

factorily. In our own case the Akaroa County Council has always worked in an unsatisfactory manner, owing to there being no community of interests between the outlying parts of the county; and if the Road Boards are done away with it will mean, in our case, a great hardship indeed. We think it will be desirable if it could be so arranged that there should be only one local taxing body, but that the ratepayers in each Road Board district should be able to declare by ballot whether body should be the Road Boards or County Councils. With reference to franchise: We think only ratepayers should have a right to vote at local elections, as only ratepayers are interested in seeing the funds spent to the best advantage. Those, too, are the points on which the Board would wish to offer their strong objection to becoming law.—ROBERT ANDERSON, Chairman.

*Pouawa Road Board.*—Pouawa Road Board are of opinion that Road Boards are necessary for carrying out local works efficiently. Counties cannot and do not do so properly. In power to levy general rate continued to counties, Councils should be obliged to see that at least a substantial portion of such rate levied from a road district should be expended there. Pouawa District is badly neglected in this respect, as it has no county road within its boundary, nor does it use any county road except a few hundred yards at Gisborne.—W. G. MACLAURIN, Chairman.

*Pukeatua Road Board.*—Strong objection to abolish Pukeatua Road Board. The district is large, sparsely settled, income small, necessitating great care in fairly apportioning funds. Not possible under county administration except at large extra cost, and consequent loss to district. Many Chairmen willing to supervise works gratuitously. A limited charge for horse-hire should be permissible by Act. Approve three-years term providing election *bonâ fide*. Not by nomination of required numbers as is usual, obviating election, liable abuse. Provision or penalty required to induce more general interest securing efficient Boards.—THOMAS HOLDER, Chairman.

*Pukekohe Road Board.*—This Road Board is of the opinion that "The Road Boards Act, 1884," and its amendments is sufficient for all the requirements of the county, and that we do not wish to be brought under the provisions of Counties Bill now before the House, our opinion being that the working of the Act will be very expensive, cumbersome; and also we wish that provision be made for the suspension of those portions of the Bill relating to County Councils in any county where such suspension may be desired by the ratepayers. We strongly object to any change in the franchise.—J. ROUTLY, Chairman.

*Pukekohe East Road Board.*—The Pukekohe East Road Board unanimously ask the Government to retain the Road Boards, and to enlarge their status as local authorities as being more economical and more efficient than County Councils.—JOHN COMRIE, Chairman.

*Pukekura Road Board.*—The Pukekura Road Board strongly object to a mere residential qualification giving power to vote away money paid by ratepayers. The principle is unfair with regard to other provisions of the Counties Act. It has no recommendations to make, having no copy of Bill.—ROBERT FISHER, Chairman.

*Remuera Road Board.*—Approve generally amalgamation of road districts; save expense of administration; but not to have two rating-powers, such as County and Road Board now have in some parts. Franchise not to be extended to non-ratepayers.—P. BUDDLE, Chairman.

*Rivaka Road Board.*—For reply see Waimea West Road Board.

*Seatoun Road Board.*—In reply to your circular letter, I am directed by the Seatoun Road Board to say that it has very strong objection to abolition of Road Boards. The Seatoun Board is in the Hutt County, but it is geographically quite separate from that county, the Boroughs of Melrose, Wellington, Onslow, and Karori lying between the Hutt County proper and the Seatoun district. The Seatoun district is practically unknown to the members of the County Council, and to attempt to govern it through such a body would never have satisfactory results. My Board has already addressed the Premier on this matter, and, as the Premier has informed me that he has placed the letter before your Committee, it is not necessary for me to go over the ground again. What the Seatoun district requires is more power to handle questions of sanitation and the removal of nightsoil, and the regulation of the erection of buildings, as the district contains a large summer population, and during the hot summer season the local body should have power to insure the health and well-being of the people that take up temporary residence in the district. My Board have therefore suggested that town districts should be created in some cases where the population is less than five hundred, as is at present provided in the proposed Act. If the limit were reduced to four hundred it would meet our case, and allow the Seatoun district to become a town district; but it would also be necessary to give separate representation to town districts, for the Seatoun district could never be governed through the Hutt County Council. The proposal to govern such districts through bodies nominated by the County Council seems to my Board to be a retrograde step.—SAMUEL ROBINSON, Clerk.

*Selwyn County, Conference of Road Boards.*—Resolutions passed at a conference of delegates representing the various Road Boards in the Selwyn County held at Christchurch on the 31st July, 1901: That this conference, representing all the Road Boards in the Selwyn County, deeply deplores the fact that the Premier did not invite representatives of Road Boards to a conference as well as county representatives. That it be a recommendation that no Board be abolished, divided, or amalgamated with any other except on the report of a Commission, and that each Road Board concerned should have representation on such Commission; the Commission to consist of representatives from each Road Board affected, with an equal number of members of the County Council, the Chairman to be appointed by the Governor; provided that no Road Board be retained that has a less capital value than £300,000. That, as representatives of Road Boards in the Selwyn County, we enter a strong protest against the Road Board system being abolished. That subsection (10) of section 4 be struck out. That the words "County Council" in clause 4, subsection (11), be struck out, and "Road Boards" be inserted. That this conference protests against any alteration in the franchise qualification. That where the Government subdivides land for settlement they should be subject to the same condition as regards formation of the roads under section 195 as a private