towards the close of the appeal, Ross and Connelly once again approached Nash to seek further Government assistance. As a result, another grant, this time of £2,500 from Art Union profits was approved by J.G. Anderton, the Minister of Internal Affairs.⁴ In view of the manner in which the population of Otago had responded to the challenge to "help themselves", the size of this grant brought forth many caustic comments. Nevertheless, with the appeal total now standing at £17,256, the

¹ See, Otago Museum, Report, 1959-60, p.7, for a complete list of the members of this committee.


⁴ Ibid., 14 Sep 1960.
Trust Board decided to complete the Wing as originally planned, even though it was still nearly £13,000 short of the total amount required. Even so, the deficit worried the Board and it continued with its efforts to secure additional Government assistance. Fitzgerald addressed yet another appeal to Nash, only to receive the reply that no further assistance was possible.¹ Just at this time however, fate seemed to play into the Board's hands. The 1960 General Election brought a change of Government which persuaded the Board that an approach to the new Prime Minister, K.J. Holyoake, would not be without hope. Nevertheless, the Board considered it wise to delay this move until the building was nearer completion and it was not until December 1961 that plans were finally laid. A conversazione to which Holyoake was invited² was held at the Museum on 14 March 1962 and, during a private supper at the end of the evening, the case for further government assistance was put to him by members of the Trust Board and the Otago Education Board. According to a memorandum appended to the Trust Board Minutes of 14 March 1962, the Prime Minister was "deeply impressed" by what he had seen of the Museum and he promised to "give his careful and immediate attention to the financial problem which had been brought to his notice." Holyoake was evidently much more impressed than his predecessor had been for, in May 1962,

¹ O.D.T., 7 Dec 1960.
the Trust Board received word that a grant of £10,000 had been made from the Golden Kiwi Lottery profits to assist with the completion of the Centennial Wing.¹ This large sum enabled the Board to open the building completely debt free and also permitted them to proceed immediately to the development of the first display halls in the new wing.

With the completion of the Centennial Memorial, the Trust Board's largest single effort had reached a successful conclusion. Its perseverance in the face of considerable difficulties was very commendable and while the success of the appeal to the residents of Otago was, in some respects, disappointing,² the results of the effort did indicate a wide measure of support from many quarters. Yet, in another respect, the Board's problems were only beginning for it now had to make effective use of the new gallery space if the extension was to be justified, and development of this nature was becoming increasingly difficult to undertake at a time when nearly all available revenue was being absorbed in maintenance and ordinary running expenses. The extent of the Board's difficulties can be assessed from the fact that it was originally planned to open both the Skinner Hall of Polynesia and the Hall of Marine Life at the time the building itself was officially opened. While the Skinner Hall of

1. Ibiü., 9 May 1962. J.G. Barnes played an important part in securing this additional grant by acting as the Trust Board's contact with the National Government. (Ross, Interview)

2. Only eight of the 29 local bodies in the Otago Province saw fit to contribute.
Polynesian was completed in time, work on the Hall of Marine Life was still in progress four years later. Nearly half of the available display area in the Centennial Wing still remains undeveloped.

Although the transfer of authority from the University to the Trust Board officially broke the long-standing link between the two bodies, the University Council did not now turn its back on the institution it had fostered for so long. An association such as this could not simply be severed at the stroke of a pen and, as J.H. Ryburn, the University's Chancellor, said at the time of the transition, although the University Council had surrendered all control over the Museum, it would continue to be vitally interested in it. In fact, apart from the Museum's much improved financial position, there was, at first, little noticeable difference between the old and the new orders. At its first meeting the Trust Board appointed Hayward, the University's Registrar, as its Secretary-Treasurer. For the previous eight years he had acted as Secretary of the Museum Committee and thus his appointment provided a strong element of continuity. In addition to granting Hayward an honorarium of £250 a year, the Board agreed to contribute £100 a year towards the accounting and clerical services provided by the University Registry. These arrangements, made through the courtesy of the University

1. E.S., 11 Apr 1956.
Council, proved to be of inestimable value to the Trust Board during its formative years and they played no small part in establishing the new administration on a firm foundation. This intimate association was not severed until April 1962 when Hayward, as a result of the increasing pressure of University business, found it necessary to relinquish his appointment. When the Board was notified of Hayward's impending resignation, it decided to separate the secretarial duties from those of Treasurer.¹ Henceforth, the secretarial work was carried out by the Museum Director, assisted by the office staff, while the Museum's finances were handled by W.E.C. Reid and Company, a Public Accounting firm. This decision materially increased the institution's administrative costs for, in addition to the increased clerical staff in the Museum's office, the account costs immediately rose to £400² and, a year later, to £500.³

Liaison between the two institutions continued in other spheres too, as some of the University's teaching departments continued to be closely associated with the Museum. Until the arrangement was terminated at the beginning of 1962, the University's lecturer in Anthropology was also the Museum's Keeper in that field.⁴ Nevertheless, even since the separation, anthropology is still taught mainly in the Museum buildings and the department continues to rely heavily on the

². Ibid., 4 Dec 1962.
³. Ibid.
⁴. See above, pp. 196 - 97.
Museum's ethnological material. Similar arrangements existed for the Botany Department and, until 1962, for the Zoology Department. The urgent need for increased storage space in recent years has, however, forced the Trust Board to repossess nearly half of the space occupied for so many years by the University\(^1\) and, when these departments found themselves rather cramped, the University Council decided to seek the Trust Board's assistance in building a lecture theatre at ground level under that part of the Centennial Wing in which the Maori Meeting House was to be re-erected.\(^2\) Although the Trust Board advised the University Council that the difficulties in meeting the cost of completing the Centennial Wing precluded any assistance, it did guarantee that if the Council was prepared to build the rooms at its own expense, no rent would be charged.\(^3\) Although it was realised that the progressive withdrawal of the University Departments from the Museum's precincts would mean that the room would eventually pass to the Trust Board and be used for Museum purposes, the University Council willingly accepted the offer.

Yet another field where close liaison has been apparent and indeed, necessary, is that of the maintenance of the Hocken Wing. Originally erected to house Hocken's gift to the Uni-

---

3. Ibid., See also, E.S., 12 Nov 1960.
versity of his books and pictures, the Wing in recent years has been occupied by the Library itself, the Museum and the Botany Department, each of which paid one-third of the maintenance costs. In 1957 the question of the future maintenance of this portion of the Museum buildings came to the fore and, while the University had a definite obligation in this respect, in view of the possible removal of both the Hocken Library and the Botany Department sometime in the future, the Trust Board agreed henceforth to assume responsibility for one-half of these costs.¹

Perhaps the most important field of co-operation is, however, to be found in the appointment of Honorary Keepers to those Museum Departments where no specialist exists on the Museum staff itself. This practice originated in the 1930's as a result of the continuing expansion and diversification of the Museum's collections and by far the greatest majority of the honorary staff have been University teachers in subjects related to the Museum's collections. Today no fewer than six of the seven Honorary Keepers are members of the University's staff.² Their time and knowledge has contributed in no small measure to the development of the Museum in its broadest aspects.

There can be no doubt that, in the ten years since the Trust Board's establishment, the Otago Museum has made consider-

¹. Ibid., Finance Committee Minutes Vol I, 25 Sep 1957.
able progress. Its financial position has been much more secure than at any other stage in its history and this fact alone has been a major contributing factor to the Museum's development in other fields. The much improved staffing position, in itself a reflection of the institution's new financial security, has resulted in a notable improvement in the nature and general standard of the displays mounted in the public galleries and these, in turn, have attracted a greatly increased stream of visitors. Since 1958, the first full year in which accurate records were kept, public attendances at the Museum have risen by more than 21,000, and in 1965, these exceeded 59,000 for the first time.1 Perhaps the most significant feature emerging from these records is the fact that attendances are generally much greater in January, May and August - the months of the school holidays - than at any other time of the year. Further, the long awaited erection of the Centennial Wing which increased the available display area from 41,000 square feet to more than 85,000 square feet, provided both the incentive and the opportunity for the long overdue redevelopment of the entire Museum. It has also permitted the Museum authorities to arrange special displays and these have played no small part in attracting larger public interest. Nevertheless, the optimism and progress noted has been tempered in recent years by the Board's inability to keep abreast of rapidly rising administrative

1. See Appendix I for a summary of the official attendances since 1958.
costs. The Trust Board is not alone in this difficulty, but the fact that these are rising more rapidly than real income, plus the very great reluctance on the part of the overwhelming majority of local bodies to even consider permitting an increase in the maximum permissible levy, makes it extremely doubtful that the Museum will continue to progress as rapidly in the immediate future as it has in the recent past.
CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

During the ninety-eight years which have passed since its doors were first opened to the public, the Otago Museum has not only come to be recognised as one of the Province's foremost cultural and educational institutions, but has also acquired an enviable reputation for the scholarship it has fostered. This reputation is recognised throughout New Zealand and extends far beyond its shores. Over the past thirty years, in particular, the institution has earned the highest praise both for the nature and extent of its collections and for the manner of their display. When Major F.S. Markham visited the Museum for the second time in 1944, he described it as "a great visual educational centre." In 1952, Dr Paul S. Wingert, Professor of Primitive Art at Columbia University, New York, proclaimed that the Museum "exceeded (his) greatest expectations," and, a few months later, Professor C.K.M. Kluckhohn, Professor of Anthropology at Harvard University, described the institution as "magnificent," and Skinner as "one of the best known and respected Anthropologists in the World." Still more recently Major Donald S. Marshall, a research anthropologist at the Peabody Museum, Salem, Massachusetts, expressed the opinion that

2. O.D.T., 19 Apr 1952.
"anyone who wants to study Polynesian Culture has to come (to the Otago Museum) and see this collection and hear what Dr Skinner has to say. Dr Skinner is the foremost anthropologist in the Polynesian field; in fact, you could call him the Dean of Anthropologists."¹

Such high praise is not bestowed lightly but, today, few would question its justification. Although its history has been scarred by many vicissitudes, the Museum has nevertheless largely succeeded in surmounting the difficulties confronting it and there have been very few occasions during the past century when progress, in some form or other, cannot be noted. The institution's continued development has been a triumph for the determination and tenacity of a relatively small handful of individuals whose efforts have made the Museum a vital and living force within the local community. But before the Otago Museum's role in the modern community can be considered, some assessment must be made of the extent to which the acknowledged aims of the institution have been achieved since its foundation.

In 1957, Forster outlined what he considered to be the three main functions of a modern museum.² These were:

1. To gather together and preserve for posterity collections pertaining to the acknowledged fields of interest of the museum.

¹ E.S., 18 Oct 1955.
"2. To carry out research based on these collections and make them available, within the limits set by the museum, for study by persons not employed within the museum.

3. To make available to the public the accumulated knowledge encompassed by these collections by means of the display halls, lectures and 'popular' publications."

While the founders of the Otago Museum did not take the trouble to define their objectives in this precise manner, it is quite clear that in general terms their aims differed little from those of today.

The foundation of the Otago Museum in 1868 came about solely because a few individuals—notably Arthur Beverly and J.S. Webb—were determined to preserve, for the benefit of future generations, the exhibits which, when displayed in the Otago bay at the New Zealand Exhibition of 1865, had attracted so much public attention. In many instances, these exhibits were no more than curiosities but there were some items, for example, Hector's geological collection and Lauder Lindsay's collection of north-western European flora, which were unique. The mere fact that these were considered worthy of preservation is sufficient indication that some people, at least, were convinced of their instructional value. Although official lethargy delayed its opening for three years, the Museum, once established, became a focal point for many who desired to preserve, permanently, articles of both real and curiosity value. For instance, the Otago Daily Times reported that, during the three weeks which followed the
Museum's opening, numerous items including an elephant seal, the vertebrae of a whale, a collection of butterflies and insects, and a starfish, had been presented.\(^1\) As time passed, several gifts of considerable importance were given by many whose interest in the institution and its development was deep and lasting. In many instances, items had long been a part of family collections which were given in order that their preservation might be assured. The list of benefactors recorded in recent Otago Museum Reports\(^2\) attests to the continuing generosity of an ever-growing band of patrons who, among them, have donated a major portion of the institution's present-day collections.

The Museum's staff, both permanent and honorary, have also materially assisted in the preservation of specimens now housed in the Otago Museum. As early as 1878, Jennings, the Museum's taxidermist, visited the Auckland and Campbell Islands in search of botanical specimens\(^3\) but field work did not become a major activity until Skinner was appointed to the Museum staff. In 1919 he paid his first visit to the Chatham Islands to study Moriori material culture at first hand and he returned to the mainland with a number of Moriori

---

1. O.D.T., 7 Oct 1868.

2. For the most recent complete list of Benefactors of the Otago Museum, see, Otago Museum, Report, 1963-64, pp. 27-28.

3. 'Annual Report for the Year ended 31 March 1879.' (filed in the back of the Minute Book of the Second Committee of Management, 1873-77).
artifacts, the gifts of Chatham Islands settlers. Over the next thirty or more years, Skinner directed and participated in an ever-increasing programme of archaeological and anthropological research aimed at permanently recording Maori pre-history as fully as possible and preserving, for later scientific study, Maori artifacts found during excavations. Skinner's work in this field has been continued and extended by many, of whom David Teviotdale and, to a somewhat lesser extent, Leslie Lockerbie, stand out. Both have given several important ethnographic pieces, the product of their excavations, to the Museum. Today, much of this activity is being undertaken by the Otago Anthropological Society under the general direction of the Keeper of Anthropology.

At the time of the Museum's foundation, research in the field of the Natural Sciences was in its infancy and, to a large extent, the development of the zoological, botanical and ethnological sciences has been concurrent with the growth of the Museum. As a direct consequence of this, much of the Museum's research work has been reflected in its public galleries. From the point of view of research, the institution has indeed been fortunate to be so intimately associated with the University of Otago because this has ensured the presence of some staff of considerable scientific standing. Without such a link, the Museum's position in the

1. Otago University Museum, Annual Report, 1919, pp. 5-6.
community today would be much less significant. Hutton and Parker, Benham and Skinner, and, currently, Forster and Simmons have all undertaken extensive research programmes based on the Museum's collections and have published numerous monographs in a number of scientific journals. These have helped materially to establish and confirm the Otago Museum's world-wide reputation.

The nature of the public displays reflect both the interests of the curators and their approach to their subject. Hutton, Parker, Benham and Skinner were all University teachers and, perhaps inevitably, this has meant that the displays set up under their direction were developed to suit the requirements of their teaching programmes rather than to appeal to members of the general public. Evidence of this can still be found in the galleries today. While little of Benham's work appears to have survived, Hutton's display of fishes still remains; Parker's imprint is to be found in the mammalian exhibits; while Skinner, who developed a typological and locality classification as the basis of his ethnological researches, used this system to a large extent when he prepared exhibits of Maori and Polynesian material. Not until the late 1930's was there any real effort to display the Museum's material in a manner calculated to appeal to non-academic visitors. Then, as a result of the visit of Frank Tose, a preparator at the Museum of the Academy of Sciences in
San Francisco, the first dioramas in any New Zealand museum were prepared.\textsuperscript{1} Henceforth, the opinion expressed by Tose\textsuperscript{2} that, "the mounting of animals is no longer a matter of mere stuffing but is primarily a business of sculpting," was adopted as the main approach to museum display, but it was not until a much greater assured income was available and the Museum's first full-time Director had been appointed, that the Otago Museum was able to make any major progress in this direction.

The single unifying thread throughout the institution's history is, undoubtedly, the fact that at no stage has there been an income sufficient for the Museum's every need. Nor have the Museum's functions and their attendant financial implications ever been generally understood or accepted by those charged with its management. The Provincial Government held that the institution could be administered adequately on an annual grant of between £100 and £600 while the Central Government clearly thought that it did not need anything like the £2,000 a year asked for by the second Museum Committee appointed by the Provincial Government. For many years too, the University Council adhered strictly to the letter of its trust and always endeavoured to keep expenditure on the Museum within the limits imposed by its meagre endowment income. In recent years the University has adopted a much more liberal approach to the whole problem of

\textsuperscript{1}See, \textit{E.S.}, 26 Nov 1937 and \textit{O.D.T.}, 1 Nov 1940.
\textsuperscript{2}\textit{E.S.}, 26 Nov 1937.
Museum finance but its belated generosity has often disguised the real costs of maintaining the institution. Further, only since 1930 has there been any real effort to educate public opinion to accept greater financial responsibility for the Museum's welfare but even this has met with only limited success. The wonder of the whole situation is the extent to which major progress has been made down through the years in spite of the severe financial handicap with which the Museum has constantly been plagued. Although the staff of the Museum has always been numerically very much smaller than that of any of the other metropolitan museums, it has nevertheless, been remarkably dedicated and the standards which have been attained have resulted from the vast amount of additional work, much of it at low rates of pay, that the staff have so readily undertaken. In particular, it is no small tribute to Skinner's energy and enthusiasm that the accolades conferred on the Otago Museum at various times by many distinguished visitors, have been well and truly earned.

At present, the Trust Board is facing yet another financial crisis. Nearly all the institution's current revenue - levies, investment income and rents - is needed to pay its day to day expenses and thus virtually nothing is left for the development of new public displays and the redevelopment of the old. The Hall of Marine Life, which originally was to have been opened along with the Centennial Wing, has still not been completed and a proposed Science
Museum, a project agreed to by a joint committee of the Trust Board and University Council,\(^1\) has had to be shelved indefinitely. Yet, in spite of the seemingly fully justified case for an amendment to the Trust Board Act which would raise the maximum permissible levy to one-thirtieth of a penny in the £, many local bodies which contribute to the Museum's maintenance, are today very determined in their opposition to such a move.\(^2\) Most local authorities today accept the contention that they have an obligation to help preserve the Museum's existing collections\(^3\) but only those local bodies located close to the Museum itself appear to be prepared to accept some measure of responsibility for its continued development.\(^4\) Up to a point, the blame for this situation lies with the Trust Board itself. Those who drafted the original Bill back in 1953, recognised that a maximum levy of one-thirtieth of a penny in the £ would probably be necessary to enable the institution to be adequately financed, but they were prepared to compromise with the local bodies in order to ensure the passage of the Bill. Although they accepted the fact that, in the immediate future, one-fiftieth of a penny in the £ would probably be sufficient for the

---


2. See E.S., 2 Sep 1966 (report of meeting with local bodies) and O.D.T., 23 Sep 1966 (Milton Borough Council), 27 Sep 1966 (Oamaru Borough Council) and 28 Sep 1966 (Clutha County Council).

3. W.R. Laneys (Mayor of Oamaru), stated this at a meeting between the Otago Museum Trust Board and representatives of local bodies held in the Museum on 1 Sep 1966.

4. See O.D.T., 2 Sep 1966 and E.S., 1 and 2 Sep 1966.
Museum's needs, it is fairly safe to assume that the majority held that, eventually, the maximum levy as originally proposed would have to be sought. Nevertheless, in 1961 when the levy was set at the one-fiftieth of a penny maximum for the first time, the resultant protests from a number of outlying local bodies were countered by Board members who emphasised that, now that the maximum levy had been reached, it would henceforth remain stable and the only increases in the future would be minor ones resulting from increased property valuations. ¹ Unfortunately, these and other similar assurances have obscured the very real fact that the increases in the total levy collected which result from the periodic revaluations of provincial property, amount to a mere £83. 6. 8 for every £1 million increase in capital valuations. This figure is at present not even keeping pace with the increasing costs that the Trust Board is having to face.

What of the future? The role of the Otago Museum as a cultural and educational centre in the modern community has been undoubtedly assured as a result of the continued interest and generosity of a great many individuals who have each sought, over the past century, to raise the institution's status to one of greatness. But the era of individual philanthropy on a large scale has probably come to an end and in the future, support for the institution must be sought from

¹ Fitzgerald is quoted (E.S., 15 Jun 1961) as having said that no amendment to the Trust Board Act "was contemplated even in the far future." Lockett reported (TB Finance Committee Minutes, Vol II, 28 Jun 1961) that he had assured the Clutha County Council "that the Board has no intention of asking that the rate be increased."
the general public (whose interest in the Museum has never been greater than it is at present.) and community organisations such as local bodies, the Royal Society and the Association of Friends. Certainly, the present unsatisfactory financial situation must be resolved in a way which will provide the Trust Board with sufficient revenue to enable it to meet its normal running costs, meet the requirements of routine maintenance, increase its scientific staff to a more satisfactory level and develop the display halls along modern lines, without having to make periodic financial appeals to allow it to continue functioning as a modern museum should function. The past century has been a momentous one in very many ways and yet, at the present time, the Museum appears to be standing on the threshold of an even brighter future. It has taken almost one hundred years for its functions to become clearly defined; now that this has been achieved, and provided it can be financed satisfactorily, the future progress of the Museum should be much more rapid.

1. See Appendix I.
APPENDIX A

Extract from a letter written by John McGlashan in connection with the proposed Geological Survey of the Province and appearing in the Otago Colonist on 18 October 1861.

"..........I beg leave to suggest that the opportunity afforded by his excursions should be embraced for collecting geological and mineralogical specimens and fossils for a museum in Dunedin. That museum, after substances have been labelled and systematically arranged, might be very appropriately connected with and placed under the management and care of the Directors of the Mechanics Institution and Athenaeum, and would be highly deserving, if judiciously treated, with an annual or occasional vote from the public funds towards its support."
## APPENDIX B

Copy of Letter Register (O.P. 9/\(\#\)) for entry No. 4522.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Prov. Secy.</td>
<td>Dr. Richardson</td>
<td>Asking him to act.</td>
<td>11.7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Dr. Hulme</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>Mr. A. Beverly</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dr. Hulme</td>
<td>Prov. Secy.</td>
<td>Will act as Trustee</td>
<td>14.7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F. Richardson</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A. Beverly</td>
<td>Dr. Hulme</td>
<td>Forwarding Gazette No. 374 containing appointment</td>
<td>12.7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Prov. Secy.</td>
<td>Dr. Richardson</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>21.7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>A. Beverly</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>22.7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>A. Beverly</td>
<td>Requesting the sanction of the Govt for any expenditure attending the removal of exhibits etc.</td>
<td>25.7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A. Beverly</td>
<td>Prov. Secy.</td>
<td>Govt. sanction a small outlay</td>
<td>31.7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Prov. Secy.</td>
<td>A. Beverly</td>
<td>do</td>
<td>do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Geologist Prov. Secy. Forwarding an Inventory of the collections belonging to the Provincial Govt.</td>
<td>4.8.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Prov. Secy. Trustees Otago Museum Forwarding inventory and copy of letter.</td>
<td>8.8.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Secy. to Trustees Prov. Secy. They find the inventory very imperfect</td>
<td>11.8.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Prov. Secy. A. Beverly Mr. Gore has been requested to communicate with him.</td>
<td>15.8.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A. Beverly Prov. Secy. Mr. Gore has put the Trustees in possession etc.</td>
<td>18.8.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Superintendent Prov. Secy.; Mayor of Dunedin; Captain Thos. Fraser; E. Hulme, M.D.; E. Alexander, Surgeon; A. Beverly; J. Hislop; L.O. Beale; R.M. Robertson, M.P.C. - Will they consent to act as members of a committee with the Superintendent for the time being in whom it is proposed to vest the management of the Museum for which rooms in the new Post Office have been set apart.</td>
<td>3.4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Replies from Capt. Fraser, Dr. Hulme and Messrs Beverly, Hislop and Robertson consenting to act</td>
<td>3rd, 6th, 8th, 6th &amp; 3rd 4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Replies from Messrs L.O. Beale and Alexander consenting to act</td>
<td>6th &amp; 11th 4.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Voucher in favour of A. Beverly for £30. 3.0 being amount of various sums paid for rent, carriage, packing, stationary, repairs etc., as Treasurer to Museum Trust.</td>
<td>12.5.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B (contd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>B. Holmes</td>
<td>Prov. Secy.</td>
<td>Applies for the appointment of Curator to the Museum</td>
<td>26.6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>C. to Ex. C.</td>
<td>B.L. Holmes</td>
<td>The Govt have no intention of appointing a Curator</td>
<td>12.6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Members of the Committee</td>
<td>To attend a meeting at his office on the 1st July to take steps for carrying out the purposes of the Museum</td>
<td>29.6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>A. Beverly</td>
<td>Encloses resolutions adopted at the meeting of the committee appointing him convener of a sub-committee etc.</td>
<td>29.6.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>J.S. Webb</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Claims to be appointed a member of the Committee as being mainly instrumental in obtaining (sic) the bulk of the articles intended for exhibition</td>
<td>2.7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>J.S. Webb</td>
<td>Was not aware of the fact stated. The question of additional members rests with the committee.</td>
<td>2.7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wm. Murison</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>Resolution of the University Council that a Board of Management of the Museum be appointed by the Govt., the Council having access to the Museum</td>
<td>3.7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>E.W. Alexander</td>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Prov. Secy.</td>
<td>Chancellor of University</td>
<td>Informed of the names of the members appointed</td>
<td>27.10.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>F.W. Hutton</td>
<td>Prov. Secy.</td>
<td>Forwards opinion of Committee that building site for the museum could be on the ground opposite the Botanical Gardens - also that Mr McGuigan be employed as architect</td>
<td>20.6.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Letters No 4522/53-79 are concerned almost exclusively with siting and other matters pertaining to the erection of the permanent Museum building. This correspondence continues through Register No. 16094.
APPENDIX C

Superintendent's Office,
DUNEDIN.

2 April 1868

Sir,

You are probably aware that there is in the possession of the Government a valuable and extensive collection of minerals and other articles sufficient to form the nucleus of a museum.

Arrangements have been made whereby a portion of the Post Office Buildings may be devoted to this purpose.

It is proposed to vest the management of the museum in the hands of a committee as under, viz.,

The Superintendent of the Province for the time being,
The Provincial Secretary do do
The Mayor of Dunedin do do
Capt. Thos Fraser,
Dr. Hulme,
Dr Alexander,
Mr. A. Beverly,
Mr. L.O. Beale,
Mr John Hislop,
Mr R.M. Robertson M.P.C.

Perhaps you will be good enough to inform me whether or not you will consent to act as a member of such committee.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your most obed. serv.,

(Sgd) Thos. Dick,
Superintendent.

1. OPC. Corres. 4522/19. (Letters 19 - 27 sent to all those listed above).
The following is the text of an Editorial which appeared in the Evening Star on 13 October 1877.

'THE OTAGO MUSEUM'

"The Museum is in rather an awkward predicament just now. To use an old simile, it is hung up between earth and heaven, like Mahomet's coffin. It has no visible means of support. It took a long time to persuade the Provincial Government to erect a proper building and place a competent director in charge of the collections, but the Museum had scarcely got on its feet when the Provincial Government vanished, and with it the Museum's income. Last year, it will be remembered, the matter was mentioned in the Assembly and the Government undertook to defray the charge for the next twelve months out of the Land Fund, pending further arrangements. This arrangement was avowedly temporary, and from its nature could only be so, the Land Fund of Otago being already laden with more than it could bear of pecuniary burdens. The question now is, what can be done to provide the Museum with a permanent income? Annual votes of the Assembly would be an extremely precarious way of obtaining it, so long as the Assembly is animated with the peculiar idea that all the towns in the colony must share and share alike in the matter of grants to Museums and similar institutions so that if the Colony is unable to afford the expense of Museums, say both at Blenheim and Dunedin, neither town shall have the benefit of one. To avoid the necessity of having recourse to the Assembly every year, Mr Stout has brought forward a Bill for the endowment of the Museum with 11,000 acres of land in the Silver Peaks Hills district, the land forming part of two runs now occupied by pastoral tenants of the Crown. It is proposed to vest this land, together with the Museum and all its contents
and a portion of the reserve adjoining, in the Otago
University, to be held by that corporation in trust for
a Museum. The Bill enables the University to lease the
11,000 acres of land, in one or more blocks, for any period
not exceeding 21 years, at such rent and on such conditions
as it shall think fit, provided the right is reserved of
terminating the lease at twelve months notice, for the
purpose of selling the land in accordance with provisions
of the Waste Lands Acts, and afterwards investing the
proceeds either on real security or in Government or
municipal debentures. The income derived from these
investments would be applied in just the same manner as
the income obtained from the land itself. A peculiar
stipulation has been inserted in the clause relating
to the application of the fund. Until the income reaches
£700 per annum the whole is to be devoted to the maintenance
of the Museum; but directly it attains that sum, nine
tenths of it are to be given to the Dunedin Athenaeum. ¹

"We should be glad to see the Bill pass, even in its
present shape, because it would, at all events, prevent the
Museum from being shut up; but the measure is capable of
much improvement. The endowment will be ample in the course
of a few years, when the land has risen in value, but in the
meantime, the results will furnish but a scanty subsistence
to the institution. We believe that the Museum cannot be
kept going at all under an outlay of £600 a year exclusive of
a salary for the curator, which is just now saved on account
of the office being held by one of the University professors.
The fortunate conjunction of circumstances which enables this
to be done might, of course, terminate at any moment; and in
providing a revenue for the Museum the estimate ought certainly
to include an allowance for the curator. It must be under-

¹. (Sic - should be nine-tenths to the Museum and one-tenth
to the Athenaeum)
stood, too, that the sum we have mentioned would not permit of the importation of foreign exhibits, which often entail a heavy expense; in fact, it would merely provide for the maintenance of the Museum in something like its present form until better times arrived. It will, therefore, be seen that the reserves set aside by the Bill would hardly suffice for its object until a few years had elapsed, and the Bill is consequently deficient in that respect. A stronger objection in our eyes is the conveyance of the Museum to the University bodily. It is simply given over to the University without any restriction save that the property is to be held "in trust for a Museum". Such a proceeding is most unusual. Public Museums, from the British Museum downwards are generally vested in independent trustees; and the transference of our Museum to the University becomes peculiarly objectionable when it is considered how entirely the University Council has failed to gain public confidence in the management of its own affairs. A preliminary to the proposed transference should be the re-organisation of the University Council and the introduction of the elective principle therein; but we do not hear of any such change being contemplated. It is very desirable, indeed, that the University and the Museum authorities should work harmoniously together, as there are circumstances which, in some degree, render it expedient that the University Council should have a voice in the management of the Museum; but those circumstances are of a temporary nature while the object of the Bill is to settle its affairs on a permanent basis. In weighing the merits of the Bill we must necessarily leave passing matters out of account and take a broader view of the subject. Even if the balance or argument were in favour of transferring the Museum, we should still object to the transference being without limitation. The University should be strictly bound to keep the Museum, as it is now, a public institution, or
we may find it drift into the position of a mere appanage
to the University, enjoyed by the public, not of right,
but of favour.

"Nor can we think the introduction of the Dunedin
Athenaeum into the Bill a wise act. We should be glad
to see the Athenaeum get a small landed endowment as a
help to its funds; but it should be a separate trans-
action. There is no intimate connection between the
Museum and the Athenaeum, and the two things ought not
to be mixed up together. The Museum wants all the
endowment which it is proposed to give, and the whole
had better be granted to it. The financial affairs
of the Museum would then be placed on a reasonably
sound footing, and if the Bill were further amended
in the direction we have indicated, an institution would be
permanently established worthy of Otago and useful to its
inhabitants."
### APPENDIX E

**MUSEUM INCOME DURING THE PROVINCIAL PERIOD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount (£)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1865/6</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td>(set aside for alterations to New Post Office - not used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867/8</td>
<td>£4500</td>
<td>(set aside for alterations to New Post Office - lapsed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868/9</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869/70</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870/1</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871/2</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872/3</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873/4</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874/5</td>
<td>£500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875/6</td>
<td>£600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No details of the expenditure of these Provincial Grants appear to have survived.
## APPENDIX F: MUSEUM INCOME AND EXPENDITURE, 1878 - 1956 (to nearest £)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>RENTS</th>
<th>GRANTS</th>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>EXHIBITS PURCHASED</th>
<th>TRANSFERS TO SPECIAL A/C</th>
<th>MISCELLANEOUS</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>LONG-TERM INDEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Endowments</td>
<td>Goldfield University</td>
<td>Otago University</td>
<td>Dunedin City Council</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>Interest on Investments</td>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>Total Income from all Sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>108^4</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>108^4</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>108^4</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1903</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1236</td>
<td>2227</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1167</td>
<td>2404</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1166</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2074</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>100^9</td>
<td>1437</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>3001</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>1657^11</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>5596</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>3741</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:**
2. *Otago Museum, Annual Reports, 1937 - 1955*
City Council were received.

1973 was the only year since 1929 in which no

Income special grant of $1,000.

For salary increases.

In the year of rent for rates as needed.

Commenced 1941; increased to $200 in 1947

For administrative expenses ($20 p.s.)

Includes salaries to this date.

Repayment of earlier charge university grant.

A verifiable income - received for four years only.

Includes $100 for purchase of equipment.

Salary increase for the period prior to 1973.

No index figures are

The index figures have been converted to


etc.

Includes fuel, electricity, insurance, stationary.

Includes rent and other rates.

*
## APPENDIX G: MUSEUM INCOME AND EXPENDITURE, 1956 - 1966 (to nearest £)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR ended</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Levied</th>
<th>Total Levies</th>
<th>Interest on Investments</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total income from all sources</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Office Expenses</th>
<th>Museum Maintenance etc.</th>
<th>Development Expenses</th>
<th>D.C.C. Rates</th>
<th>Travelling Expenses</th>
<th>Miscellaneous</th>
<th>Total Expenditure</th>
<th>Annual Surplus</th>
<th>Long Term Series (Linked Retail Price Index)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>1/73d</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,813</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>1059</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>8,662</td>
<td>1151</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1/75d</td>
<td>8,703</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10,687</td>
<td>6,502</td>
<td>1018</td>
<td>2420</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>12,311</td>
<td>1624*</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1/60d</td>
<td>12,119</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14,551</td>
<td>6,803</td>
<td>934</td>
<td>1685</td>
<td>1124</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td>2321</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1/58d</td>
<td>13,412</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,858</td>
<td>8,550</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>1228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1/58d</td>
<td>13,911</td>
<td>1,883</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16,594</td>
<td>9,441</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13,699</td>
<td>2695</td>
<td>1237</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>1/50d</td>
<td>16,673</td>
<td>1,965</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19,249</td>
<td>10,628</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>739</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>15,398</td>
<td>3851</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>1/50d</td>
<td>17,834</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>20,716</td>
<td>13,676</td>
<td>1464</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>19,885</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1/50d</td>
<td>18,809</td>
<td>1,963</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>21,645</td>
<td>14,810</td>
<td>1259</td>
<td>2923</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>21,233</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>1/50d</td>
<td>19,435</td>
<td>1,907</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>22,238</td>
<td>15,755</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>3993a</td>
<td>2146</td>
<td>186b</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>23,844</td>
<td>1606*</td>
<td>1364</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>1/50d</td>
<td>20,112</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>22,088</td>
<td>16,045</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>3451</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>194c</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>21,973</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>1412d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Otago Museum Reports for 1956, 1957-58, 1959-60, 1961-62 and 1963-64

**Notes:**

1. Base: Calendar Year 1953 = 1000

a. In this year electricity charges rose some 375% consequent upon the installation of separate meters for the Museum and University

b. Actual rates amounted to £740 - rebate of £554 granted by D.C.C.

c. Actual rates amounted to £826 - rebate of £652 granted by D.C.C.

d. Provisional figure only.

* Indicates deficit.
## Appendix H: Property Values of Otagō Local Authorities (to nearest £10,000) and the Amount of Their Levies (to nearest £)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
<td>£m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunedin City</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>57.88</td>
<td>76.63</td>
<td>95.39</td>
<td>4299</td>
<td>8651</td>
<td>10740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Kilda</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Island</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Harbour</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt. Chalmers</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosgiel</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikouaiti</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmerston</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaikorora</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balclutha</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampden</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camaro</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxburgh</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapanui</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naseby</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandra</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cromwell</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peninsular</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taieri</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>1107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikouaiti</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taieri</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikouaiti</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clutha</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Otago</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitaki</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maniototo</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** £194,591,105.01,196,37,142,70,251,46,185.27,£7800,£1667.1,£20900

**Notes:**

a. Now included in Dunedin City
b. Now included in Waikouaiti County

Property Values - in each case -

Column (1) records the actual capital value
Column (2) records the adjusted capital value (i.e. after the differential factor has been taken into account).

**Valuation Dates:**
Revaluations are made every five years.
Contributing Authorities: grouped in this table as they are grouped for representation on the Trust Board.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>7331</td>
<td>6466</td>
<td>7777</td>
<td>7031</td>
<td>7111</td>
<td>7176</td>
<td>7989</td>
<td>8631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2232</td>
<td>2480</td>
<td>2766</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2991</td>
<td>3712*</td>
<td>2454</td>
<td>4347*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>2834</td>
<td>3889</td>
<td>2707</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>3138</td>
<td>5000a</td>
<td>3806</td>
<td>3448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>3232</td>
<td>2236</td>
<td>2387</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>3120</td>
<td>5864</td>
<td>3486</td>
<td>2999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5490</td>
<td>5109</td>
<td>3893</td>
<td>4627</td>
<td>5104</td>
<td>6497</td>
<td>7929</td>
<td>9999*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>2387</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>2434</td>
<td>2216</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>4590</td>
<td>3926</td>
<td>5118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>2089</td>
<td>2423</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>4791*</td>
<td>2914</td>
<td>2914</td>
<td>3916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>3068</td>
<td>3465</td>
<td>4121</td>
<td>3472</td>
<td>5955</td>
<td>5129</td>
<td>5570</td>
<td>6346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>3251</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>2141</td>
<td>2407</td>
<td>2446</td>
<td>6561*</td>
<td>5851</td>
<td>4243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>2055</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>2314</td>
<td>5185*</td>
<td>4487</td>
<td>2412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1818</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>2245</td>
<td>2590</td>
<td>3824*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>2426</td>
<td>3193</td>
<td>2578</td>
<td>2267</td>
<td>2819</td>
<td>3577</td>
<td>3292</td>
<td>4027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Yearly Totals**: 37,934 37,782 37,060 34,323 44,522 58,350 54,294 59,040

**NOTES:**

a. Opening of Centennial Wing, 23 March 1963

* Special displays arranged during these months.
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PART I: PRIMARY SOURCES.

A. Unpublished.

1. The National Archives, Wellington.
2. The Hocken Library, Dunedin.
3. The Otago Museum, Dunedin.
4. The Early Settlers' Association Archives, Dunedin.
5. Miscellaneous.

B. Published.

2. Other.

PART II: SECONDARY MATERIAL.

A. Newspapers.
B. Unpublished Theses.
C. General Works.
D. Interviews.

PART I: PRIMARY SOURCES

A. Unpublished.

1. The National Archives, Wellington.
   (a) Otago Provincial Council, Executive Council Minutes.
   10 Vols., 11 January 1854 - 31 October 1876.
(b) Otago Provincial Council, Letters and Papers. Of special value are the following -

OP 7/41 4268 Papers relative to the disposal of Hector's geological collections, March-April 1865.
OP 7/44 4522) Papers relative to the Otago Museum, 1865 - 75.
OP 7/141 16091) Papers relative to the University of Otago.
OP 7/88 10646) Papers relative to the University of Otago.
OP 7/36 11559) Papers relative to the University of Otago.

2. The Hocken Library, Dunedin.

(a) The Archives of the University of Otago.

(i) Minutes of the University Council.
19 Vols., 10 November 1869 -

(ii) Committee Reports, 17 Vols., 1 February 1912 -

(iii) Letters and Papers.

Upon examination, it became apparent that, particularly during the early years, little attempt had been made to classify these for ready reference. The following classification has been developed to suit the needs of this particular thesis.

Series 1: Inward Correspondence from November 1869 to March 1898.

(Note: The files are not numbered. This series is extremely untidy and the gaps left occur where volumes appear to be missing. This may not be the case, however, since many documents have been found to be incorrectly classified in relation to their dates.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Series 1: (contd)....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jan 1891</td>
<td>Aug 1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Aug 1891</td>
<td>Mar 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mar 1892</td>
<td>Dec 1892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sep 1893</td>
<td>May 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>May 1894</td>
<td>Dec 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>May 1895</td>
<td>Mar 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Mar 1896</td>
<td>Dec 1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Jan 1897</td>
<td>Mar 1898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1897</td>
<td>1898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Series 2: Inward Correspondence from April 1898 to April 1916.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apr 1898</td>
<td>Feb 1899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Feb 1899</td>
<td>Jan 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jan 1900</td>
<td>Sep 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sep 1900</td>
<td>Dec 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dec 1901</td>
<td>Aug 1903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sep 1903</td>
<td>Mar 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Apr 1904</td>
<td>Sep 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oct 1904</td>
<td>Apr 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>May 1905</td>
<td>Nov 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nov 1905</td>
<td>Mar 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mar 1906</td>
<td>Oct 1906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nov 1906</td>
<td>Jun 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jul 1907</td>
<td>Jan 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Jan 1908</td>
<td>Dec 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Jan 1909</td>
<td>Dec 1909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jun 1909</td>
<td>Jun 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Jun 1910</td>
<td>Sep 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sep 1910</td>
<td>Mar 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mar 1911</td>
<td>Jul 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Aug 1911</td>
<td>Jan 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Jan 1912</td>
<td>Jun 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jul 1912</td>
<td>Feb 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Mar 1913</td>
<td>Jul 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jul 1913</td>
<td>Feb 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Feb 1914</td>
<td>Jun 1914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Series 2: (contd)...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jun 1914</td>
<td>Dec 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jan 1915</td>
<td>May 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>May 1915</td>
<td>Aug 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Aug 1915</td>
<td>Feb 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Feb 1916</td>
<td>Apr 1916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Series 3: Outward Correspondence (Letter Books)
from November 1869 to April 1916.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vol. No.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nov 1869</td>
<td>May 1878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apr 1878</td>
<td>Apr 1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Apr 1889</td>
<td>Apr 1897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Apr 1897</td>
<td>Oct 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4A)</td>
<td>Mar 1904</td>
<td>Oct 1904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Oct 1904</td>
<td>Nov 1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nov 1905</td>
<td>Jan 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jan 1907</td>
<td>May 1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>May 1908</td>
<td>Jun 1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Jun 1910</td>
<td>Jul 1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Jul 1911</td>
<td>Aug 1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Aug 1912</td>
<td>Aug 1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Aug 1913</td>
<td>Jun 1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Jun 1914</td>
<td>Apr 1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Apr 1915</td>
<td>Feb 1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Feb 1916</td>
<td>Apr 1916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Series 4: Inward Correspondence concerning Endowment Reserves from 1870 to 1890.
(Note: Files 2 and 3 are actually not numbered.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File No.</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Forest Hill)
Series 5: Correspondence and Papers from May 1916 (Current series).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Nos.</th>
<th>Period covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 7</td>
<td>May 1916 to Jul 1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 - 14</td>
<td>Jul 1917 to Jul 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 22</td>
<td>Aug 1918 to Jul 1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 - 31</td>
<td>Aug 1919 to Apr 1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 - 40</td>
<td>May 1920 to Feb 1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 48</td>
<td>Mar 1921 to Dec 1921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 - 56</td>
<td>Jan 1922 to Sep 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 - 63</td>
<td>Sep 1922 to May 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 - 68</td>
<td>Jun 1923 to Sep 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 - 76</td>
<td>Oct 1923 to Mar 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 - 85</td>
<td>Apr 1924 to Oct 1924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 - 92</td>
<td>Oct 1924 to Jun 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87A - 93</td>
<td>Jun 1925 to Dec 1925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94 - 99</td>
<td>Jan 1926 to May 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 - 106</td>
<td>Jun 1926 to Dec 1926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107 - 113</td>
<td>Jan 1927 to Jun 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114 - 119</td>
<td>Jul 1927 to Dec 1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 - 125</td>
<td>Jan 1928 to May 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 - 131</td>
<td>Jun 1928 to Oct 1928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132 - 137</td>
<td>Nov 1928 to Feb 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138 - 143</td>
<td>Mar 1929 to Aug 1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144 - 149</td>
<td>Sep 1929 to Feb 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 - 154</td>
<td>Mar 1930 to Jul 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155 - 159</td>
<td>Aug 1930 to Dec 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160 - 165</td>
<td>Jan 1931 to May 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166 - 170</td>
<td>Jun 1931 to Sep 1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171 - 175</td>
<td>Oct 1931 to Jan 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176 - 180</td>
<td>Feb 1932 to Jun 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181 - 185</td>
<td>Jul 1932 to Oct 1932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186 - 190</td>
<td>Nov 1932 to Mar 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191 - 194</td>
<td>Apr 1933 to Jul 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195 - 197</td>
<td>Aug 1933 to Oct 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198 - 201</td>
<td>Nov 1933 to Feb 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202 - 207</td>
<td>Mar 1934 to Jun 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208 - 213</td>
<td>Jul 1934 to Sep 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214 - 218</td>
<td>Oct 1934 to Jan 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219 - 224</td>
<td>Feb 1935 to May 1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225 - 242</td>
<td>Jun 1935 to Sep 1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243 - 258</td>
<td>Sep 1936 to Oct 1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259 - 275</td>
<td>Nov 1937 to Dec 1938</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thereafter each group comprises the papers of one calendar year, as follows –

276 - 293 1939
Series 5: (contd) ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File Nos.</th>
<th>Period Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>294 - 313</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314 - 326</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327 - 344</td>
<td>1942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345 - 364</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365 - 387</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388 - 410</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411 - 432</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433 - 457</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458 - 485</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486 - 511</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 - 526</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>527 - 545</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546 - 566</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567 - 586</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587 - 606</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607 - 627</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628 - 648</td>
<td>1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649 - 671</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>672 - 693</td>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694 - 717</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718 - 738A</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739 - 763</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>764 - 801</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802 - 841</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>842 - 873</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


(b) New Zealand Exhibition, 1865. Minutes of Meetings of Commissioners. 2 Vols., 21 September 1865 - 3 April 1866.

(c) Mss. Beverly, A. Private Papers, 1850 - 63.

3. The Otago Museum, Dunedin.

(a) Minutes of the Second Provincial Committee of Management. 4 November 1873 - 4 October 1877.


(c) Otago Museum Trust Board

(i) Minutes of Trust Board. 2 Vols., 10 April 1956 -
(ii) Minutes of Finance and Works Committees.  
3 Vols., 3 May 1956 -

(iii) Museum Reports. 2 Vols., 31 December 1955 -

(iv) Letters and Papers relating to Museum Management. 2 Files - April 1956 - 31 March 1962  
1 April 1962 -

4. The Archives of the Early Settlers' Association, Dunedin.

(a) The Richardson Papers,

5. Miscellaneous.

(a) The Archives of the Cromwell Borough Council, Cromwell.

(i) Minutes of the Council, 1953 - 56.

(ii) Letters and Papers relative to the 'Otago Museum Trust Bill', 1953 - 55.

(b) Minutes of the Dunedin Athenaeum and Mechanics Institution, 1859 - 1882. (Housed in the Dunedin Athenaeum).

(c) Ramsay, Haggitt and Robertson (Solicitors).  
File 4527, 'Otago Museum Trust Board Bill'. (Note: Today - 1966 - this firm is known as Robertson, Brent and Haggitt)

B. Published.


(a) Otago Provincial Council.

(i) Otago Gazette. 20 Vols., 26 December 1853 - 19 July 1876.

(ii) Votes and Proceedings. 34 Sessions, 30 December 1853 - 19 June 1875.

(b) New Zealand, Parliament, House of Representatives

(i) Journals, 1875 - 77.

(ii) Appendices to the Journals - note particularly
a. Annual Reports of the University of Otago (Various classifications, mainly E.6.)

b. 1879. H1. 'Report of the Royal Commission upon the University of New Zealand and its relations to the Secondary Schools of the Colony'. (Hutton's evidence, pp. 336 - 9)

(iii) New Zealand Parliamentary Debates.

a. Vol. 27, 1877.


(c) Otago University Museum, Annual Reports, 1902 - 36.

(d) Otago Museum, Annual Reports, 1937 - (Biennial, 1954-5, and since 1957-8).

2. Other.

Lindsay, W. Lauder, 'The Place and Power of Natural History in Colonisation with special reference to Otago (New Zealand)'. Edinburgh, 1863. ("Reprinted from the Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal, for April and July, 1863.") This is the text of an address given by Lindsay to a meeting of the Y.M.C.A. in January, 1862.

---

PART II: SECONDARY MATERIAL.

A. Newspapers.

Otago Witness. 8 February 1851 - 28 June 1932.

Otago Colonist. 26 December 1856 - 1 January 1863.

Otago Daily Times. 15 November 1861 -

Daily Telegraph. 3 January 1963 - 9 April 1864.

Evening Star. 1 May 1863 -
B. Unpublished Theses.


C. General Works.


Hocken, T.M., Contributions to the Early History of New Zealand (Otago). London, 1898.


Parker, T.J. 'The Otago University Museum'. Published in The Otago University Review (Special Number) 1895.


D. Interviews.

Dr R. Duff, Director of the Canterbury Museum, on 10 September 1965.

Dr H.D. Skinner, Director Emeritus of the Otago Museum, on 16 December 1965.

J.W. Hayward, Registrar of the University of Otago and sometime Secretary to the Otago Museum Trust Board, on 17 August 1966 and 5 September 1966.
R.A. Farquhar, Town Clerk, Cromwell, on 23 August 1966.

Dr Angus Ross, sometime member of the Museum Committee and Otago Museum Trust Board (representing the University Council) on 13 September 1966.

M. Connelly, past Councillor, Dunedin City Council and former member of Museum Committee and Otago Museum Trust Board, on 18 September 1966.