

manner, and we are prepared to assist as far as possible. However, we do feel that this Bill virtually hands over the question of transport to the motorists, and that far more important sections of the community are almost ignored—first of all, the public bodies, and then the pedestrians. We cannot find a single clause in this Bill which even suggests safety or protection so far as the rights of the great bulk of the people who do not drive motor-cars are concerned. I would point out that, from our point of view, according to clause 51 every man on the Board would probably be a motorist. The Counties Associations have four representatives, and they would almost certainly be motorists. The motorists have direct representation; but we claim that there is practically no direct representation of the people at large, and that they—who still represent probably 75 per cent. of the population—should have direct representation. Then, I would like to say a word in regard to the question of exemption of vehicles used by local bodies. We realize, of course, that this is just the thin edge of the wedge, raising a great political issue regarding the taxation of Government-owned property. But here is the position in Christchurch: I am advised by our officers that our heavy-traffic licenses alone would be £450 a year. These vehicles are all used entirely for roadmaking, and the whole of that money would have to be collected from the ratepayers—I am referring to our own vehicles—so it seems to me that it would be stupid that we should have to pay £450 for the use of our own vehicles in our own city when we have to collect that money from the public. With regard to the licensing authority, we find absolutely no trouble in Christchurch, and I think it is proved by this: that when the City Council has sat as a licensing authority, and after it has given a number of decisions, there has been only one case of a decision being reversed by the Appeal Board. In every other case the Appeal Board has upheld our decision. In regard to the licenses, we consider there should be no vested interest at all, but that the licenses should be granted for one year and go out of existence automatically at the end of the year, and that, therefore, there cannot be any claim for goodwill.

*Mr. Sullivan.*] You think they should be put on the same basis as any other license?—Yes. And we strongly protest against clause 27, which insists on the public bodies, after their having been deprived of considerable revenue, being forced to put up signposts and other things for the benefit of traffic. We have just had an illustration of that from the Railway Department, which has sent us down a claim which means that we must spend £100 on danger-signals. The Railway Department runs its trains through our streets and makes a number of crossings, and then it endeavours to insist that we find their danger-signals. We claim that the Railway Department should provide its own signals. We suggest that an addition be made to this Bill, or to any other Bill which takes its place, clarifying the position in regard to fines imposed by the Courts in connection with breaches of the Transport Regulations. We find a good deal of difference in Christchurch between the City Council and the police authorities as to who should get the fines, and I would like to respectfully suggest that this might be clarified so that it is made certain that when the prosecutions are under the by-laws the City Council gets the fines, and, of course, the police authorities should get them when the prosecutions are under the regulations of the Department. At the present time there is a lot of confusion. One of our objections to the Bill is that we think it is really a kind of levelling-down instead of a levelling-up Bill.

*Mr. Ansell.*] You say that only one of your decisions was reversed by the Appeal Board. What period did that cover?—Since 1926.

*Mr. Williams.*] When you speak of motorists' representative on the Board, and say that the local-body men would be motorists, how do you define a motorist?—I mean that those of us who drive motors instinctively look at a matter from the motorist's point of view.

*The Chairman.*: But we walk sometimes.

*Witness.*: And my experience is that people everywhere, both in the cities and in the country, are almost overlooking the fact that there are such things as pedestrians. I think this Bill will have the effect of handing over the use of the roads to the man who owns a motor-vehicle, and that the historic rights of the pedestrian, which, I understand, are primary, are being undermined.

*Mr. Ansell.*] But that cannot have any effect on the Highways Board?—Oh, yes, and the use of the roads.

Your argument might apply to the licensing council?—What I feel is that this Bill will strengthen the position.

*Mr. Sullivan.*] What is your view with regard to the provision in the Bill under which power is taken to control pedestrians? Is it your opinion that the Christchurch City Council would approve of the police controlling pedestrians at intersections?—Yes, I think we should have some control.

---

TUESDAY, 8TH OCTOBER, 1929.

GEORGE ALEXANDER TROUP, Mayor of Wellington, examined. (No. 4.)

*The Chairman.*] What evidence do you wish to give, Mr. Troup?—The Municipal Association and the Wellington City Council have asked me to give evidence on their behalf with regard to the Transport Law Amendment Bill. I need not go over the Bill in detail, as the solicitor for the Municipal Association, Mr. O'Shea, has already done that. I will therefore merely touch on a few of the more important provisions, and give you evidence, in facts and figures, to show how adversely those provisions will act upon the municipal and local bodies. With regard to the Bill as a whole, I may say that in the unanimous opinion of members of the Municipal Association it is in favour of the motor-trading interests, and against the interests of the local bodies and the transport interest which they control on behalf of the people. In their opinion, a mistake was made in the first