

Question 7—continued.

- Rangiaohia—The counties should have nothing to do in this matter; but this question should be settled by ratepayers at their annual meetings.
- Tuhikaramea—Give Councils power to alter boundaries, but only on a petition of ratepayers being presented.
- Raglan—If the County Councils continue to exist, the County Councils.
- Pirongia—The Road Boards.
- Raglan Town—Road Boards.
- Whakatane—No.
- Cook—Road Boards, with right of appeal to County Council.
- Ormond—No.
- Patutahi—Counties.
- Te Arari—Road Boards.
- Poverty Bay—Road Boards to have power.
- Tauranga—No answer.
- Kaikati—No alteration. If any, the Road Board should have the power.
- Te Puna—Counties.
- Wairoa—No road districts in county. Council have no suggestions to offer.
- Hawke's Bay—Road Boards should have the power to subdivide their districts into wards. County Councils to have the right to object to such subdivision within three months.
- Heretaunga—Road Board should have the power.
- Kereru and Arangi—Road Boards.
- Marakakaho—Road Boards.
- Okawa—Boards should have the power to subdivide districts into wards.
- Papakura—Only on the petition of a majority of ratepayers.
- Petane—No. Not without first appealing to the ratepayers.
- Te Mata—Road Board should have the power.
- Waipawa—Road Boards should have power to divide a district into wards. County to act as arbitrator in case of dispute.
- Norsewood—Road Boards should have the power to divide a district into wards. County to act as arbitrator of disputes.
- Oero—The counties.
- Ormondville—Road Boards should have the power to divide a district into wards.
- Ruataniwha North—Road Boards; and only on petition of majority of ratepayers.
- Tamumu—Road Boards only.
- Woodville—Road Board.
- Taranaki—Counties.
- Manganui—Counties to have power of altering boundaries, but not the number of the members of Road Boards.
- Mangavei—Counties, if in existence.
- Carrington—Road Boards.
- Waitara West—All alterations should emanate from the ratepayers.
- Egmont—The ratepayers only at their annual meeting.
- Moa—We consider Road Boards should have the power.
- Okato—The counties.
- Clifton—Counties should have power on application by Boards affected.
- Waitara East—Should be in the hands of the ratepayers.
- Inglewood—Yes.
- Patea—That where road districts are now divided into wards it be left to them, but if not divided it be left to counties, with the proviso that public notice be given in either case once a week for one month before the meeting deciding the question.
- Hawera—No answer.
- Hawera—Road Boards should have the power of dividing the districts into wards.
- Waimate—That Road Boards should have the power of dividing the districts into wards.
- Ngaire—Road Boards should have the power of dividing the districts into wards.
- Wanganui—Counties should have the power of receiving a petition from the ratepayers.
- Waitotara—The counties should have no control over the Road Boards.
- Rangitikei—No.
- Rangitikei—No.
- Lethbridge—No.
- Manawatu—The answer to No. 6 applies to this question also.
- Manawatu—The Road Boards, on petition of a majority of ratepayers, should have the power of altering the divisions, &c.; but it is objectionable to constitute the counties—bodies performing similar functions—as superior Courts with jurisdiction over Road Boards.
- Otaki—The Road Boards only.
- Halcombe—Yes, on petition of two-thirds of the ratepayers.
- Hutt—Counties should have the power.
- Kilbirnie—The Road Board should have the power of altering the wards within the district; but the County Councils should not have any power over Road Boards.
- Kaiwara—No; neither.
- Wairarapa West—Road Boards.
- Featherston—County. It may be necessary that a higher body should arbitrate; in such case the Council would be best, while the Highway Boards might disagree in any necessary alteration.
- Carterton—Yes.
- Waimea—The power should be vested in the counties of altering the divisions and the number of the members of the Road Boards.
- Motueka—The Road Boards should have the power of altering the divisions and the number of the members of Road Boards.
- Upper Motueka—The counties.
- Waimea—Road Boards, when in existence.
- Richmond—Counties should have the power of altering Road Board districts and members, but Road Boards that of subdistricts.
- Pangatotara—Only Road Boards in Road Board districts; ditto in counties.
- Riwaka—The Road Board to have the power to alter the divisions and the numbers of their members.
- Lower Moutere—The ratepayers to have the power of altering the division, and the Road Board the numbers of members there should be.
- Collingwood—It should be left to the ratepayers, through their Board, to alter the number of members. That it would be advisable to divide the districts into wards for the better representation thereof.
- Collingwood—Should be left to the ratepayers through their Board to alter the number of members, if required, or divide into wards.
- Buller—The counties.
- Inangahua—The counties should have the power of altering the divisions, if sanctioned by the votes of not less than three-fourths of the ratepayers within such division, but not otherwise.
- Grey—That the counties have the power to alter the divisions and numbers of the members of Road Boards.
- Marlborough—No answer.
- Awatere—Road Boards.
- Omaka—Road Boards.
- Pelorus—Counties on petition of those interested, *i.e.*, the ratepayers.
- Picton—Road Boards, if absolutely necessary.
- Spring Creek—Road Boards.
- Wairau—Road Boards.
- Lower Wairau—Counties, when in full operation; otherwise the Road Boards.
- Pukaka River Board—The Road Boards, if such alterations are absolutely necessary.
- Kaikoura—No answer.
- Kaikoura River Board—Not without the sanction of three-fourths of the ratepayers.
- Ashley—No answer.
- Eyreton—Road Board.
- Mandeville—Neither.
- Oxford—No.
- Waipara—Road Boards.
- West Eyreton—No.
- Selwyn—Present number of members of Road Boards has been found hitherto to work satisfactorily. Think that should any proposals be made for increasing the number of these bodies, the decision should rest with the Council, after consideration of the wishes of majority of ratepayers. Think it would not be advisable to leave power of alteration of divisions of road districts in hands of the Road Boards. Power of ultimate decision should rest with County Council.
- Courtenay—Yes.
- Heathcote—Consider it very desirable that County Councils should have the power of altering divisions and number of members of Road Boards upon receiving petition from ratepayers or Road Boards, to make such alteration; say from five up to nine members.
- Lincoln—No.
- Riccarton—Road Boards.
- Templeton—Road Boards only.
- South Waimakariri—Consider it very desirable that County Councils should have power of altering the divisions and the number of members of Road Boards upon petition from ratepayers or Road Boards, the Boards to consist of not less than five nor more than nine members.
- Akaroa—No answer.
- Little River—Road Boards generally seem to have conducted their business satisfactorily in the past, consequently desire no change as asked.
- Pigeon Bay—The Road Boards are more competent to do it.
- Port Victoria—Present system of Road Boards working well enough.
- Ashburton—No necessity for alteration.
- Wakanui—The Road Boards.
- Mount Somers—Stand as at present.
- Geraldine—The counties.
- Geraldine—Give Road Boards the power.
- Mount Cook—Road Boards should have this power entirely in their own hands.
- Mount Peel—Neither one or the other.
- Temuka—The counties.
- Westland—No Road Boards on the coast.
- Waitaki—Road Boards should have the power of recommending alterations in the divisions, and in the number of members of Road Boards, but the county should have the final decision.
- Kakanui—Road Boards should have the power, with consent of a majority of the ratepayers.
- Waiareka—Road Boards should have power to alter the boundaries of subdivisions on petition of a majority of ratepayers.
- Waitaki—Road Boards.
- Waikouaiti—Road Boards should have the power of recommending alteration; but