

*Parihaka Road Board.*—Our Board objects to amalgamating or merging, on the ground that our district is large enough, and extends too far from county centre to receive thorough supervision from county. Would suggest amount general rate be optional with local body. The most economical method would be to divide county into areas, containing about 400 square miles, or about 200 miles of road, and place all roads in such areas under control of one local body, with power to levy general rate up to 2d.—FRED. FRETNEY, Chairman.

*Parua Bay Road Board.*—Do not approve of road districts being amalgamated into one another or into counties, but to be retained, as they are managed better than they would be if they are merged into one another or into the county. Approve of qualifications of freeholder and residential, but disapprove of others. Also of sections 157, 250, 319.—A. F. ALLWOOD, Chairman.

*Patangata Road Board.*—Patangata Road Board strongly protest against abolishing or merging Road Boards into counties. Remain as at present constituted; have worked well hitherto. Request Captain Russell, M.H.R., to urge retention and franchise as at present.—JAMES COLLINS, Chairman.

*East and West Road Boards, Patea.*—Public meeting East and West Road Boards and ratepayers passed following resolutions: (1) That this meeting strongly recommends that the Road Boards within Patea County be merged in the county; (2) that this meeting recommends that expressed provisions should be made in the Act providing that separate riding accounts should be kept, and means devised whereby each riding must receive its full financial benefit.—W. C. SYMES, W. DERRETT, Chairmen.

*Patutahi Road Board.*—The Patutahi Road Board considers should be retained closely settled. Many districts road not benefit to merge with Council. Owing franchise being more than single vote, more farmers can't get on Council. Considers franchise should be each ratepayer one vote. More ratepayers seventeen years could not get on Board until Government reduces franchise. Patutahi Road Board to have control of cemetery and Domain.—OWEN GALLAGHER, Chairman.

*Pelorus Road Board.*—*Re Counties Bill:* Pelorus Road Board favour franchise extended to freeholders. Recommend property in any subdivision should carry qualifications to such subdivision. Object to subsection (3), dual vote of husband and wife in mining qualification. Favour present system of election of members. Object to county rating in retained road districts; Sections 101, 157, 250, 319 approved. Resolved, that this Board does not approve of the Counties Bill, and is in favour of road districts being retained, as all parts of the district are thus represented at a near centre by members well acquainted with their requirements, and the administration is cheaper and more efficient than it would be under the county.—CHAIRMAN, Pelorus Road Board.

*Picton Road Board and Pukaka River Board.*—The Picton River Board are unanimous in objecting to Road Boards being abolished. The option should, in any case, be left with the ratepayers. The Pukaka River Board hold the same opinions as the Road Board.—JAMES LAW, Chairman.

*Pigeon Bay Road Board.*—The Pigeon Bay Road Board strongly protest against abolishing Road Board districts, especially on Banks Peninsula.—ELI SCOTT, Chairman.

*Point Chevalier Road Board.*—The ratepayers and residents of Point Chevalier Road Board District are quite satisfied with present arrangements, and request to remain as we are.—G. KNIGHT, Chairman.

*Pokeno Road Board.*—Pokeno Road Board wish to protest against any alteration in system local government, and urge all Road Boards be retained. Counties Act never been worked in Manukau County under Road Boards. The administration is more efficient and economical than by counties—example, Whangamarino Bridge recently repaired cost £260. Engineering and over-seeing cost £35, done by Waikato County Council. Pokeno Road Board recently built two bridges costing £130. Expenses, engineering, &c., nil. Paid out of the Government grant, and passed by Government Engineer as first-class work.—F. W. PAYNE, Chairman.

*Porangahau Road Board.*—Porangahau Road Board suggests *re Counties Bill*, section 4, ratepayers of road district affected, not Governor in Council, should decide by poll the question of continuation or amalgamation. Section 15: Franchise should be confined to freeholders however small, and leaseholders of twelve months' tenancy; strike out (c). Section 55: Road members should hold office for three years, not two years.—G. HUNTER, Chairman.

*Port Levy Road Board.*—The Port Levy Road Board are of opinion that the best interests of this district would be served by being cut off from the Akaroa County Council, being retained as a Road Board or amalgamated with the Port Victoria Road Board. Also, ratepayers should have power to vote for or against the abolition of Road Boards or Council.—H. FIELD, Clerk to Board.

*Portobello Road Board.*—Excepting franchise clauses, approve generally of provisions of Counties Bill. Board unanimous in wishing this road district retained if capital value £445,000. Income—rate, subsidy, &c., £1,025. Insufficient; suggest amalgamating with the Otago Heads District, capital value £52,000. Income—rate, subsidy, &c., £215. Its main interest identical with this district.—W. M. DICKSON, Chairman.

*Port Victoria Road Board.*—Am posting to-day the objections which the Port Victoria Road Board wish to make to the Counties Bill now before your Committee.—ROBERT ANDERSON, Chairman.

*Port Victoria Road Board.*—With reference to your communication *re the Counties Bill:* A meeting of the Port Victoria Road Board to consider the above has just been held, when it was resolved to strongly protest against the abolition of Road Boards where they are working satis-