

men who are serving and have served in this war as I do in this and did in the last. More than this, we need more men on the land, even as we are bound to need more production from it. We need more production here and now, but all we can hope for in this is to stem the decline and in the course of the next two or three years regain the decrease we have suffered through one cause and another in recent years.

To put Jack Browne on Bill Jones' farm is not "land-settlement"—it is only land exchange, and, too often, adds nothing to our production from the land. And Bill Jones probably only takes the place of Tom Smith on some other farm, while Tom may give up farming altogether. How, then, are we to improve the position? There is only one logical way, and Northland provides a more complete answer than almost any other district in New Zealand—land-development (that is, to "break in" some of the more suitable areas of idle land so plentiful there).

There is little to be gained now in saying that such a project of land-development should have been undertaken in the early days of the war against the time when men returned to civil life. The fact remains it was not. Of course, the question arises, Is it too late now? I submit for your discussion that it is not too late. In the first place there is our need of greater production of primary produce, a need likely to be acute for many years to come, certainly

while Britain and Europe are being rebuilt and re-established. Following and co-incidental with this is our own need of "greater population," with some, at least, of this on the land. If we imagine that with the defeat of any overcrowded race we have freed ourselves of the likelihood of their resurgence, or their desire, if not demand, for more room for their peoples we delude ourselves and deny one of the cardinal principles for which we say we are fighting and which are laid down in the Atlantic Charter. If we desire to keep our little country in the occupation of "white" men—together with our "brown" Maori brothers—then we must see to it, and at once, that we make greater use of it. This can only be done by land development and settlement, about which so much has been said and written in the past, but which now should be brought to the stage of accomplishment.

Much of our idle acreage belongs to the State, and so has no more than a nominal value. Labour, machinery, both these are to be had, and will become more plentiful as time goes by. Roads, telephones, electricity, we have shown already what we can do in these. Housing, we can do this, too. But you may say: What about the surplus produce after Europe finds her feet again? My answer: That question is as old as farming in New Zealand. What is your answer?

**"Trooper."**

## ANSWERS TO SPORTS QUIZ

1. Australia won it from America in 1939.

2. Six by Phillipson, Wanganui v. Taranaki in 1919. Minns, Auckland v. Southland in 1928. Dick, Trial Match in 1937. Gillespie, Wellington v. Marlborough in 1939.

3. In August, 1907. The Wellington meeting in July, 1907, was the last meeting for which dividends were published.

4. Taylor; Sullivan, Mitchell, Caughey; Hooper, Trevathan; Simon.

5. 452 not out by Bradman, N.S.W. v. Queensland, 1929-30.

6. The Rule reads " . . . that if the red is pocketed twice in succession, in one break, from the spot without the conjunction of another score, it shall be placed on the centre spot, or if that is occupied, on the pyramid spot; and should both these spots be occupied the red shall be replaced on the spot. If again pocketed, it shall be placed on the spot."

7. Johnson, Willard, Dempsey, Tunney, Schmeling, Sharkey, Carnera, Baer, Braddock, Louis.

8. Keith Voitre with 123 winners in 1932-33.