

10. Two decisions given by the Board relating to goods-services during the year appear to us to be of particular interest and importance. We refer to these as follows:—

- (1) Appeals by Fox and Robins from the decision of No. 9 Licensing Authority affecting goods-services in Central Otago. These appeals were heard together and the Board gave a single decision covering both cases.
- (2) Appeals by Hilder and Son and some twenty-five others from decisions of No. 2 Licensing Authority affecting goods-services in the South Auckland District. Here also the Board gave one general decision covering the principles involved in all the appeals.

11. The first of these appeals was by the operators named against a decision of No. 9 Licensing Authority which refused the renewal of both services, and we upheld this decision on appeal. Both services operated from Dunedin to Central Otago, via Roxburgh. The great majority of the residents in Central Otago appeared from the evidence to be adverse to these services being continued, and in fact only a very limited class of persons supported them. Both appeals were opposed by the New Zealand Government Railways Board. In view of the importance of the Central Otago Railway, which is essential to this district because no other form of transport at present could cope with its produce, and in view of neither service being of an essential nature, and because of the strong opposition to these services in the district, the Board considered their existence was not justified. The text of our decision is given in Appendix I to this report.

12. The second set of appeals mentioned was made by some operators in the Auckland District against a decision of No. 2 Licensing Authority which had the effect of preventing them from traversing the Great South Road from Auckland, and which confined some of them to small areas in the country, while preventing some from running altogether. The basis of this decision was the opinion formed by No. 2 Licensing Authority that the districts which these operators served could be adequately dealt with by the railway in conjunction with local transport, and that the only benefit to the public from the existence of long-distance road transport in this area was a certain extra convenience in the carriage and delivery of goods. The Licensing Authority in its decision in these cases distinguished between "convenience" and "necessity" of road transport, and held that on the ground of convenience alone in these cases the road services were not warranted. We found ourselves unable to agree with the District Licensing Authority, and we reversed the general decision given by it in these cases, and dealt with each individual case on its own merits. Our actual decision was not made public until the 6th April, 1935, which is technically not within the year under review, but as all the hearings took place before the 31st March, and it is impossible to describe the year's proceedings adequately without a reference to them, we venture to refer also to the decision itself. The full text of our decision is given in Appendix I to this report.

INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS DIRECTED BY THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORT.

13. During the year the Board carried out two special inquiries at the direction of the Minister of Transport.

- (a) The first was an inquiry into the question of competition between various forms of transport, particularly with regard to the rates charged by them. The forms of transport considered were those operating by rail, road, and sea. No air transport was then established on a regular commercial basis, and consequently air carriage did not come into the inquiry. This inquiry was not held in public.
- (b) The second was an inquiry into the taxation of road transport. The inquiry was held in public, and voluminous evidence was tendered by parties concerned.

14. In accordance with our statutory duty under section 11 of the Transport Law Amendment Act, 1933, the reports and recommendations which we made to the Minister as a result of these inquiries are set out in Appendix II of this report.