

(c) and (d) Developed Allotments disposed of.

Block.	Number of Allotments disposed of.	Area.	Tenure.	Rental Capital Value.	Annual Rent or Interest receivable.
		Acres.		£	£ s. d.
Wharekohe	17	996	R.L.	9,595	479 15 0
Te Kauwhata	12	1,735	R.L.	8,325	416 5 0
			D.P.	6,165	369 1 6
Onepu*	13	1,356	R.L.	12,285	614 5 0
Koromatua	4	538	R.L.	2,900	145 0 0
Mangatutu	5	771	R.L.	4,680	234 0 0
Ngakuru	20	3,155	R.L.	26,491	1,324 11 0
Total	71	8,551	..	70,441	3,582 17 6

* In addition, eleven sections selected under small-farms scheme.

(e) The Total Amount advanced to Crown Tenants for the Development of their Holdings, the Number of Advances, and the Purpose for which such Advances have been made.

Number of settlers assisted	..	..	..	..	..	494
Loans approved—						£
Improvements	..	..	..	..	..	216,865
Stock	..	..	..	..	..	8,597
Total	..	..	..	..	..	£225,462
Amounts actually advanced—						£
Improvements	..	..	..	..	..	176,925
Stock	..	..	..	..	..	1,813
Total	..	..	..	..	..	£178,738

SMALL-FARMS SCHEME.

During the year there has been comparatively little extension of the area included in the small-farms scheme, the main item being the furtherance of the land-development operations, which have been very successful. The principal reason for not launching out on new work has been the need for the Board to take into account the fact that three-eighths of the wages-cost of development has, from 1st June last, been charged to capital, and, therefore, must be loaded on to the land. As mentioned in the report of last year, much of the land being developed or available for development is "marginal" land which cannot be developed economically by ordinary settlement, and which cannot bear any portion of the labour-costs; and the Board could not conscientiously undertake additional work on such lands, knowing that there would be losses of capital.

Several of the development blocks were completed sufficiently to permit of their being subdivided and the sections placed under the individual management of the occupiers, who were allotted herds for milking. In no case has a tenure been given, but, where the revenue is sufficient, the occupiers have been allowed to collect a proportion of the dairy cheques; in other cases, the men have remained on a wage basis of £4 per week, less 10s. per week rent for cottage.

The carrying-capacity and production have increased enormously in the case of most of the blocks, and this will be seen from a perusal of the reports of the Superintendent of Land Development and the Chief Drainage Engineer in respect of the blocks under their control. For example, six blocks under the control of the latter have produced 223,961 lb. of butterfat, representing an increase in the case of each individual block of from 50 per cent. to 100 per cent. over the previous year. In the four main King-country blocks mentioned in last year's report butterfat-production has increased in value by 80 per cent., wool by 168 per cent., and pigs by 115 per cent. Full details of production will be found in the appendices.

Of the individual holdings settled, apart from the larger development blocks, it can be said safely that, generally, they are a success. In every case of the purchase of "one-man" farms the Board was extremely conservative in the matter of valuations, and a fair price only was paid, which is, no doubt, the real reason for the rapidity with which the tenants are finding their feet and beginning to pay their way. In a number of cases in the North Auckland and Auckland Districts men are milking from thirty to forty cows (in some exceptional cases the figures are higher still) with capital charges of approximately £1,000 only; and these men in ordinary conditions cannot fail to prosper. Such properties as these are, unfortunately, not now forthcoming; in fact, it was found during the year that so small a percentage of properties offered was measuring up to the Board's standards of valuation and carrying-capacity, as well as complying with the requirement that their purchase should not throw the vendors on to the labour market, that the Board withdrew its invitation to applicants to locate and submit particulars of individual farms suitable for purchase. This was a big disappointment to the applicants, but much expense in making fruitless inspections, both by the Board's officers and by the applicants themselves, was saved.