

from the Mayor, absent in Auckland, with the information that his applications to the Board for permission to examine the papers, relating to the endowment of the Library, had been studiously ignored until July 31, when he had received copies of the wills of Gammack and Postle accompanied by a flat refusal to supply the other information requested. In the light of the revelations made by this letter, the Council resolved to discontinue the negotiations, unless the information asked for was supplied. (68) For the second time a stalemate had been reached, and the question was shelved.

A review of this second conflict would suggest that the Council now supported the letter and the spirit of the law. There can be no doubt that the Board appeared prepared to pass the responsibility of the Public Library to the Council while using the endowment to establish a new library, not mentioned in the original document. That there is no mention of the requirements of the Museum in the latter controversy would appear to represent a fundamental change of opinion on the Board's behalf. Under the changed circumstances, the Council would appear entirely justified in demanding a share of the endowment. However, in actual practice, the grant to the College Library never exceeded £20, and the Public Library's share of the endowment did not drop below £470. (69) Once more the solution that stands forth as obvious was not resorted to. It is a matter for wonderment that the Public Libraries Act was again overlooked or ignored, but any reference to it is conspicuous by its absence.

---

Library finances suffered still further by a reduction in the

68. C.C.C. Vol. 24, p.247.

69. B. of G. 1906-16.