body ; secondly, a fear that the cost of the fire-protection organization will be unduly increased ; and, thirdly, an objection to the principle under which the local authority is required to pay such levies as may be demanded by the Fire Board irrespective of the financial condition of the municipality at the time.

The first of these objections must receive due consideration in connection with any scheme for reorganization of fire-brigade control. The second objection is based on the fact that almost invariably there is a very considerable increase in costs after a Fire Board is formed, but, as explained above, this is usually due to the fact that the Board on commencing its administration is faced with expenditure on plant, equipment, and accommodation which should more properly have been spread by the municipality over the preceding years. The third objection is one which could probably be met by placing a maximum on the expenditure, which maximum could only be exceeded by the unanimous consent of the municipality, the insurance interests, and the Minister.

The basic requirements of a fire brigade — alarm system, fire - station, plant, equipment, and uniforms—are necessary irrespective of the size of the town, but as the population increases a higher standard is justified and can, of course, be supplied at a lower cost per head of population. The following list of municipal fire brigades shows the population of the town and the suggested maximum expenditure based for the purposes of consideration on an expenditure of 6s. per head for towns with a population up to 1,000, with a maximum of £200 ; 5s. per head with a population of 1,000 to 3,000, with a maximum of £500 ; 3s. per head in towns with a population of 3,000 to 6,000 ; and 2s. 6d. per head where the population exceeds 6,000. It would not, of course, be necessary to adopt this basis, but if considered more satisfactory an empirical standard adjusted to meet the views of the municipal authorities concerned could be adopted. The small Government contribution would not materially affect these figures, and for purposes of consideration the Brigade expenditure shown below can be regarded as being divided equally between local authorities and the insurance companies.

Town.	Population.	Suggested Maximum Annual Expenditure.	Town.	Population.	Suggested Maximum Annual Expenditure.
		£			£
Akaroa	510	153	Bluff	2,050	500
Alexandra	870	200	Carterton	1,940	485
Clyde	293	88	Eastbourne	2,340	500
Coromandel	844	200	Featherston	1,050	262
Cromwell	740	200	Greytown	1,190	298
Eketahuna	730	200	Havelock North	1,160	290
Fairlie	818	200	Henderson	1,150	288
Geraldine	950	200	Inglewood	1,270	318
Helensville	960	200	Matamata	1,370	342
Howick	780	200	Marton	2,760	500
Hunterville	390	117	Mataura	1,510	378
Kaikohe	690	200	Motueka	1,720	430
Kaikoura	703	200	Ngaruawahia	1,420	355
Kaponga	410	123	Northcote	2,370	500
Kawakawa	520	156	Paeroa	2,180	500
Kumara	480	144	Papakura	1,810	452
Leeston	560	168	Papatoetoe	2,480	500
Manaia	620	186	Patea	1,420	355
Manunui	780	200	Picton	1,380	345
Martinborough	960	200	Raetihi	1,180	295
Methven	897	200	Rangiora	2,250	500
Naseby	210	63	Reefton	1,444	361
Otorohanga	720	200	Richmond	1,140	285
Palmerston	800	200	Te Kuiti	2,520	500
Queenstown	930	200	Temuka	1,920	480
Ross	440	131	Waimate	2,310	500
Roxburgh	470	141	Waipawa	1,160	290
Shannon	950	200			
Southbrook	440	131	Ashburton	5,730	860
Tahunanui	860	200	Blenheim	5,040	756
Takaka	470	141	Gore	4,650	698
Tapanui	310	93	Lyttelton	3,230	485
Te Puke	970	200	New Brighton	5,270	791
Waiuku	850	200	Stratford	3,810	572
Waverley	680	200	Sumner	3,260	489
			Thames	4,260	639
			Upper Hutt	3,970	596
			Devonport	9,770	1,221
			Lower Hutt	16,500	2,062
			Otahuhu	9,780	1,222
			Takapuna	7,350	919