47 H—28

Thirdly, in the event of the Commission concluding that there was no necessity to disturb the existing structure of the territorial authorities, or should it decide that the area should be governed by a reduced number of territorial authorities, should the control and co-ordination of essential services such as water-supply, sewerage and drainage, transport, electric-power supply, town-planning, and such like be in the hands of a metropolitan Board, leaving the management of the purely local services to the territorial authorities.

Fourthly, in the event of the area continuing to be administered by more than one territorial authority, should further special or *ad hoc* authorities be created to control any of the community services not at present controlled by such an authority.

Fifthly, should any other form of local government administration be provided for the area in the interests of efficient, effective, and economic administration.

Evidence of a factual nature was presented by the Ministry of Works, the Transport Department, the State Hydro-electric Department, and other Government Departments in order that the Commission might obtain a full appreciation of the functions exercised by the various State Departments in relation to the local authorities in the area, the public transport operations, and Government developmental proposals.

Comprehensive factual data was presented by all the local authorities included within the scope of the inquiry, and the proposals which interested parties desired to bring before the notice of the Commission were outlined. So far as the local authorities were concerned, no proposals for any general over-all reorganization were submitted, but certain proposals affecting individual districts were referred to. A representative of the Auckland Chamber of Commerce indicated that evidence would be submitted in support of a single territorial local authority, including the whole or portions of the districts of all the territorial and ad hoc local authorities included within the scope of the inquiry. It was also indicated that the Chamber of Commerce proposed advocating that the metropolitan authority should be the sole rating authority, and should also control electric-power supply, transport, water and drainage systems, fire protection, and milk distribution.

The Hon. T. Bloodworth, M.L.C., although not present at the opening of the inquiry, had advised the Commission that he intended to submit proposals in support of a central authority to control all services common to the metropolitan area.

It was stated on behalf of the Manukau County Council that the Council had given consideration to the question of local government within the county, and was of the opinion that the creation of further small units of local government within the county would result in a weakening rather than a strengthening of local government in the area. It was the Council's opinion that there should be one governing authority—the County Council—co-ordinating and controlling all the major functions of the small boroughs, town districts, county townships, and rural areas in the county.

Under such circumstances, the County Council would be the single rating authority, and would provide the finance to meet the needs of the county as a whole and also for the smaller units of local government in the county. It was stated further that it was appreciated that if these proposals were adopted, counties would require increased powers, and that it was intended to submit detailed proposals to the Commission with a view to a recommendation being made by the Commission for the widening of the powers and functions of counties to enable effect to be given to the proposals.