

Mr. MOORE said that was all very well. It was a very unfortunate matter for boroughs throughout the whole Dominion. If they limited the number of inhabitants to 1,000, that would be small enough.

Mr. EVERETT (Nelson) said there was another aspect of the case. It not infrequently happened that in the counties there might be a populous part immediately adjoining a borough. It would be found that a county often lost quite enough by the creation of boroughs within its borders. To allow a Commission to pick out the eyes of a county and tack them on to a borough might result in a great loss of revenue. It was not improbable that they might get under this clause a certain part of a county tacked on to a borough, and thereby the county would stand to lose a good deal of revenue. That was a thing that would have to be conserved.

Mr. BAILEY (Waikato) desired to point out that Report No. 2 overlapped Report No. 3.

Mr. HORRELL (North Canterbury) desired to point out the same thing—namely, that in No. 3 report there was this clause: "The Committee recommend that all town districts with a population of 500 and upwards be formed into boroughs; that all town districts with a population under 500 be merged into counties, provision being made in the Counties Act for the establishment of local Committees, by election or otherwise, to administer under the control of the County Council; that the counties should have the power now exercised by the present town districts, which may be delegated to committees." There a definite number was stated, and he thought perhaps the other Committee might indicate something in the same direction.

Mr. PARR said that the clause in the report of his Committee had reference only to town districts. He did not see anything that was necessarily inconsistent in the two reports. The point was that those very small boroughs should be merged into the counties, and the same with Road Boards. The danger that Mr. Everett pointed out of a district of a county being taken into a borough did not occur in this clause.

The PRESIDENT said that this clause would be deferred until they came to the other one, and they would consider the two of them together.

Clause 3 accordingly deferred.

Clause 4.—"*Subsidies.*—That the system of subsidies to boroughs be continued, and in case of their merging in counties the subsidies for the boroughs so merged should be continued to the counties."

Consideration of this clause was also deferred.

Mr. PARR (Chairman) moved the adoption of clause 5, namely: "*Town-planning.*—That this Committee is of opinion—(a.) That special legislation to provide for town-planning is urgently required. (b.) That in particular it is necessary in the public interest that the subdivision of suburban areas for settlement should be more strictly supervised than hitherto. (c.) That any town-planning authority should be representative of the local authorities affected, or likely to be affected, with the addition of special experts on the subject."

Clause agreed to.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE NO. 3.

Mr. JULL (Chairman of No. 3 Committee) brought up the Committee's report, which was prefaced as follows: "The Committee set up by the Conference to consider Counties, Road and Town Boards, with Special View to Abolition and Amalgamation of Minor Local Bodies and Enlargement of Counties, have the honour to report that they have carefully considered the same, and beg to make the following recommendations to the Conference: The Committee proceeded to business on the assumption that the proposed provincial districts be abolished." He moved the adoption of clause 1—namely: "*Domain Boards.*—The Committee recommends that all Domain Boards within counties be vested in County Councils or municipalities."

Mr. GARLAND (Auckland) explained that he was not on this Committee. Recommendation No. 1 was an essential beginning to give the County Councils authority over those particular reserves, and it would abolish a great many of those local bodies which were spoken about yesterday.

Mr. LIFFITON (Wanganui) said there was a domain in the Wanganui County. The resolution would take it away, and hand it over to the county.

The PRESIDENT explained that the words "or municipalities" were meant to meet such cases as Mr. Liffiton had referred to.

Mr. FISHER (Southland, Wallace, and Fiord) said the members of the Boards in question gave their time and attention to the work of the collection of rates and rents, &c. He was in favour of those questions dealing with the merging of districts being referred to the Commission proposed to be set up, as recommended in Report No. 2, and that the Commission should have power to take evidence throughout the Dominion respecting the desirability or otherwise of general or specific merging. The Boards had carried out their duties in all respects in a very satisfactory manner. It was desirable that the Commission should recommend before they abolished those bodies, who would thereby have an opportunity of expressing their views.

Mr. MILLIGAN (Oamaru) proposed the addition of the following words to clause 1: "and where a domain is adjacent to several boroughs the said domain shall be controlled by the largest local authority."

Mr. BAILEY (Waikato) thought the law should be left as at present with regard to Domain Boards. The Cambridge Domain was under the municipality at one time, but there was now no better-kept domain in New Zealand. The idea of the towns was to smash up all small local bodies, and put in their places what they called "parish councils."

The PRESIDENT desired to say that, in regard to a case like that of Cambridge, the Borough Council would become the controlling authority, and would be the Domain Board. Under Mr. Jull's proposal there could be a local Committee set up, but the administration would be through the Council.