

August, passed resolution strongly objecting amalgamation with county, Suburban North Road District being isolated from rest of county. Local management more economical. Would recommend whole Wanganui Riding being formed one road district, Road Board having control same. Objections to amalgamation with county administration: Failure to obtain best results for money expended owing lack supervision while works are in progress, large sums being absolutely thrown away in this riding from that cause alone. Local management would tend to lessen expense, and secure better inspection in this riding, thereby effecting large saving.—W. GILL, Chairman.

*Takaka Road Board.*—*Re* your telegram of 13th instant, my Board strongly protests against Road Board being abolished. The Board thinks the present system works less expensively in Collingwood County than if it were merged into the County Council. My Board is also strongly adverse to new district roads being a standard width of 65 ft., as in this district, where the population and traffic are greatest, the roads are only 75 links wide, and are found to be quite wide enough.—W. C. BAIGENT, Chairman.

*Takapau Road Board.*—*Re* telegram Counties Bill: Takapau Road Board considering section 4, subsections (20) to (27): Unanimous in favour retaining present road districts against amalgamation of Board, except by express wish of ratepayers. Section 15, subsection (c): Objects to residential qualification. Board is of opinion that present system local government is satisfactory. Counties Bill now under consideration. Deem unnecessary.—AMBROSE POTTS, Chairman.

*Tamahere Road Board.*—The Tamahere Road Board maturely considered the provisions of Counties Bill when issued, and unanimously agreed that any interference with local government by Road Board would be prejudicial to public interests. The Kirikiriroa and Cambridge Road Boards passed resolutions of a similar character, and so did the Huntly and Whangamarino Road Boards.—A. T. F. WHEELER, Chairman.

*Tamaki West Road Board.*—The Tamaki West Road Board recommends that present road districts be retained, as they are more economical and efficient than County Councils, and that they be not amalgamated unless at the desire of those interested, and that only ratepayers should have votes.—ALEX. BELL, Clerk.

*Taruheru Road Board.*—Haruheru Road Board objects to being merged in any other Road Board, but approves of abolition of dual local government, and prefers merging with Cook County. It also protests against proposed extension of local franchise, as past experience proves that under present liberal scale injustice has been done in thinly populated districts.—J. MACFARLANE, Chairman.

*Tataraimaka Road Board.*—In reply to your telegram of the 13th August, 1901, the Tataraimaka Road Board is of the opinion it would be impossible to abolish present existing Road Boards, considering, as they do, that the by-roads would be affected to the disadvantage of settlers residing thereon as far as this district is concerned. This Board protests against any alteration in the present system of management.—JOHN PEARCE, Chairman.

*Tauhca Road Board.*—Unable to wire before. Resolution of Board *re* Counties Bill: That this Board strongly objects to either merge into county or amalgamate, but wish to be retained in its present position.—F. BOLER, Clerk.

*Te Horo Road Board.*—This Board considers that the question of retaining Road Boards should be decided by vote of the ratepayers, and where the County Councils have county roads running through road districts the ratepayers should also have the power to place such roads under the district Road Board.—ALFRED MONK, Chairman.

*Temuka Road Board.*—Temuka Road Board strongly desire retention their district as at present. Consider ratepayers satisfied with present system of County Council and Road Board, but if it be a question of one only, and which, would much prefer Road Board retained. Rateable value of district, £753,000; rates collected last year, £2,310. Proposed to give extended powers to retained road districts approved of.—JOHN TALBOT, Chairman.

*Te Puke Road Board.*—This Board would beg to recommend franchise remain as at present; also, either Road Boards or County Councils, but not both, to be at option of ratepayers' wish.—SAMUEL BRANZORD, Chairman.

*Tepuna Road Board.*—Consider dual control objectionable. Road Boards, except in very exceptional cases, be abolished. Committee to take their place. These might be elected instead of appointed. Strongly object to extension franchise. Satisfied present arrangements. Agree with suggestions made County Council conference.—J. A. M. DAVIDSON, Chairman.

*Titirangi Road Board.*—This Board wishes to retain its individuality, but has no objection to being merged into county. We are opposed to any further extension of franchise.—TUCKER, Chairman.

*Tomahawk Road Board.*—Bill appears satisfactory. Do not object thereto, provided no curtailment of powers of existing Road Boards, or any alteration in constitution thereof which would alter or prejudicially affect this district. Section 319 should be extended to include Parts XXV., XXVIII., XXXIV., XXXV., and XXXVI. Section 235, subsection (7), should be extended to include any nuisance committed. Section 78, Sixth Schedule, Government subsidy: Peninsula County consists entirely of road districts. No county roads. Counties Act suspended. Provision must be made that Boards receive full subsidy under new Act.—ALEX. SWAILL, Chairman.

*Tomahawk Road Board.*—*Re* Counties Bill: I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of and thank you for your telegram of the 13th inst., to which I replied yesterday as follows [see preceding paragraph]. Neither the local Postmaster nor Officer in Charge had instructions to frank reply, which I therefore sent "collect." The feeling of my Board is against any curtailment of our powers or alteration of our district. There are many exceedingly valuable provisions in the new Bill, and I shall be glad if my suggestions can be embodied therein, and the powers of Road Boards thereby extended. Section 78, Government subsidy: You will see the force of my remarks hereon when you take into consideration the position of this county. We have no County Council, the Act