

To what Extent should such Services be under the Control of Local Bodies or any other Public Control?

We believe that there should be one authority, with a virtual monopoly, owning and controlling transport facilities and transport within the said district, but with power, where it seems to that authority desirable, to permit and regulate private services which connect with the places outside its area.

As transport requirements run and develop with population movements, they can take no notice of arbitrary or political divisions, and therefore we are of opinion that the owning and controlling authority must have power to do all things necessary within its area to lay down, equip, operate, and control its transport services without being required to negotiate consents or terms with other bodies. Experience of other districts in this and other countries shows that such power can be granted without unduly interfering with the rights of other bodies within the same area.

3. (f) Is it desirable to establish a Transport Board for the said District?

Four alternative methods of dealing with Auckland's present transport difficulties were put before us at the hearing. They are—

- (1) That the ownership and control of the transport facilities should be left with the Auckland City Council, as it is now, subject, however, to due effect being given to our finding that the principle of allowing the City Council to be the licensing authority for the district cannot be justified.
- (2) As in (1), but advantage taken and use made of the provisions of sections 49 to 54 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1920. It is provided by section 49 that a person may be appointed a member of a committee under this section notwithstanding that he may not be a member of the Council. Section 52 provides that local authorities might unite in appointing joint standing or special committees for any purpose in which these local authorities are jointly interested. The suggestion is that, pursuant to these provisions, members of the adjoining local authorities should become co-opted members of the Tramway Committee of the Auckland City Council.
- (3) The city's boundaries might be enlarged by the absorption of the independent contiguous local bodies, until its political area is nearly, if not quite, coincident with the area of the transport district as already defined.
- (4) A new Board or other controlling body could be created to take over the control of transport facilities within the traffic district as already defined.
- (5) As a variation of method (4), the powers and rights of an existing Board—viz., the Auckland Electric-power Board—might be enlarged so as to enable it to take over transport as one of its functions, and thereby avoid the disadvantages attaching to the creation of another body with borrowing and rating powers.

It seems to us that the best method of approaching the consideration of these alternatives is to look first to see if any of them can and must be eliminated as obviously unsuitable and (or) impossible of attainment.

Greater Auckland Proposal eliminated.—Approaching the matter in this way we have to say that we are of opinion that that method which we believe to be best in principle must be eliminated as politically impossible. We refer to method (3), which involves the creation of Greater Auckland. It has been made abundantly clear to us by the evidence that there is no chance at all of the citizens of Auckland district agreeing at the present time or in the near future to amalgamate all the local bodies into one city.

We agree with the opinion expressed by many witnesses that there should be no attempt to effect that purpose by legislative compulsion. We think that any attempt in that direction would be viewed as a violation of the principle of self-government in a matter in which the principle should rule, and that this