PROTECTION OF AUTHOR’S COPYRIGHT

This copy has been supplied by the Library of the University of Otago on the understanding that the following conditions will be observed:

1. To comply with s56 of the Copyright Act 1994 [NZ], this thesis copy must only be used for the purposes of research or private study.

2. The author's permission must be obtained before any material in the thesis is reproduced, unless such reproduction falls within the fair dealing guidelines of the Copyright Act 1994. Due acknowledgement must be made to the author in any citation.

3. No further copies may be made without the permission of the Librarian of the University of Otago.
THE TEVIOT SOLDIERS SETTLEMENT :

An Evaluation

ATHOLEA A. SHANKS

A dissertation submitted in partial
fulfilment of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts (Honours) in Geography,
University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.
1983
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Where to start? This dissertation has been completed because of the help given to me throughout the year by staff members, classmates and friends.

I would like to thank: The Lands and Survey Department at John Wickcliffe House for allowing me access to the Teviot Settlement files, without which this study could not have taken the form it did. My thanks also go to Professor R P Hargreaves and Dr Terry Hearn for supervision and encouragement during the year; to Bill Mooney for the diagrams; Hugh Kidd for being around, and to Mrs Dale Davey who had the daunting task of typing this up.

I would particularly like to thank Mr A. Moir of Roxburgh, son of an original settler, for the time he spent with me discussing the Teviot Settlement, and Agnes, Catherine and Bruce, who now know more about soldier settlements than they ever wanted to!
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABLE OF CONTENTS</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABBREVIATIONS</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOREWARD</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 1  Introduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 The State and Liberal Land Legislation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 The Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Previous Studies of Soldier Settlement</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 A Step Forward</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Data Source</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 2  The Teviot Land</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 The Teviot Station Before Soldier Settlement</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Government Purchase</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Subdivision and Settlement</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 3  The Stability of Teviot Subdivision</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Runs</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Linkages</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Sections</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Discussion of Subdivisional Stability</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 4  The Stability of Teviot Settlers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 The Original Teviot Settlers</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Occupancy of all Teviot Settlers</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Discussion of Settler Stability</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 5  Changing Production Levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Sheep Carrying Capacity</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Estimated Carrying Capacity</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Cultivation</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Discussion on Changing Production</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHAPTER 6  Evaluation of the Teviot Settlement</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Summary of Findings</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 The Success of Teviot Settlement</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Concluding Comments</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDICES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>An Additional Perspective</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

93
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Area of land proclaimed for Discharged Soldiers, 1915-1930</td>
<td>10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purchase of land for Teviot Settlement, 1918-1920</td>
<td>23a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Selection of Teviot holdings</td>
<td>29a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Run size, 1921, 1936</td>
<td>31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Size and proportion of total holding of linked sections</td>
<td>32a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Previous farm experience</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Number of ownership changes from time of selection</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Purchase of additional land</td>
<td>50a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Teviot Rent Arrears, 1933</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rent as percentage of gross wool income, 1933</td>
<td>54a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Actual and estimated carrying capacities, 1924, 1933</td>
<td>66a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teviot Location</td>
<td>21a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teviot Subdivision, 1921</td>
<td>24a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Average Wool Prices, 1915-1940</td>
<td>28a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Run-Section Links, 1926</td>
<td>33a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section Link Changes</td>
<td>34a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Revised Teviot Subdivision, 1926</td>
<td>37a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Year of Selection and Holdings with Permanent Settlers</td>
<td>46a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sheep Returns for Teviot and Hillsprings Stations, 1907-1920</td>
<td>62a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Tuapeka County Sheep Returns</td>
<td>62b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Occupancy of Teviot Settlement</td>
<td>52a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Otao Sheep Returns</td>
<td>62c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Teviot Sheep Returns</td>
<td>62d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABBREVIATIONS

AJHR  Appendix to the Journals of the House of Representatives

CCL  Commissioner of Crown Lands, Otago

FLS  Files of the Lands and Survey Department, Dunedin

OLB  Otago Land Board

NZPD  New Zealand Parliamentary Debates
One of the main attractions which brought early settlers to New Zealand was the perceived opportunity to acquire land. To own land, especially a farm, continued to be the aspiration and expectation of many twentieth century immigrants, and those later born in New Zealand. Nearly every witness to the 1905 Land Commission made it clear that he or his father had come to New Zealand in order to secure a piece of land and become his own master.

This attitude towards land was also evident in political realms, where issues concerning the use and distribution of land frequently appeared.

The acquisition of land by colonists and the promotion of rural settlement had been pursued in New Zealand since its colonisation by Europeans. First, only individuals and companies were involved in assisting settlers, then later the government also became involved.

The acceptance of government intervention in land allocation was firmly established by the Liberal Government in the 1890s and from this time land settlement continued to be an area in which the government was actively involved. Since the 1950s there has been less need for substantial land promotion and the government's role in this area has diminished.

One of the schemes adopted by the government during its years of involvement with land settlement was that of assisting soldiers to acquire farms after the First World War. This soldier settlement scheme attracted a great deal of attention at the time of its inauguration in 1915. It was one means by which thousands of New Zealanders were enabled to become farmers.
The soldiers settlement scheme has, however, tended to be passed over by both historians and geographers. There is a lack of research into the inter-war period of New Zealand with greater attention being paid to the early period of development. Land settlement after 1915 has similarly been neglected.

There is a need to study the later land settlement schemes in order to assess their importance in the development of New Zealand. Duncan (1962, 190) indicates the need for more detailed study of topics such as the private subdivision of large estates by the government and the subsequent course of events on these holdings; while Brooking (1982) suggests a need for more of the social consequences of subdivision to be documented. By focussing on soldiers settlement, this study will fill in some of the gaps which exist in the knowledge of land settlement. A method of assessing the success of one land settlement scheme is presented through a survey of the Teviot Soldier Settlement from its inception in 1918 until 1940, two decades after its settlement.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 THE STATE AND LIBERALS LAND LEGISLATION

After the abolition of Provincial Government in 1876, land legislation in New Zealand was consolidated under the 1877 Land Act. This Act divided New Zealand into ten land districts, each administered by a Land Board and chaired by a Commissioner of Crown Lands. The 1877 Land Act embodied, to a large extent, the principle by which the Crown retained ownership of the land, while leasing it to settlers. From 1891 with the emergence of the first Liberal Government the State became the most active agent in making land available for settlers.

Gold production, which had provided the initial major boost to the New Zealand economy, fell drastically during the 1860s. Along with the collapse of the gold boom came a decline in the price of wool, New Zealand's main export. The consequent loss in revenue from gold and wool realised the need for an alternative export and the development of refrigeration during the 1880s provided such an alternative. From the first shipment of refrigerated meat and dairy products to Great Britain in 1882, there emerged an awareness of the importance of more intensive use of New Zealand's land. The success of refrigeration resulted in the rapid expansion of the frozen meat trade and an unsatisfied demand for sheep and dairying farms by those who wished to join the prospering farmer class. This demand for small holdings led to a substantial change in New Zealand's economy as from the late 1880s to the first decade of the twentieth century the number of small farmers increased (Knox 1972, 1709). The mass unemployment resulting from the 1880s depression led to a belief that private land ownership of large areas was one of the causes contributing to poverty. Many of the unemployed believed that if they could obtain land, their
situation would be greatly improved (Charman 1953, 135). Land settlement came to be seen as a solution to the urban problem of unemployment as well as being a social good in itself (Richardson 1980, 200).

Land settlement would remove some of the unemployed from urban areas and thus provide a measure of relief, but in addition would promote the more intensive use of land, creating more efficient use of the country's land resource. But by the 1890s, despite the growing demand for land, it was apparent that there was a scarcity of land suitable for public selection and settlement. Much of the best was locked up in large over-valued holdings, and this was especially so in the South Island (Duncan 1962, 169) where investors had previously found it easy to acquire extensive runs. The land which was available for settlement was mainly in inaccessible areas and often unsuited to intensive agriculture.

The Liberals were very aware of the demand for land and proposed a policy to encourage subdivision of large estates and to allow men with limited means the opportunity to take up farming. The rise in land value, consequent on the success of refrigeration, made it plain that steps must be taken to ensure that the large runs and holdings throughout the country were split into smaller areas. These would be utilised in a more intensive manner, thereby producing a greater return and supporting a greater population. The appeal of these land policies contributed to the victory for the Liberals in the 1890 general election.

The land legislation passed by the Liberal Government began with the 1892 Land Act and the 1892 Land for Settlements Act. Both Acts were aimed at consolidating previous legislation and encouraging
the provision of land suitable for subdivision. The latter Act was amended in 1894 and enabled such suitable land to be taken compulsorily if the owner refused to sell.

These measures had been promised by John Mckenzie, subsequently Minister of Lands under the Liberal leaders John Ballance and Richard Seddon. Mckenzie, from Otago, was a strong advocate of close settlement in the South Island although in effect his legislation was to have a greater impact in the North Island.

The first private land to be purchased and subdivided by the Liberal Government was the Cheviot Estate. This purchase was made after the introduction of the Land and Income Tax Act, 1894, which had increased the taxation on large estates as an incentive for owners to sell. In its original form this Act was not particularly successful in encouraging subdivision. The Cheviot Estate was an exception. Later, when the tax was again increased through an amendment to the Act in 1907, estates were more easily broken up as the subsequent high land tax was an incentive to sell.

The Impact of Liberal Land Legislation

Land held in large freehold estates had reached a maximum by the 1890s. A marked reduction in the area of large estates was a feature of the period of Liberal Government 1891-1912 (Gould 1970, 2). The aggregated area of land held by owners of 10,000 acres or more fell from approximately 7.84 million acres in 1882, to 3.51 million acres in 1910; a decline of over 55%. The greatest part of this decline took place between 1902-1910 (Gould 1970, 5).

The first estates to be broken up were the big Company estates and only later were family estates reduced in size. The power of
compulsory purchase, which had been established by the Land for Settlement Amendment Act, 1894, was only used 13 times between 1892 and 1910, as the government was continually offered far more land than it purchased (Brooking 1980, 237). Many runholders sold up because it was to their advantage to do so with high land prices and a ready buyer. Many estates were also seen as liabilities by the late 1890s and as land prices continued to rise following government investment and purchase, those estates were quitted.

Between 1893-1906 over two million acres of land was made available for closer settlement through owners voluntary subdivision, while 1.3 million acres were released through the land settlement legislation introduced by the Liberals (Brooking 1980, 237). By 1914 a total of 5,529 small farmers had been settled on land repurchased by the State (Knox 1972, 1712) and small family farms were even more of a feature of the New Zealand landscape than previously. However, despite the increase in small farmers, the extent to which the Liberals Land Legislation was responsible for the move to close settlement is the subject of considerable debate. Some historians argue that:

'vigorous measures of closer settlement initiated by the Liberal-Labour Ministry were the chief means of breaking through the economic deadlock created by the land monopoly which existed prior to 1910'

(Condliffe 1959, 233)

and 'it was quite evident that without this power [i.e. compulsory acquisition] very little progress would ever be made in the cutting up of the large estates'

(Scholefield, in Gould 1980, 12)

While more contemporary views assert that:

'the great increase in the number of small farms was undoubtedly more the result of rising prices, easier credit, and the spread of dairying'

(Oliver 1981, 144)

than the Liberal legislation. A view supported by both Brooking (1980)
It is clear from recent studies that social and economic changes while the Liberal Government was in power greatly affected the success of their legislation to promote closer settlement. However, whatever the actual impact of their land legislation, the Liberals must still be given credit for their forward-looking land measures.

The land policies followed by the Liberal Government were not wholly new. State involvement in land settlement had existed well before 1890 and had been fundamental to Vogel's village settlement endeavours, but the Liberal Land Legislation enacted, established precedents that coloured the subsequent land legislation of other political parties. Promotion of land settlement continued to be evident in the measures of the Reform Government who replaced the Liberals in 1912.

Soldiers' Settlement

One of the land settlement schemes established under the war-time Coalition Government was the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act 1915, known as the Soldiers' Settlement Scheme. This scheme gave discharged soldiers the opportunity of buying farms on land the State had purchased and emerged as a continuation of the government's involvement in land settlement. Even in 1920 land was seen as the basis of the country's prosperity and as a resource capable of far greater development, given manpower and some financial input.

During and after the First World War there was powerful pressure at the electoral level on the government to make the Dominion a land 'fit for heroes to live in' (Richardson 1980, 216). The Reform Government and the war-time Coalition were both recognised as 'farmer'
parties with their strongest support in the rural areas, and although
country workers were only 20% of the Expeditionary Force (Richardson
1980, 216) it was widely believed that 'when the war comes to an end
a very large number of our soldiers will desire to go on the land'
(NZPD 174 (24 September 1915), 211).

The Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915, was an attempt by
the government to respond to the popular desire to provide for soldiers
as well as to cope with some of the problems expected to arise from
their return to civilian life. The influx of many men looking for
jobs and seeking to establish themselves could best be absorbed by the
countryside and would also eventually lead to increased agricultural
production. In this way the scheme continued to promote the national
desire for close land settlement and more intensive land use.

By 1915 the introduction by the government of a small farm
scheme was a well-established part of the national Land Settlement
Policy. It seemed natural to the nation that one of the schemes
proposed for the rehabilitation of soldiers should be the provision
of land and finance for farming. The popular support for the scheme
was such that the Opposition offered its congratulations to the
government on their initiative and forethought in planning for the
end of the war (NZPD 174 (11 October 1915), 215).

The provision of land for soldiers was a scheme created because
of the circumstances brought about by the war as both a solution to
pending problems of dealing with returning soldiers, an extension and
adaptation of existing measures, and as an electoral platform.

On 11 October, 1915, an Act to make Provision for the Settlement
of Discharged Soldiers on Crown and Settlement Land was passed
Land was to be set aside for selection by discharged soldiers under ordinary tenures and special tenures. Under ordinary tenures, areas of Crown or Settlement land could be set apart for selection by soldiers in the manner prescribed by the Land Act, 1908, and The Land for Settlement Act, 1908. The former Act offered land for sale, on deferred payment or on renewable lease, while the latter Act offered land on renewable lease only.

Land set aside under these tenures could be revoked if it was not required for soldier settlement. The 'special tenures' made land available for soldiers only by way of sale or lease and provisions of other Land Acts relating to the administration of Crown or Settlement land were not to apply to land disposed of by special tenure.

Land set aside under this 1915 Act was to be administered by the District Land Boards who were responsible for the subdivision, selection of soldiers, supervision of the settlers, financial assistance to the settlers and the land rents.

Financial assistance was available for settlers for the erection of buildings and purchase of stock and other materials necessary for the successful occupation of the land. This followed the policy set by the Liberals with the Advances to Settlers Act, 1894 which allowed small farmers to borrow from the State at low interest rates. It was recognised that cheap credit was essential for successful close settlement as farm settlers needed capital to develop the land. Provision of finance was to ensure that soldiers could become quickly established successfully on the land.

The Act, 1915, initially defined those eligible for land as any member of the New Zealand Naval Forces or any Expeditionary Force who
had served overseas and received his honourable discharge from service. A restriction of 10 years was placed on the right of transfer of any land allotted to soldiers, and that the soldier was to be in continual residence on the land.

The government was anxious to promote permanent settlement for a number of reasons, among which may have been the intent to prevent speculation, increase production and to provide protection for its own investment.

Amendments to the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915

As the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915, was brought into operation, amendments were found necessary to clarify its terms and improve its administration. Amendments passed in 1916 and 1917 expanded the category of those eligible for land under the Act to include soldiers' widows, soldiers' widowed mothers, Army nurses, and some soldiers who had not served overseas. The amount of money available for spending on the scheme was increased under both Amendment Acts as the £50,000 initially set aside was not adequate with land prices rising rapidly.

Amendments to the original Act enabled land set aside under special tenure to be revoked, if it was not required for soldiers. Any other Crown Land settlement land, or land administered by a Land Board held under lease or licence, also could be repossessed to provide land for the settlement of discharged soldiers. The 1919 Amendment allowed for extra financial assistance for soldiers and the dispensement of the payment of interest on land in cases of hardship.

The 1919 Amendment again authorised more money to be available for the purposes of the acquisition and disposal of land under the
Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915, as it was found rapidly rising costs for farmers made the previous monetary provisions inadequate.

The Discharged Soldiers Settlement Amendment Act, 1923, was a special provision to provide relief for soldier settlers. The slump in wool prices in 1921 combined with the high rents payable for the land resulted in extreme hardship for many soldier settlers. An Inquiry Board had been set up in 1922 to investigate the soldiers' position and as a result the 1923 Amendment Act was passed to appoint a Dominion Revaluation Board to whom any discharged soldier could apply for rent revaluation or remissions. This Board was an effort by the government to help the soldiers over the financial difficulties many faced in the early 1920s.

Land Purchase for Soldiers' Settlement

The amount of unoccupied Crown land available in New Zealand was insufficient and often unsuitable for the large number of soldiers who would be returning, and so the government began purchasing additional land for soldier settlement. By 31 March 1918 the government had purchased 346 estates totalling 1,646,975 acres for soldier settlement. Among these was the Teviot Estate in Central Otago. From 1915-1918, 634 holdings were selected by soldiers, but during the peak year ending March 1921, 1,087 soldiers selected land. The rapid increase in demand for land after 1919 followed the return of the main forces from overseas. The slump in wool prices during 1921 was reflected in the sharp decline in soldier applications for land with 5,396 in 1921 compared to only 878 applications received in 1922 (AJHR 1939, C-9). From this time the number of soldiers allotted land steadily decreased. By 1925, 95% of the applications for land by soldiers had been made.
The total area of land proclaimed under the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915, was 1,438,935 acres. Half of this, 700,172 acres, was available under ordinary tenure while the rest was available under special tenure. The amount of land set aside for discharged soldiers was approximately the same between the two islands with 53.5% of it in the South Island by 1930, and 46.7% in the North Island. However, the distribution of land between the Land Boards was quite different. By 1930 Otago had the most land proclaimed for discharged soldiers with 22.2% of the country's total, while Southland only had 1.7% (Table 1).

In Otago by 1926, 441 soldiers were settled; 162 of these on land purchased from the Crown, and 273 as tenants on leased Crown land.

1.3 PREVIOUS STUDIES OF SOLDIER SETTLEMENT

Previous evaluations of the soldiers settlement scheme have indicated that generally it was unsuccessful. The government spent large sums of money to provide farms for soldiers, but the land was often bought at excessive prices. As a result of the post-war economic conditions:

"many farmers found themselves in a desperate position burdened with mortgages and interest based on the previous high and rising prices. A good many ex-Servicemen gave up their holding"

(Sinclair 1969, 244)

Reference to the soldiers settlement scheme found in the literature tends to be negative, with the settlements having "many of these new farmers forced off their land" (Brooking 1980, 227); and comments like:

"of the various forms of rehabilitation of returned servicemen after the war, land settlement was the best known, the most expensive, and the least successful"

(McClintock 1966, 663)

The position in which many of the soldier settlers found themselves in by 1923 was nationally recognised, and in 1923 the government commissioned a Board of Inquiry to investigate and report
### TABLE 1

**AREA OF LAND PROCLAIMED FOR DISCHARGED SOLDIERS, 1915-1930**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land District</th>
<th>Total Area to 31 March 1930</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Auckland</td>
<td>69,652</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>217,045</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gisborne</td>
<td>16,182</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawkes Bay</td>
<td>200,239</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taranaki</td>
<td>54,565</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>113,278</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>70,618</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>21,463</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westland</td>
<td>28,232</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>301,588</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago</td>
<td>320,435</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southland</td>
<td>25,638</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,438,935</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: New Zealand Official Yearbook
upon the position of soldier farmers. The reports made by the
Inquiry Board led to the initiation of the Dominion Revaluation Board
to assist soldier farms in financial difficulty as it was plain that
unless the soldiers were given financial help to remain on the land,
an even greater number would be forced off their holdings. Of the
4,322 soldiers who requested an inspection from the Revaluation Board
in 1923, 30.7% were judged as temporarily unsuccessful, and 18.7%
declared to be outright failures (AJHR 1923, C9A). The position of
soldier holdings was judged in terms of the profitability of the
holding. The situation of the soldiers, with only half being assessed
as successful, was considered less drastic than it at first appears,
because 3,303 or 43% of all soldier holdings did not request an
inspection. The 43% of all soldiers who did not request an inspection
were described in the report as safely being assumed to be on
successful holdings. Presumably the lack of a request for an
inspection was taken to indicate that these soldiers had achieved a
satisfactory measure of success in farming. This assumption might
not be correct. Many soldiers would not request an inspection through
ignorance as to the purpose of an inspection, rather than because they
were in a satisfactory financial position.

The 1923 Inquiry Board Report did describe many soldier
settlements as unprofitable but the decisions as to successfulness of
farms varied greatly between Land Districts. A group of three
inspectors were responsible for the assessment of farms in each Land
District, and there is a limit to the generalisations which can be
made about the state of soldier settlements from the Inquiry Board
report, because of the variations in assessment made by the different
inspection groups. However, the general impression gained of soldiers
settlements, obtained from both primary and secondary sources, is
summed up by one politician; 'so far as most of the land in the hands of soldiers is concerned, it has proved a failure' (NZPD 196 (31 August 1922), 801).

Although many comments have been made about the soldier settlement scheme and it is proported to have been unsuccessful, apart from the Inquiry Board Report of 1923, only three detailed studies of the scheme have been conducted. Allan (1967) provides the first explorative study in a descriptive survey of soldier farms established in South Canterbury 1915-1937. This includes an explanation of how relevant geographical elements such as topography, soil and climate affected soldier settlements. Allan (1967) determined six phases through which the soldier settlement scheme progressed. The phases are cited here as they provide a useful time framework around which to base a study of soldier settlement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Development of Soldiers Settlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1915-1917</td>
<td>The initial legislation and introduction of the scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1919-1921</td>
<td>The peak years of its operation with extensive buying of land and settlement of soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1921-1925</td>
<td>The onset of the slump in agricultural prices which resulted in financial difficulties and forced many soldier settlers to leave the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1925-1930</td>
<td>An interdepression period with a partial recovery of sheep farmers and the completion of soldier settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1930-1935</td>
<td>The main effort by the Land Board to keep as many men as possible on the land while the recession lasted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1936-1939</td>
<td>The re-appearance of good prices for agricultural produce and increased prosperity for those soldiers remaining on the land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main difficulty encountered by Allan (1967) in exploring the apparent failure, because of the high rate of movement by soldiers off the farms, was a lack of data. Little documentary material relating to soldiers settlement was available, but the study did find that soldier
farms were of a smaller size than the average South Canterbury farm. The reason for the comparatively small size of soldier holdings was ascribed to the high cost of land and the continuing desire by the government to settle as many soldiers as possible at the least cost. An imminent election prompted a desire to achieve results at the expense of sound judgement. The uneconomical size of farms resulted in many soldiers leaving the land with the peak years of movement being 1921-1927. The main reason for failure was given as the unsuitable size of holdings and their high rents. The rent charged for soldier farms was related to the initial purchase price and not on the productivity of the unit. With the slump in agricultural prices in 1921 many soldiers found they could not meet the rent demands. The assessment of soldier settlements in South Canterbury presented a less gloomy conclusion of the scheme than at first suggested as despite the failures:

'under the soldier settlement programme a very considerable area of what had been under-developed or inaccessible land was opened up and brought into production' (Allan 1967, 132).

Thus one of the aims of the soldiers settlement scheme was in fact fulfilled.

The second study to be done of soldiers settlement Powell (1971a), also identifies a very marked movement by soldiers off the land during the early 1920s. Use of parliamentary papers formed the basis of Powell's study which established the regional trends of soldier settlement, 1916-1923. The average size of holdings in New Zealand in 1922 was compared with the average size of soldier holdings in the same year, and it was found that North Island soldier holdings were 20% smaller than the average civilian holding; while the South Island holdings were 40% larger than the average non-soldier holding. However, when the size of surrendered and forfeited soldier holdings are compared with the average size of the soldier holdings retained, it
is found that the holdings that passed from soldier hands were over 40% smaller in size. This applied in both islands.

Powell's assessment (1971a), of the reasons given by the 1923 Inquiry Board and the Land Boards for the failure of soldier settlements states that the prime reason for failure was economic; 'the soldiers simply did not have enough time to commence farming profitably before the slump affected them' (Powell 1971, 155).

The main weakness of the foregoing study lay in the definition of the 'failure'. Forfeited and surrendered holdings were defined as failures, but the number of such holdings in comparison with the total number of soldier settlements is not given. As indicated by the Inquiry Board, failure can be judged in terms other than by movement off the land. Farms can be failures, yet soldiers unable to leave and hence not countered as failures, when movement is used as the criterion, or a soldier might remain in possession, but be obliged to find alternative employment in order to supplement the farm income.

The third and most recent study of soldiers settlement is by Maloney (1982) which examines two southern soldier settlements to test how accurately the government of the day had assessed the reasons for the acknowledged failure of the scheme that had been established. Again the assumption is that the reports by the 1923 Inquiry Board must lead to the conclusion that the scheme was unsuccessful.

Maloney (1982) examines the establishment and subsequent development of the 5,341 acre Clifton soldier settlement and the 23,000 acre Benmore soldier settlement, both opened in 1917. At Clifton the settlement was divided into 22 farms while on the Benmore settlement 15 settlers were established. In both cases within three years of being open for selection by soldiers nearly one third of the settlers
had left. Attempts were made by the Land Board to keep soldiers on the land after it was recognised that the settlers were in difficulty, but by 1922 eight of the 22 settlers had left the Clifton settlement and by 1930 all but one of the original settlers had gone from the Benmore settlement.

In both cases at Clifton and Benmore, the unsuitability of the subdivision was a major cause of the departures. Subdivisions were too close with the resulting holdings being too small. In addition the subdivision did not take into adequate account the winter climate and topographic conditions of the areas, especially at Benmore. Pressure on the government, which was anxious to be seen to be cutting up the estates, was given as the only way to account for so many of the soldier settlements being cut up into sections that were too small (Maloney 1980, 29).

There was no evidence that inefficient selection of soldiers for settlers had contributed to the failure of the scheme to any significant extent, but the machinery to administer the settlement scheme was not satisfactory and one author believes 'the government failed to develop the Land Boards so they could do a thorough job in subdividing the land and supervising the soldiers' (Maloney 1980, 35). Other critics of the government land settlements have found that the ability of settlers to remain on the land was directly related to their level of farming experience and amount of capital each possessed (Waterson 1967; Brooking 1982).

None of the studies of soldier settlement have adequately determined the importance of previous farm experience in the movement of soldiers off the land, although they suggest that it was of little importance. A quantitative investigation is necessary to assess accurately, the significance of previous experience in the ability of
soldiers to remain as viable farmers. This may not yet have been done because of a lack of relevant information.

All three studies of soldiers settlement done have found the scheme to be deficient. Considerable movement by soldiers off the land was used by Allan (1967), Powell (1971) and Maloney (1982) as an indication of the failure of the soldier settlement scheme. However, a large movement away from the land was not exclusive to soldiers and this must be taken into account when assessing the success of this scheme. It has been estimated that nearly half of the occupied land changed hands between 1915-1924 (Sinclair 1969, 244). The economic conditions after the First World War affected all farmers, not just soldiers. A high turnover of settlers had also been experienced previously on other government settlement schemes (Waterson 1969, 16). Movement by soldiers off the land is therefore not a good indication, on its own, of the failure of the soldier settlement scheme, yet in the past this has been used as the main measure of assessing the scheme.

The unsuitability of the subdivisions on many settlements is used as a further indication of the unsuccessful nature of the scheme (Allan 1967; Bray 1945), yet the extensive subdivision which was revealed is not exclusive to soldier settlements. Earlier land subdivisions have also been criticised as inadequate, resulting in uneconomic farm units (MacDonald 1962).

The three studies of soldier settlement (Allan 1967; Powell 1971; Maloney 1982) all rely heavily on official reports of the settlements, to determine the success of the scheme. Maloney (1982) cites the administration of the scheme as an important factor in its failure; Allan (1967) highlights the unsuitable subdivision and high rents in conjunction with the economic conditions, while Powell (1971) found the lack of success of the scheme is due largely to the economic conditions.
facing the soldier settlers. The scheme was, in most cases, judged in terms of official statistics that show a high incidence of movement by soldier settlers off the land. The general assessment of the studies in these terms could only be that the scheme was not as successful as envisaged.

1.4 A STEP FORWARD

This study will expand on previous considerations of soldiers settlement with the extensive use of original documents. The objective is to carry out a more detailed analysis of the success of soldier settlements than has been done before. This will be done by evaluating the success of one soldier settlement, Teviot.

Previously the reasons for failure have been the focus of the study, but an evaluation of the success of the Teviot Settlement will be the focus of this study. A survey is made from 1918 when the first land was purchased, until the end of 1939 in order to obtain a detailed assessment of this settlement. The final year of the study was chosen as 1939 as this leads into the Second World War and a complete revision of legislation concerning soldier settlement. The 19 years of settlement at Teviot, 1921-1939, will enable the success or otherwise of this soldier settlement to be determined. It is essential that the means by which the settlement is evaluated are detailed and comprehensive. Previous studies have relied on few measures by which to examine the settlements. The criteria used in this study to evaluate the Teviot Settlement were developed as;

1. The stability of the original subdivision
2. The stability of ownership
3. Change in production.
Maloney (1982) and Allan (1967) largely attributed the failure of soldier settlers to the nature of the original subdivision of the land, although the definition of failure is inexplicit and hard to follow. This study will analyse the original subdivision of the Teviot Settlement and its subsequent changes. Stability, or lack of changes to the boundaries established prior to the selection of the land, will be used to determine the success of the subdivision. Any changes or alterations to the original subdivision will be used as evidence of deficiencies in the original survey of the settlement.

Movement off the land has been a prime factor constantly reiterated as an indication of the failure of the soldiers settlement scheme. This study will establish the extent of movement off the Teviot Settlement, 1921-1939, and use a quantitative method to evaluate the importance of the movement as an indication of failure. By examining the movement over a period the initial movement which is associated with any settlement scheme (Waterson. 1969) will be given less weight and the movement resulting from this particular scheme will become more obvious.

The third criteria, changes in production on the subdivided Teviot Estate, relates to the more general objective of this land settlement scheme. No previous efforts have been made to assess such change on soldier land, a surprising omission given that the government continually held that

'no land suitable for cultivation should at this time be allowed to remain unimproved. The land of this country must be made to produce more.'

(NZPD 186 (6 July 1920), 136)

If production of the land did increase per acre as a result of the subdivision for soldier settlement, then one of the major objectives of the scheme would have been reached.
1.5 DATA SOURCE

Information from primary documents forms the basis of this study and are supplemented by secondary sources, including regional and district histories and field work.

Files of the Lands and Survey Department kept on each government settlement are used as the main source of information on Teviot Settlement. Files on this settlement are available from 1917 until 1940 and contain reports from the District Crown Rangers; The Commissioner of Crown Lands and from Revaluation Board Inspectors; letters to and from the Manager of Teviot Station, private settlers and between the Otago Land Board and the Minister of Lands; as well as any other correspondence relating to the establishment and development of the Teviot Settlement. These records are an invaluable source of information otherwise only briefly recorded in the published official reports. As identified previously, the Lands and Survey records offer

'a novel vantage point for the examination of the dynamics of success or failure in the pulsation of settlement . . . [and can ] provide a unique commentary on the popular appraisal of economic and social conditions' (Powell 1972, 76).

There are, however, limitations to the use of these files. The correspondence was often of a personal nature written in an informal manner about everyday concerns. This sometimes resulted in discrepancies between the files and official reports, as files often represented observations based on memory and perception rather than official data. For this reason data in the files was checked against official sources and where discrepancies were found, the official reports were accepted as containing the most accurate information.

Lands and Deeds files were a further source of information about ownership and subdivision changes which occurred on the Teviot Settlement.
The Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives, newspapers, Otago Land application forms, and New Zealand Parliamentary debates, provided additional sources of information about general opinion and development of soldier settlements.

Field work was also important as a means of increasing understanding of the Teviot area. Local residents and descendants of original settlers were able to give additional and interesting insight into the Teviot Settlement. This information was, however, often selective and from partial recollections, thus limiting its direct use for evaluating the success of the Teviot Settlement. This information, nonetheless, was still useful in confirming documentary evidence and helping balance conclusions.

Statistical data on soldier settlement was available in the New Zealand Official Yearbook, the AJHR, Census, and NZPD. These statistics were often compiled in different ways, over different periods of time leading to discrepancies between the sources. To overcome this, the AJHR was chosen as the major source of reference for statistics on the general development of soldier settlements, as this source includes the annual reports on the soldiers settlement scheme as requested by Parliament. The statistics presented in the reports were compiled by the Commissioner of Crown Lands for each Land District, and are the most accurate and complete available.

This study quotes all areas in 'acres' as this is the unit dealt with at the time the scheme was in operation. As it is the unit used in all official reports of soldier settlements it was appropriate to retain its use in this study.
CHAPTER 2
THE TEVIOT LAND

2.1 THE TEVIOT STATION BEFORE SOLDIER SETTLEMENT

The Teviot Station, located 1.5 miles east of Roxburgh in Central Otago (figure 1) was originally part of Run 199 leased from the Otago Provincial Government in 1860. The leasees of the Station, John Cargill and Edward Robert Anderson, purchased 20,000 acres of it in 1882. The sale of Teviot Station for £16,000 to Cargill and Anderson was part of the attempt by the Otago Provincial Government to increase its income.

In 1871 the Province was facing a serious financial crisis and the attempt to get money resulted in the sale of 50,000 acres of the Moa Flat Station to the Australian millionaire, W J T Clarke. The sale was concluded in somewhat unusual circumstances and to the dissatisfaction of many who felt the land should be used for subdivision, it was placed in the hands of one land owner, alienating it for settlement purposes. Clarke also wanted part of the Teviot Station, adjacent to Moa Flat, but because of the feelings against the previous sale, this purchase was done through the leasees Cargill and Anderson. After the sale, Cargill and Anderson transferred their new freehold of Teviot Station to Mr Joseph Clarke, son of W J F Clarke (Clarke 1980, 254). The ownership of Teviot Station is somewhat obscure, until the Crown purchased the freehold in 1907, but it is presumed the Station remained in the hands of the Clarke family up to that time.

Accounts of the 1907 sale differ, with one report that 'the last owner of the original (Teviot) Station, Mr D MacFarkine, cut it into two purchases' (Mt Benger Mail, 16.1.18) while a local history states 'the Crown acquired the freehold for settlement purposes, the first recorded sale being in 1907' (Webster 1948, 34). Exactly
Figure 1: TEVIOT LOCATION
who owned the land in 1907, whether the government, the Clarkes, or MacFarkine (possibly a Clarke relation) is unclear and could not be determined from Lands and Deeds files because of the subsequent subdivision which has occurred. However, in 1907 the Teviot Station was divided into two blocks and sold. Mr J A Pannett purchased the Hillsprings block while Mr A F Roberts bought the homestead block (also called the Teviot Station, the name used to refer to this block in this study). Both Robert and Pannett remained the owners of this land until the properties were acquired by the Crown for further subdivision under the soldiers settlement legislation.

2.2 GOVERNMENT PURCHASE

'The government have purchased Teviot" announced a telegram from the Otago Commissioner of Crown Lands to the Otago Land Board on 29 January 1918. The Teviot Estate was purchased for subdivision as a soldier settlement after it was offered for sale by a court order of 11 December 1917. As the owner of the station, Alexander Frederic Roberts had been committed as a mental patient with no successors, the Public Trust was appointed statutory administrator and authorised to sell the property by public auction or private contract. The Estate was offered for sale at a time when the government was acquiring land for soldiers settlement and other land for this purpose had already been bought in the Clutha Valley. Teviot Estate joined the nearby Westcott and Ballomy Settlements as land for discharged soldiers.

The Teviot Estate was well suited for subdivision and closer settlement, with a report that this move would create 'increased production and increased prosperity follows as a natural sequence and the whole contributing to the progress of the district' (Mt Benger Mail, 16.1.18). This was the attitude fostered by the government
itself, in promoting closer rural settlement. The Estate consisted of 12,446 acres freehold bought at £6 an acre and 19,250 acres of leasehold given in at the same time. The price was comparatively cheap for land bought in Otago after the war. Land prices had soared with government intervention in land purchasing for soldier settlement and because of the demand for New Zealand agricultural products, which the war had created. Much of the land offered to the government was at exorbitant prices (McClintock 1966, 663) but because of the promise to provide land for soldiers the government still often purchased the land despite the cost. In 1918 when £6 an acre was paid for the Teviot Estate, 5,273 acres was bought for a soldier settlement at Gladbroom for £11.34 an acre, 874 acres at Teihika for £15 an acre, and 445 acres at Monte Christo for £23 an acre, all settlements in Otago. Between 1912 and 1922 the average cost of land purchased in the Otago Land District was £9.52 an acre and for all estates acquired by the Crown, £10.2 - however the pre-war prices helped hide the post-war inflated land values. The range of prices paid was from £18.7 an acre for 95,751 acres in Wellington to only £3.55 an acre for 106,915 acres in Marlborough (AJHR 1922, C-9).

More land was purchased to be included in the Teviot Settlement (Table 2) after 1918. Two blocks of land, 381 and 500 acres each, were offered for sale to the government on the death of the owner. These were purchased by the government with the intention of increasing the size of the settlement to prevent any future difficulties over access to specific areas. In 1919 a further 11 acres was purchased for access reasons, and in 1920 9,820 acres of the Hillsprings freehold and 28,600 acres leasehold were added to the Teviot Station after Mr Pannett's death, bringing the total area of land available for subdivision on the Teviot Settlement by 1921 to 23,158 acres freehold and 47,850 acres leasehold. In 1921 the area
TABLE 2

PURCHASE OF LAND FOR THE TEVIOT SETTLEMENT: 1918-1920

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Property</th>
<th>Area (acres):</th>
<th>Cost/Acre</th>
<th>Date Purchased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freehold</td>
<td>Leasehold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teviot Estate</td>
<td>12,446</td>
<td>19,250</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiel's Farm</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>5.12/6</td>
<td>July 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker's Farm</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>July 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsprings Estate</td>
<td>9,820</td>
<td>28,600</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Ormaglade</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td>June 1919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Cost: £ 138,926/0/00

Source: AJHR C-5, 1918-1920
of the Teviot Settlement was twice the size of the original land secured and contained most of the land of the Teviot Station prior to the 1907 split.

2.3 **SUBDIVISION AND SETTLEMENT**

After purchasing the Teviot Estate the Otago Land Board placed a manager, Mr Ritchie, on the Estate to continue the running of the farm until such time as the land was ready for disposal. The preliminary survey for the subdivisional properties and access roads for the settlement was begun in May 1918. The need for adequate roading in this area had long been discussed (Mark 1977, 277) and with the government's purchase of the land, the roading was finally able to be put in, to open up the area. With the need to survey the additional land purchases of 1919 and 1920 the date for the opening of the settlement for selection by soldiers was set as early 1921.

In December 1920 the subdivision of the Teviot Settlement by the surveyor, Mr Armitt, was completed. On the former freehold land, 36 pastoral sections were surveyed and on the leasehold land, 13 high country runs (figure 2). Land was also set aside for community use - 24 acres as the woolshed reserve, and two acres each for a school and a dam reserve. The woolshed reserve which included a sheep dip was intended for the use of all settlers, each of whom paid a proportion of its rent. The land set aside for a school was never needed, the few children on the Settlement attending the Miller's Flat school. The rent for the dam reserve was also paid for by all settlers, although those on the runs used it most as it provided a useful area for holding sheep while they were being shifted between summer and winter grazing area.

From correspondence available in The Lands and Survey files, it
appears that considerable effort was made by the Otago Land Board to devise the most suitable subdivision for the settlement, taking into account the physical and climatic features of the area. The report to the Land Board made by the valuer prior to the purchase, described the Teviot Estate as 'favourable for subdivision' with the eastern part known as the Phaton block referred to as 'very suitable for subdivision' with 'soils of excellent quality and exceedingly fertile' (FLS 4/27 (1) 1918; Mr Begg to OLB). His report also contained a warning over the difficulty of providing permanent water to all holdings, and rabbits were described as a problem on some parts of the settlement with 1,300 acres being 'rough land which had been eaten out by the pest' (FLS 4/27 (1) 1918; Begg to CCL). The valuer considered control of rabbits to be the crucial factor in the success of the settlement while he also placed considerable emphasis on the availability of water. It was recognised that the dry character of the western part of the settlement would necessitate its subdivision into fairly large blocks. Linking of some sections in the western area with runs, was carried out to enable farmers to rest their dry front blocks in summer by removing stock to the back runs. This linking meant a greater number of settlers could be placed on the land. The area on the eastern part of the original Estate was recognised as being well watered and as a result was subdivided into single, self-contained blocks. It was recognised that 'a good subdivision of an estate is most essential to its successful working and too much care cannot be exercised in this direction' (FLS 4/27 (2) 1918; CCL to Minister of Lands).

Not only was the valuer's report on the Teviot Estate considered during the subdivision but once the initial boundaries were established the manager of the Teviot Estate was instructed to inspect their suitability. This instruction reflects the Land Board's concern that a successful subdivision be made. To that end, provision was also made for
roading. The physical features, water supply, climate, and rabbits were all considered in assessment of the land's ability to support closer settlement. The care taken possibly reflects the experience already gained with respect to earlier soldier settlements where subdivision had often been excessive. The stability of this subdivision is examined in Chapter 3.

Settlement of the Land

In February 1921, three years after the first land purchase, 12 runs and 20 sections were opened for selection on the Teviot Settlement. Applications were invited from landless returned soldiers over the age of 21 with a minimum of $1,000. The monetary requirement was to ensure those securing land would be able to carry out all the lease conditions and not encounter financial difficulty over the initial high costs and low returns involved in establishing a farm. As well as the rent, which was set at 4.5% of the capital value of the land, the successful applicant was also required to pay for fencing, any buildings on the property and a proportion of the licence over the dam and woolshed reserves. Further conditions of settlement were - to keep the rabbits down, prevent the growth and spread of noxious weeds, and to plant at least one acre of trees on the runs every year. Altogether the outlay of money required by prospective settlers was great.

The Teviot ballot followed the form established in 1888, with applicants applying for specific holdings. The land was available under two tenures: sections under a renewable lease for 35 years, and runs under a licence to occupy Crown land for pastoral purposes, for a term of 21 years. The run licences were to be held concurrently with a lease over a section.

A further condition for settlers taking land in 1921 was that
holdings could not be stocked immediately, although the settlers could proceed with fencing, building and cultivation. The Land Board's manager on the Teviot Station had recommended:

'I strongly urge that although the soldiers are given possession of their sections, they are not allowed to put any sheep on them ... in my opinion this is the only way to ensure the success of the settlement'

(FLS 4/27 (2) 29,11.20; Mr Ritchie to Minister of Lands).

This restriction on stocking was approved because the Teviot Settlement was suffering from the previous year's drought conditions and to allow stocking could result in damage to the land. Grazing under such circumstances could affect the future carrying capacity of the holdings.

The Crown Rangers for the Otago District believed that the stocking restriction would keep the best class of settler away from the ballot while the Commissioner of Crown Lands requested that the Minister of Lands postpone the ballot until 1922, when absolute possession could be given of the land. This request was declined and plans for the ballot to be held in March 1921 continued with the restriction on stocking for one year imposed.

Although rent was not to be paid for the first unofficial year due to the stocking restriction, the Land Board received only 13 applications for the 32 farms offered and two of these were withdrawn before the ballot. Interviews with the remaining 11 applicants were held by the Land Board on 31 March 1921 after which eight runs were allotted to soldiers. Three applications for sections were declined for unknown reasons, while two of the successful applicants withdrew after they were approved by the Land Board and before taking up any land. These withdrawals resulted in only six soldiers taking up land on the Teviot Settlement in 1921.
one occurred because the section was being re-linked with a smaller run which did not require as large a section, while the second was reduced because it was unlinked and no longer needed to provide support for a run.

Five of the six unlinked sections which underwent changes in boundary were increased in size, while one was eliminated completely. The sections were increased by 28%, 26.4%, 10.1%, 10% and 5.9% of their original area through the redistribution of the 636 acres from the section which was eliminated. All sections involved in area change had failed to be selected in the 1921 ballot. By increasing their size, the Otago Land Board hoped to encourage settlement of these holdings. All of these sections were on the eastern block of the settlement which had originally been regarded as the most suitable area for subdivision. As a consequence of this evaluation the area was closely subdivided, but this proved to be unsuitable and the holdings increased in size.

In November 1924 the decision was taken to change the boundaries of the six sections which were still unselected, as it appeared unlikely that they would attract settlers in their existing form. Previously applications had been received by some individuals who wished to occupy two of these six sections, but no applicants were willing to settle on holdings as offered. One applicant who applied for sections 7 and 21, described section 7 as being 'too small to enable a man to get a living' while another criticised section 34 as 'too small and dear by itself' (FLS 4/27 (4), 3.3.24). A further section involved in the changes had been described by a Teviot settler as 'very high and cold and very far back and also bad with rabbits. It is only fit to run in conjunction with another block' (FLS 4/27 (4), 3.12.24).

Three of these sections still vacant in 1924 had had rent
The Roxburgh local newspaper reported the 'little attention' and only 'moderate response' to the Teviot ballot as a result of the stocking restriction which meant settlers 'could not obtain a return for nearly two years' (Mt Benger Mail 6.4.21). The Otago Land Board report on the ballot stated that the lack of interest shown in the Teviot Settlement was due to 'the drop in wool and stock prices, the bad appearance of the land and the special condition prohibiting stocking' (FLS 4/27 (2) 20.4.21; OLB to Minister of Lands).

After the poor results of the first ballot, the proclamation setting the Teviot Settlement land apart for soldier settlement only, was revoked from the vacant holdings and in 1922 the unoccupied land was opened for general applications, with preference being given to soldiers. The Teviot Settlement by 1922 had cost the government in excess of £156,000 in respect of its purchase, subdivision, roading and administration. The only returns which had been gained for this outlay were from the stock being run on the Teviot Estate.

It appears that by the end of 1921 the Otago Land Board concluded that the demand for land by soldiers would not increase as the peak of applications for land had passed. By opening the remaining vacant Teviot holdings for general application, it was hoped to encourage settlement of the land. The change of the Teviot Settlement to ordinary settlement did not alter the way in which the land was settled, just the criteria of those eligible to become settlers.

Improvement in wool prices after 1922 (figure 3) led to 12 sections and one run being settled between 1922-1924. Land still vacant in 1924 was offered in a second ballot after some boundary changes had occurred. This second ballot of four sections and seven runs attracted a great deal of attention with 79 applications being received for the 11 holdings offered. Nine settlers were selected from those applying.
Figure 3.: Average Wool Prices per Pound.

SOURCE: Delgaty's annual wool review
as no applications were received for two of the sections offered. However, one of the successful applicants withdrew on selection because of ill-health and a further two withdrew stating only that they had decided not to accept the land. This resulted in six settlers taking up land on the Teviot Settlement in 1924.

The six sections and three runs still unoccupied in November 1924 underwent major boundary alterations carried out by the Otago Land Board and were re-offered at a third ballot as six holdings in 1925. There was no difficulty attracting settlers for these reorganised holdings, with the average number of applicants for each of the three runs being 47, and for each of the three sections, 21. One run received no fewer than 60 applicants. This demand for the land contrasted with the interest shown at previous ballots suggests the manner of the subdivision and subsequent holding size as a significant factor in delaying their selection.

The slow occupancy of the Teviot Settlement (Table 3) differs from most other soldier settlements where the land tended to be selected quickly after being offered. The Benmore and Clifton Settlements are an example of this and both were fully settled after one land ballot (Maloney 1982). Only five years after the Teviot Settlement was first offered for selection was the land fully occupied.

The Teviot soldier settlement was one of the areas bought by the government to provide land for discharged soldiers and was subdivided to allow closer settlement than previously. The success of this settlement in meeting the government's aims are now examined.
**TABLE 3: SELECTION OF TEVIOT HOLDINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SECTIONS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OFFERED</td>
<td>TAKEN</td>
<td>OFFERED</td>
<td>TAKEN</td>
<td>OFFERED</td>
<td>% TAKEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st BALLOT 1921</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6*</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETWEEN 1921-1924</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd BALLOT 1924</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd BALLOT 1925</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 15 \] \[ n = 15 \]

* Applicants withdrawing on selection, excluded
CHAPTER 3

THE STABILITY OF THE TEVIOT SUBDIVISION

The way in which land was subdivided for settlement is repeatedly cited as important to the eventual success or failure of soldier settlements. Maloney (1982) for example, argues that in Otago, soldiers were offered farms which were too small to be profitable. The same was found by Allan (1967) in South Canterbury. Both these authors found faulty subdivision contributed to the failure (as they defined it) of the settlements. This chapter examines the subdivision for the Teviot Settlement and discusses its importance to the outcome of this soldier settlement.

One useful measure of the success of a subdivision is the maintenance or relative stability of the boundaries over a period of time. The original Teviot holdings offered for selection in 1921 will be compared with their later boundaries. If changes occurred in the boundaries after the first ballot in 1921, this would indicate that there was a deficiency in the initial subdivision. The stability of boundaries will be assessed in terms of changes to the size of runs and sections and by the change in the links between runs and sections which were offered together to form a holding.

The boundaries published in 1921 will be compared with those published in 1924 and 1925, and with the size of holdings quoted by the Otago Land Board in the files of Lands and Survey for 1931 and 1936. Minor changes in the area of holding over this time will be disregarded as likely to be the result of survey errors.

The 1921 Subdivision

The Teviot Settlement was surveyed into 46 holdings, 20 sections and 13 sections which were to be farmed in conjunction with 13 runs
(figure 2). The linkage of some sections with runs, although physically miles apart, was intended to permit the utilisation of both the back country and dry front section in as effective a way as possible. The land incorporated in the runs was former leasehold land and comprised mainly tall tussock grass growing above 600 metres. As described previously (see Chapter 2), care was taken by the Otago Land Board over the form of the subdivision with the intention of creating the most suitable single man holdings on the land available. The stability of the boundaries established for runs and sections, and the links between, are examined.

3.1 RUNS

The 13 runs surveyed in 1921 ranged in size from 1,382 to 5,760 acres (Table 4). Only one of the run boundaries was changed in any significant way. The largest run, number 643, was split into two smaller units by its lease in 1927. This subdivision occurred as the owner found, after five years' occupancy, that the holding was too large to be farmed satisfactorily by one person.

Minor changes were made to the boundaries on other runs but all involved less than 2% of their total area, and are most likely to indicate survey errors. Overall, the boundaries established for the runs remained relatively unchanged from 1921-1936, when the last information on the boundaries of holding is available (there was only one change over this time). An evaluation of the stability of runs is incomplete in this form as consideration must also be made of the section-run links on the settlement. Some sections and runs were linked as only in this way was the land considered to form a suitable holding. The success of runs was dependent on their adequate integration with sections to provide winter pasture.
### TABLE 4: RUN SIZE, 1921 AND 1936

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RUN</th>
<th>1921 (acres)</th>
<th>1936 (acres)</th>
<th>Change in area (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>602</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>1382</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>2682</td>
<td>2682</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>2160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>2940</td>
<td>2940</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>4450</td>
<td>4450</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>633</td>
<td>2310</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>2405</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>5540</td>
<td>5490</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>4610</td>
<td>4530</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>4830</td>
<td>4790</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>5760</td>
<td>(4000)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 13 \quad n = 14 \]
3.2 **LINKAGES**

Sections linked with runs had a great variation in size, ranging from 575 to 1,046 acres (Table 5). The size of the section in proportion to the size of their runs was also very varied with some sections being in an area of only 12.5% of their run size while others were as large as 52% of their run size. By 1926 seven of the 13 sections linked with runs had been altered in some way. Five of these sections had changed their original size while three had link changes. Of the five sections which had area changes, three were increased in size by 7.7%, 15.9% and 17% each, and two decreased by 6.5% and 4.1% of their 1921 size while remaining linked to their original runs.

In 1925 two sections, proportionately small in comparison to their runs, were unlinked and the runs had new sections allotted to replace them. This occurred after the holdings had failed by 1925 to become occupied. One of the runs was re-linked with a section, previously linked to another run, to provide the run with a much larger section. Each of the changes was an attempt by the Otago Land Board to create a better balanced holding of summer and winter pasture.

Another change in section-run linkage was made after a request was made by a settler of five years to exchange his linked section for a more suitable one. The request was granted as the Land Board agreed that the original section was not the most suitable for the run which it was linked to. The new section chosen by the settler was 200 acres smaller, but closer by road to the run than the previous section. One further linkage change occurred when run 643 was subdivided in 1927 and a section had to be linked to the new holding. This was done simply, as the settler who took over the lease of part of 643 already owned a section.
### TABLE 5

SIZE AND PROPORTION OF TOTAL HOLDING OF LINKED SECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Size 1921 (acres)</th>
<th>% Total Run-Section Holding</th>
<th>% Change in Section Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>+ 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>+ 17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>- 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>+ 15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,046</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>- 4.1b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>+ 7.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In all, five links were altered between 1921 and 1927 and a further five of the linked sections had a change of boundary. The total area of the sections linked to runs increased by 989 acres, mainly through the addition of a section to link with part of run 643 when it was subdivided, and the average size of these sections increased from 716 acres in 1921 to 735.5 acres in 1927.

Attempts to integrate the linked sections and runs into more suitable holdings was effected mainly by changing linkages (figure 5). These changes were found to be necessary after the formation of the original subdivision because in some cases holdings had been produced which were just not economically viable. To ensure full settlement of the land, the Land Board found it was necessary to change some of the holding links. Only seven of the 13 section-run links, and the size of these holdings, remained constant after 1921 (figure 4). The changes which occurred all took place before 1927.

3.3 SECTIONS

The original subdivision established 20 single sections and 13 run-sections. The run-sections have been dealt with, but will be included in this discussion in order to provide an understanding of the total changes to section boundaries which occurred on the Teviot Settlement. Eleven sections changed in size between 1921-1926, five of which were on sections linked with runs and six on single sections.

The increase in size which occurred on linked sections (7.7%, 15.9% and 17%) were in respect of the sections linked with the smallest runs, and two were on holdings abandoned by their first selectors. The increase in section size by the Otago Land Board after these holdings were left vacant suggests that the character of the section-run link was part of the cause. Of the two linked sections which were reduced in size,
one occurred because the section was being re-linked with a smaller run which did not require as large a section, while the second was reduced because it was unlinked and no longer needed to provide support for a run.

Five of the six unlinked sections which underwent changes in boundary were increased in size, while one was eliminated completely. The sections were increased by 28%, 26.4%, 10.1%, 10% and 5.9% of their original area through the redistribution of the 636 acres from the section which was eliminated. All sections involved in area change had failed to be selected in the 1921 ballot. By increasing their size, the Otago Land Board hoped to encourage settlement of these holdings. All of these sections were on the eastern block of the settlement which had originally been regarded as the most suitable area for subdivision. As a consequence of this evaluation the area was closely subdivided, but this proved to be unsuitable and the holdings increased in size.

In November 1924 the decision was taken to change the boundaries of the six sections which were still unselected, as it appeared unlikely that they would attract settlers in their existing form. Previously applications had been received by some individuals who wished to occupy two of these six sections, but no applicants were willing to settle on holdings as offered. One applicant who applied for sections 7 and 21, described section 7 as being 'too small to enable a man to get a living' while another criticised section 34 as 'too small and dear by itself' (FLS 4/27 (4), 3.3.24). A further section involved in the changes had been described by a Teviot settler as 'very high and cold and very far back and also bad with rabbits. It is only fit to run in conjunction with another block' (FLS 4/27 (4), 3.12.24).

Three of these sections still vacant in 1924 had had rent
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increases of £10 or £20 in 1922 in an attempt by the Otago Land Board to show a credit on the Teviot Settlement balance sheet. Section rents were already high as a result of the Estate having been purchased at $6 an acre and the amount of roading which was needed necessitated further expenditure. The high rents, in conjunction with falling wool prices and the small size of the sections, deterred potential selectors. Further, these six sections were classified as second class land in 1921, but were reclassified in 1936 as third class. The officially unrecognised poor quality of the land is likely to have been another factor in their failure to be selected.

To encourage selection of the six vacant sections, four were amalgamated to form two holdings as applicants had been requesting, and two of the sections previously linked with runs were combined to form one single holding. The vacant land was not redistributed among existing selected sections as the Commissioner of Crown Lands did not think 'any of the vacant sections could be satisfactorily utilised to enlarge the present selected small sections' (FLS 4/27 (5), 1.8.24). The new amalgamated holdings were readily selected when offered in 1925.

One further amalgamation occurred in 1925 when two sections reverted to a mortgage company after the owners were both convicted of sheep stealing. The mortgage company considered both sections to be too small on their own to attract new settlers and requested the Otago Land Board to allow their merger into one holding. This, not all boundary changes were initiated by the Land Board; some were the result of the desire of individuals to create change. The reasons for altering section boundaries, whether by the Land Board or others, was always to secure a more suitable farm unit either by increasing the area of the holding or changing the run-section links.
3.4 DISCUSSION OF SUBDIVISIONAL STABILITY

Between 1921 and 1927 changes to the original surveyed area occurred on 19 of the 33 sections surveyed, with respect to size, amalgamation and links with runs. Only one run was altered through subdivision, although four runs had section links changed. With respect to the changes in the size of sections, 13 occurred on the 20 single sections, and six on the sections originally linked with runs. Only 14 of the total 33 sections remained with unchanged boundaries in 1927.

By 1926 instead of the 33 farm units originally surveyed, only 29 existed. The reduction of four holdings on the Teviot Settlement was the result of amalgamation and in one case, elimination. The Land Board's attempt to promote close settlement on Teviot had meant in the first instance, excessive subdivision. The eastern block, particularly, was cut into uneconomically small units which later had to be increased.

When it became apparent after the first and second ballots that some of the holdings were not being selected because of their small size and high rents, the Land Board readily altered the subdivision. Sections still unselected by the end of 1924 underwent further revisions to create more attractive holdings. It was only after subdivisional changes had been made to increase the size of some holdings and create a better balance between section and run holdings that the Teviot Settlement boundaries ceased to change, and from 1926 on the land was fully occupied. Changes did occur through ownership transactions where several settlers sold out to others, but from 1926 no further intervention was necessary by the Otago Land Board to produce a suitable subdivision.

Although care had been taken over the initial subdivision,
boundaries did have to be altered both before land was selected and after, yet the extent of the changes on the Teviot Settlement were minor in comparison to changes found necessary on other soldier settlements, where little attention had been paid to topography and climatic conditions (Maloney 1982). Seven of the run-section holdings on the Teviot Settlement remained unchanged in 1936, as did eight of the boundaries of the single sections.

The success of the subdivision and its stability can only be assessed when ownership changes are also considered. The revisions to the original survey which existed by 1926 (figure 6) resulted in the creation of a subdivision well suited to the land, and which had few later changes. The maintenance of these holdings as separate units and the continuity in their ownership are two further criteria by which success of this settlement can be assessed.
CHAPTER 4

THE STABILITY OF TEVIOT SETTLERS

A further criteria for assessing the success of the Teviot Settlement is the extent of ownership changes which occurred between 1921-1940, or the 'stability' of the settlers.

Powell (1971) records the number of forfeited and surrendered soldier holdings in Otao and suggests a very high level of mobility among soldier settlers which merits the attention of more comprehensive analysis. Maloney (1982) also found there was a high level of movement by soldiers off the land they had selected. On the Clifton soldier settlement, 38% of the settlers had departed within three years, while on the Benmore soldier settlement, all soldiers excluding one had moved away from the land by 1930 (Maloney 1982, 57).

This section will establish the frequency of movement off the Teviot Settlement by settlers between 1921-1940. The movement of the first selectors off the settlement and then the mobility of this group and all subsequent settlers will be examined. The farming experience and background of the first settlers will also be determined. Any administrative changes and the prevailing economic conditions which could affect farmers, are also considered to determine their effect on the length of time settlers were resident at Teviot.

Movement by settlers, both soldier and civilian, off the Teviot Settlement within five years of taking up residence will be used as evidence of settler instability and possible reflection of the successfulness of this soldier settlement. The conditions of land selection included a five year residency clause for the selector and transfer of land was only allowed within five years of selection in exceptional circumstances, subject to the approval of the District Land
The reasons identified as the cause of settlers departing will be considered to determine why the movement of settlers off the land took place. The reasons found at Teviot will be compared with reasons given for the failure of soldier settlements by Allan (1967), and with those cited by the Inquiry Board in 1923 for the Otago Land District.

4.1 THE ORIGINAL TEVIOT LAND SETTLERS

Of the 31 successful applicants who settled land on the Teviot Settlement, nine of the settlers had departed within three years, while a further three settlers left within five years of selecting land. Thirty-eight per cent of the original settlers left before the five year residency clause of land selection had been fulfilled, this is a much lower level than that apparent on other soldier settlements (Maloney 1982). Twelve of the original land settlers remained on the Teviot Settlement in 1940, 15 years after they first arrived, whereas on the Benmore soldier settlement, all of the original settlers had left by this date, 17 years after it was first settled.

For this study a questionnaire (Appendix B) was compiled and completed for 26 of the 31 original settlers. Information about the settlers was obtained from their original land application forms to the Otago Land Board and from Lands and Deeds records. Five of the original land applications forms were missing from the archives and to obtain information about these settlers, it was necessary to rely solely on Land and Deeds records which provided only incomplete information. This questionnaire enabled the characteristics of the original settlers, their previous farm experience, the type of land tenure selected, year of selection, and any subsequent purchases of land, used to assess factors affecting the length of time the first land settlers remained on the Teviot Settlement.
Fewer than half the Teviot settlers were in fact discharged soldiers. The rest were civilians who were able to apply for land on this settlement after 1922 when the clause setting the Teviot land aside for discharged soldiers only, was revoked by the Otago Land Board.

All of the Teviot settlers came from locations within the Otago and Canterbury provinces. The previous place of residence was very diverse between these settlers within these two provinces, with the exception of six settlers who all came from Miller's Flat. This area, less than five miles from the Settlement, was the only location to have more than two applicants accepted as Teviot settlers. This high number of settlers from Miller's Flat which had only a small population suggests that the Otago Land Board favoured applicants' knowledge of the land being offered for selection. The disproportionate number of settlers from Miller's Flat in relation to its size suggests, moreover, that the land ballot was not in fact completely random, but the suitability of applicants closely examined. The suitability of applicants from the local area for selection as settlers on the Teviot Settlement was accurately assessed by the Otago Land Board as all six of the Miller's Flat settlers remained on the Settlement for longer than five years. The settlement expectations of these local applicants, in conjunction with their assessment of the land's productivity and the climate of the area, made them suitable candidates for selection. This group of settlers had first hand realistic knowledge of the settlement enabling them to adapt to the conditions. This is of importance as the Lands and Survey descriptions of the settlement and the land tended to be ambiguous, making the area sound particularly attractive when in fact it did have many unattractive features. Sections offered for selection in 1924 were described as 'undulating ... containing a large proportion of ploughable land. The soil is good schist loam' (Lands and Survey Map 21/94, 1924). This description does not accurately describe all
sections, many of which were rugged with steep gullies. The term 'undulating' was too mild in this context, especially as it can be interpreted in so many different ways depending upon past experience; the 'undulating' land of South Canterbury is quite unlike the area referred to by the Otago Land Board at Teviot. The generalised description by the Lands and Survey Department of the Teviot sections enabled the holdings being offered for selection to sound much more attractive to potential settlers than they actually were.

Although 12 of the original settlers (out of 26) had had previous applications for land declined, and most of these also by the Otago Land Board, the quality of the Teviot settlers does not appear to have been in any way inferior to that of other settlements established in Otago. The stability of residence of Teviot settlers was greater than on other soldier settlements which have been studied.

The need for soldiers to have some prior farming experience before being allotted land, was stressed by the government at the time the Discharged Soldier Settlement Bill was introduced in 1915, but although plans to establish farm training schools were proposed, these never eventuated.

In 1920 the Commissioner of Crown Lands, Otago, advocated that soldiers wishing to settle at Teviot be employed as farm labourers on the Teviot Station with the assurance that 'those who make good will, when the time comes, be allotted sections' (FLS 1/27 (2), 1.3.20).

This promise was never carried out, but the Otago Land Board's concern that settlers should have previously had adequate farming experience to take up a holding is shown by those who were selected.
Previous Farm Experience

The Otago Land Board in its reports, was inclined to lay a sizeable portion of the blame for failure of soldier holdings at the doorstep of the settler himself (Powell 1971a, 156). The Inquiry Board however, reported in 1923 that only 20% of the unsuccessful soldier farms in Otago had inexperience or incorrect farming techniques as a factor contributing to their failure (AJHR 1923, C-9A). All of the original Teviot settlers whose land application forms were available were used to determine what effect previous farming experience had on length of residency. A question on the land application form asking each applicant to state present occupation and another asking for past farm experience, were used. This latter question enabled previous experience to be quantified, as most applicants had recorded experience as a certain number of years, providing a more objective measure of experience than the stated occupation. Many settlers appeared to have taken up non-farm work after the war, although they had previously been employed on farms, and this was not always evident from the occupation stated.

All of the applicants who were chosen as settlers for the Teviot land had had some previous experience in farming. The extent of the farming experience ranged from less than one year to over 20 years. Only five of the settlers had had less than two years' experience when applying for the land. Twenty of the original land selectors had more than 10 years experience with half of these stating "life" as their length of experience (Table 6). The term 'life' is unquantifiable but obviously indicates considerable farming experience. The variation of farm experience was similar for both soldier and civilian settlers.
The previous occupations stated by each settler on his land application form were divided into two groups: farm related and non-farm related. This enabled the former occupations of the settlers to be compared with their length of residency on the settlement. Sixteen settlers recorded previous occupations as farm related while only nine had non-farm related occupations prior to their selection of land on the Teviot Settlement. Eleven settlers who had previously had farm employment, and four who had not, remained on the settlement for over 10 years. A greater proportion of those who recorded former occupation as farm related remained longer on the Teviot Settlement than those who did not.

Settlers who left the settlement within two years had a similar variation in the length of farm experience as settlers who were still on the land in 1940. One settler, with more than 10 years farm experience, left the settlement within 24 months while two settlers with less than two years experience at the time of selection, were still on the settlement in 1940. This contrast suggests that previous farm experience did not have a major influence on the length of occupation of settlers on the Teviot Settlement, and is in accord
with the conclusion reached for two other soldier settlements by Maloney (1982). However, as none of the Teviot settlers were completely inexperienced in farming, with all having had some experience even if less than one year, the conclusion that previous farm experience does not affect length of settlement cannot be generalised beyond the group studied. Whether or not settlers with no previous experience would have had a similar pattern of stability of residency as the experienced Teviot settlers is a point still unknown.

A comparative study is necessary between those individuals who were selected to become farmers, and those who were declined land by the Land Boards, in order for the importance of previous farm experience to be fully determined. A comparison of this nature would provide an interesting insight into the characteristics of those who were selected to become settlers under the government's soldier settlement scheme, but does not come within the scope of this study.

Land Tenure and Length of Residence

Land on the Teviot Settlement was offered under two different tenures. Runs were offered on a lease to be held in conjunction with a licence of a specific section, while single sections were to form holdings on their own without the support of a run. Run-section holdings changed hands less frequently than did the single sections, with no run having more than three owners from time of selection until 1940, while three single sections had four owners in this time (Table 7).
The three runs on which the most ownership changes took place were all areas of tall tussock where seasonal snow generally continued into the spring. This type of run was the least profitable because of its altitude, and as a consequence, had the greatest change of owners, but even these holdings with three owners in 16 years is not necessarily evidence of an unsuccessful settlement.

Within five years of selection, only two runs had changed hands, while in the same time, seven of the single sections had a new owner. Of the original settlers of the Teviot Settlement, 12 still remained on the land in 1940.

Seven of these permanent residents were run holders while only five were section owners, although the number of single sections far out-numbered the number of runs. The size of the sections which were linked to the runs did not affect the holdings' ability to retain a settler. Runs with allotted sections which were only a small proportion of the run size had the same tendency for settlers to remain on these holdings, as did those runs which were linked to large sections. Conversely the size of a single section was important in influencing the length of residency of the settler on that holding. Single sections with settlers who remained for the shortest time were also those which
had the smallest land area. This relationship between size of holding and length of residency supports the finding in South Canterbury that the small size of holdings was the principal reason for soldier farmers to fail (Allan 1967, 85). The Teviot sections which had the greatest number of ownership changes were located on the eastern side of the settlement. This area had been closely subdivided because of the valuer's report which emphasised its suitability for subdivision. The result of this subdivision was the production of single sections which were too small to be profitable, and in 1925 these were reported by the Crown Rangers for the area to be badly infested with rabbits. These holdings continued to have frequent owner changes until they had become greatly increased in size either through amalgamation with other sections carried out by the Otago Land Board prior to 1925, or through purchase by settlers who already owned land on the settlement. These sections had not proved to be as adequately formed as was anticipated because although the area was well watered, the nature of the Teviot land and climate meant to be farmed, best holdings required either to be larger in size or to be supported by summer run country.

The holdings with the fewest changes in settlers (figure 7) were those clustered on the western side of the settlement. This area had not been originally as closely subdivided because of its perceived poor water supply. There was one severe drought which affected the settlement during 1924-1925 but the larger western holdings were able to adequately support their settlers because of their size. A recent land use capability study (Otago Regional Water Board, 1976) has identified this area as Class IV or VII land, capable of moderate grazing and limited cultivation, whereas other areas of the settlement are today designated as Class VIII land. It would appear that in 1920 the Lands and Survey under-assessed the western block and regarded it as being of much poorer quality land than it later proved to be, while
The production potential of the eastern block was overestimated. The integration of summer and winter country as was carried out to form linked run-section holdings proved to be the best subdivision arrangement with these combinations retaining settlers longer than single sections.

Year of Selection

The year in which holdings were selected proved to have an effect on the length of residence of the settlers. Nine holdings were selected in 1924, and only three of these selectors still remained on the land in 1940; while of the 12 holdings taken in 1923, only one was still held by the original settler in 1940. The one holding which retained its settler was a section which had been greatly enlarged prior to its selection. Seven of the holdings taken in 1923 had settlers depart within three years of selection, whereas none of the holdings taken in 1924 or in 1925 had had settlers leave in this time.

Holdings selected in 1925 tended to retain their original settlers because these were the holdings which had been subject to boundary changes prior to their selection. The later date at which holdings were selected, the more stable was their subsequent ownership (figure 7). This is a result of the reorganisation which occurred within the Teviot Settlement after the original subdivision of the land was made. Some holdings had their boundaries altered prior to their selection in 1925, and this, in conjunction with the general improvements which occurred in the economy after 1926, provided increased land areas which resulted in better incomes for these settlers. These later settlers were thus more likely to become profitable farmers and hence remained on the land. Holdings selected after 1923 were also those which had been revalued and given rent reductions, which helped the new settlers financially. The lower rents of the later selected holdings enabled settlers to meet financial
commitments in order to maintain themselves on the land more easily than those who took up land under the original rents.

Until 1924 only soldier settlers were eligible for rent revaluations as provisions for this were set out in the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Amendment Act, 1923. This 1923 Amendment Act set up the Dominion Revaluation Board which was constituted with the power to revalue and reduce the land price and rents on soldier holdings, where it was deemed necessary for their continued maintenance. The revaluations which were made were back-dated to 1 July 1921, or the date of the lease commencement. Teviot civilian settlers were not eligible for this financial assistance until later legislation was passed. Runs selected by soldiers on the settlement in 1921 had rents reduced by the Revaluation Board in 1922, in response to the Commissioner of Crown Lands who at the time the runs were selected stated 'the rentals are too high to enable the settlers to make a living' (FLS 4/27 (3), 19.7.21).

The rents placed on the Teviot holdings had been appropriate at the time they were set, but with the declining prices for agricultural products after 1921, the rents were too high for the settlers to meet. Runs selected in 1921 were reduced 40-57% of their original rent but none of the sections received rent reductions as they were still considered to be appropriate. Rents had been set in relation to the costs of the land purchase and the subsequent preparations for the settlement. An addition £60 had been placed on the Teviot holdings after the initial rents were suggested to provide extra revenue for the additional roading needed. This extra increase made the rents exorbitant and was a factor which hindered the sections becoming selected.
In 1925 the Dominion Revaluation Board advised that reductions of up to 48% be given to rents on 12 of the sections owned by soldiers, which had not previously been revalued. Later that same year, a further seven sections, with civilian settlers, were granted one year's remission of rent while the remaining eight sections, which had not previously had rent reductions, underwent revaluation.

By the end of 1925 all Teviot holdings, both soldier and civilian, had been revalued. Rent reductions enabled those acquiring holdings, after they had been revalued, to remain on the land, whereas earlier settlers often could not, the revaluation coming much too late for them to be able to cope financially and remain.

The six Teviot holdings selected in 1921 had few ownership changes with three of the six holdings having only one owner up to 1940, an apparent contradiction with previous statements. However, this was because these 1921 holdings were taken by selectors who had first choice of the land, and who took the most attractive holdings - the runs. These 1921 selectors were also all soldiers, and therefore eligible for early rent reductions. Runs with their links to sections offered settlers a more traditional unit in this area, and the rents were lower in proportion to the amount of land in each of these holdings in comparison to the separate sections. Soldiers as a group were relatively stable settlers because they had first selection of the land, and had in general purchased run holdings.

Purchase of Additional Land

In two counties adjacent to Tuapeka it was found that pastoralists responded to falling product prices by increasing stock numbers (O'Connor 1980, 210). One means of farming to increase stock numbers was to buy additional land and thus enlarge the area of land they had available for
stock carrying. Additional land purchases, in response to the economic situation, was used by 12 of the 18 settlers who remained longer than 10 years on the Teviot Settlement, to increase the size of their land holdings (Table 8).

Eight of the additional land areas purchased by settlers were inside the Teviot Settlement, and a further four were on land close to the settlement. The land purchased by settlers outside the settlement comprised of small blocks which were purchased with the intention of erecting houses, as well as for using the area surrounding the house as extra winter grazing. The houses on the Teviot Settlement tended to be clustered on the south side of the Settlement close to the roads leading to Roxburgh. Some of the settlers' houses were built farther away on their section holdings, although the land close to the Clutha River held more appeal as a location, apparently because of the easy access. The original settlers were responsible for establishing their own houses as only some holdings had dwellings at the time of selection with financial assistance available to soldiers for this purpose.

The purchase of additional land by some settlers suggests they considered that their original holdings were inadequate. Some runholders felt that the balance of winter and summer country was not suitable and some were forced to buy more freehold land for wintering stock, in order to take advantage of their large area of summer country. However, runholders were less likely to purchase additional land than were owners of single sections. Owners of these sections, which had not been increased by the Otago Land Board prior to selection, purchased more additional land than those who possessed holdings which had been increased by the Land Board prior to selection. Two section owners increased their properties by acquiring the lease of adjacent sections. This extra land enabled them to increase stock numbers and hereby a more
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Runs</th>
<th>Additional Purchase (acres)</th>
<th>% of Original Section Holding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>604</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>605</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>606</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>607</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>639</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>640</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>641</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>644</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections</th>
<th>Additional Purchase (acres)</th>
<th>% of Original Section Holding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 + 7</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 + 3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>104.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 + 35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
satisfactory income. The single sections on their own were inadequate to meet financial needs of these settlers. Generally, on the Teviot Settlement, the smaller the section, the more likely the owner was to have purchased additional land. With declining wool and stock prices the small sections clearly did not have the carrying capacity to support the settler.

The six settlers who remained on the settlement for over 10 years and who did not purchase additional land were on holdings which had been increased in size, or which had undergone a section link change prior to selection. These changes developed holdings which were better suited to the farmers' needs, and as a result, were not deficient, and did not require the purchase of extra land to make them into viable holding. Single section owners purchased more additional land than runholders because they were the owners of a less satisfactory holding, altogether too small, and with high rents which made them uneconomical on their own.

All additional land purchases were of section land. Sections were available to be bought as additional land because some owners left. The settler who remained the longest on the Teviot Settlement did tend to invest in more land and increase the size of the original holding; no settler who left within five years of selection acquired more land before departing. Purchase of additional land was a factor in determining length of ownership, but whether or not this caused settlers to remain longer, or was the result of their long residency, is unclear.

4.2 OCCUPANCY OF ALL TEVIOT SETTLERS

By 1940, although many holdings had changed hands, only a total of 40 settlers had owned land on the Teviot Settlement (joint ownership counted as one) and 31 of these were original land settlers. Only nine
new settlers took land transferred from settlers who were selected before 1926, at which time on the settlement was fully occupied. These nine later settlers do not account for all ownership changes which occurred after 1926, as many holdings were transferred from one Teviot settler to another. By 1940 there were only 24 farms on the Teviot Settlement where previously there had been 29. This decrease in holdings was the result of settlers purchasing additional sections on the settlement, and the amalgamation of titles.

Two groups of movement away from the land occurred (figure 10): the first was in 1926-1927 when seven holdings had ownership transfers; the second group of departures took place between 1932-1935. Both these periods of movement reflect the economic situation faced by many settlers at the time. Wool prices fell in 1925 and again during 1931-1932, as part of the depression which affected New Zealand for the first half of the 1930s. The 1924-1925 farm season was described as one with a 'disastrous slump in prices' (Dalgety Annual Wool Review 28) while the 1925-1926 season was described as even worse for the farmer. The average price paid for wool in Dunedin over the 1925 season was only 13d compared with 20d paid for the previous season.

The rent reductions were not enough to help settlers already in difficulty and many left in the years 1926-1927. All wool from the Teviot Settlement was transported by rail to Dunedin, where it was sold on the Dunedin wool market. The wool slump which affected New Zealand during the 1930s was even greater in Dunedin where wool prices were, in normal times, below the average New Zealand wool price (figure 3). Many settlers found that low wool prices made it impossible for them to remain on the land, as financial commitments could not be met. Those who did not leave the land still encountered difficulties meeting rent demands during the 1930 depression. Farmers at Teviot who did not leave the land petitioned the Otago Land Board in 1931, and again in 1932, for
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further rent reductions. Bodkin (MP Otago Central) supported the Teviot settlers' petition and indeed claimed that if the situation continued unchanged 'every soldier settler will be completely crushed off the property' (FLS 4/27 (7), 1932). Despite this assertion, events proved him to be wrong. The petition by the Teviot settlers pointed out the problems created by some settlers having a holding with the run and section on average 10-16 miles apart, causing valuable time to be lost on travel and where heavy snow often made it impossible for farmers to reach their runs. To overcome this problem, the settlers had to make better use of winter country and were obliged to put in irrigation which was, in turn, very expensive. The settlers considered the rent revaluation, prior to 1925, inadequate as at the time these levies were set, the wool prices were improving. The high price paid to the government for stock from the Teviot Station was a further factor in the settlers' financial difficulties causing requests to be made for further rent reductions. Only three of the 12 settlers who applied for revaluations were not in arrears for rent in 1933 (Table 9). Eleven of the settlers were over £300 in arrears, while a further settler had arrears over £600. In 1932, with respect to seven holdings, the Otago Land Board postponed the rests that were due that year until 1934 to help settlers; financially this was regarded as a gesture and criticised as inadequate assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount in Arrears</th>
<th>Number of Settlers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-299</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300-399</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-499</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-599</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-699</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( n = 21 \)
Rent paid by the Teviot settlers in 1933 was calculated as a percentage of their gross wool income to gain an objective measure by which to judge the situation facing Teviot settlers. A report on the Teviot settlers who applied for rent reduction was compiled for the Otago Land Board in 1933, and enabled the number of sheep run on each of these holdings and the average wool slip for that year, to be obtained. The price paid for wool in Dunedin where the Teviot settlers would have sold their supplies was 6.67d, and from this wool incomes for 21% of the settlers was calculated (Table 10). Wool was the main source of income although settlers would also have sold some sheep. Gross income cannot be calculated because the number of sheep sold from each holding is unknown, however, calculation of rent as a percentage of gross wool income gives some indication of the financial situation facing Teviot settlers in the 1930s.

The three settlers who did not request a rent revaluation (two of these had only recently purchased their holdings in 1933) two of these were run holders, and one was on a single section which had been revalued in 1926 and been subject to boundary changes in 1924. The failure of these three settlers to apply for rent reductions could have been related either to their recent occupation of the land or evidence of the satisfactory nature of the holdings.

The 21 settlers who requested rent revaluations said they had 'been burdened with exorbitant rentals' (FLS 4/27 (5), 1932) and maintained that despite the previous land revaluations, the rents were still too high to make the holdings viable economic units. High rents, as they described them, together with the low prices for wool and meat, had caused considerable financial difficulties.

The revaluations made in 1924 were at a time when the average price per pound of wool was 21.9d for New Zealand; in 1925 when
### TABLE 10

**1933 RENT AS PERCENTAGE OF GROSS WOOL INCOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Holding</th>
<th>Total Wool lbs</th>
<th>Gross Wool Income £ s</th>
<th>1933 Rent £ s</th>
<th>% Rent GWI</th>
<th>Col. 1 New Rent 1933 % GWI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Runs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,720</td>
<td>186 76</td>
<td>163 00</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,250</td>
<td>618 36</td>
<td>319 2</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,522</td>
<td>709 29</td>
<td>228 12</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>575 28</td>
<td>292 1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>311 26</td>
<td>152 00</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,325</td>
<td>592 65</td>
<td>354 11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,250</td>
<td>534 98</td>
<td>202 13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26,720</td>
<td>742 59</td>
<td>325 00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,912.5</td>
<td>470 00</td>
<td>299 00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,750</td>
<td>437 7</td>
<td>302 10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22,800</td>
<td>633 65</td>
<td>242 2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n = 12</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,580</strong></td>
<td><strong>571 95</strong></td>
<td><strong>200 13</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sections</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>311 27</td>
<td>286 11</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>236 23</td>
<td>270 16</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,730</td>
<td>270 41</td>
<td>112 00</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>667 00</td>
<td>309 3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,440</td>
<td>373 52</td>
<td>292 12</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>291 81</td>
<td>139 10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>444 67</td>
<td>220 10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>541 94</td>
<td>295 10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n = 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,210</strong></td>
<td><strong>589 46</strong></td>
<td><strong>261 9</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 Average weight wool clip x total flock

*2 Total wool weight x 6.67, price per lb wool, Dunedin 1933
further revaluations were made it was a high at 24.7d. By 1930 the wool price had fallen drastically to only 6.34d per pound and was still less than 7d by 1932 when settlers complained of financial difficulties. Reason for the settlers' anxiety is apparent when rent as percentage of gross wool income is compared. Five of the runholders were paying over 50% of their wool income on rent while a further settler was paying over 87%. The settlers on sections were in an even worse position with five of the nine settlers paying over 50% of their wool income in rent, and one settler even having a rent greater than his total wool income.

As a result of the petition made by Teviot settlers and the Otago Land Board's inspection of their condition, rents were altered in 1933 (Table 10, column 2). Seventeen settlers received rent reductions which, together with the increase in wool prices in 1934 to an average of 15.15d per pound in Dunedin, resulted in most of the Teviot settlers being placed in a reasonable financial position. Rents were also increased on two sections and one run; a 2% rent increase being made on one section which was described as 'good ewe country' and a 12% increase was made on another section which included 'deep loam soil suitable for cultivation'. This latter holding was considered by the Land Board to be stocked at levels well below the potential carrying capacity. The run which had a rent increase was reported by the 1933 inspectors to be a 'good holding' with a 'fair section', but was also being stocked well below carrying capacity.

The response of the Otago Land Board to the problems described by the Teviot settlers reveals that there was a concern to ensure as much as possible was done to make the settlement a success, and to retain settlers on the holdings. Unfortunately, no previous study has included details of rent revaluations or the percentage of income paid
in rent by soldier settlers, to enable a comparison to be made with trends evident on the Teviot Settlement. However, it would appear (Maloney 1982) that the Otago Land Board was not always as flexible in dealing with soldier settlers' complaints, as it was on the Teviot Settlement. Through persistent requests, the Teviot settlers did succeed in gaining a great deal of financial assistance from the Otago Land Board, and it was this assistance which helped settlers to remain on their holdings. Perhaps the earlier experience of the Land Board with soldier settlements, gained during the 1921 wool price slump when many soldiers were forced to leave the land, prompted the judicious care taken over the Teviot Settlement.

It appears that administrative flexibility was of considerable importance in the maintenance of settlers on their land. The Otago Land Board did not ascribe the general difficulties faced by Teviot settlers to individual inability of the settlers, not to a lack of initiative or experience, but accepted responsibility for implementing measures which the settlers felt would help meet their problems.

Reasons for Departure

From the time the first holdings were occupied until 1940, 21 settlers left the Teviot Settlement. Of those who left, three died, two were imprisoned, three abandoned their holdings, and a further 13 departed after selling their land.

The three settlers who abandoned their holdings all left within a year of selecting the land and were all on single sections which they considered to be too small with excessive rents. The 13 land transfers which occurred as the result of sales, appear to have been for economic reasons and occurred after, or during periods of depressed wool prices. When the given reason for settlers departing
is compared with the person's previous farm experience, it seems that
those with more than five years' farm experience tended to leave for
proportionately fewer economic reasons, than did those with less than
five years' experience. This suggests, in contrast to previous findings,
that farm experience possibly affected the length of residence.

When sales for other than economic reasons are excluded from
calculations, runholders continue to have a greater stability than do
single section owners. One settler left his section after repeated
applications to the Otago Land Board to be allowed to increase his
holding by securing another section, but his applications for additional
land were declined by the Land Board, which was of the view that the
settler involved already had a very fair holding. Another settler left
after two years, claiming that section 8 was 'very rabbity [and
with] too high a rent' (FLS 4/27 (6), 20.5.26). This section
referred to, later became part of a runholder's property as it was
unable to attract new settlers on its own merits. The settler's
judgement of the land had been accurate although not recognised by
the Land Board.

4.3 DISCUSSION OF SETTLER STABILITY

The extent of movement off the Teviot Settlement was less than
that which is indicated to be common on other soldier settlements.
Powell (1971a) recorded the length of tenure on forfeited and
surrendered soldier holdings for all Land Districts in New Zealand.
For Otago, the length of tenure for these holdings was 2.5 years, and
South Canterbury 89% of all soldier holdings which were failures, were
forfeited (Allan 1967). The presence of forfeiture is usually the
consequence of the inability of the farmer who is unable to comply
with lease conditions. Although the Discharged Soldier Settlement
Act, 1915, and Amendments provided for leniency where soldiers could
not meet lease conditions, forfeiture still occurred (Allan 1967, 70). The level of forfeiture recorded on other soldier settlements is in contrast to that which occurred on the Teviot Settlement. No holdings were forfeited, and only three surrendered. The surrender of leasehold property is commonly a result of economic difficulties encountered by the farmer, and while this did occur, no settlers were forced off the land through an inability to meet the conditions set by the Otago Land Board.

The high mobility of soldiers indicated by Powell (1971) and Maloney (1932) was not present on the Teviot Settlement, where only 29% of the original settlers left within five years of residency and 12 still remained in 1940. The year in which the settlement was opened, and the Otago Land Board's flexibility enabled this settlement to meet its main objective of providing land for permanent settlement. The Otago Land Board altered the original subdivisional plans where it was shown to be deficient and responded to representations for rent reductions.

Movement of settlers off the land which occur after it was fully occupied in 1926, was probably no more than could have been expected, given the unsettled prices for agricultural produce and the tendency for government settlements to have a movement of the first settlers.

The characteristics of the settlers and their previous experience in farming were assessed in respect of the original settlers and while there is little evidence that such factors are related to stability, there is need for more research in this area. The size of holdings and the year selected were important in the length of ownership of the Teviot settlers. Length of residence as a criterion for assessing success of a soldier settlement has been treated in a more comprehensive
way than in previous studies where length of ownership tended only to be examined prior to 1924; criteria used to define failure was the forfeiture or surrendering of the land. However,

'by employing forfeiture and surrender as criteria for measuring success, one cannot justifiably say that in Canterbury the first land settlement programme for discharged soldiers was a total failure' (Allan 1967, 128).

This study has overcome this limitation and provided a more detailed assessment of the movement of settlers from one settlement. The movement off the land at Teviot Settlement has been found to be not excessive, with economic factors and the form of the subdivision being the cause of most of the deliberate movement which took place. Judging stability of ownership as a criteria for success, the Teviot Settlement would appear to have been successful.
CHAPTER 5

CHANGING PRODUCTION LEVELS

A consequence of land subdivision and closer settlement was expected to be an increase in the production from the land. A concern about increasing production of the land in New Zealand was evident in 1920 with a Parliamentary speaker stating 'the land of this country must be made to produce more' (NZPD 186 (6 July 1920), 136). Production changes therefore, constitute a further criterion against which the success of the Teviot Settlement can be measured.

The specific measure of production used to ascertain change will be sheep numbers. The number of sheep carried on the land before and after subdivision are compared to determine the changes, if any, in sheep per acre carrying capacities. This is used as a measure of the total production of meat and wool on the settlement. Sheep were the sole source of income for the settlers on the Teviot land, other livestock being kept only for household use.

Some cultivation was also carried out but this was largely for the supply of winter feed, in itself a practice intended to increase stocking levels. A comparison between the actual carrying capacity given by settlers, and those estimated by the Revaluation Board inspectors, was made in order to assess how realistic the official estimates of the land's production potential was. Finally, sheep returns on Teviot land from 1907-1921 are compared with the trends in sheep carried for the Tuapeka County and Otago Land District over the same period (these dates are chosen as prior to 1907 the numbers of sheep carried on the Teviot land is unknown, and after 1921 statistics on sheep are not collected on a county basis). This comparison allows it to be determined whether the trends evident at Teviot were indeed similar to those taking place generally, or were specific to this land. This comparison will also be used to help assess whether changes which took place in the numbers
of sheep carried on the Teviot Settlement were a response to the subdivision of the land or to the general changes which were occurring in agriculture production at this time.

Sheep returns, to determine changes in carrying capacities, are derived from AJHR H-23, the New Zealand Official Yearbook, and the Lands and Survey Teviot files. Annual sheep returns are available for each land holder until 1930, but because of the confusion over the ownership of the Teviot Station prior to 1907, this renders it difficult to use these early returns. The sheep returns for the Teviot and Hillsprings Stations from 1907 can be used to measure the changes in production which occurred on the land until 1930, and although sheep returns relate to the land holders, rather than to the actual holdings, the constant study area allows the changing carrying capacity for the land to be established.

The number of sheep carried on the land 1907-1920 was calculated by adding the total sheep carried on the Teviot and Hillsprings Stations, while the 1921-1930 figures are drawn from the annual sheep returns for all settlers known to be on the Teviot Settlement. The numbers calculated for the Teviot Settlement are likely to slightly exceed the exact number on the settlement itself as some owners are known to have held land elsewhere which would increase their sheep numbers. The general trends still can be used to determine changing production levels.

5.1 SHEEP CARRYING CAPACITY

The Teviot Settlement, as in the Tuapeka County, had the Romney and Corriedale sheep as the dominant breeds, both types of sheep being suited to the moist climate and to the production of both meat and wool.

The number of sheep carried on the Teviot and Hillsprings Stations on 31 March 1907 to 1920 fluctuated constantly but in an upward direction
(figure 9). This trend follows that of the sheep returns for the Tuapeka County through to 1920 (figure 9), but only coincides with the trend in sheep carried for the whole Otago Land District until 1915 (figure 11). The differing fluctuations in sheep returns for the Teviot Station and the Tuapeka County most closely represent changing climatic conditions which often do not affect the whole of Otago.

Prior to the government's purchase of the Teviot Station in 1913, the number of sheep per acre on the freehold land was 1.38, while at the same time on the Hillsprings Station freehold it was 2.29 sheep per acre. This represents a carrying capacity, before the land was subdivided for soldier settlement, of 1.83 sheep per acre. Between 1907-1918, when the government purchased Teviot Station, the highest carrying capacity reached by this land was 1.93 sheep per acre and occurred in 1916. The Hillsprings Station had its highest carrying capacity of 2.84 sheep per acre in 1914.

After the Teviot Estate was purchased by the government and a manager placed on the land by the Otago Land Board, the number of sheep carried increased rapidly until the time the settlement began to be sold in its subdivided form (figure 12). The abrupt drop in sheep which occurs in 1919 and 1920 is a result of the mass sale of the Hillsprings sheep and this distorts the trend, whereby sheep numbers rose on Teviot Station at this time. The rise in sheep carried on the Teviot Station is likely to be a response to both better management of the land and the change in sheep and wool prices.

The removal of the commandeer system of government-guaranteed farm prices in June 1920 resulted in a slump in wool prices as the surplus of wool accumulated by the government during the war was put on the market in addition to the normal supply. The supply of wool which was much greater than consumption needs, led to a drastic fall in
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prices. A traditional pastoralist response to the fall in product prices, affecting income, is to increase stock numbers (O'Connor 1980, 216). This appears to have been the response of the Teviot manager and helps account for the rapid increase in sheep in 1920. The illness and uncertainty about the future of the Teviot Station would also have led to it having a lower number of sheep than usual when it was offered for sale.

There is a downward trend in the number of sheep carried on the Teviot Station from 1921-1925 with the exception of a rise in 1922. Sheep carried on holdings which did not have boundary changes were compared to assess whether there was any trend in the changing sheep numbers on individual holdings. It appears that runs, although showing some fluctuations, exhibited an overall increase in carrying capacity 1923-1933. The rate of increase varied from a doubling of sheep numbers within four years, to a much slower increase over 10 years. The variations in the changing stock numbers is likely to reflect differences in individual initiative and resources, as much as a difference in the carrying capacity potential between the holdings. The number of holdings without boundary changes for which information was available were insufficient for specific patterns to emerge.

Total settlement figures provide the only adequate basis for estimating changing carrying capacities as many individual holdings underwent changes resulting in the sheep returns given for settlers over the years referring to different land areas.

There was a general decline in sheep numbers on the Teviot Settlement 1921-1924 (despite an unsustained rise in 1922), which does not coincide with the trend for increase seen in the Otago Land District over this time. The decreasing sheep numbers on the Teviot Settlement appear to be a response to the opening of the settlement for selection.
after subdivision, and of adverse weather conditions.

The initial decline in 1921 reflects the drought conditions which had persisted during the previous year and necessitating sale of much of the Teviot Station stock. The restriction on stocking, operative in the first ballot in 1921, further kept the sheep numbers low. The increase in sheep in 1922 reflects the removal of the stocking restriction, while a year later in 1923, the continued decline in sheep on the Teviot Settlement reflects both current climatic and economic conditions.

The weather during 1923 and 1924 was described as the most disastrous the Otago Province had experienced for nearly 20 years (Dalgety Annual Wool Review 26, 41). Heavy snowfalls especially affected the high country holdings, and these were followed by a spring of unprecedented drought conditions which was equally unpleasant for farmers. The weather caused the lambing rate at Teviot for 1923 to be much lower than average, resulting in a further decline in the sheep returns for 1924. This decline in sheep carried on Teviot Settlement in 1924 is similar to the trend apparent for Otago. The rising stock and wool prices would have led farmers selling stock where previously the low prices had deterred this. The prices in 1924 were the highest experienced for almost a decade, and farmers responded to this by selling all expendable stock. The continued unsettled ownership of Teviot land in 1924 also contributed to the continuing slide in stock numbers.

Sheep numbers on the Teviot Settlement contrived to increase after 1925, in a way similar to the increase in Otago. From this time the Teviot Settlement was fully occupied and this in conjunction with improved wool prices led to increased stocking rates. In 1926, by which time all of the Teviot holdings were settled, the carrying
capacity stood at 1.26 sheep per acre of freehold land, and by 1933 (the last year for which data is available), it had risen to 1.82 sheep per acre.

The 1933 carrying capacity of the Teviot Settlement was similar to that of the Teviot and Hillsprings Stations in 1918, prior to subdivision, but less than the carrying capacity for either stations in their peak carrying capacity (1.93 and 2.84 sheep per acre respectively). It appears that although carrying capacity did rise after the subdivision of the land and permanent settlers found for the holdings, it was 10 years before the carrying capacity of the area returned to the level on the land prior to subdivision. The fluctuating economic conditions, the high costs of establishing farms, and the initial unsuitability of some holdings, are the most likely causes of the long time taken for recovery.

The 1920s wool slump and the 1930s depression greatly affected all farmers, and those on the Teviot Settlement were no exception. The increase in production of the land, which was intended to be an outcome of subdivision do not occur markedly before 1933. Evaluating the success of the subdivision only up to 1933, with the concomitant factors of general financial difficulty for most farmers, gives a picture of the only diffident increase in sheep production as a result of subdivision.

It would be necessary to have information on the changing production after 1933 before an accurate assessment could be made of the affect of subdivision. The trends indicated in the Teviot Lands and Survey files is that carrying capacity continued to rise and could well have increased above the highest level reached by either Teviot or Hillsprings Stations.
5.2 **ESTIMATES OF CARRYING CAPACITY**

Actual sheep returns and official estimates of carrying capacities were compared for the years 1924 and 1933 (Table 1). Data were available only for a small proportion of the holdings, but a comparison does give an indication of the accuracy of the official estimates made by three inspectors from the Otago Land Board in both 1924 and 1933. In 1924 the estimates given for both runs and sections are similar to the actual sheep numbers carried, as quoted for the holdings by the settlers. The Teviot settlers appear from these figures to have been stocking the holdings at the level judged to be appropriate by officials. Thus it would appear that the Otago Land Board held a realistic idea of the production potential of the Teviot holdings.

In 1933 runs were carrying more stock than the field inspectors gave as suitable for these holdings. This apparent overstocking by runholders, according to the official assessment, is likely to be the result of farmers responding to declining produce prices. Not enough data was available to determine any trends for the single sections between official estimates and actual carrying capacity for 1933. Generally it would seem that the official estimates of the holdings' production potential was suitable and the settlers were generally carrying the amount of stock stated as appropriate. This indicates that the Otago Land Board was aware of actual farming practices and conditions, and were in a position to plan for the Teviot Settlement and its continued development.

5.3 **CULTIVATION**

In January 1918 a report prepared on the Teviot Estate for the Otago Land Board estimated that 8,000 acres of land were already under cultivation, while a further 5% of the Estate was suitable for
TABLE 11:  ACTUAL AND ESTIMATED CARRYING CAPACITY, 1924 and 1933

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sections 1924</th>
<th>Sections 1933</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Carried (x100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Runs 1924</th>
<th>Runs 1933</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Carried (x100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Actual carrying capacity

Estimated carrying capacity
cultivation (FLS 4/27 (1), 1918). In 1933 a report submitted to the Land Board by three field inspectors reported that 21 out of the 24 holdings on the Teviot Settlement had some cultivation taking place. Of the 58,504 acres on the Teviot Settlement included in the 1933 inspection, 10,800 (18.5%) was declared suitable for arable production. This included all of the section holdings and as all but 300 acres of this comprised the former Teviot Estate freehold, the 1918 and 1933 estimates of land being cultivated can be compared.

In 1933, of the area reported as suitable for cultivation only, 11.1% was actually being cultivated that year. The estimate of the total amount of land suitable for cultivation in 1933, was 33% (2,400 acres) greater, than the area recorded in 1918. This increase in cultivatable land is not caused by additional land purchases as these are excluded from the calculation. Through irrigation and improved agricultural machinery, the area of land suitable for cultivation was extended. In 1938, nine farmers on the Teviot Settlement were using irrigation, on a total of 730 acres. There is no evidence that irrigation was being used on the Teviot Estate before it was subdivided. The production of winter feed was able to be increased because of the introduction of irrigation and improved cultivation techniques.

5.4 DISCUSSION ON CHANGING PRODUCTION

The sheep numbers fluctuated on the Teviot and Hillsprings Stations in an upward direction from 1907 until the time when each was purchased by the government for subdivision and settlement. The marked declines that occurred prior to subdivision were mainly associated with adverse weather conditions.

The Teviot Station had a rapid change in sheep carrying capacity after 1918, following the placement of a manager on the Estate by the Otago Land Board. This trend of increase came to an abrupt halt
in 1921 when the individual holdings began to be settled. The Hillsprings Estate, bought in 1920, experienced a rapid reduction in sheep units carried, as stock was sold off prior to subdivision.

By the time the Teviot Settlement was ready for settlement in 1921, 36,000 sheep were being carried on the land; a stocking rate of 1.83 sheep per acre on freehold land. Subdivision and settlement was followed by a rapid decline in sheep numbers until 1925 at which point the settlement was fully occupied and the holding boundaries had become permanent. The restriction on stocking in 1921, the decline in wool prices, and the adverse weather conditions, all affected stocking rates, which steadily declined until 1925. It was not until 1929 that the pre-subdivision number was again reached on the Teviot land.

The decline in sheep numbers on the Teviot Settlement 1921-1924 was the converse of that evident in the Otago Land District. From 1924 until 1930 the fluctuation in sheep numbers on the Teviot land is similar to that in Otago. The initial deviation of the Teviot Settlement from regional trends occurred because of the slow settlement of the land which disrupted the stocking rates, and the depressed conditions for most pastoral farmers which prevented rapid stocking by settlers. Once the settlement land ownership was established, the sheep carrying capacity reverted to that of the region.

The extent to which subdivision technique and improvement in farming knowledge and mechanisation was responsible for the increase after 1925, cannot be determined, but it would appear that subdivision encouraged better farming practices, a more intensive utilisation of the lower land to provide winter feed and consequently an increased stocking rate. The carrying capacity of the Teviot Settlement was not as high up to 1933 as that of some years prior to subdivision, but this is perhaps a reflection of the worsening land condition due to the lack of
attention paid to sustaining land quality by early settlers (O'Connor 1980).

The control of rabbits on the settlement after 1927, itself the outcome of firmer control by the Rabbit Board, and increased prices for rabbit skins, also allowed greater stocking. An increase in rabbit numbers in 1923 was followed by the observation that the 'financial misfortune of some of the settlers (soldiers and others) on lands recently subdivided makes one fear that sufficient profits will not be made to adequately cope with the pest' (Dalgety Annual Wool Review 26, 43). This fear was justified as in 1926 the rabbits were still a great menace to farmers (Dalgety Annual Wool Review 28, 47), but by 1929 the Crown Rangers reported that the rabbits had been reduced to within manageable bounds. The increase in rabbits during the 1930s reached the early 1920 level when subdivision had made the initial rabbit problem worse with each farmer responsible for eradication on his own land, where previously control had been exercised over the whole area.

Once holding ownership was established and rabbit skins returning a good profit, effort was made by the settlers to eliminate the pest, and rabbits cease to be mentioned as a problem in any Teviot Lands and Survey files after 1932.

Sheep production was rising on the Teviot Settlement in 1933 and indications are that this continued. If this is accurate, by 1940 the sheep production would be much more than pre-subdivisional carrying capacity. Unfortunately the exact level of the rise after 1933 cannot be determined from known data sources and few conclusions can be reached about the effect of subdivision on the long term production of the land. Land which had once supported two farmers and their labourers (the number was never recorded in available documents) was by 1924
supporting 24 settlers and a larger area was under cultivation.

Whether one of the major objectives of the land legislation, of which the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915, was an integral part, was achieved at Teviot is still open to speculation. The information available has limited the extent to which this aspect could be investigated, however, this author believes it would appear from data that this objective was in part successfully realised. Production of the land would only have subsequently risen as a result of adequate subdivision.
CHAPTER 6

EVALUATION OF THE TEVIOT SETTLEMENT

6.1 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Previous studies of soldier settlements have asserted that the scheme was not successful, as many of the soldiers selecting land under the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915, were not able to become profitable, permanent settlers.

Allan (1967) found the principal reason for the failure of soldier holdings in South Canterbury was the small size of the holdings. In this study failure was identified as the abandonment of forfeiture of land. The land bought for soldier settlements was divided into holdings which were too small to become economical because of the high cost of land, coupled with the government's desire to settle soldiers as small farmers. Most of the movement by soldiers off holdings in South Canterbury occurred in 1919 and 1920, immediately preceding the 1921 slump in wool prices with fewer failures during and after the recession itself.

The 1921 wool slump made the situation of the soldier settlers worse as they were already facing difficulties because of the character of the subdivision and the high land rents. The high cost of stock, fencing and farm equipment, at the time when most of the soldier settlements were occupied, added to the financial difficulties of these settlers. Some financial assistance was available from the government, but this was insufficient to overcome all problems, and the poor economic prospects facing many soldiers culminated in their departure from the land.

Allan (1967) found the major constraint on the study of soldier settlement was the lack of detailed information, and the necessity to
rely on official reports of the scheme published by Land Boards. Although this study concluded that the soldier settlement scheme appeared to have failed, the difficulty of making an accurate judgement was acknowledged, because of the limitations of the information available. Allan (1967) assessed failure in terms of the length of occupancy, and the number of forfeited and surrendered holdings, presumably as these holdings did not fulfil the basic objective of the soldier settlement scheme, which was to provide soldiers with a permanent residence and living.

The instability of settlers on a settlement is not an adequate means by which to assess the scheme as a failure. Studies of others have shown government settlement schemes often have a high turnover of settlers in the initial years of selection, and this is not always a result of the form of the settlement itself. Personal reasons always feature in some of the decisions by new settlers to leave the land.

A study of forfeited and surrendered holdings is not in itself an accurate enough criteria to assess the success of soldier settlement, because holdings of this kind only account for a small number of the total number of soldier holdings; in South Canterbury forfeited and surrendered holdings only accounted for 6% of the total number of soldier holdings.

The development of the soldier settlement scheme and its regional trends were examined by Powell (1971) and included an evaluation of the reasons given for the failure of soldier settlements. The reasons given for the failure of soldier holdings by the 1923 Inquiry Board were compared with other evaluations of failure. However, using the Inquiry Board report as the basic evidence for failure presents a subjective assessment of the soldier settlement scheme. The 1923 Inquiry Board report was based only on the soldier
holdings of those who had requested an inspection. Over half of the soldier settlers in New Zealand are known to have not requested an inspection, and therefore their situation cannot be accurately judged. The Inquiry Board's assessment of the soldier settlement scheme is based on only half the total number of soldier settlers. The report suggests that soldiers who did not request an inspection were in a satisfactory position. This assumption may not be correct as it is suggested in recent studies that many soldiers did not understand the implications of requesting an inspection, and therefore did not, even though they might have been in the category which was classed as a failure.

Soldiers who surrendered or forfeited land before 1922 were also excluded from the Inquiry Board report, as they also were not inspected. As a means of measuring the success of the soldier settlement scheme, the 1923 Inquiry Board report (AJHR 1923, C-9A), is not sufficient as it is based on a biased sample of all holdings.

Powell (1971) concluded that the cause of failure of soldier settlements was largely a result of the time at which most of the holdings were occupied. Many soldier settlers found they simply did not have long enough to commence profitable activity before the wool price slump began. The slump, in conjunction with the high price of land and the small size of holdings, forced many to leave.

Maloney (1982) studied two soldier settlements to assess reasons for failure, but only the original subdivision and the first soldier settlers were examined. Later amendments to the subdivision and the length of residence of settlers who subsequently took up the land, was excluded. The progress of the settlements, after the initial problems were recognised, is not determined and as the first settlers were found to be 'failures', the whole scheme is classed as such. Again, as in
previous studies, failure appears to have been identified as the departure of settlers from the holdings, although no explicit measure of success is given. The two settlements chosen for study substantiate the opinions of the official reports, that the scheme was not successful. Maloney (1982) attributes part of the lack of success of the soldier settlement scheme to the government's failure to develop the Land Boards in such a way that they would deal with the problems of soldier settlements as they arose. Excessive and inappropriate subdivision of land and the economic situation, which was bad for farmers, were again cited as contributing to the failure of settlements.

In general, studies indicate that soldier settlements had a high level of movement off the land by settlers because of the high price of land or rents, the character of the subdivision, the time at which occupation occurred and the fluctuating price for farm products. However, it is difficult to estimate the worth of the conclusions drawn from these studies, either individually or collectively, since no explicit criteria were advanced or defined by which success could have been judged, nor indeed, was the concept of 'success' defined, at least not in a manner by which it could be measured.

A means of measuring the general success of soldier holdings, and not just those included in official reports, was needed. The sources of information used for previous studies often excluded the soldier holdings which were successful.

Allan (1967) suggests that the one really meaningful way in which it would be possible to come to a definite assessment of the success of soldier settlements, would be to examine the case histories of individual farm settlements.
6.2 THE SUCCESS OF TEVIOT SETTLEMENT

This study has defined success as the fulfilment of the objectives of the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915. The Act was to provide land on which soldiers could become permanent, profitable settlers, and it intended to do this through the close settlement of land. This study sought to measure the success of soldier settlements objectively, by reference to three explicit criteria; namely, the continuance of the original subdivision, the stability of ownership, and changes in production.

The first two criteria were selected as they are cited in varying forms by earlier studies as evidence for failure, while the third is implicit in the soldier settlement scheme and would be an outcome of the scheme, if it were successful.

One soldier settlement was chosen, to which the three criteria designed to measure success, could be applied. The Teviot Settlement was selected because it was one of the largest soldier settlements in Otago and Southland, data was available on its establishment and its development. Further, this settlement had not been included in any previous study.

Stability of Subdivision

The stability, or maintenance of the original subdivision, which is the first criteria for measuring in part the success of a soldier settlement, was assessed in relation to the Teviot Settlement. Land for this settlement was purchased between 1918-1920 and was ready for selection by soldiers in February 1921. The original subdivision established 33 holdings and a great deal of care was taken over the subdivision by the Otago Land Board. The subdivisional plan was drawn up after careful reference to topography, climate, and achieving the best utilisation of the land. Consultation over the subdivision was
made with the manager who was placed on the Teviot Station; a person thoroughly familiar with the land to be included in the settlement. Consideration was also given to the needs of the settlers, with roading being undertaken and provision made for the future establishment of a settlement school. Although such care was taken, deficiencies in the subdivision became evident after the settlement was opened for selection.

Excessive subdivision, although less evident than on other soldier settlements, did occur on the Teviot Settlement and this, coupled with high rents, discouraged the selection of some holdings. The Otago Land Board recognised that there were faults in the subdivision and attempted to achieve a more satisfactory one by altering the surveyed boundaries of the unsuitable holdings. One holding was eliminated to allow others to be increased, and changes to some run-section links were made to effect a better balance of summer and winter country. A further series of changes occurred with the amalgamation of some sections into much larger holdings which were then considered economical.

The original subdivision might have been maintained with few ownership changes if the 1921 wool price slump had not happened. With the depressed state of farm prices after 1921, the Otago Land Board realised that the original subdivision was not suitable and proceeded to alter some of the holdings so that they became viable in the changed circumstances.

By 1926 the Otago Land Board was satisfied that the subdivision created on the Teviot Settlement was adequate and after this time did not initiate any further changes. Later changes did come to the titles set by the Land Board through other settlers buying additional land on the settlement, but such changes were comparatively minor.
The excessive subdivision evident on earlier soldier, and other government settlement schemes, was not a feature of the Teviot Settlement. The original policy of integrating summer and winter country, while dividing the well-watered eastern block into single sections, was generally satisfactory. Holdings which were judged unsuitable and therefore not taken up, were altered by the Otago Land Board after the first and second ballots had been held. The revised holdings had no problem attracting suitable settlers.

There were few holdings regarded as too small after the revision in contrast to other soldier settlements where excessive subdivision was recognised as a factor contributing to the drift of soldiers off their land. Perhaps this is a reflection of the experience which had been gained by the Otago Land Board by 1921. Difficulties associated with subdivision were apparent on other soldier settlements in Otago and the Land Board had taken particular care in trying to avoid similar problems on the new settlement, and rectifying them when they did emerge.

Flexibility on the Otago Land Board's part resulted in stable settlement boundaries by 1926. Previous studies of soldier settlements have not examined the changes effected in initial subdivisions, a lack which precludes comparison with the Teviot case. It is important to note, however, that at Teviot the Otago Land Board readily made changes where need was shown through lack of selection or the departure of a settler. The alterations were made in accordance with one of the main objectives of the soldier settlement scheme; that of providing holdings on which settlers could become successful, permanent residents.

This criterion (the stability of the original subdivision) makes a valuable contribution to weighing up the success of a soldier settlement; it indicates problems inherent in the tract of land itself, apart from the settler or the administration of the scheme. The sub-
division of the land can have a bearing on other measures of success such as stability of occupancy, therefore it is essential to establish it clearly. Reference to maps and Lands and Deeds files enables subdivisional alterations to be traced for use in conjunction with other evidence to assess the success of a settlement.

Stability of Settler Occupancy

The second criterion used for measuring the achievement of the Teviot Settlement was the stability of ownership or occupancy of the holdings. This has been used by previous studies as evidence for failure, although its exact means of measurement is often vague.

The original subdivision could have been sustained, but ownership turnover could still have been high. The extent of movement off the Teviot Settlement by occupiers was appraised to determine whether the subdivision enabled them to remain as permanent settlers. Movement within five years of selection was used as evidence of instability and the ownership of each holding was traced from the time of selection to 1940. In this way a detailed assessment of the fixity of occupancy could be secured.

On soldier settlements elsewhere excessive subdivision, inappropriate for the topography and climate of the area, often led to considerable movement of soldiers off the land. The instability of other soldier settlers was not paralleled on the Teviot Settlement, where 12 of the original settlers still remained in 1940. Selection of holdings after 1921 was an important reason for the stability of Teviot settlers.

Forfeiture and surrendering of holdings, although numerous on other soldier settlements, were also relatively insignificant on the Teviot Settlement, with no holdings being forfeited and only three surrendered. Settlers were able to comply with the lease conditions
set by the Otago Land Board and therefore were not required to give up the land. Previous farm experience, selection of land after 1921, and rent revisions all contributed to the absence of forfeiture.

When non-intentional movement (death and imprisonment) is excluded, economic difficulties were found to be the major cause of movement. Most movement occurred as a result of land sales in 1926-1927 and during the 1930s depression. Teviot settlers did undergo financial difficulties, especially in those instances in which they had at first to cope with unbalanced holdings, but there was never a general exodus off the land as occurred on the Benmore soldier settlement. Despite unfavourable economic conditions, 12 settlers managed to remain on the land until 1940, while 69% of the settlers stayed at Teviot longer then five years.

Runholders experienced the least difficulty, and hence the fewest ownership changes while conversely the single section holdings recorded more changes. Most of the movement off single sections occurred before the sections were revised and their size increased and rent reductions made. It was noticeable that the later a holding was selected the more stable was its occupancy, almost certainly a reflection of the boundary revisions carried out by the Otago Land Board.

The ability of Teviot settlers to remain on the land, when other soldier settlements have been shown to have had a high rate of movement off the land reflects the validity of several factors; the selection of land by settlers after 1921, the form of the subdivision and its alterations and the financial assistance given to settlers through rent remissions and reductions. It is essential to establish the exact criteria for assessing movement off the land as evidence for failure. This present study explicitly states the criteria used and therefore can measure the extent to which, in this respect, the Teviot Settlement was successful.
The third criterion for assessing success is the changing agricultural production measured in terms of the number of sheep carried on the Teviot Settlement before and after subdivision.

Assessing the change in production on Teviot Settlement is difficult because of the changes which occurred in the boundaries of some of the holdings and because sheep returns were for each settler rather than for a consistent land area. Purchase of additional land by a settler or a change in the boundary of his holding would result in a change in his sheep return although these changes are not indicated in the returns.

Before further progress can be made in assessing the effect of soldier settlement on production, some means of obtaining reliable livestock returns for individual holdings over a length of time are necessary. Sheep returns in the AJHR are available for individual settlers only until 1930 after which they are compiled in a different way. At Teviot the pre-subdivisional and post-subdivisional changes in carrying capacity were further obscured by the incomplete purchase of farms. For example, only 381 acres of Walker's farm was included in the settlement. Therefore, as sheep returns are given on the basis of the owner's holding, the sheep returns for this land cannot be used to determine the exact carrying capacity per acre of the Teviot Settlement prior to subdivision. It is recognised that there are data limitations to assessing success from this third criteria, but it does give a valuable contribution to the overall assessment of a settlement.

The carrying capacity of the Teviot Settlement decreased immediately after subdivision until 1925, at which stage all land on the settlement was occupied. From this time on the number of sheep
carried rose and the rise corresponded with the trend evident in the Otago Land District as a whole. Although production levels could not be quantified for the period after 1930, except for the year 1933, evidence from the Teviot Settlement Lands and Survey file which contains reports on the settlers for the years 1936 and 1938, suggest that sheep carrying capacities continued to increase and had reached beyond pre-subdivisional levels by 1940. The relative significance of the subdivision on the one hand, and technological developments on the other, in this apparent increase, cannot be fully accounted for. Subdivision, however, could be expected to play an important role in increasing sheep production, in part at least, by increasing the capital per acre and the labour inputs.

Increased production was a major objective of closer rural settlement and this appears to have been achieved on the Teviot Settlement. As changes in production after subdivision have not been documented for other soldier settlements, no comparison with the Teviot situation can be made.

6.3 CONCLUDING COMMENTS

In terms of the criteria established in the foregoing section, the Teviot Settlement can be described as a successful settlement. The subdivision was stable after 1926, by which year obvious deficiencies had been rectified. The majority of the Teviot settlers stayed longer than five years and the evidence indicates that sheep production rose after the settlement was fully occupied.

The land subdivided in 1920 formed 24 stable units held, in 1940, by 24 settlers who had not previously owned farm land. The Teviot land was supported a greater number of people in 1940 than it had in 1918 before subdivision. The Discharged Soldier Settlement Act, 1915, had resulted in closer settlement of this land and its increased production.
The Teviot Settlement certainly had settlers who left, and cases where revisions to boundaries were required, but overall this settlement can be judged a success. The soldier settlement scheme did provide a means by which some soldiers became permanent farmers, and so fulfilled one of its main objectives, the Teviot Settlement is such a case.

It is essential in any study of settlement to have a clear definition of the problems being assessed. In previous studies of soldier settlements, the lack of clarification of 'success' or 'failure' leads to difficulty in gauging the accuracy of the findings.

In this study three criteria were used to assess the stability of one soldier settlement, and it has been shown that each would contribute to the development of a framework for studying settlement, especially soldier settlement, so that effective comparison between settlement studies could be made. Such a comparison would enable the form of land settlement in New Zealand to be more fully understood. Acceptance of official reports about soldier settlements is not sufficient. A more suitable means of appraising success is necessary and this study has attempted to produce a method of comparability with other settlements.

The Teviot Settlement, the focus of this study of soldier settlements, appears in the annual report by the Otago Land Board as a soldier settlement. This classification is however, more of the original intention rather than the actual achievement. The clause setting this land aside for soldier settlement was revoked in 1922 after the first ballot, from all unselected land, and at all subsequent ballots, the Teviot holdings were offered for general selection with first preference given to soldiers. Only 14 soldiers
eventually selected land at Teviot, all other settlers being civilians.

As the Teviot Settlement was only partly occupied by discharged soldiers, this may well have been the cause of the apparent difference in assessment between this and other settlements. However, as the extent to which other soldier settlements were actually occupied by soldiers has not yet been documented, no conclusive assessment can be made as to why the Teviot Settlement appeared to differ from the accepted assessment of soldier settlements. Studies which include the assessment of settlements fully occupied by soldiers, and those which reverted to general selection, would be of value in evaluating the success of the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915.

There is a need for further studies of individual soldier settlements, in such a way as to allow comparison between the settlements, and to determine whether the findings relating to Teviot Settlement are unique.

Teviot Settlement was a success; were others an unacknowledged success too?
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Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915

New Zealand.

Analyzation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Financial and Other Assistance to Settlers under this Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Short Title</td>
<td>6. Minister may assist settlers with respect to erection of buildings, purchase of stock, &amp;c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Interpretation</td>
<td>7. Revision of rent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Special Settlements for Occupation by Discharged Soldiers.

Ordinary Terms.

3. Areas of Crown or of settlement land may be set apart for selection by discharged soldiers in manner prescribed by Land Act or Land for Settlements Act.

Special Terms.


5. Regulations.

1915, No. 45.

An Act to make Provision for the Settlement of Discharged 
Soldiers on Crown and Settlement Lands. [11th October, 1915.]

BE IT ENACTED by the General Assembly of New Zealand in Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

1. This Act may be cited as the Discharged Soldiers Settlement Act, 1915.  

2. In this Act "discharged soldier" means any person who—

(a.) Has been a member of the New Zealand Naval Forces or of any Expeditionary Force;

(b.) Has served beyond New Zealand in connection with the present war;

(c.) Has returned to New Zealand; and

(d.) Has received his discharge from service, either before or after his return to New Zealand:

Provided that nothing in this Act shall apply to any person whose discharge from service was due to incapacity resulting from his own default or misconduct.
Special Settlements for Occupation by Discharged Soldiers.

Ordinary Tenures.

3. (1) The Governor may from time to time, by Proclamation, set apart any area or areas of Crown land or of settlement land for selection by discharged soldiers under the Land Act, 1908, or the Land for Settlements Act, 1908.

   (2) Any Proclamation under this section may be at any time revoked in so far as it relates to any land that is not required or that is not suitable for the purpose for which it was set apart.

Special Tenures.

4. (1) In addition to the powers conferred by the last preceding section, the Governor may from time to time, by Proclamation, set apart any area or areas of Crown land or of settlement land to be disposed of, by way of sale or lease, to discharged soldiers, in the manner hereinafter provided.

   (2) The land so set apart shall be subdivided into such allotments as the Land Board, with the approval of the Minister of Lands, determines.

   (3) Application for allotments under this section shall be addressed to the Land Board, and shall contain particulars as to the following matters:—

      (a) The name, address, and occupation of the applicant, and his occupation prior to becoming a member of the New Zealand Naval Forces or of any Expeditionary Force

      (b) His service in the New Zealand Naval Forces or in an Expeditionary Force, specifying—

         (i.) The Force of which he was a member;

         (ii.) The period of his service, and the date of his discharge;

         (iii.) The reason of his discharge; and

         (iv.) Particulars as to any physical disability caused by wounds or disease resulting from his naval or military service;

      (c) The allotment or allotments for which application is made;

      (d) The purpose for which the applicant proposes to use the land;

      (e) The experience of the applicant in the business for which he proposes to use the land, or in any other class of farming;

      (f) The amount of capital available for expenditure by the applicant in connection with the land;

      (g) The nature and estimated amount of assistance, if any, that the applicant will require to enable him to work the land successfully; and

      (h) Such other particulars as may be required.

   (2) Except as may be otherwise provided by this Act or by regulations under this Act, the provisions of the Land Act, 1908, or
the Land for Settlements Act, 1903, or of any other Act relating to the administration of Crown or settlement land, shall not apply to lands disposed of under this section.

Regulations.

5. For the purpose of giving effect to the last preceding section, and generally for the purposes of this Act, the Governor may from time to time, by Order in Council gazetted, make regulations prescribing—

(a.) With respect to any land, whether it shall be disposed of by way of sale or by way of lease;
(b.) In the case of land to be disposed of by way of sale, the terms and conditions of such sale, including conditions relating to the payment of the purchase-money;
(c.) In the case of lands to be disposed of by way of lease, the conditions of such lease, including provisions as to—
   (i.) The form or forms of leases;
   (ii.) The term or terms for which leases may be granted;
   (iii.) The acquisition of the fee-simple by lessees;
   (iv.) Improvements to be effected by lessees;
   (v.) Residence of lessees on the land;
   (vi.) The method of computing the rent to be paid by lessees; and
   (vii.) The transfer, surrender, and forfeiture of leases;
(d.) The application of any of the provisions of the Land Act, 1903, or of the Land for Settlements Act, 1903, or of any other Act relating to the administration of Crown or settlement land, to lands disposed of under section four hereof;
(e.) Such other matters as in the opinion of the Governor may be necessary or expedient for the purpose of giving full effect to the provisions of this Act.

FINANCIAL AND OTHER ASSISTANCE TO SETTLERS UNDER THIS ACT.

6. (1.) In considering applications under section four hereof the Board shall take into consideration, either with or without special application, the advisability of assisting applicants with respect to any of the following matters:—
(a.) The clearing, fencing, draining, and general improvement of lands disposed of under this Act;
(b.) The erection of buildings on any such land; and
(c.) The purchase of implements, stock, seeds, plants, trees, and such other things as may be deemed necessary for the successful occupation of the land.

(2.) If in the opinion of the Board it is desirable that assistance should be given to the settler with respect to any or all of the foregoing matters, it shall make a recommendation to that effect to the Minister of Lands, and shall set out in its recommendation the nature and extent of the assistance recommended, and the grounds.
of the recommendation. On receipt of any such recommendation the
Minister may take such action thereon as he thinks fit in accordance
with regulations under this Act.

(3) All moneys advanced or expended by the Minister under
the authority of this section in respect of any land shall bear interest
at such rate as may be determined by the Minister, and shall be
secured by way of a first mortgage over the said land or over the
setler's interest in the said land:
Provided that the Minister may, if he thinks fit, in any case of
hardship dispense, either wholly or in part, with the payment of
interest under this section.

7. The Board may, with the consent of the Minister, remit
wholly or in part and for such period or periods as it thinks fit any
rent payable by a discharged soldier under a lease issued pursuant
to this Act, or may postpone the due date for the payment of any
such rent.

GENERAL

8. (1) For the purposes of this Act the Minister of Finance
may from time to time raise, on the security of and charged upon
the public revenues of New Zealand, such amount as he thinks fit,
not exceeding in the aggregate the sum of fifty thousand pounds.
(2) The sums so raised shall, as and when raised, be paid into
the Public Account to the credit of an account to be called the
Discharged Soldiers Settlement Account, and shall bear interest at
such rate, not exceeding five per centum per annum, as the Minister
of Finance prescribes.

(3) This Act shall be deemed to be an authorizing Act within
the meaning of the New Zealand Loans Act, 1908, and the moneys
hereby authorized to be raised shall be raised under and subject to
the provisions of that Act accordingly.

(4) It shall be lawful for any society, trustees, or other persons
having control of a war fund to invest any moneys belonging to
such fund in debentures or other securities issued by the Minister
of Finance for the purpose of raising any moneys under this section:
Provided that nothing in this subsection shall be so construed
as to limit or restrict the powers of any such society, trustees, or
persons with respect to the investment of moneys belonging to a
war fund.

9. (1) All moneys required for the purposes of the administration
of this Act shall be paid out of the Discharged Soldiers Settlement
Account without further appropriation than this Act, and all moneys
received by way of interest on or by way of repayment of moneys
advanced or expended on behalf of any settler pursuant to section
six hereof shall be paid into the said account.

(2) All moneys accruing from the sale or leasing of lands under
this Act shall be disposed of as if they had accrued from the sale or
leasing of Crown land under the Land Act, 1908, or of settlement
land under the Land for Settlements Act, 1908, as the case may
require.

10. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to authorize the sale
of any national-endowment land.
11. No land leased or sold to a discharged soldier under this Act shall, except with the consent of the Land Board and the approval of the Minister of Lands, be capable of being transferred until the expiry of ten years after the date of the commencement of the lease or the date of the sale.

12. The Valuer-General shall, on the request of the Minister, cause a special valuation to be made of any land set apart for the purposes of this Act under section three or section four hereof, and the value of the land as so determined shall for all purposes supersede any former valuation of the land, anything in the Land Act, 1908, or the Land for Settlements Act, 1908, to the contrary notwithstanding.

13. The right of any discharged soldier within the meaning of this Act to a pension or to the continuance of a pension under the War Pensions Act, 1915, shall not be affected by reason of any benefit to which he may become entitled under this Act.

14. (1.) The Minister of Lands shall in April of each year cause to be prepared a report showing, for the year ending on the preceding thirty-first day of March,—

(a.) The aggregate areas of land set apart under section three and section four hereof respectively;

(b.) The number of applications received for such land, and the number of allotments and the aggregate area disposed of by way of sale and by way of lease respectively;

(c.) The amount expended in assisting settlers under this Act;

and

(d.) Such other particulars as may be prescribed.

(2.) Every such report shall be laid before Parliament within thirty days after the receipt thereof by the Minister if Parliament is then in session, and if not, then within thirty days after the commencement of the next ensuing session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selectors</th>
<th>APPENDIX B : Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Place of Origin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Previous Farm Experience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Dependents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Returned Serviceman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Applied Previously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Purchased Additional Property Outside Settlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Length of Ownership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Reason for Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Type of Holding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Year of Selection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Completed with reference to: Otago Lands and Survey Application Books, and Lands and Survey Land Deed Titles
This account, written after discussion with an original Teviot settler's son, Mr A D Moir of Roxburgh (who farmed the holding with his father), provides an additional perspective to this study, and endorses some of the findings made through documentary research. It comments on some of the aspects of the settlement which cannot be determined from documents, but which are only known by those who lived and have worked on the land. The settlements were for people, and this section relates to one individual's experience of the Teviot Settlement.

Mr A D Moir remembers well when his father and family moved onto the Teviot Settlement to take up run 642 and sections 32 and 35 in 1925. His father, from Timaru, had previously been farming at Fairlie and was one of the many civilians who were selected by the Otago Land Board to take possession of the land on the Teviot Settlement.

When asked about the form of the original Teviot subdivision, Mr Moir commented that in principle the allocation of run and section land to holdings was equitably suited to the land, although in some cases the actual subdivision could have been more suitably organised if there had been better knowledge of the land involved. He remarked that in some cases there appeared to have been little practical application of the subdivision to such features as creeks and gullies. As an example of this, he described how Moir's holding included 1.5 miles of Ruby Creek which provided permanent water for their property; yet a neighbouring settler, Mr Smith, had no direct access to water at all. This settler could only stock his holding according to the dry times and as a result was often faced with financial difficulties.
Another settler, recalled by Mr Moir, did not remain long on his holding (run 606) because it was too small, high and cold, right from the start, and often under snow.

The single sections were considered by Mr Moir to have been generally too small and expensive in their original form, with few settlers willing to remain long on these unprofitable holdings.

Overall, Mr Moir considered the Teviot subdivision to have been quite successful with little amalgamation of holdings taking place before the Second World War, although much of this did occur afterwards.

Mr Moir commented that almost all of the wool produced on the settlement was sent by rail to the Dunedin market, a point confirmed by the Teviot Lands and Survey file. The sheep, on the other hand, tended to be taken off the high country as five year olds, and sent to Canterbury for two years of fattening on dry country. Only a small number were kept for fattening on the settlement.

The dam reserve was frequently used by runholders for shearing when the sheep were brought down from the runs. Each settler paid 1/24th of the reserve rent and Mr Moir believes this was a very successful community facility. The school and woolshed reserves which were never needed were taken up by individual settlers and integrated into existing holdings after the Second World War. There were never enough children on the Teviot Settlement to warrant the building of a school and Mr A D Moir was one of the 10 Teviot Settlement children who walked down to the Miller's Flat School.

The subdivision, in Mr Moir's judgement, did result in increased production from the land, with the Teviot irrigation
scheme further increasing sheep carrying capacity. A further two factors which Mr Moir believes contributed to the increased production of the settlement after 1945, were the elimination of rabbits by the Rabbit Board, and the advent of aerial topdressing.

The social side of the settlement which is not recorded by documents was able to be commented on by Mr Moir who has lived almost all of his life on the Teviot Settlement. He believes the settlers originally came to Teviot with the intention of staying permanently and that no land speculation was intended. He believes there was a good community spirit amongst the settlers, and although the 1930s depression affected all Teviot settlers, they were in no worse a position than other farmers in New Zealand at this time.

There was no mechanised farm equipment on the Teviot Settlement prior to 1940, with all the farmers relying on horse and cart, although all houses had telephones and power from the start, provided by the Teviot Electric Power Company. The Teviot settlers were not isolated in Mr Moir's opinion, as the government provided good metal roads providing access to and from the settlement.

Mr Moir concluded the discussion by ascerting that in his experience, the Teviot Settlement was a success, a factor which has been confirmed by the documentary research in this study.

Roxburgh, August 1983.
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Appendix to the Journal of the House of Representatives:
- The Annual Reports of the Department of Lands, 1916-1940, C-1
- Summaries of Reports of Inquiry Boards, 1923, C-9A
- Annual Sheep Returns, 1907-1930, H-23

Dalgety’s Annual Wool Review for Australasia, 1919-1930, Dalgety and Co. Ltd.

Dalgety’s Annual Wool Review for Australia and New Zealand, 1931-1941, Dalgety and Co. Ltd., 33-43.

Teviot Settlement, 1917-1940. Files of the Lands and Survey Department, Otago Land Board, Dunedin.

Mt. Benger Mail, 1918-1930

New Zealand Gazette, 1921, 1923, 1924, 1925

New Zealand Parliamentary Debates, various dates 1915-1930

New Zealand Yearbook, 1907-1940

Otago Lands and Survey Application Books, Otago Land Board, 1921-1925

Otago Daily Times, various dates

Quick March, New Zealand Returned Soldiers National Paper, 1918-1922.

SECONDARY SOURCES


Marks, R. *Hammer and Tap: Shaping Tuapeka County, 1876-1976.* Tuapeka County Council, Lawrence, 1977.


