

hand, men with small amounts of capital can realize the impossibility of only half doing the job, and they would only have half done the job by the time their capital was exhausted, and so they would lose the lot. That is my personal opinion.

3. It depends really on the amount of capital that a settler had behind him when this land is being settled?—Yes; and I think, also, the clear realization that even if things were not going on as well as one expected—to use an ordinary phrase—good money would have to be thrown in to try and save the situation. That is to say, the settler must not give up.

4. In a nutshell, do you really believe that the best part of the pumice land—we are not talking of all the pumice land, because we know that some of it is impossible—could be brought into cultivation, and that it would ultimately give a return?—Yes. The best of the pumice land may be broken into settlement without any loss to the State at the finish. But that remark refers only to the very best.

5. You said yesterday that, being a departmental officer, you had no faith in the proposal that the Government should undertake the development work. Does your lack of faith mean that you have no faith in the Department or in the men to be put there to do the job?—Not at all. I consider that the development of this country could best be done by private enterprise, if private enterprise were prepared to do it. I realize that the attraction in front of private enterprise is not sufficient, has as been proved by the fact that the place is not settled. The trouble I foresee in any Government development scheme is that one would have to conduct that development on lines which were approved by the Government rather than approved by the individual. If, for instance, the individual decided that as far as the housing of the employees was concerned it should be of a limited kind, he would probably not be able to put his idea into effect. That, generally, is the feeling one has in regard to the matter.

6. You think it would be better to put an individual on this very poor land, probably with little knowledge, and leave him to struggle away in a desperate kind of a fashion for years, getting no returns, rather than to put the land into proper working-order by the State under the supervision of men who, having years of knowledge of farming, had learned how to do the job?—The preliminary preparation of the ground will have to be done and full finance provided before any settlers endeavour to make a livelihood on such land.

7. I am talking of the preliminary preparation of the land. You have told us that slow returns are due to the fact that the individual might have little capital, and also perhaps to the lack of proper implements; also that the settler is sometimes starved off the land before he can get any returns. Does not success depend upon putting all that land into cultivation in the speediest and most scientific way possible?—Yes.

8. Would it not be far better to do that by picking out a number of young men—strong, healthy fellows—and employing them in groups so that mass action could be applied to the land; then each of the men could be offered a section?—I follow what you are saying.

9. I am not suggesting that there should be placed there a large number of men on the go-as-you-please system; I mean the cost of wages the men receive from the Government should be made a charge on the land, and that it should be ultimately repaid when returns are available. My suggestion is really to capitalize the wages paid, not to spend money without the possibility of a return. The man who goes on the land will know that he has to repay that money, having been given shelter, food, and clothing, with a few shillings extra while preparing his home; he will know that one day he must pay back to the Government what has been expended on him. Is not that a good idea?—Yes, that is the only way the country can be settled.

10. You say that it is the only way the country can be settled?—Yes, considering that private enterprise is not prepared to do the work.

11. You said yesterday that fifty cows would return a good livelihood for a family on the best of the pumice land after it has been brought into cultivation?—Yes.

12. How many acres do you suggest would carry fifty cows, if the land is brought into proper cultivation?—Brought up to what one terms good production as far as dairying is concerned, about $2\frac{1}{2}$ acres per cow. I repeat that that is on fully improved land.

13. That would be about 125 acres?—The holdings would really have to be larger than that.

14. Say about 150 acres?—Yes, about 150 acres. On every holding you would probably have a certain percentage of land not properly broken in. We can say the area of the holding should be from 130 acres to 200 acres.

15. Then 200 acres would be ample to provide for the livelihood of a family?—I hold the view that the putting of a sufficient sum into 200 acres of pumice country is immeasurably better than putting half of what is sufficient into 400 acres.

16. That is to do the job thoroughly?—Yes. I consider that this pumice land so developed is really capable of being used for dairying, provided it is properly provided with shelter, fences, &c.

17. You regard it as more suitable for dairying than for anything else?—That appears to be the only outlook. It is extremely unfortunate that in the settlement of the pumice country there is not a special crop which one could sell off the ground to make a livelihood in the early years. We have a very good example of what is termed a "cash" crop—that is, a crop sold off the ground—in the case of Mr. Parsons, of the Guthrie Settlement. Were it not for the fact that he is producing from 7 to 10 acres of potatoes each year he would have to walk off his holding.

18. You said something yesterday about water and the difficulty it presents on the pumice land: do you know whether there has been any boring for water?—I do not think so. The whole question of watering and the conveyance of water is a matter requiring the most careful examination.

19. The low-lying nature of the country would not lend itself to irrigation?—No. Thinking the matter over last night, I feel pretty well confident that the majority of the farm-watering would have to be done through pipes.