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INTRODUCTION

On 2 June 1925 the Seventh Session of the International Labour Conference unanimously adopted a Resolution requesting the Governing Body to instruct the International Labour Office to present, as early as possible, a report on the representation and organisation of agricultural workers. The terms of the Resolution, which was proposed by the Japanese Workers’ Delegate, were as follows:

Whereas the Labour Part of the Treaties of Peace provides not only for the protection of industrial workers, but also for the protection of agricultural workers, and whereas the International Court of Justice has confirmed this intention of the Treaties;

Whereas by virtue of this decision, and of the general principles of the Labour Part, rural workers must be accurately represented in the various bodies of the International Labour Organisation;

And whereas the special nature of agricultural labour and the great variety of categories of agricultural workers in every country render the question of their organisation and representation especially difficult and delicate, and whereas it is important to have full knowledge of the facts in order to avoid possible misunderstandings or even disputes:

The Conference requests the Governing Body to instruct the International Labour Office to prepare and submit as early as possible a report showing what are the various categories of agricultural workers in every country and also the principles upon which they are organised and where necessary represented both in their national institutions and in the International Labour Organisation.

The Governing Body, at its twenty-ninth Session on 17 October 1925, accordingly instructed the International Labour Office to prepare such a report. A preliminary report was submitted to the Eighth Session of the International Labour Conference, 1926. The present study has been prepared for the use of the Conference at its Tenth Session. It will be seen that the study is in the main confined to an assembling of facts. Certain inferences which arise here and there are indicated, but without any formulation of the final principles which should govern the representation of agricultural workers in the International Labour Organisation. At the same time, following the general indications of the last paragraph of the Resolution, it is assumed that the organisation and representation of agricultural workers internationally has a very close connection

with their organisation and representation on a national basis. This explains the scope of the present study.

The material used for the study has been drawn from two sources — the records of the International Labour Organisation and of the League of Nations and special information obtained from workers' organisations, especially from agricultural workers' organisations.

The study falls into three Parts:

I. An enquiry into representation of agricultural workers in the International Labour Organisation: this has involved an enquiry into the representation of agricultural interests in general in the Organisation, and an examination of the early official records which preceded or immediately followed the creation of the Organisation brings out the interesting fact that originally some stress was laid on a definite, or even on a separate, representation of agricultural interests in the Organisation: attention is further drawn to recent arrangements which may have the result of concentrating the discussion of agricultural matters within the Organisation in a body which could act in an advisory capacity to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office.

II. An enquiry into the definition of an agricultural worker: an examination of the texts of the Draft Conventions and the Recommendations of the International Labour Organisation shows that they do not offer any precise definition of what constitutes an agricultural worker, but that in general they can have a wide application; national legislation and practice, and the practice and opinion of workers' organisations are then examined.

III. An enquiry into the classification of agricultural workers and into national organisations of agricultural workers in a certain number of countries; this enquiry, the first of its kind undertaken on an international basis, brings out the background and character of the trade union movement among agricultural workers and shows how far it is of recent growth and how far linked up with the general trade union movements in each country.
PART I

REPRESENTATION OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS IN THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR ORGANISATION

§ 1. — The Commission on International Labour Legislation

The question of the representation of agricultural interests was first raised at the Commission on International Labour Legislation appointed by the Peace Conference on 31 January 1919 to examine proposals for a permanent body to secure common international action on labour questions. The question was discussed in reference to the composition of the delegations to be sent by each State to the International Labour Conference. The claims of agricultural workers (and equally of agricultural employers) to seats at the Conference were advanced. It was claimed that seats at the Conference should either be allotted permanently to agricultural employers and workers, or that some arrangement should be made whereby they could be allotted for special Sessions.

These claims were very decidedly advocated at the fifth and sixth sittings on 7 and 10 February 1919 by Mr. Loucheur (France) and Mr. Colliard (France), supported by Baron Mayor des Planches (Italy). Mr. Loucheur's suggestion was that there should be two representatives of employers and of workers respectively at each Session. "By this means", he added, "it would be possible to find a place for representatives of agriculture on the side both of the employers and the workpeople, which, especially for a country like France, was eminently desirable."\(^1\) Baron Mayor des Planches stated that his country was interested in Mr. Loucheur's proposal, as in Italy "the agricultural class was very numerous and there were a large

number of agricultural organisations”. Finally, Mr. Colliard, in supporting Mr. Loucheur’s proposals, “laid particular emphasis on the hardships and the backward state of rural conditions. It was therefore urgently necessary to bring the conditions of agricultural labour within the scope of international labour legislation. Such being the case, the workers on the land would not understand why they should not be able to put their claims before the Conference. Their resentment would be all the greater and the more comprehensible because during the war they had made greater sacrifices than any other class.”

The first objection raised against Mr. Loucheur’s proposal was on the ground that no practical results could be achieved at the Sessions of the Conference if the number of delegates was too great. This point was raised by Mr. Mahaim (Belgium), who proceeded to suggest that it would be possible to appoint from among the Technical Advisers the Delegate best qualified to deal with each particular subject, as it arose, and that in this way “an agricultural representative could be chosen when agricultural questions came up for discussion”. He was supported by Mr. Vandervelde (Belgium), who raised the further objection that “in a highly-industrialised country like Belgium, it would not be understood if separate representation were given to agriculture”; and again by the President of the Commission, Mr. Gompers (United States of America), who brought forward the third point that “in some countries like the United States, where agricultural workers were numerous, they were nevertheless very badly organised, with the result that it would be impossible to appoint men who could be considered as truly representing them”.

At this stage Mr. Loucheur’s proposal was reformulated by Baron Mayor des Planches in a way which would have allowed, but which would not have enforced, the representation

---

1 Ibid., p. 33.
2 Ibid.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 Mr. Loucheur’s proposal took the form of an amendment to par. I of Article III of the British “Draft Convention creating a Permanent Organisation for the Promotion of the International Regulation of Labour Conditions”. The text of this Draft Convention will be found reprinted in Volume I of the Official Bulletin of the International Labour Office, pp. 9-16.
of agricultural interests on each Delegation. The new formulation was as follows:

Each Delegation should consist of two representatives of the Government, two representatives of the workers, and two representatives of the employers, but their industrial qualifications should not be specified, whereby it would be possible to select them from the most important national industry in each case without it being necessary to draw them from any specified industry.

The question of the separate representation of agricultural interests had therefore been raised. In the first place, on the hypothesis that such representation could only be given by doubling the number of workers' and of employers' representatives — and this, as increasing the total size of the Conference, was in itself open to objection — it was argued that the only division which could then be made would be to allot one delegate each to agriculture and to industry, both in the case of workers' and in the case of employers' representatives. This, in the case of highly-industrialised countries (Belgium), might result in overweighting the Delegation in favour of agriculture; it might not reflect the real economic relations of industry to agriculture; in other words, it might be an exaggeration of the agricultural element, and this would be true for those countries, whether such divided representation were enforced permanently for all Sessions or only for one Session. In the second place it was argued that agricultural workers in certain countries were very imperfectly organised, and that this would make choice of Agricultural Workers' Delegates difficult. This second objection was subsequently combated by Mr. Colliard, who declared it to be "not conclusive" and who also met yet a third objection by stating that "it was possible to give special representation to agriculture without being obliged to extend it to all trades and industries".

The reformulated amendment was lost, and the Commission then turned to an alternative suggestion, which had already been raised in the course of the discussion by Mr. Mahaim (Belgium) and Mr. H. B. Butler (British Empire), namely, to secure representation of agricultural interests through the nomination of Technical Advisers qualified in agriculture. Count Zoltowski (Poland) proposed the following amendment:

Each Delegate shall be accompanied by two Advisers; one of the Advisers accompanying the Workers' Delegate and one accompanying

1 Ibid., pp. 33-34.
2 Ibid., p. 34.
the Employers' Delegate should represent agricultural interests when questions relating to agriculture are discussed 1.

This amendment was dropped. A previous amendment to make the appointment of Advisers obligatory, and not optional, had been lost, and in the course of the discussion it was made clear that there was nothing to prevent the procedure laid down in Count Zoltowski's amendment from being adopted, but that it could not be made compulsory, as there would be no effective sanction 2.

The question of the sufficiency of the representation of agricultural working-class interests was again raised by Mr. di Palma Castiglione (Italy) in the course of the discussion on methods for appointing members of the Governing Body of the organisation now known as the International Labour Office. The British Delegation had suggested that of the twelve representatives of the Governments, eight should be nominated by the High Contracting Parties which were "of chief industrial importance". A discussion took place as to whether "this proposal allowed for a sufficient representation of the working classes in countries where agriculture plays an important part" 3. Mr. Vandervelde (Belgium), Mr. Mahaim (Belgium), Mr. Gompers (United States of America), Mr. Barnes (British Empire), Mr. di Palma Castiglione (Italy), and Sir Malcolm Delevingne (British Empire) took part in the discussion. In view of the subsequent proceedings before the International Court of Justice in 1922 the conclusion formulated is significant. It reads as follows:

The text as proposed, which referred to States of the greatest industrial importance, did not exclude the western countries, in which a large proportion of the wage-earning classes were employed in agriculture. The English version, taking into account the meaning of the word "industrial" was clear. It would be satisfactory if the French translation were made equally explicit. The question was referred to the Drafting Committee 4.

Towards a final stage of the proceedings, when on a request of the President the Delegations had been asked to summarise to the Commission the results of consultations with their home

1 Ibid., p. 34.
2 For the practical application of the procedure suggested during the Third Session of the Conference, 1921, see below, § 4.
4 Ibid., pp. 84-85. The Commission eventually adopted the form which is embodied in Part XIII of the Treaty of Versailles, Article 393, op. cit., p. 280.
authorities during the interval between the eighteenth meeting (28 February 1919) and the nineteenth meeting (11 March 1919), Baron Mayor des Planches, speaking at the latter meeting, and reporting the conclusions arrived at by the Italian Government in consultation with a special meeting of workers and employers convened for the purpose, once more raised the point of the representation of the agricultural workers. He stated that unanimous agreement had been reached in Italy on five points, and reported that the fourth of these five points was:

Augmentation of the number of Delegates to the Conference, so that nations which have an agricultural proletariat of considerable importance, in addition to their industrial proletariat, may secure the representation of their agricultural interests at the Conference concurrently with their industrial interests.\(^1\)

Baron Mayor des Planches proposed to bring the matter up again at the third reading of the Commission’s proposals. At the third reading the matter did not, however, come up in precisely the form indicated by this speaker. The discussion of the third reading of Article III of the draft before the Commission at the twenty-eighth and the twenty-ninth sittings on 19 March 1919 to some extent resumed the question of the number of representatives to the Sessions of the Conference to be allotted to each State. The adoption of the principle of four representatives in all (two Government, one employers’ and one workers’), by eight votes to six\(^2\) finally ruled out the alternative suggestion of two representatives for employers and two for workers, which, had the Commission seen fit to recommend it, would have made it possible to provide for, or even to enforce, the separate representation of agricultural interests.

At the same time, the allotting of two representatives to Governments occasioned an observation on the part of Mr. Vandervelde (Belgium) that this would in some degree permit of different claims being satisfied, and among the claims he mentioned in this connection were those regarding “the representatives of agricultural interests”.\(^3\) On the same occasion, for various reasons, Mr. Loucheur (France) stated his agreement with the principle of four representatives in all. Baron Mayor des Planches explained his views in a statement which did

\(^{1}\) Ibid., p. 110.  
\(^{2}\) Ibid., p. 186.  
\(^{3}\) Ibid., p. 185.
not directly touch on the representation of agricultural interests.

The discussion on the representation of agricultural interests on the International Labour Organisation was summed up by the Commission in Part I of its report\(^1\) presented to the Preliminary Peace Conference. After mention of the alternative proposals which had been put forward as to the composition of the Conference, the report added:

The Italian Delegation, which united with the French Delegation in urging the importance of securing representation for agricultural interests, were to some extent reconciled to the above decision [that each Government should have two Delegates as against one each to the employers and workers] by the consideration that, as the Governments would have two Delegates, it would be easier to secure such representation. It should also be observed that, as different Technical Advisers may be appointed for each subject of discussion, agricultural advisers may be selected, when necessary\(^2\).

Thus we have presented, in the report of the Commission set up by the Powers at the end of the war to examine a suitable constitution for the coming International Labour Organisation, two principles which touch on the representation of agricultural workers in that Organisation. The first lays down that, in view of the fact that the Government of each State Member of the Organisation was called upon to send two Delegates to each Session of the International Labour Conference, whereas only one Delegate was allotted to the workers of each State, representation of agricultural workers (as distinct from other workers) could be secured via one of the Government Delegates in those countries where it could be argued that such representation was not secured, or not adequately secured, via the Workers' Delegate. The second principle lays down that representation could be secured via a Technical Adviser. It is indicated that where agricultural workers' interests are concerned this would be a Technical Adviser to the Workers' Delegate, while a Technical Adviser to the Employers' Delegate would perform parallel functions on behalf of agricultural employers.

In addition, the question of securing representation of agricultural workers on the Governing Body of the Organisation, again via the Government representative, was also raised.

Neither of these two principles is exclusive of the other. The wording of the report quoted immediately above lends itself to the view that the Commission had in mind that they

---

\(^1\) Part I of the report was adopted by the Preliminary Peace Conference at its plenary sitting of 11 April 1919.

might both be adopted and together do something to secure 
the end contemplated. The satisfaction which they offer was 
not complete, for the French and Italian Delegations were said 
to be only "to some extent reconciled" to the decisions arrived 
at.

The first principle — representation through a Govern­ 
ment Delegate — was from time to time the subject of discussion 
from 1919 to 1922.

The Italian view was reaffirmed at the First Session of the 
Conference at Washington, 1919, where, on an occasion when 
a good deal of discussion was taking place on principles of 
representation in connection with the appointment of the first 
Governing Body of the International Labour Office, Mr. di 
Palma Castiglione said:

The fact that the International Commission on Labour Legislation 
decided to have two Government representatives for each State is due 
precisely to the reason that in that way they wanted to give opportunity 
for the agricultural wage earners interested to be represented at the 
annual Conference.

The point here made is that not agriculture in general so 
much as agricultural workers are represented in this way. 
Precisely the same view was advanced by the President of the 
Peace Conference, Mr. Clemenceau, in a letter of 31 May 1919 
addressed by him to the President of the German Peace Dele­ 
genation. In reply to the objection raised by the German Peace 
Delegation that the system of representation adopted in the 
proposed International Labour Organisation was undemocratic, 
Mr. Clemenceau replied:

The theory of the German Delegation that Article 390 of the draft 
may "exclude the workers" is wholly fallacious, as the so-called Govern­ 
mental representatives, at least those of the Allied and Associated 
Powers, would be representatives of the people of those countries. It 
is to be remembered that in many countries a very large part of the 
workers are engaged in agriculture and that these workers are not 
generally united in industrial organisations, and it is therefore peculiarly 
appropriate that their interest be represented at Labour Conferences 
through their Governments.

---


2 *Official Bulletin*, Vol. I, p. 321. The view here taken was also referred to by the representative of the International Federation of Trade Unions, Mr. Jouhaux, on 10 July 1922, when speaking before the Permanent Court of International Justice on the competence of the International Labour Organisation in agriculture. Further, by the Director of the International Labour Office when speaking before the same Court on 6 July 1922: Mr. Thomas referred to the "principle of organisation" which is the necessary complement of the democratic principle (*Official Bulletin*, Vol. VI, No. 4, pp. 201-202, and p. 175).
This shows great stress laid on the first principle — representation of agricultural workers through their Government Delegates. It is perhaps fair to point out that these words were written before the International Labour Organisation had got into working order and before there had been any experience whatever of the effectiveness of such a representation.

§ 2. — Work of the Organising Committee for the First Session of the International Labour Conference, Washington, 1919; Interpretation of the Phrase, "Members of Chief Industrial Importance"

After the signing of the Peace Treaty the Powers concerned advanced to the practical realisation of an organisation to deal with international labour problems. This involved not only the holding of a first Session of an International Labour Conference, but also preliminary steps to secure the existence of the other part of the proposed organisation, namely, an International Labour Office and a Governing Body to that Office.

The first Session of the International Labour Conference was held at Washington from 29 October to 29 November 1919. The work of preparation was undertaken by an International Organising Committee, which had been appointed by Resolution of the Peace Conference and which sat in Paris and London from 14 April to 4 August 1919. This Organising Committee had also to concern itself with the preparatory work for the appointment of the first Governing Body. In the course of carrying out this second task they encountered some very great difficulties, which arose directly out of the whole problem of the place of agriculture in the International Labour Organisation.

In a Circular Letter of 10 May 1919, addressed by the Organising Committee to the Governments, they pointed out that the question of the appointment of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office would have to be considered at the First Session of the Conference, and in a telegram of 12 August, confirmed by Circular Letter of 20 August, they further noted that, for that purpose, if the election of the Governing Body was to be proceeded with, the list of the eight Members of the International Labour Organisation of "chief industrial import-

ance” would previously have had to be determined. They therefore suggested a preliminary list, with due regard to the right of Governments to lodge objections and to Article 393 of the Treaty of Versailles, which, if ratified, would cause any question as to which were the Members of chief industrial importance to come before the Council of the League of Nations for decision 1. In consequence of the receipt of a first objection to the text from Canada, dated 5 June 1919 a, the Organising Committee despatched a further telegram on 8 July 1919 to certain States asking for some necessary information. The first item of the required information was formulated in the telegram as follows:

(2) The total number of persons employed in industry: the figures given should include transport and mine workers but should exclude agricultural and commercial workers 3.

Following on the action taken by the Organising Committee, communications to various authorities were made by some States which objected to the preliminary list. In certain of these communications the claims of the States to be included among the eight Members of chief industrial importance are argued as based in part on their agricultural interests and resources. It will be recalled that, during the work of the original Commission on International Labour Legislation, a certain “conclusion” had been formulated, which had declared that “the phrase ‘greatest industrial importance’ did not exclude the western countries, in which a large proportion of the wage-earning classes were employed in agriculture” 4.

In a telegram from the Governor-General of Canada to the British Secretary of State for the Colonies of 9 September 1919, the claim arising out of the size of Canada’s “industrial population” is put as follows:

With regard to industrial population, Canada outranks Switzerland 6 heaviy in agricultural, mining, fishing and transportation classes 6.

The same question is dealt with in a communication from the Secretary of State for India to the Secretary-General of the

1 Ibid., p. 364.
2 Ibid., pp. 451-452.
3 Ibid., p. 452.
4 As a matter of fact, none of the protesting countries made reference to this “conclusion”.
5 Switzerland had been mentioned as the eighth State of chief industrial importance in the list of the Organising Committee.
League of Nations, dated 7 October 1919, in a way which reserves the right of India to bring forward the item of agricultural population as follows:

I venture to submit that the most important test, and the one best calculated to give effect to the spirit and intention of the Treaty, is the number of workers likely to be affected by the decisions of the International Labour Conference. Judged by this test there can be no doubt that India is one of the eight countries of chief industrial importance. Even if no account be taken of agricultural labourers (who number 25,000,000, and whose conditions of employment may also be the concern of the Conference), and even if from the 20,000,000 returned as industrial workers the most liberal allowance be made for those employed in cottage industries and hereditary village occupations, the number of industrial workers of India, using the term in its narrowest sense, is still very considerable. Factories, mines and railways alone provide employment for 1,887,000 persons, etc.

The claim of India was subsequently pursued and was placed on the agenda of the First Meeting of the Assembly of the League of Nations. In the course of pursuing this claim, the Government of India definitely quoted the number of the agricultural population of India in support of its argument that India was one of the eight Members of chief industrial importance. Sir William Meyer, in addressing the First Assembly of the League of Nations on the point, at the twenty-fourth plenary meeting on 15 December 1920, said:

Among the documents which have already been furnished to the Assembly are statistics which show India’s pre-eminent claim, and I would merely mention here a few salient figures illustrating her industrial importance. Excluding peasant proprietors, there are nearly 25,000,000 agricultural workers who come within the scope of the International Labour Office, etc.

After the Washington Conference the Republics of Cuba and Czechoslovakia, neither of which had obtained a Government seat on the Governing Body as constituted at that Session of the Conference, put forward claims supported by a number of arguments. Among these arguments the agricultural importance of either State is advanced. The statement from Cuba, dated 5 March 1920 and addressed to the Director of the Inter-

---

1 Ibid., p. 456.
2 It was rejected by the Assembly on 15 December 1920 as a question on which the Council of the League, and not the Assembly, was competent. See next note.
3 League of Nations. The Records of the First Assembly; Plenary Meetings, Geneva, 1920; p. 553. For the subsequent history of the claim of India, see below § 3.
national Labour Office, draws particular attention to it, as follows:

Cuba, on the other hand, considers that it possesses the duty and the right to be represented on the present Governing Body, not only for the reasons set forth (i.e. because of having been one of the belligerent nations and having collaborated at the Paris Conference in the creation of this International Office), but also because the interests of labour are involved not only in industry but also in agriculture; and if in the composition of the Governing Body (as is the case at the present time) other interests than those of industry are not represented, its action cannot but prove unsatisfactory. It is of interest to note in this connection that the majority of European nations are industrial rather than agricultural countries, whereas almost all the Latin-American States are essentially agricultural, and Cuba is a good example of this fact, for it alone produces one-quarter of the sugar (a product of prime importance) consumed by the whole world, which constitutes an irrefutable claim to be represented on the Governing Body, for our labour problems interest all nations, the more so that in the production of sugar and in dependent industries nearly 500,000 workers, mostly of foreign origin, are employed at each annual harvest. The statement from the Ministry of Social Welfare of the Republic of Czechoslovakia to the Director of the International Labour Office, dated 26 September 1920, after noting the natural mineral riches and the development of manufacture in that country adds:

These economic activities, aided by advanced agriculture, give Czechoslovakia an important place in the economy of the world.

§ 3. — Work of the Committee Appointed to Consider the Criteria to be Adopted in the Selection of the Eight States of Chief Industrial Importance, 1921-1922

The history of the further interpretation of the phrase “Members of chief industrial importance” is in part as follows.

For reasons arising out of the difficulties, already described, attending the first appointment of the Governing Body at Washington in 1919, it was decided early in 1921 to set up a special Committee, composed of four members of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office and two representatives of the Secretariat of the League of Nations. The question of what constituted “chief industrial importance” within the meaning of Article 393 of the Treaty of Versailles was carefully examined. The Committee presented a report on 31 May 1922.  

---

2 Ibid., p. 466. Reference to the claim set forth by Poland is made below.
In regard to the representation of agricultural interests the following remarks may be made. The Committee recommended in principle that in determining the list of eight Members of chief industrial importance, account should be taken of "industrialised agriculture", which, according to their own statement, is a term including more than industries for the working-up or transformation of agricultural products. They noted, however, the practical difficulties in the way of obtaining the necessary data. The most important decision on the subject arrived at by the Committee was as follows:

Unless the Labour Conference decides that the competence of the International Labour Office does not extend to agricultural workers, no reason exists why agriculture should not also be taken into account up to a certain point for the establishment of the industrial importance of a State.

The interpretation of the words "up to a certain point" would appear to be suggested in a passage from the Annex I to the report. This Annex, a Memorandum drawn up by Professor Gini, representative of the Secretariat on the Committee, and dated 20 October 1921, was not made the basis of the decisions of the Committee on account of the financial conditions of the time, but was defined by them as "deserving of consideration for a future occasion". In a passage which appears worth quoting on account of its intrinsic interest, Professor Gini says:

This being the case, several questions remain to be settled. The first of these is whether agriculture should be included among the industries. It has been said that the literal interpretation of the word "industry" varies in English and in French. It does not appear, however, that such an important problem can be reduced to a simple question of words. According to the logical principles which we have submitted, when the industrial importance in the sense of Article 393 has to be defined, the question whether agriculture is to be taken into account depends on the extent of the competence of the International Labour Office. If the International Labour Office has to regulate the relations between capital and labour in agriculture as well as in other spheres, it is logical that the industrial importance to be considered should also include the agricultural factor; the contrary conclusion is reached if the Labour Office has not to consider the relations between employers.

---

1 The Committee sat and the Committee's report was presented during the period when the competence of the International Labour Organisation in agriculture was pending before the Permanent Court of International Justice. The conclusion quoted, however, is not incorporated in the text of the Committee's own report, but is found in Annex I to that report (Memorandum drawn up by Professor Gini). The discussion on the Council of the League in September 1922, when the list of the eight Members was determined, took place after the decision of the Court had been given in favour of competence.
and agricultural workers. The decision taken on this subject at Copenhagen is thus fully justified; it was that there is no reason to refuse to give some consideration to agriculture in determining the industrial importance of a State if the Labour Conference admits that the competence of the International Labour Office also extends to agricultural workers. It is, however, understood that it is not desired to assimilate the agricultural workers to other industrial workers, nor the production of agriculture to the production of other industries. A distinction can and should be established, but it should result only from the respective importance of agriculture and of other industries in the international regulation of labour.

Without attributing to the literal interpretation of the word "industrial" an importance which would be in contradiction with the interpretation which we have given to the Article of the Treaty, we think that the technical interpretation of the word itself confirms this conclusion. It is only the everyday language which in some countries draws a distinction between the words "industry" and "agriculture". From the technical point of view one has no difficulty in speaking of agricultural industries. One may in general terms define industry as productive activity intensified on the basis of the specialisation of labour and, consequently, on the basis of mutual exchange of products. Accepting this definition, one may easily see that agriculture does not present an industrial character until it has attained a certain degree of intensification. One will also perceive that it is particularly in connection with such intensified and specialised production that the regulation of the relations between capital and labour is of importance. At the same time it is impossible to fix an objective criterion determining the point beyond which production acquires an industrial character. Neither the employment of mechanical power nor the degree of organisation of the workers is a sufficient criterion. Long before all technical improvements and all organisation of labour, during the whole of antiquity, there existed flourishing industries.

The above remarks contain our criticism of the system proposed by Mr. Rufenacht, who starts from the principle that only forms of production other than agriculture are to be considered as industrial, i.e. those forms of production, and those only, which do not create food. Mr. Rufenacht goes even further. In his opinion a State would only deserve the name industrial when its agriculture did not suffice to feed its population. Acceptance of this view would prevent the United States of America from being an industrial country, and would leave Germany as industrial only in a very limited degree.

After the report of the Committee had been issued, the whole problem came before the Council of the League of Nations, which, it will be remembered, is mentioned in Article 393 of the Treaty as the organ which should decide any question arising out of it. On 30 September 1922 the Council adopted a Resolution determining which were at that time the eight Members of the International Labour Organisation of chief industrial importance. Among these States was India. It will be recalled that the claim of India had already been set forth before the Assembly of the League and had been disallowed for formal reasons. In now presenting her claim to the Council, India

2 See above, p. 16.
again laid stress on the existence of a large number of agricultural wage earners in that country, arguing that it "would be out of accord with the spirit and intention of the Labour Covenant to exclude from consideration any class of wage earners". The following passage sets forth her claim under this head:

The number of males engaged in agriculture, the chief industry of India, is ...... very considerable. The 71 millions, however, shown (in Appendix B) against India include a large number of small-holders who cannot be properly described as agricultural workers; but farm servants and field labourers employed in ordinary cultivation and workers in the large organised agricultural industries, such as tea, coffee, and indigo, number as many as 27,810,130 (13,864,857 males and 13,945,273 females). This is the true measure of the industrial importance of India on the agricultural side in respect of the work of the International Labour Organisation, and even if we assume (and the assumption is exceedingly unfavourable to India) that in Italy, Belgium, Japan, and Switzerland all those returned as engaged in agriculture are wage earners, India would still be of greater industrial importance from this particular point of view than these four countries taken together.1

The Republic of Poland had also formulated a claim in continuance of a protest which had been originally despatched against the action of the Organising Committee for the Washington Conference in 1919, but which had been subsequently withdrawn. This protest was taken up again by Poland in a communication to the Council of the League of 16 December 1921, and was eventually supported by a Memorandum dated 7 August 1922. In these documents the Polish Republic argues that account should be taken of the agricultural importance of countries in determining claims to chief industrial importance and quotes in considerable detail figures of Polish agricultural production (wheat, rye, barley, oats, potatoes, sugar-beet) in support of the claim, finally advancing the consideration that agriculture should be taken account of "at least as a subsidiary index with a diminished weight".

In reference to these claims, where the agricultural importance of a State was cited in support of a contention that a particular
country should be placed on the list of eight Members of chief industrial importance, it might be agreed that agricultural workers are only indirectly represented through Government members on the Governing Body of the International Labour Office. Attention may, however, be drawn to the different view to which allusion has already been made in connection with representation on the Conference. If the Government Delegates on the Conference itself were held by some speakers to represent the agricultural workers, or to represent them in some degree, the same could be argued in the case of the Governing Body, and with much greater force, seeing that a certain number of States are bound to secure on that body one seat only, so that, where that one seat is a Government seat, such Government representatives might be held to represent all the interests of that country.

To sum up the gist of Sections 2 and 3 of Part I of this study. The history of the discussions on the Commission on International Labour Legislation, on the Organising Committee for the Washington Conference itself, and on the Committee appointed to establish the Criteria to be Adopted in the Selection of the Eight States of Chief Industrial Importance, would seem to establish the following facts: (I) that it was a view definitely held by some representatives, and formally confirmed in the name of the Allied and Associated Powers by Mr. Clemenceau, that the principle of having two Government Delegates present at the Sessions of the International Labour Conference would assist in securing to agricultural workers representation on the Conference which it had not been possible to secure to them independently; (II) that the same was argued in the case of the Governing Body, and could as a matter of fact be argued even more powerfully, seeing that, in certain cases, States secure only a single seat on the Governing Body; (III) that the question was specifically raised and answered to the extent that “industrial” in the phrase Members of “chief industrial importance” was held to include “agricultural” on the Commission of the Peace Conference which laid down the constitution of the International Labour Organisation; (IV) that the view that (a) general agricultural interests and more especially (b) the interests of agricultural workers should be taken into account in interpreting this phrase has never been rejected by an organ of the League of Nations; (V) that it was accepted, at any rate, as regards (a), at the Copenhagen sitting of the
Committee appointed to consider the criteria which should be taken into account in interpreting the words "chief industrial importance", though for practical reasons very restricted application was given to it; (VI) that five States cited this item in support of their claims to be considered Members of chief industrial importance, and (VII) that one State, India, which had particularly cited its agricultural working population was finally listed by the Council of the League as a Member of chief industrial importance and at present holds its permanent seat on the Governing Body in virtue of that decision, but that there is no evidence as to the precise value given by the Council to agriculture in the claim of that State.

§4. —The Third Session of the International Labour Conference, Geneva, 1921

The representation of agricultural workers in the various bodies of the International Labour Organisation, but more especially at the International Labour Conference, became a matter of practical urgency when the Third Session of the Conference was to be held at Geneva in 1921. This Session was largely devoted to agricultural matters. Not, however, exclusively; and other important items, namely, reform of the constitution of the Governing Body, prohibition of the use of white lead, disinfection of wool infected with anthrax spores, the weekly rest-day, and an item on maritime labour, also figured on the Agenda. The States were faced with the problem of appointing Delegations qualified to deal with the whole of the Agenda.

The question was dealt with in a Circular Letter signed by the Director of the International Labour Office and sent to all States Members of the Organisation on 4 November 1920, in preparation for the Third Session in the following year. This letter includes the following passage:

I have been asked whether, on account of the importance of the second item of the Agenda (Agricultural Questions), the most representative organisations of agricultural employers and workers ought not to be consulted in regard to the selection of Employers' and Workers' Delegates in each country. The raising of this question would perhaps appear to be justified by the fact that in many countries the organisations of agricultural employers and workers are separate and distinct from the industrial organisations, and that therefore the nomination of Delegates after consultation only of the industrial organisations
would not constitute adequate representation of the special interests of the agricultural employers and workers.

The letter proceeds to draw attention to the similar difficulty which was felt when the Second Session of the Conference, on maritime labour, was held in Genoa in 1920, and notes that the Governing Body, when reference was made to it on the point, passed the following Resolution:

In order to avoid possible confusion in the appointing of non-Government Delegates to the forthcoming Maritime Conference at Genoa, and to future special Conferences, the Governing Body deems it advisable to declare: That the third paragraph, Article 389 of the Treaty of Peace, should be interpreted to mean:

That to all General Conferences of Representatives of the Members (special or otherwise), non-Government Delegates should be chosen in agreement with employers' association and workers' federations most representative of all sections of industry if such organisations exist.

Such, then, was the official interpretation placed by the Governing Body on the wording of the Treaty. It was the considered opinion of the Governing Body that Workers' (and Employers') Delegates should be chosen in agreement with organisations representative of all sections of industry even for a Session of the Conference dealing with special questions. The letter then proceeds to point out a practical consideration which should be taken into account, namely, the desirability of ensuring continuity of policy and uniformity of principles at the Sessions of the Conference. It is noted that such continuity and uniformity of work would become extremely difficult if the choice of Delegates were left to organisations concerned with a special industry and not to the central organisations.

Neither the terms of the Resolution of the Governing Body, nor the argument of the letter, in any way precluded choice of a Delegate outside a central organisation; nor, indeed, could the liberty of action of the Governments in any case have been limited, either in this or in any other direction, as is expressly noted in the letter. But, whatever might be the decision of each Government as to the choice of the Workers' Delegate, there was another means of ensuring representation of special industries, namely, through the Technical Advisers.

This suggestion was, of course, an old one. It had been put
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2 Ibid.
forward on the International Commission for Labour Legislation of the Peace Conference, and, in noting the work of that Commission, we defined it as the second principle of possible representation of the interests of agricultural workers in the International Labour Organisation. The Circular Letter of 4 November 1920 sets it forth as follows:

But important as it is that the choice of the Delegates should ensure the element of continuity necessary for the accomplishment of the task of the International Labour Organisation, it is equally important that industries specially concerned in the decisions of the Conference should be able to explain their point of view during the Session. The nomination of Technical Advisers was provided for precisely with the object of securing the representation of the special interests of particular industries when questions which concerned them came under consideration. The Treaty of Peace fixes the number of Advisers as two for each Delegate for each separate item of the Agenda of the Session, and the various branches of industry have, therefore, the means of ensuring the adequate representation of their views at the Sessions of the Conference.

Both the uniformity which is desirable in the composition of the Conference, and the proper representation of the interests of industries specially concerned with an item of the Agenda, can be ensured by calling upon the organisations most representative of that industry for the nomination of Technical Advisers.

During the proceedings of the Conference itself another question, namely the qualification of Delegates to deal with the whole of the Agenda of a Session of the Conference, and not only with certain items, was raised in a way which has some bearing on problems of representation in the International Labour Organisation. The Credentials Commission, to whom an objection lodged against the mandate of the French Employers' Delegate had been referred, included the following passage in its report:

A question concerning the mandate of the French non-Governmental Delegates has been referred to the Commission. The French Employers' Delegate had received from the Organisation in agreement with which he had been appointed, a mandate limited to the questions on the Agenda other than those dealing with agriculture. These industrial organisations in consequence considered that there was no French Employers' Delegate for agricultural questions. The question therefore arose as to whether, when agricultural questions came up for discussion, the absence of an Employers' Delegate would affect the right of the French Workers' Delegate to take part in the discussion and to vote, by the application of the provisions of Article 390 of the Treaty of Peace.
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1 See above, pp. 9 and 12.
2 Item II, Agricultural Questions, was subsequently reformulated as Items II, III, and IV of the Agenda of the Third Session of the Conference. This permitted of the appointment of a larger number of Technical Advisers (two to each item (Article 389 of the Treaty of Versailles)).
3 International Labour Conference, Third Session, Geneva, 1921; Vol. II, p. 612. Par. 2 of Article 390 of the Treaty reads: "If one of the Members fails to nominate one of the non-Government Delegates whom it is entitled to nominate, the other non-Government Delegate shall be allowed to sit and speak at the Conference, but not to vote."
The Credentials Commission did not take this view. It declared that "the Employers' and Workers' Delegates are in fact appointed by the Governments for a Session of a Conference and not for one or two distinct questions on the Agenda". It is perhaps relevant to note that the report of the Credentials Commission was never formally adopted by the Conference. The Conference in its place adopted a Resolution asking for an Advisory Opinion from the Permanent Court of International Justice on the interpretation of Article 389 of the Treaty of Versailles and on the rules which should be observed by Members of the International Labour Organisation in order to comply with the terms of that Article in appointing non-Government Delegates and Technical Advisers.1

It cannot be said that the question of the representation of agricultural workers was ever discussed in principle in connection with the Third Session of the International Labour Conference. Several rules or suggestions were laid down by bodies having undoubted authority, but they were not final. Thus the Governing Body declared that, whatever Workers' Delegates were chosen, whether from "special industries" or not, they must be chosen in agreement with a central "most representative" organisation, i.e. an organisation representative of all sections of industry. The International Labour Office, in its Circular Letter, drew attention to this view, and added the suggestion, already current in 1919, that representation could be best secured through the system of Technical Advisers. The Credentials Commission declared that Workers' Delegates were appointed to deal with all, and not merely with part of, the items of a Session Agenda. It may be added that the Permanent Court of International Justice, on 31 July 1922, declared: "In accordance with the terms of the first paragraph of Article 389, the Workers' Delegate represents all workers belonging to a particular Member"2, which is perhaps the most important pronouncement so far made by any organ of the League of Nations on the general principles of workers' representation in the bodies of the International Labour Organisation.

One question may perhaps be raised: whether it is practical to regard agriculture as a "special industry", and on this ground
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to limit its representation to what would naturally be secured to a special industry through the system of Technical Advisers. Agriculture employs, on a rough estimate, over half the workers of the world. It was no doubt in the knowledge of this fact that the representation of agricultural workers on an equality with that of industrial workers (in the narrow sense of the word "industrial") was originally raised at the International Commission on Labour Legislation. The opposite point of view was put by the representative of the International Federation of Trade Unions, Mr. Jouhaux, on 10 July 1922, when addressing the Permanent Court of International Justice on the competence of the International Labour Organisation in agriculture. Mr. Jouhaux said:

Supposing that agricultural workers had special representatives at the International Labour Conferences, we should have had to make provision for special representatives of workers engaged in commerce, sailors, etc., and the result would have been that in this way the number of Delegates taking part in the Conferences would have been increased beyond measure. Perhaps, also, opposition would have been aroused between individual interests at meetings the purpose of which is to consider general interests; moreover, having regard to their numbers, the result might be that agricultural workers would obtain a privileged position as compared with industrial labour. This is the real reason why the Commission on Labour Legislation did not accept the proposals made to it.

If never fully discussed in principle, nevertheless, the representation of agricultural workers at the Third Session of the Conference, as far as it can be analysed in fact, presents obvious points of interest.

Of the 55 States which were members of the International Labour Organisation at the Conference in 1921, 15 were not represented at that Session, 14 sent Government Delegates only, while the remaining 26 sent Delegations which included Workers' Delegates. Of those 26 workers' representatives, 4 represented agricultural workers' organisations directly, namely, those from Austria, Finland, Latvia, and Norway.

Of the eight items on the Agenda for the 1921 Session of the Conference three dealt with agricultural subjects. The maximum possible number of Technical Advisers for each

---

1 Ibid., p. 203.

2 In the case of Austria the Workers' Delegate fell ill and was replaced by a representative of the agricultural workers' union, who had up to that time attended the Conference as an Adviser.

3 Both in Norway and Finland the principal general workers' organisations had refused to appoint a Delegate.
Workers' Delegate was 16, and the maximum possible number in all would have been 156 for agricultural items and 260 for the other items. In fact only 18 States sent Advisers to Workers' Delegates. The total number of these Advisers was 71, of whom 15, coming from eight States, were directly representative of agricultural trade unions. In one case only did a Workers' Delegate who was himself directly representative of a Union of Agricultural Workers have an Adviser for the agricultural items.

Thus of 26 States sending Workers' Delegates 11 had secured the advantage of knowledge of agricultural questions on these Delegations by means of an appointment of a Workers' Delegate or of an Adviser representing agricultural workers' unions.

§ 5. — The Mixed Advisory Agricultural Committee

The representation of agricultural workers on one other body, an organ (in part) of the International Labour Organisation, remains to be considered. This is the Mixed Advisory Agricultural Committee. This Committee is a mixed committee, as its name implies, including equal representation from the International Labour Office, on the one hand, and from the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome (not a part of the League of Nations), on the other, the purpose in establishing the Committee being to advise on the collaboration to be observed between these two institutions in enquiries into agricultural problems.

The recommendations of the Committee are addressed both to the Governing Body of the International Labour Office and to the Permanent Committee of the Institute.

The Committee was originally composed of 6 members, of whom 3 represented the Governing Body of the International Labour Office. In 1926 the number of the Committee was enlarged to 12, of whom 6 represent the Governing Body. The 6 seats thus allotted are distributed equally between Governments, employers, and workers; thus agricultural workers throughout the world, in so far as acting through the League of Nations, are represented by 2 seats on a Committee of 12. These two workers' seats are held by two out of the workers' representatives on the Governing Body itself; selection is made

1 See also the Note appended to Part II of the present study.
by decision of the Governing Body. It will easily be seen that, if this is the case, the principles governing representation of agricultural workers on the Governing Body also govern their representation on this Committee.

Until 1926 it was usual to appoint experts to attend certain meetings of the Committee. These experts were appointed by the Committee itself. Care was had to include the appointment of persons described on one occasion in the proceedings of the Committee as "social experts", i.e. experts in the social problems of agriculture. Among these "social experts" have been three who quite specially represented the agricultural workers, namely, the secretary of the International Federation of Land Workers (who was at the same time the general secretary of the German Agricultural Workers' Union), the secretary of the International Federation of Christian Land Workers' Trade Unions, and the general secretary of the National Agricultural Workers' Union of England and Wales. At the third session of the Committee, in January 1927, it was decided, however, not to nominate any list of experts of the Committee, though the Committee retains the right at all times to call and hear experts. This decision will have some bearing on the opportunity of agricultural workers to convey their opinions directly to an organ of the League of Nations; their general representation, through the two workers' representatives who are members (not experts) of the Committee remains untouched. Moreover, at the thirty-fifth Session of the Governing Body, in April 1927, a suggestion was accepted that the six members of the Advisory Agricultural Committee representing the International Labour Office, together with any experts whom they might wish to convolve, could meet as a small separate body to advise the Governing Body. This, the most recent decision on the whole subject, may eventually result in providing an organ — even if only with consultative powers — which would concentrate in its hands discussion on agricultural agenda within the League of Nations, and might prove a very useful organ through which agricultural workers could make their wishes known.
PART II

THE DEFINITION OF AN AGRICULTURAL WORKER

The first Part of this study has consisted of an examination of the representation of agricultural workers within the International Labour Organisation. At the outset it was stated that the organisation and representation of agricultural workers on an international basis depended on their organisation and representation on a national basis. The second and third Parts will therefore deal with the latter question, namely, national organisation and representation. The present, second, Part will deal with the general principles involved and will discuss the question: what constitutes an agricultural worker?

§ 1. — Examination of the Texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations

The first step is to examine any preceding decisions of the International Labour Organisation. In reviewing the scope of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations dealing with agriculture, it will be seen that they may vary from Convention to Convention and Recommendation to Recommendation. The Draft Convention concerning the Rights of Association and Combination of Agricultural Workers covers “all those engaged in agriculture”. The Draft Convention concerning Workmen’s Compensation in Agriculture applies to “all agricultural wage earners” and the Recommendation concerning Social Insurance in Agriculture to “agricultural wage earners”. The Draft Convention concerning the Age for Admission of Children to Employment in Agriculture applies to “children under the age of fourteen years”, and the Recommendation concerning Night Work of Children and Young Persons in Agriculture to “children under the age of fourteen years in agricultural undertakings” and to “young persons between the ages of fourteen and eighteen years in agricultural undertakings”, no distinction being made between paid or unpaid employment nor any reference included to the position of the parent, whether wage earner, tenant, or owner, or not connected with...
an agricultural undertaking at all. The Recommendation concerning the Prevention of Unemployment in Agriculture covers "agricultural workers". The Recommendation concerning Living-in Conditions of Agricultural Workers applies to "all accommodation provided by employers for housing their workers either individually or in groups, or with their families". The Recommendation concerning the Development of Technical Agricultural Education states that an endeavour shall be made to develop such education and to make it available in particular "to agricultural wage earners on the same conditions as to other persons engaged in agriculture". The Recommendations concerning the Protection, before and after Childbirth, of Women Wage Earners in Agriculture and concerning Night Work of Women in Agriculture apply to "women wage earners in agriculture (agricultural undertakings)".

It will be seen that the scope of the decisions of the International Labour Organisation includes in the first place wage earners in agriculture and agricultural workers; in the second place, children under the age of fourteen years who are employed in agriculture; and, in the third place, can also include persons engaged in agriculture, even if not wage earners. The scope of the Recommendation on technical agricultural education would seem to be even wider than "all persons engaged in agriculture" and to extend to persons outside the industry of agriculture.

Important also is the text of the Advisory Opinion given by the Permanent Court of International Justice on 12 August 1922. This Advisory Opinion reads:

The Court is of opinion that the competence of the International Labour Organisation does extend to international regulation of the conditions of labour of persons employed in agriculture, etc.¹

Thus an analysis of the texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations shows that the Conference has placed the limits within which they are to apply very widely in certain cases where the subject matter handled by the Convention or Recommendation seemed to require such coverage. The right to place those limits widely, to include "persons employed in agriculture", would appear to have been confirmed in the Advisory Opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice.

§ 2. — Scope of the Question: What Constitutes an Agricultural Worker? The Position of the Smallholder and Similar Groups

The general utility of the conclusion noted in the last paragraph, namely, that the field of application of the previous decisions of the International Labour Conference is a wide one, is obvious. The texts of the Draft Conventions and Recommendations show that the Organisation claims to deal with agricultural labour on no narrow basis; they do not help much, however, towards any formal definition of an agricultural worker. If it is necessary to proceed to such a definition, help must be sought elsewhere, always bearing in mind that if and when the "agricultural worker" has been defined, the Conventions and Recommendations are there to apply to the "international regulation of the conditions of labour of persons employed in agriculture".

The definition of an agricultural worker depends upon the delimitation of the two words "agriculture" and "worker".

The definition of the word "agriculture" is a question of very great importance to the International Labour Organisation. "Agriculture" presumably includes in all countries the cultivation of crops and their harvesting, and stock-tending and stock-breeding. But here agreement ends. Even forestry is not in all countries a part of the agricultural industry; where it is simply an extractive industry, i.e. lumbering, it is not always counted as agriculture. Horticulture is in an even more doubtful position: horticulture is much more "industrialised", using that word in a narrow sense, than is ordinary field work, and sometimes claims to be counted as a non-agricultural industry. Moreover, there are various branches of horticulture, commercial market gardening, floristry, etc.; and there is park-keeping and private job gardening. Again, there are all the industries "allied" with agriculture (dairies, distilleries, beet-crushing works, etc.). These allied industries are usually industries working up agricultural products. At the other end there is work preparatory to agricultural work, namely, clearing, drainage, irrigation, and even road-making, which are sometimes counted in agriculture, but not always. One need not raise such small points as hunting, osier-gathering, etc.; a number of these minor points could be raised. The International Labour Office has not yet had an opportunity of examining the question in detail. For the purpose of the present study
it must therefore be left aside; it is sufficient to draw attention to the fact that in the text of the Draft Convention on Sickness Insurance for Agricultural Workers prepared for the Tenth Session of the Conference this year, no change has been made in the principle hitherto adopted by the Conference of leaving the definition of "agriculture" to each country.

The definition of an "agricultural worker" is closely connected with the definition of "agriculture". What is the position of an electrician employed on a farm where there is a large electric plant? Of a rural craftsman employed at times on a farm? Of a mechanic travelling with a threshing machine? Of a resident worker living in the farmhouse and doing partly domestic and partly agricultural work (this is a well-known point of controversy)? Such are a few of the questions which ought to be answered before any clear and authoritative definition of an agricultural worker can be laid down.

The delimitation of the word "worker" is a very wide problem and involves arguments which apply to all industries. However, it may be observed even at this stage that these vexed problems are particularly acute in the case of agriculture and merit separate examination without necessarily involving a decision as to what is a "worker" in other industries.

The present study does not deal with all these questions, but confines itself to one question of principle, which is important, namely: does the agricultural "worker" comprise only the wage-paid worker? Or are there not, ranged between the wage-paid worker and the large-scale landed proprietor, a large number of tenant cultivators and even of owners of small farms or plots, who, while on the one side they approach the land-owning class proper, on the other merge insensibly into the class of the wage earner, so that it becomes impossible to say where the group of agricultural "workers" really ends?

Employer and Employed in Agriculture

The reason why it is difficult to draw a definite line between employers and employed in agriculture is because a definite separation of capital and labour in different hands does not exist. It is true that the capital required to carry on an agri-
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cultural undertaking, at least in all developed countries, is considerable. One might consequently have expected, in analogy with what has happened in manufacturing industry, a great concentration and accumulation of agricultural land in the hands of a small class of agricultural capitalists. This has not taken place very markedly. Even where large areas are owned by a few persons, as, for example, is the case in Great Britain and in large districts of Central Europe, technical difficulties and, not least, difficulties of management have prevented the concentration of the exploitation of the soil in a relatively small number of big undertakings. Cultivation takes place instead on a number of holdings having each their responsible chief. The more intensive agriculture becomes, the smaller becomes the area which can be run from one centre. But with the replacing of the large-scale estate by several independent undertakings follows also the splitting up of the economic risk. The possibility of heavy losses for single persons is diminished, but, at the same time, also the possibility of an accumulation of large profits.

In fact, the state of affairs at present is that there exists a large number of persons running their farms without employing any workers. From the point of view of economic theory it is sufficient to call such persons "exploitors", i.e. persons who run undertakings at their own risk and for their own profit; not so for the International Labour Organisation, which has to distinguish between employers and employed. Where in this scale should the exploiter, who is not an employer, be ranged? He is obviously an exploiter, for he works at his own risk; but he is no employer, for he employs nobody but himself. But the fact that he does "employ himself", i.e. does do work comparable in kind, amount, and in the conditions under which it is performed with that done by wage-paid employed workers is sufficient to make his labour conditions of interest to the International Labour Organisation.

Does Part XIII of the Treaty cover labour not done on account of another person, i.e. independent labour or self-employment? If so, what representation is there, or can there be, in the International Labour Organisation, for persons contributing such labour to agriculture all over the world? Should representation, for instance, be accorded in so far as such persons can prove that they rank with wage-earning and employed workers from the point of view of their national law, their
economic rewards, and their general social environment, and excluded — at any rate from the Labour delegations — in so far as they form a class apart, with interests distinct from, or even alien to, those of the employed workers? The independent worker is still a common enough phenomenon in the manufacturing world, even if disappearing or at least losing in relative importance. The special difficulty for agriculture is that in some countries he forms the principal group of persons at work, by comparison with whom the worker employed for wages forms a smaller class.

In other words, while wage earning in agriculture is quite general, it is far from being universal, and it would appear to be a task incumbent on the International Labour Organisation to consider by what means and on what basis its constitution can be construed and applied to cover this situation.

Moreover, in certain important countries the number of such independent workers is rapidly increasing owing to processes of agrarian reform, even to the diminution of the numbers of employed workers. Economically their position is often very weak, and what they enjoy in the way of legal independence is forfeited in part by their need for economic assistance.

The fact may be cited that at the outset the smallholder or tenant starts without the possession of initial capital. Proof of this may be drawn, for instance, from the very high percentage of working capital (quite apart from mortgages on the holding itself) which is being given under modern systems of agrarian reform to new settlers. Moreover, the small cultivator fails to accumulate capital in the course of his exploitation. The most that he does is to pay off the debt on his farm, and this process may take the best part of his natural life. It has been picturesquely said that the smallholder "spends his whole life in paying for his farm".

After death the smallholding, where it has been owned by the cultivator, ought not to be treated merely as fluid savings and divided among the heirs. The tendency to treat a smallholdings as capital and, under equalitarian laws of inheritance, to divide that capital after death among the children of the owner has only been disastrous and has so broken up the surface of the earth that it has positively in some places destroyed the value of the very thing it was sought to hand on. A small piece of land is not really capital as capital is understood in the modern world. For this reason modern agrarian legislation
insists on maintaining in perpetuity the integrity of the smallholding, treating it invariably as a means of production or tool, and not as realisable capital.

Again, the smallholder and small tenant have the same standard of living and of comfort as the wage-earning worker; their annual budget is practically the same, rent assuming in the budget of the small tenant the place taken by taxes, interest, and repairs in that of the small proprietor. Opportunities for education and recreation are almost identical with those of the wage-earning agricultural worker. Housing is similar in character. It is important to note that there is, as a rule, a well-marked social distinction between the "farmer" and the smallholding class.

Finally, the smallholder automatically takes his place in the wage-earning market either at regular seasons of the year, or when his smallholding fails him; he competes for employment and for wages. This is perhaps the most considerable point of interest which he offers to the International Labour Organisation. The smallholder can, on occasion, undersell the wage-earning worker, and there have been complaints on this score; as a potential labour force the smallholder is, in any case, always of importance. It may be added that his sons and daughters mostly enter the labour market in the usual way.

To these classes we now have to add a whole series of groups of small cultivators, of very various importance in different countries, who are not even legally independent. By far the most important of these groups are the share-farmers. Share-farming is widespread in France, Italy, Portugal, Spain, in the Balkan countries, in Greece, and in Turkey, in vast tracts of the eastern world (China, Japan, etc.), South America, and also in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States of America. In the last-named countries share-farming is possibly a transitory phenomenon, but it is difficult to prophesy.

It has already been stated that the accumulation of considerable fluid capital in agriculture is not easy. What was said above of the small tenant's want of capital applies, with only slight modification, to the position of the share-tenant. Where capital is not very plentiful, it is convenient to share the

---

1 There is an important class of smallholders or small tenants who are regularly employed in crafts or in manufacturing undertakings.
responsibility of providing that capital between two persons, and it is in this way that share-renting arrangements in agriculture are apt to grow up. Share-tenancy has been developed, and very admirably developed in spite of certain minor abuses, to solve this difficulty. In certain parts of the world the small cultivator has never been in a position to acquire an independent farm properly equipped; it is therefore an arrangement between him and his landlord that his landlord should supply him with fixed and working capital, i.e. stock, buildings, seeds, fertilisers, etc. But no man owning capital is willing to supply it without security in goods unless he can retain a certain control over it. The security offered by the share-tenant is not in goods but in the labour of himself and of his family, and it is this exchange of capital as against labour which is the characteristic of the share-tenancy system, while the shared management of the land, the control retained by the landlord, is the very heart of the arrangement; that control partakes of the nature of the control exercised by an employer over services owed by an employee. The ultimate sharing of the harvest — which is so often quoted as the hallmark of the system — is only the final statement given to arrangements which have been permanently operative throughout the year.

An explanation of share-tenancy can also be given from the landlord’s point of view. For him it is a question of want of the necessary labour with which to work his land (use his capital). His offer of dart capital is thus an inducement to labour to come forward. Thus either party, in view of the scarcity of a desired commodity (working capital, labour) is willing to enter on what is practically an exchange in kind instead of going into the open market and there securing what he wants at cash rates.

In view of the fact that share-tenancy arrangements are in effect an exchange of capital against labour, the classification at law of share-tenancy is not simple. Wherever a landowner in releasing surplus land accepts an arrangement which is not either definitely a tenancy agreement or definitely a labour-employing contract, the person who helps him in cultivating that surplus of land is in an ambiguous position. Or, rather, his relations are not so much ambiguous as double: the element of labour (contract of service) and the element of the use of the land (tenancy) are simultaneously present. This ambiguity, which is inherent in the situation, is the character-
istic of a large number of arrangements which have as their object the cultivation of the earth’s surface. There seems to be a distinct tendency to evolve a point of view which is in advance of the actual legal texts on the subject. The comments of lawyers, especially in Italy, tend to favour the opinion that such contracts are employment contracts and to regard as unimportant the tenancy aspect. In general, it is interesting to observe that Governments and administrations often have a sympathy for, and an appreciation of, the economic and social situation of such groups which is very imperfectly expressed in the laws of their country. Resource is often had to a variety of voluntary arrangements of social insurance, etc., which can be applied without the inconvenience of having to introduce an obligatory system.

Share-tenancy (métayage) in France, Italy, and Spain. — Share-tenancy is a very widespread form of cultivation over eastern and southern Europe. Apart from some very large share-tenancy farms — which do not fall within the present study — share-tenancy holdings are almost invariably small family enterprises. In France they are regulated by the Act of 18 July 1889. Section 1 of that Act reads:

A lease of part settlement or share-tenancy shall be defined as a contract by which the owner of a rural estate leases such estate for a certain period to a holder who engages to cultivate it on condition that the produce be shared with the lessor.

In Italy such contracts fall under the Civil Code. Article 1647 of that Code reads:

The person cultivating an area on condition of sharing the produce with the lessor shall be defined as a share-tenant or settler (colono), and the resulting contract shall be defined as a share-tenancy or settlement. The general principles governing the hiring of goods and more particularly governing the hiring of land shall be applicable to such contracts...

In Spain the Civil Code defines share-tenancies as partnerships. Article 1579 of that Code reads:

The letting of land on share-tenancy for cultivation, stockbreeding, or for manufacturing or industrial establishments, is governed by the provisions relating to partnership agreements, by the stipulations made between the parties, and, in default of these, by the custom of the district.

Partnerships, hiring of land, and hiring of goods are all mentioned in the Codes of these countries as principles to which reference can be made in the definition of share-tenancy, and, were these definitions final, it would have to be conceded...
that at law share-tenancy formally ranks with one or other of these forms of contract. There seems, however, to have been a certain change in the point of view of lawyers and authorities responsible for Governmental acts since these Codes were issued. The most important action taken is the recent decision of the Italian Government to rank share-farmers as workers for purposes of industrial classification under the Act on Corporations of 3 April 1926; this Act regulates and organises all Italian industry, and for that purpose classifies persons occupied in industries as employers and employed. By Royal Decree of 1 July 1926, which contains the regulations for the carrying-out of the Act, share-farmers are to constitute separate associations which shall be constituent bodies of the higher-grade agricultural workers' associations; owners and tenants of small properties, on the other hand, are ranked with employers (§§5 and 34); this apparently applies even to the cultivators of the smallest holding, but since the issue of the Decree the question of tenancy has been referred to a Committee, in view of the vehement protests of the workers, protests supported by the authoritative opinion of Professor Serpieri, some time Under-Secretary of State for Agriculture. As a matter of fact, where holdings are really small, they are mostly run on the share-farming system, and, as already stated, share-farmers rank as workers. The decision laid down by the Decree is particularly interesting as it puts an end, at any rate for the present, to a great deal of discussion and dispute on the subject. Previous legislation had been inconsistent, but opinion was clearly coming round to regarding the share-farmer as a worker rather than anything else. Thus a recent well-informed Italian writer states "from an economic point of view the contract (of share-tenancy) is fundamentally different from a contract for the hiring of goods". This more modern view attributes considerable importance to the labour side of the arrangement, and views the Italian share-tenancy contract as a mixed one, participating both in the nature of a labour contract and also of a contract for the hiring of land or of goods. The recent official decision has now the effect of making the labour element the decisive element.

1 See Part III of the present study, under Italy.
2 Mr. Costanzo in the International Review of Agricultural Economics, Jan. 1924, International Institute of Agriculture, Rome.
3 Cf. among other authorities, Mr. Serpieri, formerly Under-Secretary (for Agriculture) in the Ministry of National Economy in his Studiisui contratti agrari.
In recent French opinion there is a tendency to couple the share-farmer rather loosely with the employed worker. The Act of 3 January 1924 on Chambers of Agriculture, in defining the various classes of persons entitled to elect to the Chambers, ranks owners of property, then share-farmers, small tenants, and managers, etc., and finally workers, as three separate groups. An official body like the National Labour Council, at a meeting of 19 February 1927, has gone further and accepted a programme which included some important recommendations to improve the position of share-farmers; this is a good illustration of a point of view which recognises the share-farmer's need for social protection, though not at present classing him as a worker, and bears out what was said above, that general opinion is often in advance of legislative texts on this subject.

The present point of view of the Spanish Government is that the share-farmer, though not a wage earner, must to all intents and purposes be treated like a wage earner, inasmuch as he is a worker. Even the small independent worker, i.e. the owner or tenant of a small piece of land, approximates, though somewhat less closely, to the social position of the wage earner. This opinion is based on the findings of the National Social Insurance Conference, convened by the National Social Affairs Institute at Barcelona in 1922. The Spanish Government states:

Spain is a country which has a very high percentage of independent workers whose economic position is not appreciably better than that of workers in many wage-earning occupations. Artisans and small tradespeople are a very numerous class and so are small agricultural proprietors. Each year these groups increase and it may be anticipated that in some districts new sections of small proprietors will be created. Besides, there are more than 600,000 families which cultivate land belonging to someone else without being paid wages (tenant-farmers, métayers, etc.)

The Spanish Government goes on to state that the exclusion of these classes from social insurance has caused dissatisfaction

---

1 For insurance legislation in France and for workers' opinions, see below, pp. 44 et seq., and also the following note.

and that, at the Conference mentioned above, the representatives of agriculture put forward the inclusion of small proprietors and settlers in compulsory insurance arrangements as one of the demands of agriculture. The Government expresses itself as sympathetic to measures for protecting the position of these persons.

Thus in these three countries there seems to be a certain evolution of opinion going on, which tends to range the share-farmer, and with rather less certainty the small independent owner or tenant of land, alongside of the wage-earning worker.

*Share-tenancy (Teilpacht), tenant-workers' contracts (Heuerlingsvertrag), in Germany.* In Germany the tendency is undoubtedly towards the disappearance of these intermediate contracts. They linger, under the name of *Teilpacht*, in vine and tobacco-growing districts. The last census, however, which noted the extent of the system was that of 1895; there were then 38,396 undertakings covering 48,735 hectares which were (sometimes in part only) cultivated on a share-tenancy system.

Commenting on this an authoritative source states:

The share-tenancy system can from one point of view be regarded as a sub-form of tenancy, from another as a form of labour contract. In view of the fact that the share tenant's holding is also the place of his employment, it may be stated that the labour and the tenancy relations are simultaneously regarded as a single contract.

The tenant-workers' contract (*Heuerlingsvertrag*) is perhaps more widespread. Under it the landlord requires a number of days' work, varying between 30 and 250 per year, from his tenant-worker.

*The tenant-labourers (torpare) in Sweden.* Very significant is the position of the Swedish tenant-labourers or *torpare*. The *torpare* are tenants of cottages and of a small plot of ground; but they are employees in so far as they pay for their farms not in money rent, but by contracting to do two or three days' labour per week on their employer's farm. Their double relation as tenant-employees is extremely well brought out under the Accident Insurance Act of 1917, for under this Act they are compulsorily insured against accidents in respect of work done.

---

1 "*Teilbau u. Teilpacht*" in *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften* Jena, Fischer, 1911.
during the days they work on their employer's farm, but need not be insured in respect of work done on their own torp. The tenancy and labour relationships could scarcely be more closely united. When the labour side of the contract is only one degree strengthened, we have the group of the domiciled workers or statare. These are regular employees enjoying in some cases the use of a small plot of land, who beyond any doubt enter into a contract of service. The close relationship between them and the torpare shows how gradually the tenancy may pass into the labour contract 2.

Share-cropping in the United States of America. For purposes of record the share-cropping of the United States is noted here, as it seems too characteristic a form of share-tenancy to omit in an investigatory report. The system is extensively adopted in the Southern States. Historically it has origins not unlike that of the métayage system in western and southern Europe; in other words, it was an arrangement originally designed to meet the poverty of the cultivating tenants and which has since been retained. The slave population released after the Civil War in the South was totally without capital or resources; on the other hand, it was the only rural labour force in the country. A system which supplied labour to land, and land and equipment to labour was eminently practical.

What is interesting to observe is that in the States where cropping agreements are used they are interpreted in opposite directions by different Acts. The croppers are definitely ranked as employees under a South Carolina Act of 25 February 1904 3. The Code of Georgia incorporates a negative statement only, namely, that “the relation of landlord and tenant does not

---

1 Statement from the Swedish Social Board to the International Labour Office.
3 An Act to amend section 357, Criminal Code of Laws, 1902, Vol. II, relating to violation of labourers’ contracts. The Act reads in part: "Any labourer working on shares of crop, or for wages in money or other valuable consideration under a verbal or written contract to labour on farm lands, who shall receive advances, either in money or supplies, and thereafter wilfully or without just cause fails to perform the reasonable service required of him by the terms of the said contract, shall be liable to prosecution for a misdemeanour", etc. The system of advances is part of the cropping system, and it is clear from the above wording, and from the title of the Act, that under that system the cropper is held to enter into a contract of service.
arise” as between the person who lets the land and his cropper. On the other hand, the 1923 Code of Alabama is absolutely precise in the opposite sense. The same is true in Mississippi, where the relation of landlord and tenant is held to obtain. This contradiction in State law is significant. Moreover, while at the last Federal census (1920) croppers’ lands were handled, for purposes of convenience, along with tenancies, nevertheless, the official analysis of this part of the census included the following passage:

It is significant to compare the conditions of croppers and other much supervised share-tenants with that of labourers working for fixed wages. In other words, while tenancy in theory represents merely a method of holding possession of land, in practice it sometimes works out into a method of obtaining labourers to work on the land. For while the cotton-belt cropper has possession of his little 30-acre tract, his possession is hedged about with so many restrictions and so much supervision that it does not amount to very much more than the mere possession of a job.

Share-crop rents in Canada. Share-tenancy, in the sense of the payment of rent as a proportion of the crop grown, is quite the commonest form of a tenancy in the wheat growing districts of Canada. These are true share-produce agreements, peculiarly suited to one-crop enterprises. They range from arrangements where the landlord supplies only the land, receiving one-third of the crop, to arrangements where the landlord supplies land and one-half of the equipment (twine, seed, etc.) receiving one-half of the crop, or supplies land and the whole of the equipment and receives two-thirds of the crop. While the first two forms of agreement, which are the most common, scarcely include any elements which set up a contract of service, the last which is, however, more exceptional, is often little more than a contract of service, seeing that the tenant supplies nothing but his labour.

1 Section 3707: “Cropper. Where one is employed to work for part of the crop, the relation of landlord and tenant does not arise. The title to the crop, subject to the interest of the cropper therein, and the possession of the land remain in the owner.”

2 Section 8807 (4742, 4743): “Relation between party furnishing land and party furnishing labour. When one party furnishes the land and the other party furnishes the labour to cultivate it, with stipulations, express or implied, to divide the crop between them in certain proportions, the relation of landlord and tenant, with all its incidents, and to all intents and purposes, shall be held to exist between them.”

3 Schlicht v. Callicott, 76 Miss. 487, is cited.

Share-milking in New Zealand. Yet another form of mixed contract of a peculiarly interesting nature is the share-milking contract of New Zealand. Here the capital advanced as against the labour of the other contracting party is not merely land, but land with stock, indeed, stock in the first place. In a model agreement drawn up by the South Auckland Dairy Association, under the heading: "Status of Parties," it is expressly laid down that the agreement shall not be deemed to have created a partnership, nor shall the milker be deemed in any way a tenant of the land he uses; he shall be deemed the bailiff only of the stock of the owner. A further article gives the owner of the land and stock certain rights of dismissal and engagement over the persons for whose services the milker sub-contracts. Yet the general tenor of the contract makes it difficult to regard the milker merely as the paid agent of the owner. It is, in fact, a true mixed contract, combining relations arising out of the hire of goods and those arising out of services to be rendered.

The above are a few out of many examples which could be cited of the various forms taken by agricultural contracts relating simultaneously to services and to goods. Some remarks supplied to the International Labour Office in connection with the last-named type are illustrative of the permanent economic factor which underlies almost all these varying types. It is stated that the custom of share-milking in New Zealand sprang up out of the economic needs of the dairy industry in its earliest days, when the country was still one of virgin fertility and capital was fluid. It was adopted because it "gave more satisfaction to the owner," but also because it "gave many of the necessities of life to the family man"; the share-system, it is stated, "has been the stepping-stone for many a man to get a farm on his own account." But with the passing away of these special economic conditions it is presumed that share-milking in New Zealand will cease, and the reason given is important: because dairying will become a science, in which agricultural knowledge, chemistry, business ability, and education will be the necessary equipment of the successful man. In other words, the mental and material capital which will have to be put into the industry will have to be immensely increased. Share-tenancy and similar systems are recognised

1 Copy supplied to the International Labour Office by the Secretary of the New Zealand Labour Party.
methods — they are one of the old inherited forms of the self-organisation of the agricultural industry — the economic purpose of which is to supply the actual cultivators of the earth’s surface with the means of carrying on their task; this is their social justification. They give to labour its “means of production”. But they cease to do so where agriculture has entered on a phase of complicated capital expenditure. These intermediary forms then no longer suffice; they are too individualistic, too slightly guaranteed, too liable to disturbance, and above all on too small a scale to be at all convenient. But where they do exist — and sufficient evidence has been quoted to show that they are known over a large part of the earth’s surface and under the most varying conditions — they are far from being accidental, haphazard, or mere survivals, but are intrinsic to the economic agricultural conditions of these particular countries at these epochs; they are, in fact, a common stage in agricultural development. This is a powerful argument for not neglecting them in any survey of world agricultural conditions or in any system of world representation to be given to agriculture.

Social Protection of the “Intermediate” Groups of Cultivators

It may reasonably be inferred that industrial or social protection legislation expresses or expressed at the time of its enactment current opinion on the classification of the “intermediate” groups of cultivators, whether with the wage-earning workers or in some other way. The net result of the examples cited below will be to show that general statements are difficult. Legal practice varies from country to country, sometimes even within a country, according to the subject-matter or the date of the relevant Acts. Nevertheless, the remark is justified that quite often industrial legislation takes notice of the share-tenant and similar groups as well as of the wage-earning worker; the further inference that, by so doing, it necessarily classes these groups as workers is much more doubtful.

The present analysis is confined to that type of industrial legislation which aims at the social protection of the worker. There are three conditions which may arise in reference to the intermediate groups of cultivators: they may be excluded alto-
gether: they may be voluntarily admitted to a system of insurance, which is compulsory or voluntary; they may be compelled to enter a system of obligatory insurance.

The first condition — exclusion — undoubtedly amounts to a proof that the groups are in certain countries not classed as workers. The exclusion is not usually an express one, but in the form of an article stating that the benefits of an Act are reserved to workers employed for wages, or some corresponding phrase. Special cases of doubt are decided in the courts. The Workmen’s Accident Compensation Acts of the States of the Commonwealth of Australia may be quoted, requiring, as they do, a contract of service or apprenticeship as a condition. Yet here it is interesting to note that one State — Queensland — expressly widened its Act by amendment to include share-farmers 1.

The second condition, that of the admission of the intermediate groups as voluntary contributors to some system of voluntary or compulsory insurance is of great interest. It proves that in many countries social insurance legislation takes note of these groups as of persons requiring social assistance or social protection; this inference is greatly strengthened where the voluntary insurance system is partly or largely backed by State grants, for in that case the insured persons are enjoying benefits which are established not merely for private, but for social community purposes. It does not follow, however, that they are classed as workers. Some social insurance laws are quite general in their scope and cover either all persons fulfilling certain conditions or else all persons fulfilling certain conditions and occupied in a specified industry. In neither case is any inference to be drawn as to the beneficiaries being actually employed workers or ex-workers. Interest rather arises where in the very act of admitting the intermediate groups to the benefits of social insurance care is taken to draw up definitions excluding persons who can be genuinely classed as employers. It follows that the intermediate groups are obviously held not to be employers, and to exclude the intermediate group from the class of employers is a step of considerable significance.

1 Workers’ Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1921; section 3(3b) inserted in 1921 reads: “Every share-farmer and every wages-man employed by any share-farmer shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be a worker employed by the owner of the farm.”
Definitions in such cases sometimes attack the problem directly by stating that the insurable person, etc., may not employ more than one, sometimes more than two, workers himself; some grace is necessarily allowed, for many smallholders require some outside help, often of a seasonal nature, but are by no means thereby to be classed with the employing farmer even on a medium-sized farm. In other cases the law requires that the smallholder or share tenant and/or his wife and children shall themselves be doing manual work on the farm. Definition is also sought more indirectly, but nevertheless effectively, where it is stated that such holdings must not be over a certain area, or must not carry more than a certain number (usually very few) animals, or must not produce more than a certain revenue. These conditions, or some among them, are also found in combination. More severe is a definition which will be noticed below under our third condition — obligatory insurance — excluding the cultivator of a holding sufficiently large in the main to support life for himself and his family. In this case the inference is significant, namely, that the beneficiary shall at least in part be dependent on employment for wages.

Insurance legislation which enforces compensation for accidents allows the voluntary insurance of small holders or share tenants, e.g. in Bulgaria (independent cultivators, etc., whose annual revenue does not exceed 50,000 levas)¹; Denmark (small employers not employing workers subject to insurance and themselves earning less than a specified amount; all market gardeners)²; France (cultivators usually working alone or with the help of members of their immediate family, or relatives, or with occasional paid or unpaid outside help)³; Germany (owners of agricultural undertakings may, by the rules of the accident insurance institution within whose circumspection they fall, be rendered liable to compulsory insurance; if not compulsorily insured, may insure voluntarily; further, the governments of the States may prescribe to what extent and under what conditions they are to be insured; practically all agricultural employers have been insured compulsorily in virtue of this provision)⁴; Austria and Czechoslovakia (insurance against industrial

¹ Act of 6 March 1924.
² Act last amended on 28 June 1920.
³ Act of 15 December 1922 and Decree of 29 July 1923.
accidents is open to employers whether their undertakings are liable to compulsory insurance or not); Netherlands (all employers and any person engaged in agriculture on his own account may insure voluntarily).

Insurance legislation which makes provision for sickness allows the voluntary insurance of smallholders or share tenants, e.g. in Belgium (leaving it to mutual insurance societies to define their membership; there are no exclusive provisions against any class of persons laid down by legislation); Bulgaria (independent cultivators, etc., whose annual income does not exceed 50,000 levas); Denmark (persons without private means beyond a moderate amount belonging to the labouring classes and persons in a similar economic position, e.g. small farmers, handicraftsmen, salaried employees, etc.); France (the same principle as in Belgium; a Bill has passed through certain stages giving special facilities, inter alia, to smallholders and share tenants whose annual income does not exceed 10,000 francs); Germany (employers, including agricultural employers, working alone or employing not more than two insurable paid workers and whose annual income does not exceed 2,700 Reichsmarks); Poland (all persons whose annual income does not exceed 7,500 zloty).

Insurance legislation which makes provision for invalidity, old age, or against death allows the voluntary insurance of smallholders or share tenants, e.g. in Belgium (voluntary insurance for all persons whose annual income does not exceed 15,000 francs); Bulgaria (independent cultivators, etc., whose annual income does not exceed 50,000 levas); Denmark (all persons insured under sickness insurance are compulsorily

---

2 Act of 20 May 1922, section 99 (1) and (2).
3 The list of countries is not set forth as exhaustive.
4 Act of 23 June 1894.
5 Act of 6 March 1924.
7 Act of 1 April 1898; Bill adopted by the Chamber of Deputies on 8 April 1924.
10 The list of countries is not set forth as exhaustive.
11 Act of 10 Dec. 1924.
12 Act of 6 March 1924.
insured against invalidity)\(^1\), France (smallholders, share tenants, and artisans who habitually work alone or with a single worker or with the members of their family residing with them, also wage-paid workers whose annual income is over 10,000 and does not exceed 12,000 francs)\(^2\), Germany (employers, including agricultural employers, under 40 years of age and not employing more than two workers)\(^3\), Italy (small proprietors who pay taxes not exceeding 500 lire per year; for share tenants, see below under compulsory insurance)\(^4\), Luxemburg (persons not over 40 years of age, employing habitually not more than two paid workers and whose annual income does not exceed 4,500 frs.)\(^5\).\(^6\).

The third condition, that of compelling the smallholder and share tenant to enter an obligatory insurance system, results in some countries in ranging these two groups pretty definitely with the workers; in other countries, however, no certain inference of this nature can be drawn.

In Italy\(^7\) Legislative Decree No. 1480 for compulsory insurance against accidents in agriculture of 23 August 1917 (as amended on 20 March 1920) stipulates in its first section that three classes of persons shall be insured, namely, (a) workers employed for wages, (b) landowners, share tenants, and tenants and their wives and children habitually doing manual work on their holdings, and (c) managers, bailiffs, etc., employed in agricultural or forestry undertakings whose earnings do not exceed 20 lire per day. If an analogy may be drawn from another Italian Decree, No. 603, of 21 April 1919, on old-age and invalidity insurance, the inference is that the share tenant and smallholder is hereby classed not only with the workers, but as a worker. For section 1 of this second Decree runs:

---

1. Act of 6 May 1921, amended 29 March 1924.
2. Acts of 5 April 1910 and 18 April 1922; section 36 (2) of the 1910 Act lays down that the landlord of the share tenant shall himself contribute to the insurance premiums; it is a fair inference that the landlord is in part the employer and the share tenant in part the employed person. In other respects the Acts group by income level rather than by type of employment; thus even wage earners whose salary exceeds 10,000 francs would be in the second group, of persons insuring voluntarily, not in the first, of persons compulsorily insured.
5. Act of 6 May 1911.
6. The list of countries is not set forth as exhaustive.
7. On the new classification of share-holders and small tenants in Italy, see Part III, Section on Italy.
Insurance against invalidity and old age shall be compulsory on persons of both sexes who... work for hire in the following capacities.... Among the persons specified in (1) of the present section shall be included share tenants and tenants who habitually perform manual labour in their respective undertakings, and who do not as a rule employ more than one person not belonging to their own family for the purpose of working the land held under a share tenancy or tenancy agreement.

These provisions were annulled by Royal Decree, No. 3184, of 30 December 1923, and share tenants and tenants were excluded from the benefits of this type of insurance; it may, however, be stated that the exclusion was for financial reasons and should not affect the theory of their position at law. Nevertheless, it is again to be noted that Regulations of 28 August 1924, issued in pursuance of the Decree of 1923, class the smallholder and share tenant as an employer in respect of any workers whom he may engage and as such subject him to the necessity of paying contributions on their behalf.

Another instance of the grouping of the smallholder and share tenant with the agricultural worker can further be quoted from Portugal. Decree No. 5638 of 10 May 1919 on compulsory insurance against invalidity, old age, and death, states that in addition to wage-earners there shall be insured small industrial and commercial employers, small tenants and proprietors whose annual income does not exceed a certain amount.

An instance of rather a different type is an unemployment relief Order issued by the German Federal Government on 14 November 1924 (amended 18 January 1926). The Order defines classes of undertakings exempt from payment of unemployment relief premiums and among those undertakings are agricultural or forestry undertakings cultivated by persons who are in part employed for wages but who at the same time are proprietors or tenants of holdings sufficiently large "in the main to support life for the cultivator himself and his family". The definition, it will be seen, draws the line much more severely than in some of the cases cited above — the net result is certainly to exclude rather than to include the small proprietor. The determination of what is a holding sufficiently large under the terms of the Order is in the hands of certain local authorities.

A form of semi-compulsory insurance against unemployment

1Reichsarbeitsblatt, 24 Nov. 1924. The wage-paid worker having a long engagement or right to long notice, is also excluded (from contributions), so that the line is really drawn not between holding of land and landless persons, but between exposure to risk of unemployment and non-exposure.
obtains in Denmark. Voluntary as from the State, the trade unions make it compulsory on their members. But only wage-paid labourers are admitted to insurance, and in order to distinguish between labourers and smallholders certain rules have been drawn up. According to these a smallholder in order to be classed with agricultural labourers must not have land valued at over 3,000 kroner, or more than one small horse, two cows and a heifer, and must prove that he is working at least 200 days per year for an employer. 

**Opinion of the Workers**

A point of great interest is the attitude of the organised unions of wage-earning agricultural workers on this question of the "intermediate" groups of cultivators. Are such intermediate groups admitted to the agricultural trade unions, and if so, on what conditions? The question has been specifically addressed to organised agricultural wage earners all over the world in communications sent out by the International Labour Office, and a summary will be found in Part III of this study of the answers received up to date, country by country.

If there were a strong body of opinion among organised workers that the "intermediate" groups of cultivators belonged to their ranks or, vice versa, that they did not, this opinion would be a very good guide to the International Labour Office. It is, however, clear that no such decisive opinion exists, although, on the whole, organised agricultural workers are friendly to the small cultivator and anxious to retain his support.

The following illustrative facts may perhaps be noted. For further information reference should be made to Part III of this study.

The attitude of the two existing international federations of agricultural wage-earners is as follows. The International Federation of Land Workers, which is affiliated with the International Federation of Trade Unions (Amsterdam), at its third congress in September, 1924, passed an interesting resolution, which is here quoted in full in translation.

It is proper to establish the fact that in many countries small landed proprietors (smallholders) are additionally employed for wages as workers in agriculture and forestry. The employment relation is often

---

1 The list of countries is not set forth as exhaustive.
not a permanent one, but an occasional one, for instance, seasonal labour. The interests of such persons are as much affected by the organisation of gainfully employed workers as they are by organisations to encourage independent proprietors.

In recognition of this fact the Third International Land Workers' Congress records its opinion that the organising of the small agricultural proprietors, who represent proletarian standards of life, can take place within the framework of agricultural workers' organisation.

The Congress records its opinion that the organising of these classes of the rural proletariat can be of use to assist the struggle of the wage workers employed in agriculture and forestry.

The Congress further records its opinion that the organising of these small proprietors (smallholders) will also contribute to assist the organising of those classes of land workers who are employed as separate workers (farm servants) on large farms.

Finally, the Congress is of opinion that the co-operation together of all groups of the rural proletariat in organisations of land workers and smallholders, either acting jointly or being identical, is in the common interest, and therefore recommends affiliated federations to pay special attention to this question and to take note of it in drawing up their regular reports to the Secretariat of the Land Workers' International.

The Congress leaves to the separate national federations the question of the organised classification of these groups and the representation of their special interests, as in view of inadequate experience it is not yet possible to lay down general principles.

This resolution was passed at the instance of the constituent Austrian organisation, which at that time was particularly interested in the admission of smallholders into the ranks of the wage-earning workers. Since then the Austrian organisation has itself entered upon a slightly revised policy. The resolution is perhaps rather a statement of principle than an immediate working policy.

The International Federation of Christian Agricultural Workers' Trade Unions, which is affiliated with the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, was constituted at a congress held at Coblenz, 27-28 April 1921. Article 5 of the Constitution of the Federation, adopted on that occasion, reads:

The following may be admitted as members of the Federation: all national federations and all national unions of land workers which accept Christian principles as a basis, which accept the present statutes, etc.

At this congress two organisations representing the intermediate groups of cultivators had representation, namely, the National Federation of Share-Tenants and Smallholders, Italy,

---

1 Original in German.
and the Italian Federation of Small Proprietors. These organisations were (in 1926) not affiliated to the International Federation of Christian Agricultural Workers’ Trade Unions, but the first had been affiliated and both were considered still eligible for affiliation and were, in any case, affiliated to the General Federation of Christian Trade Unions of Italy; however, inferences must not be built on this isolated situation; more especially do objections seem to have been felt to the affiliation of an association of small landowners. The opinion of the International, as conveyed to the International Labour Office through its secretary, is that there is very little inclination in the Federation to give to the word “worker” an interpretation so wide as to allow of the inclusion of all persons working on the land. In view of the multifarious forms under which the social organisation of agricultural labour appears, it is very difficult to draw an absolutely hard and fast line, but the Federation will probably be unlikely — if confronted with the question — to depart very widely from the idea of the “worker”, and if they admitted share-farmers would scarcely go so far as to admit regular small tenants, etc. That, at any rate, is the state of affairs as far as it can be stated at present.

Of action undertaken by national organisations the most interesting has undoubtedly been the step at one time taken by an Austrian union. After a special section for smallholders had been formed on 17 March 1923 within the Union of Austrian Agricultural and Forestry Workers, the following year a revised constitution was adopted at the third congress of the union on 15, 16 and 17 August 1924, of which Article 5 frankly threw open membership in the union to wage earners and to smallholders on identical terms. The Article reads:

Membership is open to all persons of both sexes engaged in agriculture, forestry, horticulture, lumbering and allied occupations; further, to all owners of agricultural undertakings who can be reckoned to be small farmers, vinegrowers, or small tenants. The Executive Committee can also allow other persons to become members.

This action was, however, rescinded in June 1925. The statement of the union notes that the rapid growth of the smallholders’ section, and certain differences in the interests of the two groups, led to separation by mutual agreement and consent. The Smallholders’ Section has therefore become
an independent body, but has a joint committee with the mother union.

Similar action was contemplated by the Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers in Czechoslovakia, which was founded in 1919 in continuation of the old Austrian Union of Agriculture and Forestry Workers. This union had entered into negotiations with the Central Union of Smallholders, and an amalgamation had been discussed. The idea was, however, abandoned. A statement to the International Labour Office from the Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers notes that “the interests of the members of these two bodies are after all not identical. The successful furtherance of those interests requires special methods. The special interests of each organisation, and the special methods required to further them, make a separate organisation necessary in each case. Amalgamation was therefore rejected, but questions of common interest are discussed in collaboration as they arise.” The larger agricultural unions in Czechoslovakia all have a policy of admission of smallholders, etc., to membership, but in varying degrees. The Bohemian organisation attached to the Christian trade union movement is desirous to secure smallholders as members in order to prevent lowering of agricultural wages by competition. The union affiliated to the Federation of Czechoslovak Trade Unions comprises smallholders when they do paid work for an employer, but has transferred to separate smallholders’ organisations a number of members who have received plots under agrarian reform legislation. The union affiliated to the National-Social movement has also tried to cater for the interests of the smallholder.

In France, as has already been made clear, smallholders and share-tenants are a numerous and important class. Attempts to organise them go back more than twenty years, but have been on a local basis. Examples of these local organisations may be mentioned. Thus a federation was formed in the Bourbonnais in 1904 and existed until 1912. This federation never affiliated with any regular trade union body, but has transferred to separate smallholders’ organisations a number of members who have received plots under agrarian reform legislation. The union affiliated to the National-Social movement has also tried to cater for the interests of the smallholder.
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1 Souchon: La Crise de la main-d'œuvre agricole en France; Paris, 1914. Cf. on the general situation, Rembaud: La Question des fermiers généraux en France et à l'étranger; Paris, 1913.
of the Landes, which had originally been established in 1906, was after the war affiliated with the National Federation of Agricultural Workers, and consequently through this union, with the General Confederation of Labour. The National Federation of Agricultural Workers itself has a policy on the subject of contact with intermediate groups of cultivators which is clearly laid down in its constitution. Only unions composed of paid workers are admitted to affiliation, but these unions are empowered to admit on their own responsibility small proprietors, tenants, and share-tenants who work alone with their families. Recent literature published by the Federation states: "It is the rôle of the Federation to... unite into one and the same group vineyard workers, forestry and horticultural workers, share tenants, etc." 2

The General Confederation of Labour, one of the principal trade union bodies in the world, is thoroughly in favour of drawing into its ranks not only the three million wage-earning agricultural workers in France, but a proportion of the five million odd small proprietors, tenants and share-tenants whom it is estimated exist in the country 3. Definite efforts have from time to time been made in this direction. The latest which has come to the notice of the International Labour Office was the calling on 21 November 1926 of a mixed conference of representatives of agricultural labour and representatives of share-farming in the south-west of France (where the local organisations of share-farmers to which reference was made above exist), for the special purpose of discussing the relations of share-farmers to agricultural workers' organisations. The Conference was unanimously of opinion "that share-farmers and tenants, although wage-earners of an unusual type, should unite with the other workers of the General Confederation of Labour"; further, the ultimate ideal was stated to be complete abolition of share-farming in favour of more progressive forms of production 4. Another congress, held at Toulouse, on 24 October 1926,

---

4 Communication to the International Labour Office.
also assumed a solidarity of interests between share-farmers and wage earners, though, of course, the actual demands put forward by the two groups were not the same. From the side of French general trade unionism there is thus no hesitation in welcoming the share-holder, and perhaps even the smallholder. Except in the districts mentioned, however, effective action has been slight, and this is no doubt traceable to the same general causes as still hamper the organisation of agricultural wage-earners in France.

In Italy also share tenants and smallholders are a very numerous and important class. The question of their admission to trade union organisations of wage-earning agricultural workers has always been a difficulty. An original resolution in favour of socialisation of the land, adopted after much discussion, at the constituent congress of 1901, from which the principal organisation, the National Federation of Agricultural Workers had its birth, might seem to have settled the question as against the admission of owners or tenants of land; the practice of the next twenty years, however, showed the local organisers of the Federation by no means in agreement, some admitting, and some refusing to admit, share-tenants, etc. More especially was the policy of mere exclusion largely abandoned after the war, in view of the rivalry for employment between the regular wage-earning and the small tenant classes, a proof of an identity of economic interests.

The attitude of the Fascist trade unions to the question, from 1923 to 1926, is discussed below, in the section on the representation of the intermediate groups of cultivators at the International Labour Conference. In any case the classification of share-holders with workers has recently been settled by the Italian Government. What is interesting is that the workers themselves wish to go one step further, and to claim small tenants as workers. They claim that "the tenancy contract should be considered a true labour contract", and set this forth in a significant resolution adopted by a congress of agricultural workers' associations for central and south Italy on 7 March 1927. It is to be observed that under existing Italian law the intermediate groups of cultivators must be ranged

---

1 Industrial and Labour Information, Vol. XX, No. 9.
2 See below, pp. 60 et seq.
3 See below, Part III, Section on Italy.
either with workers or with employers; they cannot be an independent class.

In Sweden the constitution of the Swedish Agricultural Workers' Union admits to membership farm workers, women farm servants, statare, tenant-workers, small farmers, stablemen or stockmen, dairy staff, day labourers, farm smiths and carpenters, etc. More striking still is the composition and membership of the Union of Forestry Workers and Timber Floaters. This union comprises those engaged in these operations without regard to whether they are landless workers or smallholders, and claims to have achieved collaboration between these two groups.

In Hungary membership in the Union of Agricultural Workers is very wide, and includes all workers of the soil, whether resident or non-resident farm workers, or share-reapers, or small tenants.

In Estonia membership of the recently formed Association of the Rural Working Population is open not only to all agricultural workers, but to all rural dwellers who live by their own work and do not employ others against remuneration.

In the United States of America the constitution of the Farm Labour Union of America admits farmers or farm labourers, namely, any actual labourer or producer of farm products, whose interest is farming.

On the other hand, a strong feeling against smallholding in principle exists among the agricultural workers in Great Britain. Both the National Union of Agricultural Workers (of England and Wales) and the Scottish Farm Servants' Union have expressed themselves as averse to the extension of smallholding. Nor must the admission of smallholders to agricultural workers' unions in other countries, nor friendly relations with smallholders' organisations, be assumed as an expression of approbation on the part of agricultural workers of smallholding as a good principle in the farming of land. Even the French organisation, which definitely wishes to include the smallholder within its ranks, has placed on record its ultimate belief in other methods for carrying on the cultivation of the soil.

The general facts are these. This is a question which agricultural trade unions have not always been called upon to meet, at least not as stated in set terms. In practice it is easy to admit to agricultural trade unions persons who own land when they can make out any sort of a case to show that
they are also employed workers. It is unlikely that such persons
would apply for admission to workers' organisations unless
they were thoroughly in sympathy with the workers' point of
view: there may even be a propaganda movement here and
there to persuade them to join the agricultural trade unions.
But when it comes to affiliating whole separate bodies of such
workers, practice is much more hesitating. The more progres­
sive trade unions realise the importance of their relations with
this class so closely allied to them economically, socially, and
morally. Moreover, it is an admitted fact, the bearings of which
must be fully grasped, that agricultural trade unionism itself
is most imperfectly developed. In some countries — France
is a good example — there is a strong general trade union
movement, and a very weak, almost non-existent, agricultural
trade union movement. In other countries — Greece is an
example — there are very few employed agricultural workers
who could form an organisation movement on regular trade
union lines; here it would rather be a question whether the
(co-operative) organisations of smallholders could be persuaded
to admit a few wage-earning agricultural workers. In the
British Dominions and the United States of America the situa­
tion is again quite different. Family farming predominates
and, although family farming occasionally employs a hired
worker, yet it is not in any sense carried on by an employing
class. On the other side, it is difficult to group the family
farmer with what is strictly known as smallholding. The
conditions are different and the whole state of agricultural society
is more fluid than it is in some countries where smallholding
in the almost technical sense of that word and share-farming
are old-established methods of carrying on the cultivation of
the soil.

The International Labour Office has the impression that
the trade union world is not unfavourable to the smallholder,
provided that the accepted principles of trade unionism are
not infringed by any action taken or contemplated on his
behalf. What makes any statement difficult is the general
weakness of the agricultural trade union movement. Were
such a movement influential and powerful, it could perhaps
afford to carry along with it the smallholder.

It is no doubt easy to exaggerate the importance of a special
group or class. However, the small cultivator who is econom­
ically in a weak position has some special claims on the
Organisation if the spirit of the Treaty of Versailles is to be effective. A mere glance at the economic conditions prevailing in a number of countries should suffice to show the unwisdom of ignoring the smallholder, the share-farmer, the small tenant, and all these groups of cultivators. To ignore such groups is to ignore a large proportion of the whole number of persons who cultivate the surface of the earth. If the workers' organised movement does not recognise such groups it is thereby proved inadequate, and if the International Labour Organisation does not recognise them, then that Organisation is also proved inadequate.

The upshot is that we have this additional difficulty superimposed on our original difficulty of the representation and organisation of the agricultural worker. It is difficult enough to know how the wage-earning agricultural worker is to claim his right place in the Organisation. When we realise that the question does not end here, but that there is a further question of the cultivator who is in all respects a worker but yet not an employed worker, it is clear that the representation and organisation of agricultural workers is not a simple question for the International Labour Organisation.

The wider question of the whole place of the agricultural worker and of agriculture in the Organisation raises issues of great importance. The relations of agriculture to "industry" are not fully worked out, but it is at least probable that the next twenty or thirty years will see some changes.

NOTE. — The "Intermediate" Groups of Cultivators and the International Labour Organisation

(a) The Agricultural Advisory Committee

Reference has been made on more than one occasion on the Governing Body and on the Mixed Advisory Agricultural Committee (which derives its powers in part from the Governing Body) to smallholders, share-farmers, and other similar groups. The question came under discussion in a rather incidental way in the course of deciding the exact composition of the Advisory Agricultural Committee. This Committee, as has already been stated, is a body which was set up in 1922-1923 for the purpose of advising on the collaboration to be observed in enquiries into agricultural problems between the International Labour Office and the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome.

The result of such discussion as took place was that the Governing Body rejected the proposal specifically to classify these groups for special representation on the Committee, and the question was set aside. The first occasion on which the position of these groups was discussed was at the Eleventh Session of the Governing Body, January 1922,

1 See above, pp. 27 et seq.
arising out of a motion (Mr. Zumeta's motion) passed at the previous (Third) Session of the International Labour Conference, Geneva, 1921, calling for the constitution of an Agricultural Committee. This Committee was envisaged as a joint one, that is, with equal representation for employers and employed. The question of the representation of the intermediate groups was mentioned, and the existence and importance of "joint" bodies, i.e. bodies including every type of cultivator, large landowners, smallholders, share-tenants, etc., and even wage-earning workers, was noted. It was proposed to reserve, on a Commission of seventeen persons, three places for "representatives of the joint unions or of co-operative organisations".

In opening the discussion on this document the Workers' Representative for Switzerland (Mr. Schürch), speaking on behalf of the Workers' Group on the Governing Body, objected to the proposal for special representation of mixed bodies and co-operative organisations. He pointed out that the resolution passed at the previous session of the Conference on Mr. Zumeta's proposition had definitely named a commission on which employers and workers would have equal representation. He proposed therefore that there should be no direct representation of such mixed or co-operative bodies, but that their representatives could be included either among the employers or the workers. This objection, coming from the workers' side, was sufficient, and at the next meeting of the Governing Body, in April 1922, the suggestion of special representation for the intermediate or mixed groups of cultivators was definitely abandoned in view of his remarks.

Moreover, when the Agricultural Advisory Committee finally came to be constituted in 1923, the original suggestion was enlarged, with a consequent alteration in the composition of the Committee. It was set up as a mixed committee of six members, three of whom represented the

---

1 Minutes of the Eleventh Session of the Governing Body, pp. 73 et seq.

The following passage occurs in a preliminary document submitted by the International Labour Office as a basis of discussion: "In our opinion employers' organisations on the one hand, and workers' organisations on the other hand, should certainly remain the essential basis of the representation of the world of agriculture. It is on the basis of business-like and fair discussion between employers and wage-earners that the measures of international protection which are the proper objects of our Organisation must necessarily rest. Nevertheless, we must not forget that in many countries the vast majority of agricultural workers consists of independent cultivators. It is possible that future Conferences will adopt resolutions having direct or indirect reference to this class. At the Geneva Conference itself it was pointed out that the rights of association interested them directly. Again, independent cultivators are often wage-earners, in places where cultivation on a small scale alternates with large-scale cultivation (as in Central and Eastern Europe) and yet the fact that these cultivators work independently is in some cases sufficient to exclude them from professional trade unions. (The reference to the "Geneva Conference" is to discussions on the Third Committee of the 1921 Session of the Conference.) "In other countries the independent cultivators are the backbone of the trade unions and agricultural co-operative societies, and their discussions might contribute to the solution of problems which concern the International Labour Office more closely. Moreover, the special position of workers in this category might be the means of supplying the Commission more readily with unprejudiced opinion, and they might sometimes also perform the rôle of mediators."

2 Ibid., p. 40.

3 Minutes of the Twelfth Session of the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, Rome, April 1922, pp. 11 et seq., p. 44, and pp. 162-163, Appendix VI, Sixth Item on the Agenda; "Constitution of the Advisory Committee on Agriculture"
International Labour Office (namely, one Government, one employers', and one workers' representative), and three an outside body, the International Institute of Agriculture, Rome. In view of this change in the character of the Committee the question of the classification of the intermediate groups in agriculture rather disappeared from view. No formal discussion has taken place on the Committee on the subject; but a short passage from the report adopted by the Committee at its first Session in August 1923 at Geneva is undoubtedly of interest, as showing that the sphere of work of the Committee is held to include the intermediate groups of cultivators:

The meaning of the expression "workers" must, of course, be sufficiently wide to include not only the "wage-earners" in agriculture, but also the small proprietors, whatever may be the legal tie holding them to their property (small proprietors, small farmers, colonists, workers who receive part payment in produce, etc.)

(b) Representation at the Sessions of the International Labour Conference

The question as to whether the intermediate groups of cultivators could be, or have in fact been, represented at the Sessions of the International Labour Conference is of obvious interest.

The question was raised by the Greek Government in a letter of 9 December 1920 addressed to the International Labour Office in reference to the forthcoming Third Session of the Conference. This is here reproduced, as it sets forth a very typical situation:

Throughout the Kingdom of Greece, except in Thessaly and Macedonia, agricultural property exists in the form of small holdings cultivated personally by the holder and his family. The question of wage-earning or other employed workers cannot arise under these conditions. In Thessaly and Macedonia large-scale properties (the tsiflik) still exist; but these are usually cultivated by the agency of share-tenant settlers, working on their own account and paying a rent in kind to the landlord; wage-earning workers are but rarely employed. Moreover, in view of the fact that the expropriation of these large-scale properties for the benefit of the tenants, which began in 1917, is in process of being carried out, there will exist in the near future no class but that of the smallholders cultivating their holdings by means of their own labour and the labour of their families. The number of wage-earning workers will always be limited. This is the reason why trade unions of agricultural workers have so far failed to be constituted in Greece. In fact, we have no purely trade union bodies of this kind. The only organisations existing among cultivators of the soil are agricultural co-operative production societies, the membership of which is exclusively composed of the tenants of large-scale properties liable to expropriation and of small independent holders. Such co-operatives are found throughout Greece. They have lately announced a proposal for the formation of a Federation...

In view of the absence of other agricultural organisations we are in doubt as to whether we should address ourselves to this Federation in connection with the appointment of Technical Advisers to our Delegates. We realise that such a proceeding would fail to secure representation of the wage-earning agricultural workers; but, as has already been noted, the numerical and economic importance of this class is very limited. In any case, it would in our opinion be more convenient to represent the wage-earning agricultural workers, whether in reference to the Delegates or to the Technical

---

1 The Committee now consists of 12 persons; see above, p. 27.

Advisers, through the General Confederation of Labour only, even if no co-operative organisation is affiliated thereto.

Nevertheless, we cannot lose sight of the fact that, by reason of the very limited number of wage-earning agricultural workers, the agricultural items on the agenda of the Conference can only be of real interest to Greece in so far as they refer in general to the cultivating population, whether or no holders of land. Where this is the case, then beyond doubt the best representation of agricultural interests would be through the Federation of Co-operative Societies or perhaps through a delegation collectively representative of all the agricultural co-operative societies in the country.

Below are set forth the detailed facts which may bear on the representation of the intermediate groups of cultivators at preceding Sessions of the International Labour Conference.

Included in the personnel of the Delegations to the Third Session of the Conference were the following representatives of share-farming or smallholding:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1921</th>
<th>Government Delegates</th>
<th>Workers' Delegates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINLAND</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Mr. Heikki Laakso, Union of Agricultural Leaseholders and Smallholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRANCE</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Mr. Hodée, secretary of the National Federation of Agricultural Workers (Technical Adviser).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Mr. Franz Behrens, president, Central Union (Christian) of Agricultural Workers; president, International Federation of Christian Agricultural Workers' Trade Unions. (Technical Adviser).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td>Dr. D. Guzzini, Doctor of Agricultural Science¹, (Technical Adviser).</td>
<td>Professor O. Gorni, secretary of the National Federation of Agricultural Co-operative Societies (Technical Adviser). Mrs. Altobelli, secretary of the National Land Workers' Federation (Technical Adviser).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWAY</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Mr. Erik Kleve, farmer, Norwegian Small Farmers' Union. Mr. K. Amundsen, farmer, Norwegian Union of Agricultural Workers (Technical Adviser).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Included in the personnel of the various Delegations at subsequent Sessions were the following representatives of share-farming or smallholding:

| 1922 | FINLAND | Mr. Emil Viljanen, Union of Agricultural Leaseholders and Smallholders. |
| NORWAY | — | Mr. Erik Kleve. |

¹ Connected with the National Association of Agricultural Co-operative Societies.
The above cases fall into two groups (a) where the representation was indirect, (b) where it was direct. "Indirect" representation may be held to be established where a Delegate is recommended as from a general or national organisation, to which organisation is or are affiliated one or more federations, associations or bodies of smallholders or share tenants. Thus the National Federation of Agricultural Labourers, France (Mr. Hodée), included among its constituent organisations associations of share tenants; so did the National Federation of Agricultural Co-operative Societies, Italy (Professor Gorni), while the Italian Land Workers' Federation (Mrs. Altobelli) was an organisation to which was affiliated the Federation of Agricultural Co-operative Societies. Further, the International Federation of Christian Agricultural Workers (Mr. Behrens) had been in communication, at its original constitution in the spring of 1921, with two associations of share-tenants and small farmers.

From a formal point of view a larger number of cases of indirect representation could be established. Were it conceded that wherever a Workers' Delegate attended the Conference recommended as from a national federation of trade unions, industrial or other, to which national federation was affiliated an agricultural federation, to which in turn was affiliated some body of small farmers or share tenants, in these cases such Workers' Delegate should be reckoned to represent inter alia share-tenantry or small farming, then, undoubtedly, the list given above could be enlarged. The representation, however, in such cases would certainly appear remote. The instances mentioned are therefore confined to cases where recommendation as from an agricultural organisation was established, to which agricultural organisation was affiliated some body of share tenants or small farmers.

Direct representation is undoubtedly established where a Delegate is recommended as from a smallholders' or share tenants' association itself. The Workers' Delegates attending the Conference from Finland and Norway in 1921, the Technical Adviser to the Norwegian Workers' Delegate in 1921, and the Workers' Delegates attending the Conference from Finland and Norway in 1922, are cases in point.

These cases, however, are complicated by the previous refusal of certain organisations to take part in the nomination of a Workers' Delegate to the International Labour Conference. The detailed situation is here set forth exactly as it appears from the letters of credentials in the archives of the International Labour Office.

The Letter of Credentials under date 21 September 1921, appointing Mr. Laakso in 1921, states him to be "Rédacteur." In the letter announcing selection of the Delegation, under date 18 March 1921, from the Ministry of Social Affairs, Finland, Mr. Laakso is described as "editor, formerly agricultural labourer".

In a subsequent letter from the same Ministry under date 28 September 1921 reference is made to the refusal of the Central Organisation of Trade Unions in Finland (Suomen Ammattijärjestö) to assist in the selection of Delegates and it is stated: "in consequence of which the Delegate nominated by the Organisation of the Agricultural Workers will represent the whole working class in Finland". The letter of refusal (undated) from the Central Organisation in answer to the invitation to select reaching them from the Ministry of Social Affairs, Finland, Mr. Laakso is described as "editor, formerly agricultural labourer".

The Letter of Credentials under date 18 August 1922 appointing Mr. Viljanen in 1922 stated him to be President de l'association des petits cultivateurs, and appoints him en qualité de Représentant des Ouvriers de la République de Finlande. The situation as towards the Central

---

1 See Part III, p. 75.
2 "President of the Association of Small Cultivators".
3 "In the capacity of Representative of the workers of the Republic of Finland".
Organisation of Trade Unions was the same as in 1921, as is made known by copies of correspondence passing between that organisation and the Finnish Ministry of Social Affairs forwarded by the Ministry to the International Labour Office.

The Letter of Credentials under date 17 October 1921 from the Norwegian Ministry for Foreign Affairs appointing Mr. Kleve as Workers' Delegate and Mr. Amundsen as his Technical Adviser, states Mr. Kleve to be fermier and Mr. Amundsen to be ancien député; and declares them to be appointed d'accord avec les Organisations industrielles représentant (les Patrons et) les Ouvriers norvégiens, à savoir (la Norsk Arbeidsgiverforening) et les "Norsk Bonde-og Smaabrukerlag" et "Arbeidernes Faglige Landsorganisation". In letters announcing selection of the Delegation from the Department of Social Affairs dated 23 June and 17 September 1921 the names of the same organisations were mentioned and Mr. Kleve is stated to be petit cultivateur (smaabruker) and Mr. Amundsen to be a small farmer.

The Letter of Credentials under date 22 September 1922 from the Norwegian Ministry for Foreign Affairs appointing Mr. Kleve as Workers' Delegate, states Mr. Kleve to be fermier, Délégué représentant les ouvriers norvégiens and declares that the appointment was made d'accord avec l'Organisation des paysans et des petits cultivateurs norvégiens. In a letter from the Department for Social Affairs under date 25 September 1922, Mr. Kleve is stated to be petit cultivateur (smaabruker) and it is added that, as the Arbeidernes Faglige Landsorganisasjon was unwilling to propose the name of a Workers' Delegate, Mr. Kleve had been appointed after consultation with the Norsk Bonde- og Smaabrukerlag.

It follows from the above facts (1) that the Workers' Delegations from Finland and Norway in 1921 and 1922 undoubtedly represented smallholdings; (2) that the Delegates selected were selected, as the Letters of Credentials show, as representative of the workers in those countries; (3) that, nevertheless, the organised bodies of workers in Finland categorically objected to representation at the Conference and the organised bodies of workers in Norway while admitting it and "consenting to" the Delegates selected in 1921, in 1922 withdrew their consent and co-operation; (4) that the Conference adopted the credentials as valid in absence of any objection to them; nevertheless, that the absence of any objection must apparently be attributed to the general non-participation in, and complete dissociation from, the International Labour Organisation expressed in their own country and to their own Governments by the organised workers of Finland and Norway.

1 "Farmer".
2 "Formerly Member of Parliament".
3 With reference to the Employers' Delegate.
4 Federation of Employers' Societies.
5 Union of Farmers and Smallholders.
6 National Federation of Trade Unions.
7 "In agreement with the Industrial Organisations representing (the Norwegian employers and) the workers, namely (the Norsk Arbeidsgiverforening and) the Norsk Bonde-og Smaabrukerlag and Arbeidernes Faglige Landsorganisation".
8 "Small cultivator (smaabruker)".
9 "Farmer, Delegate representing the Norwegian workers".
10 "In agreement with the Organisation of Norwegian peasants and small cultivators".
11 The situation was substantially the same as in Finland.
12 There were no Workers' Delegates for Norway at the Fifth or Sixth Sessions of the International Labour Conference in 1923 and 1924.
Consequently, it is difficult to state the Finnish and Norwegian representation as a true precedent in law and in fact.

All the above instances of representation, whether direct or indirect, and whatever the circumstances surrounding them, were accepted by the Credentials Committee of the Sessions of the Conference without protest having been raised. On two further occasions, at the Fifth and Sixth Sessions of the Conference in 1923 and 1924 respectively, protest was raised against the credentials of a Workers' Delegate who claimed to represent share tenanting and small farming together with organised groups of workers, and on both occasions the protests led to prolonged discussion at the plenary conference.

The disputed credentials both in 1923 and 1924 were those of the Italian Workers' Delegate (Mr. Rossoni), who had been selected by the Italian (Fascist) Government in agreement with the (Fascist) Confederation of National Trade Union Corporations (Confederazione nazionale delle corporazione sindicali). Protest at both Sessions was raised on behalf of the Workers' Group by the French Workers' Delegate (Mr. Jouhaux), who in the course of his speech in 1924 quoted Article 7 of the Constitution of the Confederation to the following effect:

The Confederation assumes the protection of the interests of small direct producers (métayers, small landowners, tenant farmers, handicraftsmen) so far as such interests find their justification in the social utility arising from the intensification and specialisation of industrial or agricultural production and leave open the opportunity for work and improvement to wage-earning workers to the extent permitted by the conditions of the estates and the undertakings.

And continued his speech by stating:

Therefore the regulations of the Fascist corporations provide for the defence of both employers' and workers' interests, and I consider accordingly that the term "mixed organisations" is a perfectly true and accurate description of the Fascist organisations.

In reply the Italian Workers' Delegate said:

It is obvious that the representative of the Socialist Federation of Amsterdam does not know what agricultural organisation is when he claims that there is no difference between agricultural wage earners and share tenants. Everybody knows that in all countries the share tenant has a certain holding of land to cultivate; in the winter he works alone or with the members of his family; in the summer he always employs paid workers, that is to say, paid agricultural workers. But he himself is a paid agricultural worker. Instead of being paid in cash he is paid by the allocation at the end of the year of one-half of the crops. We pay attention only to the braccianti, who work by the day for share tenants and small farmers cultivating the soil alone or with the help of the members of their family. The point raised by the representative of the Socialist Federation of Amsterdam entirely begs the question.

The credentials were accepted by the Conference in 1923 by 63 to 17 votes, and in 1924 by 55 to 32 votes. On both occasions the Credentials Committees had issued both majority and minority reports, in each case


2 Ibid.

3 Day-labourers.

the two members of the Committee representing the Government Group and the Employers' Group signing the majority report, while the third member representing the Workers' Group signed the minority report. In 1923 the majority report argued that the Confederation of National Trade Union Corporations was not a mixed, but a workers', organisation. In the course of their report they stated:

The signatories of the Report readily recognise that the authors of Part XIII of the Treaty did not in their drafting provide for the case of joint organisations. The question arises whether industrial organisations including both employers and workers with the same right in the same unions can be considered as "representative" of employers or workers.

The majority of the Committee, however, does not consider that it is called upon to examine this question here, since it is of a theoretical nature, as the Italian Government, as well as Mr. Rossoni, have formally denied that the organisations consulted are joint organisations 1.

In 1924 the majority report argued that the case was exactly the same as it had been at the previous Session and that there was no need to re-open the question "in view of the fact that the question was then settled by a vote of the Conference" 2. In 1925 and 1926 the credentials of the Italian Workers' Delegate were accepted by the Conference, after protest had been made, without reference to smallholding 3. Since the holding of the last Session of the Conference an official decision has been taken by the Italian Government, which will have the effect of ranging share-farmers with workers. The position of smallholders is still under consideration 4.

4 See Part III, Section on Italy below.
There are some points about agricultural trade unionism which at once strike the observer, most of all perhaps its youth and its very limited extent; on the other hand, there is the magnitude of the change which might come about if agricultural workers all over the world were organised. The small size of the movement (even making very large allowance for organisations existing but not mentioned in the present study) is certainly very striking, both when contrasted with the size of the trade union movement in manufacturing industry and still more when contrasted with the possible field of organisation in agriculture itself.

But while the contrast between the agricultural trade union movement as it exists and as it might be is certainly striking, it is necessary to guard against supposing that the influence of trade union principles in agriculture is exhausted with the membership of the agricultural trade unions. Thus, the German Union of Agricultural Workers states that the number of workers benefited by the action of their union is more than ten times the average membership of the union. An apparently vast increase in the strength of agricultural trade unionism immediately after the war was followed by an extraordinarily rapid decline; this is the first impression given by the figures of membership, at any rate, of various European unions. But the officers of these unions are of the opinion that these violent fluctuations, whether upward or downward, are a thing of the past and that the forward movement is now likely to be steady; nevertheless, the impetus given by the war, even if followed by a reaction, was of enormous importance to agricultural trade unionism, which profited by it to a remarkable extent.

The relation of agricultural trade unionism to the trade union movement in manufacturing industry is a point of importance.

One small, but important, fact may perhaps be mentioned in passing, and that is that agricultural trade unionism has from its earliest start adopted general trade union principles in maintaining its right to strike. The history of agricultural trade unionism, as given for each country in the following Sections, has included mention of some strikes carried through by agricultural workers during the earliest phases of the movement. Both in this and in other respects it must broadly be allowed that agricultural trade unionists have nearly always followed the methods and ideals already evolved by their fellow workers in manufacturing industry. Frequently agricultural trade unions owed their very origin to the action of workers in manufacturing industry, and sometimes have had to be financially supported for some years by workers in manufacturing industry. A few instances are known where an agricultural trade union movement has started without connection with the general trade union movement of the country, but this separation has usually proved a fatal weakness.

It is clearly to the interest of the workers that there should be one, and not two (or even more), trade union movements in a country, one general movement embracing all industry, and not a movement in manufacturing industry and a movement in agriculture. Now, not only are the agricultural workers in many countries at least equal in numbers to the workers in manufacturing industry, but they are even a majority over them. It might be expected that at least sometimes agricultural trade unionism would take the lead more obviously than it does in striking out the general lines of a national trade union movement. There are countries where agriculture is at present the only possible field for trade unionism; there are other countries where agriculture is a preponderating industry; there are even examples where agricultural trade unionism has played an historical part in the early history of the trade union movement (Australia); and the question is certainly one for speculation as to what is the proper rôle of agricultural trade unionism and as to the position to which it is naturally entitled.

Contrast with these speculations the actual state of affairs. Even in the rare cases where agricultural trade unionism has played a leading part in the general labour movement of a country, agricultural workers are found in an inferior position. Nowhere is this better expressed than in the phrase in which
agricultural workers have protested against being "second-class citizens". The general characteristic of agricultural labour all over the world is that it is less well protected by law than industrial labour. In spite of the fact that the Australian shearers made important contributions to early trade unionism and fought one of the most historic labour battles in the nineteenth century in that continent, Australian agricultural workers are still in an inferior position at law to industrial workers. There must be some reason for this inferiority in organisation and inferiority in position, and without carefully considering what these reasons are the essentials of agricultural trade unionism cannot be weighed.

The principle reason is beyond question the dispersion of agricultural workers. Agriculture is not carried on in factories. There are no aggregations of a number of workers in the same spot and in the same town day after day and year after year. Natural forces which give rise to trade unionism, namely, association and contiguity, are absent. Every agricultural trade union organiser acknowledges the difficulty of obtaining for his union the membership, for instance, of the isolated farm servant resident on his employer's farm. Great as are the distinctions between the grades of workers in manufacturing industry, they are, nevertheless, far greater in the case of grades of agricultural workers, and these distinctions, when added to the differences made by residence in the employer's house, on his farm, in a neighbouring village, or in some other district miles away from the place of work, or perhaps in a home in some other country, are not to be overlooked and not easily bridged. It follows that the interest shown in organisation by farm servants engaged by the year, by day-labourers, by foresters, by the other innumerable groups of agricultural workers, is different in kind and in degree, and this is one of the inherent conditions of agriculture and one to which agricultural trade unionism must necessarily adapt itself and which places great difficulties in its path.

The other principal difficulty in the way of organisation of agricultural workers on trade union principles is the absence of any clear and accepted distinction between employers and employed in agriculture. In the course of the preceding Parts of this study, and in the course of the Sections which follow, this has abundantly been made clear. There is therefore no need to labour it here.

It is necessary to remark that an examination of trade union
organisation in agriculture by no means exhausts the facts as to all organisation among agricultural workers. In many countries there is co-operative organisation of agricultural workers, which is of particular importance, and a description of the facts of that organisation would be necessary in order to give a proper picture of the way in which the cultivators of the earth's surface are associated and combined. In the present study a description of co-operative organisation has necessarily been excluded, but its existence must be borne in mind in reading the following Sections.

A study which began with the representation of agricultural workers has ended in examining their organisation and their classification, and this is not merely natural, but is essential, as the wording of the Resolution on which this study is based shows. No representation is possible in the international field without organisation, and the weakness of the national organisations of agricultural workers (taken as a whole), at any rate in their capacity as employed workers, is beyond doubt the cause of weakness to them when they wish to make themselves felt in the international field. It is hoped, however, that the present study shows that an agricultural trade union movement does exist, and that it has in it the beginnings of a vigorous life.

***

Part III of this study will bring out the character of the trade union movement among agricultural workers in each country, the conditions under which it has developed, and the natural limits of its extension. These natural limits are obviously set, in the first place, by the general structure of agriculture in each country. The tenure of land, whether large-scale farming carried on with a large amount of paid labour, both regular and casual, or peasant farming carried on by the labour of resident farm servants, or family holdings, goes far to explain the organisation of the agricultural population of a country, inasmuch as it determines the proportion between the number of agricultural wage-earning workers and the total population engaged in agriculture. The smaller the number of workers the greater are their chances to become independent farmers, and this fact has a natural influence on their eagerness or their indifference to join an employed workers' organisation.
The importance of the distribution of land and of agricultural population as a basis for present and future organisation justifies the brief remarks made on these two subjects as an introduction to the description of agricultural trade unionism in each country in the present study. Great difficulty has been experienced in regard to both points. In regard to the distribution of land, the number of holdings (i.e. areas held on separate legal titles) is sometimes stated, sometimes the number of farm businesses or undertakings, and sometimes the number of properties (i.e. areas united in the hands of a single owner); very small parcels are in some countries included, in some excluded, and this point is of special importance for the present study; very small plots (sometimes gardens to houses) often do not belong to the agricultural population at all. Still more acute are the doubts as to figures for agricultural workers. The date of a census is of extreme importance in a seasonal industry like agriculture, but has to be fixed with regard to national and not to merely agricultural considerations. The demarcations between agriculture and industry, the record of members of the family assisting the cultivator (especially of women), the record of female servants as sometimes domestic, sometimes agricultural, the record of farmers' sons for a period acting as workers, the record of persons doing seasonal work in agriculture as a secondary trade, and other important points may vitally affect the figures.

In addition, a description of the general grouping of agricultural workers is attempted, based both on the legal nature of their contracts and, again, on the type of agricultural operation which they perform. This grouping is usually based on official documents or legislation or official statistical groupings adopted by the authorities of the different countries. An understanding of the existing grouping of agricultural workers in each country is, of course, an essential preliminary to an understanding of their organisation on trade union lines. Besides notes on the two existing international federations of agricultural workers, a list of all agricultural, forestry, and horticultural trade unions known to the International Labour Office, together with notes on the agricultural and forestry unions, is given for each country.

In Part II of this study the smallholder's position was examined from the theoretical point of view. In so far as he actually enters the labour market as a wage-paid worker in competition with an ordinary wage-paid worker his presence, his entry
into trade union organisations, or his efforts to form organisations of his own are noticed in Part III. Special stress has been laid upon making clear the opinion of agricultural trade unions with regard to their relations with smallholders.

Where the law on trade unionism in agriculture has been, or is still, different from the law governing trade unions in other industries, a note to that effect has been made; but for a systematic study of the rights of association of agricultural workers as part of the whole working population of a country reference should be made to the study on freedom of association appearing simultaneously with the present study.

An attempt was made to collect information on the representation of agricultural workers in their national institutions (e.g. in Chambers of Agriculture, Parliamentary bodies, etc.), in accordance with the last paragraph of the Resolution to which reference has so often been made in this study. It was found, however, that this subject was too complex to enable any brief statement to be made and reference to it has therefore been omitted.

It remains to add that to the Section on the agricultural trade union movement in each country is added a list of the names of Workers’ Delegates at the Sessions of the International Labour Conference, together with a mention of the names of those of their Technical Advisers who had relations with agriculture; the organisations in agreement with which these nominations were made are mentioned, and note is taken of any protests against workers’ credentials. These facts should present the necessary detailed information as to the past representation of agricultural workers at Sessions of the Conference. To this may be added the information in the Appendix, which gives a list of countries (a) which have never been represented at the Sessions of the Conference, (b) which have never sent a Workers’ Delegate to the Sessions of the Conference, (c) in which there are no organisations of agricultural workers or in which the existence and history of such organisations was not sufficiently known to the International Labour Office to justify a separate Section.

---

1 Omitting the Second and Ninth Sessions of the Conference at Genoa in 1920 and at Geneva in 1926 (the “Seamen’s Conferences”).

2 The possible representation of smallholders was dealt with in the long Note appended to Part II of this study (p. 58).
The International Land Workers' Federation (Soc.-Dem.) was founded at an International Conference of Agricultural Trade Unions, held at Amsterdam on 17-19 August 1920 and convoked on the initiative of the Netherlands organisation. The following unions were represented and affiliated to the new international Federation: Belgian Union of Agricultural Workers (Belgische Landarbeidersbond); Danish Union of Agricultural Workers (Landarbejderforbundet i Danmark); German Union of Agricultural Workers (Deutscher Landarbeiterverband); National Agricultural Labourers' and Rural Workers' Union (England); Workers' Union (England); Union of Agricultural Workers in the Netherlands (Landarbeidersbond in Holland); Italian Federation of Land Workers (Federazione nazionale lavoratori della terra); Swedish Union of Agricultural Workers (Svenska Landarbejderförbunden); Austrian Union of Agricultural Workers (Landarbeiterverband Deutsch-Oesterreichs); Scottish Farm Servants' Union.

The objects of the Federation are, according to the constitution, to promote and maintain the industrial organisation of agricultural, horticultural, and forestry labourers of all countries in a strong and international federation in order to promote the economic and social interests of all workers organised in the International Land Workers' Federation, and to support such joint national and international action against the exploitation of labour as circumstances may warrant, and to maintain international working class solidarity. All trade unions and federations of agricultural, horticultural, and forestry labourers are entitled to affiliate to the Federation, provided they recognise the objects of the Federation as defined in the constitution and the resolutions passed at the international congresses of the Federation.

At a meeting of the executive committee in June 1921 it was reported that attempts were being made to form international organisations of horticultural workers. The executive committee was of opinion that there was no need for an international organisation of this kind, and that horticultural workers' organisations should affiliate with the International Land Workers' Federation.
Federation. This has also taken place. For the present two horticultural workers' unions are affiliated to the organisation.

At its foundation the Federation counted 2,104,000 members, of which some 780,000 belonged to the German, and 846,000 to the Italian, organisation. Already at the second congress two years later in Vienna, the membership had fallen to 1,250,000, mostly due to the breaking up of the Italian Federation. At the third congress in Berlin, 1924, the membership was 448,000, and at the fourth congress in Geneva in 1926 it was 366,000.

The table below gives the names of organisations affiliated to the Federation and their membership at the last congress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austrian Land and Forestry Workers' Union (Verband der land-</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>und forstwirtschaftlichen Arbeiter Oesterreichs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czechoslovak Land and Forestry Workers' Union (Verband der</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land- und forstwirtschaftlichen Arbeiter) (German)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Land Workers' Union (Landarbejderforbundet i Danmark)</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danish Gardeners' Union (Dansk Garthnerforbund)</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Union of Agricultural Workers (England)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finnish Land Workers' Union (Suomen Maatyöväen liitto)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Land Workers' Union (Deutscher Landarbeiterverband)</td>
<td>185,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Gardeners' Union (Verband der Gärtner und Gärtnerarbeiter)</td>
<td>9,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Land Workers' Union (Magyarorszagi Földmunkások)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian Land Workers' Union (Federazione nazionale lavoratori</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>della terra)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvian Land Workers' Union (Latvijas Laukstradnieku Savieni-bas Centra Valde)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuanian Land Workers' Union (Lietuvos Zemes Ukio Darbininkuku Profesines Sajungu Centro Valbyda)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands Land Workers' Union (Nederlandsche Bond van Arbeiders in het Landbouw- Tuinbouw- en Zuivelbedrijf)</td>
<td>6,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Land Workers' Union (Zarzad Glowny Zw. Zawod)</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Farm Servants' Union</td>
<td>13,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Union of Commerce, Transport and Food Industry Workers</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Verband der Handels-, Transport- und Lebensmittelarbeiter)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>365,852</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the Congress the following organisations have joined the Federation, namely, the General Union of Employees in Dairy Farms (Germany) Allgemeiner Schweizerbund; the Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers (Czechoslovakia) (Svaz zemedelskych a lesnickych delniku); the National Union of Agricultural Workers (France) (Fédération nationale des travailleurs de l'Agriculture); the Union of Swedish Agricultural Workers (Svenska Landarbeterareförbundet). The Czech organisation sent its representatives to the 1926 Congress.

At the last congress the secretary in his report described the situation as following:

The decline of membership from 1924 to 1926 could at first glance be taken as a sign of the weakening of the Federation; but when each
separate union is considered it is seen, for example, that in such countries as Germany, Austria, and Poland, where through currency inflation the membership of the unions had been reduced, these unions have now essentially established themselves and stand on a more healthy basis than they did before the war.

The same movement can be observed in other countries; e.g. in Denmark, after the rush to the organisation and the natural reaction therefrom, the organisation has found its equilibrium and the membership is now steadily growing. In such a country as the Netherlands, where organisation dates back as far as 1900, such violent fluctuations in the membership have been avoided.1

The attitude of the Federation on the admission of smallholders was indicated above, in Part II of this study. The Federation is affiliated to the International Federation of Trade Unions (Amsterdam).

INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION OF CHRISTIAN LAND WORKERS' TRADE UNIONS2

During the International Congress of Christian Trade Unions which was held at The Hague in June 1920, it occurred to some of the representatives of the Christian agricultural workers' unions that it would be desirable to hold a special international congress of the workers which they represented. After some preliminary meetings at Cologne the conference was held at Coblenz from 27 to 28 April 1921. The following organisations, which were represented, joined the new International Federation of Christian Land Workers' Unions: Austrian Christian Land Workers' Union (Christlicher Reichslandarbeiterbund); Union of Horticultural, Agricultural and Forestry Workers in Belgium (Centrale ouvrière des jardiniers, agriculteurs et forestiers); German Central Union of Land Workers (Zentralverband der Landarbeiter); Netherlands Roman Catholic Union of Land Workers (Nederlandsche Roomsch-Katholieke Landarbeidersbond); Netherlands Christian Union of Land Workers (Nederlandsche Christelijke Landarbeidersbond).

According to its constitution the Federation adopts the principles of Christianity as a basis. It therefore affirms that the economic and social life of all the members of one nation implies mutual co-operation, and it consequently repudiates violent methods and class warfare. The Federation considers that society as at present constituted is in opposition to the spirit of Christianity. It therefore aims at a radical transformation

of society. The Federation, in accordance with the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, has the following objects:

To represent the interests of agricultural workers, especially as regards the international organisations of labour.
To serve the interests of the affiliated unions.
To encourage propaganda for the Christian land workers’ trade union movement.
To encourage mutual assistance between the affiliated unions if the necessity arises.

All national federations and all national unions of land workers which accept Christian principles as a basis, which accept the constitution of the Federation, and which are affiliated to a national federation forming part of the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions, except in cases where there is no federation in the country in question, and where special circumstances exist, can become members of the Federation.

At its foundation the Federation counted 224,000 members. Soon afterwards several other organisations joined the Federation, namely: the Union of Christian Land Workers in Hungary, the Italian National Federation of Share Farmers and Small Tenants (Federazione nazionale mezzadri e piccoli affittuari), and the Italian Federation of Bee Workers (Federazione italiana lavoratori apicoli). The Italian Federation of Small Owners (Federazione italiana piccoli proprietari) was not finally admitted, because it was not certain whether this organisation really consisted of wage-paid workers. The total membership in this way increased to 1,060,000 1.

The Federation has held no other congress since its foundation, but a few meetings of its bureau, the last in Antwerp in September 1926. The following unions were affiliated at that date:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Union</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The German Central Union of Land Workers (Zentralverband der Landarbeiter)</td>
<td>78,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Austrian Central Union of Land Workers (Zentralverband der Landarbeiter)</td>
<td>4,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Belgian Christian Union of Workers in Food and Drink Industries (Centrale Chrétienne de l’Alimentation, de l’Agriculture et de l’Horticulture)</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands Roman Catholic Land Workers’ Union (Nederlandsche Roomsch-Katholieke Landarbeidersbond)</td>
<td>6,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands Christian Land Workers’ Union (Nederlandsche Christelijke Landarbeidersbond)</td>
<td>5,646</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 96,353

1 Bericht über den 2. Kongress des Internationalen Bundes der christlichen Gewerkschaften, June 1922, Innsbruck.
The Federation has had the same decline in its membership as the Social-Democratic International Federation. The secretary reported to the meeting of the bureau mentioned above that affiliated organisations had succeeded in standing out against the crisis which had affected the trade union movement of the various countries in recent years. The number of members was increasing everywhere.\(^1\)

The attitude of the Federation on the admission of smallholders was indicated above, in Part II of this study. The Federation is affiliated to the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions.

**ARGENTINA**

There are four regions in Argentina which can be distinguished by the type of cultivation carried on: the north, the region of vinegrowing, the region of cereal cultivation, and the south. Of these the north, which is nearest the equator, is principally given up to forests or to very large estates as yet but slightly cultivated; the south is dry and very sparsely populated and is given up principally to huge cattle ranches. More intensive cultivation is found in the two central regions, and here quite small holdings are found, sometimes even under 5 hectares. Data as to the distribution of land date from 1914\(^2\). There are over 300,000 holdings in all, of which over 150,000 are under 25 hectares, and another 80,000 under 100 hectares each. The bulk of the remaining holdings are of a size between 500 and 5,000 hectares, but there are over 5,000 holdings existing of an area exceeding 5,000 hectares. There are even some holdings which are recorded as exceeding 25,000 hectares; these are vast cattle ranches. It is difficult to state what is a small, what a medium-sized, and what a large, holding, on account of the different types of farming carried on, namely, either cattle breeding, or cattle breeding and crop cultivation, or more intensive crop cultivation, even such intensive farming as vinegrowing. But in general a small holding does not exceed 100, or occasionally 200, hectares.

---

2. The figures for the area of farms have been taken from a map published in 1925 by the Ministry of Agriculture in Argentina. The figures from the 1914 census have been taken from the *Tercer Censo Nacional*, Vols. II, III, and IV.
There is a tendency to subdivide properties in order to accommodate the growing population, which is being largely recruited by immigration. A common process is the acquisition in private hands of a vast stretch of land which is farmed as a cattle ranch, but a portion of which is gradually divided into holdings and let out to tenants. The tenants to some extent form a supplementary labour force for the working of the ranch and the subdivision into tenancies generally goes with more intensive cultivation and therefore with an increase in the value of the property.

The tenant farmers who cultivate a family holding, while they are at law tenants and not workers, are nevertheless very dependent on their landlords. They have perhaps a general resemblance to share-farmers and other intermediate groups in other countries of the world, although in point of fact actual share-farming is not known in Argentina. According to the census of 1914 they constituted over 46 per cent. of all the cultivators in the country, and since that date there has been further subdivision of properties and creation of tenancies, especially as the price of land has risen so that few small cultivators are in a position to buy their holding outright. By an Act of 28 September 1921 the Government intervened to protect tenants against economic pressure from their landlords. The Act lays down that no tenancy can run for a shorter period than four years, that no tenant can be obliged to sell his produce to his landlord or to any specified person, or to insure his crops with any specified society or person, or to purchase machinery, or in any way employ the services of any specified firm or person, and contracts made in contravention of these principles, notwithstanding the consent of the parties, are null and void. The tenant is entitled to construct certain buildings and to make certain improvements up to a maximum value stated in the Act, and can claim compensation for such improvements on quitting.

According to the figures of 1908 the total agricultural population was nearly 2,500,000 persons.

Much has been done in modern times to improve the breeds

of cattle which used to roam the plains in a wild state; for this purpose regular breeding establishments on the estancias are now organised. The workers engaged in these establishments are capotaces (foremen), cuidadores (workers detailed for the care of horned cattle), pastores (shepherds), and esquiladores (shearers). These workers are boarded and lodged and receive a cash wage of different amounts according to whether they are all-round workers, or members of a gang (who are better paid), or foremen. The wage varies also according to the season. Married workers receive the use of a dwelling and also allowances in kind of an amount sufficient to maintain their families.

On the farms where crop cultivation as well as cattle breeding is carried on, the primary source of labour is family labour. Families are installed in one of the tenancies mentioned above as formed out of a large estate. There is, however, a certain amount of hired labour used on some of these tenant exploitations, namely, workers employed in preparing the ground and in sowing operations, workers employed on reaping operations, workers employed in the flour mills, and workers employed on the maize harvests. All workers receive their board; the first group are paid by the month, the second and third groups by the day. In addition, workers are engaged for threshing operations and receive, in addition to their board and lodging, piecwork rates.

Vine cultivation is carried on almost exclusively on family holdings; hired day-labourers are employed for the vintage and are paid at piecwork rates, sometimes by the day, while waggoners are paid for the transport of the grapes by the day.

While there are no organisations of hired agricultural workers proper, the need for self-protection among the tenants has led to some important efforts to organise, and this organisation partly takes the place of the organisations of employed workers in other countries, and is one of the most important organisations in South America.

Following on some considerable agitation in 1911 and 1922, the Federación Agraria Argentina was founded, with headquarters at Rosario de Santa Fé and a branch at Buenos Ayres. After some initial success the number of branches had declined by 1916 from 217 to 32. In that year the president was assassinated, and the congress held a month after his death was attended by only 25 delegates. A new president, however, was appointed, and since then the organisation has made very considerable
progress and has even bought two large holdings of a total area of 22,000 hectares with a view to undertaking subdivision and to direct leasing to its members as tenants, thus substituting itself for a landlord.

In 1926 the Federation had over 17,000 members, of whom about 4,600 were Argentine, 9,400 Italian, and 3,000 Spanish, with a few members of other nationalities. The present membership is over 19,000.

**REPRESENTATION AT THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE**

1919: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Americo Balino.
1921-22: Not represented.
1923: Government Delegates only.
1924: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Jose Negri (vice-chairman of the Railwaymen's Association).
1925: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Carlos Y. F. Conci.
1926: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Alfredo Viola.

**AUSTRALIA**

Australian agriculture includes such important branches of farming as the wool and meat industries, the dairy industry, the fruit-growing and canning industry, the wine industry, besides ordinary mixed farming. By far the greater number of holdings are still held from the Crown on lease or licence. Figures on the relative size of holdings are only available for the land held privately, but, assuming that the sizes of farms quoted are typical, it is clear that, however much these sizes may differ according to the type of country opened up, yet the average farm, especially the average pastoral farm, is very large. This has an important bearing on the organisation of persons occupied in agriculture, and frequent reference is made to the factor of rural distance as a difficulty both in organising adults and in the education of children. The resident hired farm worker, especially, is usually out of immediate contact with his fellow-workers.

---

2. In Australian publications, "agriculture" is commonly distinguished from the pastoral industry. In the present study "agriculture" is used in the wide sense to include the pastoral industry.
A comparison of figures for 1914-1915 and 1924-1925 for privately-held land shows that the smallest holdings, up to 50 acres, are decreasing in number; but it is not certain that all these holdings are true agricultural undertakings. The largest holdings, over 20,000 acres, are also decreasing. Most holdings are in the groups of 100-500, 500-1,000, and 1,000-5,000 acre farms; the biggest increase over the ten-year period indicated has been in farms of 1,000-5,000 acres.

In all, nearly 480,000 persons are occupied in agriculture and another 44,000 in forestry or allied branches; of those occupied in agriculture in the narrower sense of that word, well over one-fourth are in the pastoral and dairy industries. Figures are available from the census of 1921 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral and dairy industries</td>
<td>58,206</td>
<td>4,288</td>
<td>232,181</td>
<td>3,627</td>
<td>298,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers, overseers, clerks</td>
<td>6,735</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,691</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>9,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants, agricultural labourers</td>
<td>69,954</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>94,876</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>166,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1,865</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136,760</td>
<td>4,536</td>
<td>332,958</td>
<td>5,334</td>
<td>479,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pastoral industry is usually operated on a large scale and requires heavy capital; in this and in the dairying industry there are more persons employed for remuneration than there are employers or relatives of employers or independent persons. In the other branches of agriculture smaller scale production is more possible, and here the number of employers, members of their family, and independent workers is between two and three times as great as the number of persons employed for remuneration.


2 Minister of State for Home and Territories: Census of the Commonwealth of Australia taken for the night between 3 and 4 April 1921. Part XVII, "Occupations (including Unemployment)", pp. 1280-1283 and 1312-1315. Melbourne, n.d.
The type of farming is the farm run by family labour plus important aid given by seasonal labour, but there are also a number of permanently employed workers. General organisation, which, owing to the large agricultural exports of the country, is particularly directed to marketing purposes, is stronger in agriculture, especially among small farmers, than in manufacture or industry, and some interesting developments have taken place, especially in Queensland. Such marketing and general organisation, however, though it includes the working cultivator on the family farm, excludes the hired worker.

A consideration of the elaborate land legislation passed in the Australian States would be out of place here, but it may be stated that in recent years one of the general purposes of that legislation has been to place a working population on the land on "smallholdings". This must have effects on the organisation of employed agricultural workers as such. Of direct interest to the subject of this study is the practice of share-farming, which is referred to as a sort of stepping stone to proprietorship, and, according to one parliamentary speaker, as having enabled "very many people... to rise from the position of rural workers or ordinary labourers until they have been able to take up land for themselves and become farmers". The practice of share-farming started, in the form of share-milking contracts, in Western Victoria and has now become general. Complete statistics are not available for the whole Commonwealth, but the following shows the importance of share-farming in one State, New South Wales, where share-farming took its rise at the end of the last century and helped to overcome some of the difficulties of extending the cultivated area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of holdings on which share-farming is practised</th>
<th>Number of share-farmers</th>
<th>Acres cultivated on the share-farming system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1918-1919</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>745,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919-1920</td>
<td>1,501</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>671,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-1921</td>
<td>1,668</td>
<td>2,761</td>
<td>736,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-1922</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>3,449</td>
<td>861,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922-1923</td>
<td>2,457</td>
<td>3,970</td>
<td>955,557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Official Year Book, p. 546. There were, in 1925, 30 registered agricultural employers' associations with 46,487 members.
3 New South Wales Parliamentary Debates, Third Session, 1925, p. 3325.
5 Official Year Book of New South Wales, 1923, p. 473.
The maximum development was in 1915-1916, when the area cultivated on this system exceeded one-fifth of the total area under crops in the State. A bad season then hit share-farming hard. After 1919-1920 there was a marked revival. The farming carried on is almost always wheat-farming, and the share-farmer takes sometimes one-half, sometimes two-thirds, of the crop.

Under the Queensland Workers' Compensation Acts, 1916 to 1921, section 3 (3b), the share-farmer is ruled to be a worker for purposes of compensation for an industrial accident. The Acts of the other States do not lay down a principle on the point.

It is difficult to estimate the organisable employed workers in agriculture, owing to the importance of seasonal work. There is a wide variation between census figures, taken at a particular moment, and annual returns of the average number of permanently employed workers. On an average perhaps there is seasonal work done to the value of about one-third of the permanent work performed. The seasonal agricultural worker is often, during most or part of the year, a town dweller and town worker. In any case there are no well-marked "off" seasons in Australian agriculture; one operation or occupation succeeds the other, so that there is a constant movement of skilled workers from one part of the country to another. In 1925 organisation on trade union lines of employed workers in agriculture (i.e. without forestry, etc.) included 48,157 workers in eight registered unions; this was between 6 and 7 per cent. of all organised workers. The figures for preceding years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unions (pastoral and agricultural)</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48,157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The history of the formation and development of agricultural, especially of pastoral, workers' unions in Australia is an interesting

---

1 *Official Year Book of New South Wales*, p. 470 and 617.
2 See also under New Zealand below, where a fuller description of the succession of pastoral and agricultural operations over the year in the southern hemisphere is given with special reference to that country.
3 Counting sections of unions in each State as a union; if counted for the whole Commonwealth, there would be three registered unions.
4 *Official Year Book*, p. 543.
part of the history of trade unionism in Australia generally. The period of formation of shearers' and of general rural workers' unions was between 1880 and 1890, and the gathering together of a great body of unskilled or semi-skilled workers in support of trade union principles was a marked feature of these years, and differentiated this period from the preceding decade 1870-1880, when unionism was principally spreading in the more highly-skilled manufacturing trades. However, the shearers themselves, with whom agricultural trade unionism started, were and are a skilled body of men, numerous and well-paid and at that time ardent propagandists of the labour doctrines of the day. The Australian Shearers' Union was formed in 1886, and after three years' organising work came to an agreement with the employers' association, the Pastoralists' Union. Organisation both of shearers and of other less skilled agricultural workers also went on continuously for some time in the Australian Workers' Union. In 1893 all unions except the Queensland unions were absorbed in the Australian Workers' Union, and ten years later the Queensland workers also joined this union, which has since remained the principal organisation representing all grades of Australian agricultural workers. The branches of the Australian Workers' Union are affiliated to the central trade union bodies (the Trades and Labour Councils) in the different States.

The early organisation of the shearers had the effect of causing the employers in the pastoral industry to organise also. Two great contests in 1891 and 1894 took place, when the shearers in Queensland, and in 1894 also in New South Wales, struck, principally on the point of the employment of non-union labour for shearing. The strikes were of a very serious character and widely affected the industry of the Australian States. The point at issue was not directly settled, but in connection with the second strike the Australian Workers' Union were one of the first bodies which formally put the suggestion of compulsory arbitration in labour conditions, the result of which has been the famous series of laws in all the Australian States based on that principle.


2 In a letter of 27 August 1894 from the president of the union to Sir George Reid, the Premier of New South Wales. Coghlan, op. cit., p. 2106.
Nevertheless, agricultural workers, apart from shearers and similar groups of skilled pastoral workers, only in part come under the industrial arbitration or wages board legislation now in force in Australia. The Commonwealth Industrial Arbitration Acts, 1904-1921, apply to all industries where an inter-State dispute arises, and this Act has been applied to shearers, some of whose labour conditions are also regulated by a series of Shearers’ Accommodation Acts in each State. The less privileged classes of agricultural workers, i.e. the farm labourers, are in some States excluded from the State regulation of wages and conditions, or enjoy only some of the rights conferred by regulation. The legislation in each State is different. The latest action taken has been in New South Wales, where an Act of 1918 amended the exclusion of “rural workers” from an original arbitration (wages) Act of 1912, but not so as to give these workers full privileges. Further changes made in 1922 were finally abolished by an amending Act of 18 March 1926, which for the first time placed all agricultural workers in this State on an equality with other workers under this type of legislation.

Representation at the International Labour Conference

1919: Not represented.
1921: Workers’ Delegate: Mr. Thomas B. Merry, Operative Painters’ and Decorators’ Union of Australia.
1922: Not represented.
1923: Workers’ Delegate: Mr. E. J. Holloway, secretary, Trades and Labour Council, Melbourne.
1924: Workers’ Delegate: Mr. J. Curtin.
1925: Workers’ Delegate: Mr. George Lawson, chairman, Trades and Labour Council, Brisbane.
1926: Workers’ Delegate: Mr. John Albert Beasley, president of the Labour Council of New South Wales.

The Workers’ Delegate has always been nominated in agreement with the Trades and Labour Councils in the States of Australia.

Austria

In Austria it is the peasant holding that dominates; only 6.1 per cent. of the whole arable area belongs to owners possess-

---

1 For an application in Queensland, put in by the Australian Workers’ Union, see Industrial and Labour Information, Vol. XI, No. 7, pp. 293 et seq.
ing more than 100 hectares of land. On the other hand, the forests mostly form part of large properties. It is true that from 1870 up to after the war a considerable number of farms were bought and laid together; but this was done by persons wanting a summer residence or a hunting ground and not for the purpose of creating large agricultural undertakings. Austrian agrarian reform has been restricted to a redistribution of such properties. The grouping of the agricultural population is therefore largely the same as it was before the war.

In 1902 the population engaged in agriculture and living within the present territory of the Austrian Confederation, with the exception of Burgenland, was:

| Proprietors | 547,246 | 39 |
| Members of their families | 493,486 | 35 |
| Officials, etc. | 11,195 | 1 |
| Regular farm hands | 299,826 | 21 |
| Day labourers | 44,707 | 4 |
| **Total** | **1,396,260** | **100** |

From 1902 to 1910 the agricultural population decreased, but this seems to have been balanced by the acquisition of Burgenland after the war. The total figures were probably nearly the same as in 1902 and the number of agricultural and forestry workers therefore about 340,000.

From the post-war period occupational census figures exist only for Lower Austria. In this census the only distinction made is between independent and non-independent persons occupied in agriculture, the latter including both working members of a cultivator's family and wage-paid workers. From the Social-Democratic side paid workers are estimated to include about 450,000 agricultural workers and 40,000 forestry workers, together nearly half a million persons. The same total is quoted in the periodical of the Christian land workers' organisation.

A special Federal Act of 26 September 1923 applies to salaried

---

1 KALLBRUNNER: *Die österreichische Landwirtschaft*. Vienna, 1924.
3 LEAGUE OF NATIONS, *op. cit.*, p. 70. The descriptions of groups given in the table are those adopted in this publication.
4 Statistisches Handbuch für die Republik Oesterreich, VII. Jahrgang.
5 Information communicated to the International Labour Office.
6 Die Landstimme, Vienna, July 1926, No. 7.
employees engaged in agricultural and forestry undertakings or industries subsidiary thereto, mainly in the performance of work of a commercial character or in superior positions or in clerical work. Other agricultural workers come under the legislation of the separate States, where agricultural Codes have recently replaced the old Master and Servants Codes; though their scope varies somewhat, these comprise, on the whole, all wage-earning workers in agriculture and forestry; in two States members of a cultivator's family also come under the Code when they are separately remunerated; in one State special legislation exists for vineyard workers.

About 70 per cent. of agricultural workers are farm servants on peasant farms, while 30 per cent. are engaged on large-scale and medium-sized farms. On peasant farms 30 per cent. of wages are paid in cash, the rest in kind; on other farms the proportions are reversed. On peasant farms no division of labour takes place; the workers must do every type of work. On other farms 20 per cent. of the workers are dairy-herd men and stablemen, 30 per cent. horse and ox drivers, 10 per cent. handicraftsmen and machinemen, and 40 per cent. day labourers. These are the permanent workers. During rush periods harvesters (Schnitter) and seasonal workers are also employed; these mostly work at piece rates, half of which are paid in kind and half in cash. Forest workers are engaged on large undertakings and receive, apart from fuel and sometimes a dwelling, cash wages only, mostly reckoned at piece rates. Many smallholders are unable to gain a living from their holdings and therefore work at certain times of the year either in industrial undertakings, in home industries, as day workers on large estates, or as hewers in forests; sometimes they do loading work in the forests and sometimes they are handicraftsmen.

The right of combination of workers in Austria is undisputed. Several of the State agricultural Codes expressly protect the worker in the exercise of this right. The Act on Conciliation Boards and Collective Agreements (Act of 18 December 1919), however, does not apply to agriculture. Four of the eight Codes nevertheless give to collective agreements in agriculture and forestry the same legal force as the Act mentioned gives to collective agreements in other industries. But the deviations are stated to be not inconsiderable and the regulations governing

1 H. HEINDL: Das Arbeitsrecht in der Land- und Forstwirtschaft. Vienna, 1925.
collective agreements under the agricultural Codes are incomplete, again a case where agricultural organisation stands on a legal basis other than that applied to industrial workers.

(1) The Austrian Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers (*Oesterreichischer Land und Forstarbeiterverband*) is the largest union of agricultural workers in Austria. The history of this union is as follows. In February 1906 the Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers in Lower Austria was established. The next year the Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers in Austria was created, with headquarters at Gablonz in Northern Bohemia. Very soon the question of amalgamating these two unions came up. Meanwhile the majority of State forestry workers were either indifferent or organised in Catholic workers’ associations; salt workers had entered the Union of Chemical Workers, which some forestry workers, mainly Protestants, had also joined; however, the State forestry workers had for some time wanted to create their own union of State forestry workers. In 1908 about 120 forestry workers left the Union of Chemical Workers and created their own organisation under the name of the Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers in the Austrian Alp Districts (it is interesting to note that one of the first executive committees of this union consisted exclusively of industrial workers).

In the years that followed, the Gablonz union was losing in importance, membership having declined from 600 to 100. The question of amalgamation therefore came up again in 1911, when the three unions were merged into one union, the existing Austrian Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers. This union had at that time about 1,000 members. Its subsequent development is shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of branches</th>
<th>Total membership at the beginning of the year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>71,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>59,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>40,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>37,133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In this year 36,790 men and 3,753 women.
2 The decline in number of branches is sometimes due to simplification of administration.
In 1926 the distribution of membership over the various States was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>1,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Austria</td>
<td>20,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Austria</td>
<td>3,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salzburg</td>
<td>582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Styria</td>
<td>3,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carinthia</td>
<td>1,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyrol and Vorarlberg</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgenland</td>
<td>4,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,133</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It will be seen that when the war was over organisation of agricultural workers had to start again almost from the bottom. In 1920 the entry of many workers engaged on large-scale estates in Lower Austria helped the union to develop. The centre of gravity was now in Lower Austria and the seat of the executive committee was transferred from Graz to Vienna. At the congress in 1925 it was stated that the Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers had difficulties arising out of the demarcation question with the woodworkers' trade union and that 3,000 State forestry workers had gone over to the Union of Technical Workers, a change which is reflected in the figures for membership given above.

The union has sections for different groups of employed persons, such as agricultural workers, forestry workers, saw-mill workers, dairy-herd men, horticultural workers, vineyard workers, pitch makers, etc. Any person of either sex engaged in agriculture or forestry, horticulture, or any of the previously mentioned occupations, or road-repairing, has the right of membership. Smallholders who work as wage-earning workers in agriculture and forestry can become members of the union. They are often simultaneously members of the smallholders' union, the relations with which are discussed more fully below.

The Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers is affiliated to the Austrian Trade Union Committee (Gewerkschaftskommission Österreichs) and to the International Federation of Land Workers.

(2) The Austrian Union of Estate Employees (Verband der Güterbeamten Deutschösterreichs) was founded in 1919.

---

This organisation is affiliated to the Austrian Trade Union Committee. It has relations with the corresponding German organisation (*Reichsverband deutscher Guts- und Forstbeamten*, Berlin), and with the Agricultural Union of Estate Employees in Czechoslovakia. All persons being officials and salaried employees in agriculture or forestry (including hunting and allied occupations, as well as soil improvement work) may become members. It is, however, assumed that applicants come under the Act on Estate Employees of 26 September 1923. The membership is 6,000.

(3) The Central Union of Agricultural Workers in Austria (*Zentralverband der Landarbeiter Oesterreichs*) was founded in 1919 under the name of the Alliance of Agricultural Workers (*Landarbeiterbund*). The union is affiliated to the Central Union of Christian Trade Unions in Austria (*Zentralkommission der christlichen Gewerkschaften Oesterreichs*), to the International Federation of Christian Land Workers' Trade Unions, and has relations with the Christian unions of agricultural workers in Czechoslovakia and Germany. Under its constitution the following workers may be members: agricultural workers and farm and house servants; smallholders and small tenants; road repairers; horticultural workers; vineyard workers; forestry workers; pitch makers; settlers; etc. It is at present divided into sections for farm workers and servants; smallholders; road repairers. The membership is about 6,000. Smallholders and tenant-workers who do not employ outside help may become members, and it is stated by the union that they frequently avail themselves of this right. Independent Christian associations of smallholders do not exist.

(4) The Union of Active and Pensioned Christian Forestry and Salt Workers in Austrian State Undertakings (*Verband aktiver und provisionierter christlicher Forst- und Salinenarbeiter der Bundesbetriebe Oesterreichs*) was founded on 1 June 1924. This union is affiliated to the Central Committee of Christian Trade Unions in Austria. It is divided into four sections: employed salt workers; employed forestry workers; pensioned salt workers and their widows; pensioned forestry workers and their widows. Only workers engaged in the Austrian State Salt Works or forests and entitled to pension, together with persons of both sexes in receipt of pensions from these undertakings, are admitted to the union, which has a membership
of about 2,000. Forestry workers in these undertakings engaged on free contracts belong, if they are Christian, to the Christian Union of Woodworkers.

(5) In 1923 a Union of Smallholders was created as a section of the Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers (Soc.-Dem.; see above). By September 1924 this union had 200 branches and 10,000 members and published its own periodical. The rapid growth of the smallholders' section, and the fact that the interests of the two groups of persons engaged in agriculture are not quite identical, led to the creation in the summer of 1925 of the smallholders' section as an entirely independent organisation, under the name of the Union of Austrian Smallholders, Vineyarders and Small Tenants (Verband der Kleinbauern, Weinbauteilenden u. Kleinpächter Oesterreichs). The Union of Smallholders is formed of constituent unions for each Austrian State, except Tyrol, and has a membership of about 10,000. All persons who are owners or tenants of agricultural land and who are engaged in agriculture or forestry have the right to membership. This union is not affiliated to the Austrian Trade Union Committee, but states itself to be in close relations with all "free" unions in Austria and also with the German Union of Smallholders in Czechoslovakia. It has a joint committee with the Union of Austrian Agricultural and Forestry Workers. The two organisations also publish together a yearly calendar.

The Technical Union, which really is a union of State employees and of telegraph, telephone and postal workers, has, as already mentioned, a certain number of forestry workers as members.

The same is the case with both the Social-Democratic and the Christian woodworkers' organisations and, as far as smallholders are also engaged in industrial work or handicrafts, they are often members of the corresponding unions.

In addition to the unions mentioned above, a Union of Agricultural Workers, affiliated to the Federation of German Trade Unions in Austria, has existed in that country, but has now disappeared.

Representation at the International Labour Conference

1919: Not a member of the International Labour Organisation.
1921: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Ferdinand HANUSCH, Austrian Trade Union Committee (replaced during the Session by Mr. Hans MORAWITZ, president of the Austrian Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers).
1922: Government Delegates only.
1923: Workers' Delegate: Mr. E. STRASS, Austrian Trade Union Committee.
1924: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Julius ZIPPER, secretary to the Association of Food and Drink Workers.
1925: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Anton HUEBER, president of the Austrian Trade Union Committee.
1926: Workers' Delegate: Mr. WEIGL, secretary of the Commercial and Transport Workers' Union.

All nominations have been made in agreement with the Austrian Trade Union Committee.

BELGIUM

Recent figures on the distribution of land in Belgium are not available, but the existence of innumerable small plots is admitted, perhaps nearly 500,000; even subtracting these smallest holdings, the average size of all other holdings in Belgium is not estimated to exceed 5 hectares.

According to the census of 1920¹ there were 610,573 persons in Belgium engaged in agriculture and forestry, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers (heads of undertakings)</td>
<td>214,012</td>
<td>38,439</td>
<td>252,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of farmers' families occupied in agriculture</td>
<td>76,546</td>
<td>56,369</td>
<td>132,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried employees</td>
<td>647</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage-paid workers</td>
<td>189,873</td>
<td>34,565</td>
<td>224,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>481,078</td>
<td>129,495</td>
<td>610,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinction between heads of undertakings and workers by no means corresponds with a distinction between persons occupying land and persons not occupying land. On the contrary, one of the noticeable features of Belgian industrial life is the number of wage-earning workers, both agricultural and in manufacturing industry, who own or lease or in some way occupy a plot of land, sometimes minute, but sometimes almost attaining the dimensions of a smallholding.

It has further been stated that only 16 out of each 100 persons employed in agriculture are wage-paid workers (presumably regular wage-paid workers lodged at the farm)². As will be

² Times Special Supplement, 9 April 1920 (statement by Mr. van Oorshoven, of the Belgian Ministry of Agriculture).
seen below, however, even these workers often occupy, and sometimes own, a little land. In summing up the results of an important official enquiry into the conditions of agricultural labour in 1919, the Government Reporter states:

In order to obtain an accurate idea of the resources of agricultural workers, account must be taken of those accessory advantages which accrue to them in various ways. Except for farm servants, both men and women, who are lodged and boarded at the farm and the whole of whose time is taken up by their duties, most agricultural workers are additionally engaged in growing crops or keeping animals on their own account, with the help of the members of their family.\(^1\)

The same remarks apply to a considerable number of workers in manufacturing industry. The short distances, the excellence of the communications, and cheap fares make possible the combined cultivation of a plot of ground (where family help is available) and of some wage-paid work.

The same report divides agricultural workers into two main groups, resident and non-resident. Resident farm workers comprise workers who are largely engaged on domestic and only partly on agricultural work. It is noted that the resident agricultural workers' contract in Belgium is legally a monthly or fortnightly contract, and not, as in so many countries, an annual or six-monthly contract; this, however, does not mean that resident workers do not remain for long periods on the same farm. Non-resident workers fall into two distinct groups, namely, workers paid by the day and usually working for the same employer day after day, and those doing piecework or paid by the job. The latter often come from another part of the country and are temporarily lodged in buildings at the farm. In some parts of the country there are very few regular day workers.

Both resident and permanent day workers commonly have allowances in land given to them by their employers, and this land is often ploughed and manured by the employer. In this way even the resident worker's position has a certain resemblance to that of the occupier of a piece of land. Moreover, resident workers sometimes own or lease land independently, sometimes from their own employer, sometimes from another farmer.

The piece or job workers are employed at sowing and harvest

---

time, and principally on the large estates cultivating beets and cereals in Brabant, Hainault, etc. These workers are drawn from the class of cultivators mentioned above who combine the occupation of a smallholding and some wage-paid work. Their employment is organised on a pretty stable customary basis year after year; they work in gangs of seven or eight, and engagement often takes place through a middleman. Between the cereal and the beetroot harvest they often return home to deal with their own holding. There is also an important exit of seasonal workers into France.

In general, there is a shortage of agricultural labour for large-estate work. The varied and intensive nature of the crops grown makes a large supply of temporary labour essential.

Market gardening in the vicinity of industrial centres is of importance.

In general, agricultural and industrial life in Belgium is closely allied. Merely owing to topographic vicinity there is no great gulf between town and country. This factor is reflected in the organisation of workers.

(1) The Central Belgian Trade Union of Workers on the Land (Soc.-Dem.) (Union centrale belge des travailleurs de la Terre) was affiliated to the Trade Union Committee of Belgium (Commission syndicale de Belgique). In 1921 it was amalgamated with the Central Union of Food Workers (Union centrale de l'Alimentation), and the joint union has since then continued to exist under the name of the Central Union of Workers in the Food Industry and in Agriculture of Belgium (Centrale des travailleurs des industries alimentaires et de l'Agriculture de Belgique).

(2) The Central Union of Horticultural, Agricultural, and Forestry Workers (Union centrale ouvrière des jardiniers, agricul­teurs et forestiers) was affiliated to the Federation of Belgian Christian Trade Unions (Confédération des syndicats chrétiens de Belgique), but was amalgamated in 1924 with the Christian Food and Drink Workers' Union. The combined union is known as the Central Union of Food and Drink Workers, Agricultural Workers, Horticultural and Forestry Workers (Centrale de l'Alimentation, des ouvriers agriculteurs, jardiniers et forestiers), and is affiliated to the International Federation of Christian Land Workers' Trade Unions.
1919: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Corneille MERTENS, secretary-general of the Trades Union Committee of Belgium.

1921: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Corneille MERTENS. **Advisers:** Mr. Pierre VAEL, secretary, Harvest Workers' Union; Mr. René CARELS, secretary, Central Union of Horticultural, Agricultural and Forestry Employees; Mr. Victor PLANTEFÊVE, secretary, Land Workers' Union.

1923-26 **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Corneille MERTENS.

Mr. Mertens has been nominated in agreement with the Trades Union Committee of Belgium (*Commission syndicale de Belguique*). His Advisers in 1921 were nominated in agreement with the organisations of which they were members.

**BULGARIA**

Statistics of the distribution of land in Bulgaria date from 1908. The present national area is about 10 per cent. greater than at that date, but the relation between the various size-groups of farms has not changed. Nearly all crop land belonged to private owners, who, to the number of 639,000, held 800,000 properties between them. Of these 120,000 included less than 1 hectare of crop land, 100,000 between 1 and 2 hectares, 240,000 between 2 and 5 hectares, and 300,000 between 5 and 20 hectares; only 4,500 included more than 50 hectares, together 7 per cent. of the total crop area. To the number of private properties must be added 5,000 properties owned by public institutions. An average of 5 hectares of land is considered sufficient to support a family; however, the Act on Agrarian Reform of 1921 has defined the area of crop land and pasture together that can be held by a family of 4 persons as 30 hectares.

Most of the agricultural workers seem to possess some land; only 8,000 are indicated as having none. In agreement with this is the fact that the number of “farmers” in the present

---


4 *Ibid.* There are also 30,000 refugee families of Bulgarian nationality in process of being settled on the land.
national area of the country is lower than the number of "property owners" mentioned above, which must mean that a certain number of persons own land but are nevertheless not classified as farmers. The figures shown in the table below cover all types of agriculture, including forestry; a disadvantage is the classing together in the statistics of working members of cultivators' families and managing staff 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owners themselves cultivating land</td>
<td>465,961</td>
<td>48,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share-farmers</td>
<td>11,585</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other independent persons 1</td>
<td>15,422</td>
<td>1,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working members of cultivators' families and managing staff</td>
<td>422,830</td>
<td>951,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants on yearly contracts</td>
<td>26,090</td>
<td>3,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-labourers engaged in agriculture proper</td>
<td>62,489</td>
<td>96,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other workers, including forestry workers, etc.</td>
<td>29,195</td>
<td>5,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of workers</td>
<td>117,774</td>
<td>104,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population engaged</td>
<td>1,033,627</td>
<td>1,107,670</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Such as vineyarders, tobacco cultivators, etc.

It will be seen that the number of workers, especially those engaged per year, is very small compared with the total number of persons engaged in agriculture.

An organisation of agricultural, forestry, and gardening workers existed in Bulgaria, affiliated to the Bulgarian Federation of Trade Unions. In 1923 this organisation had 2,390 members; it was dissolved that year when, for political reasons, the whole Federation, which was Communist in sympathies, was forbidden.

No organisation of agricultural workers is affiliated to the Union of Free Trade Unions in Bulgaria. This union stated that the "land workers in Bulgaria are combined with other categories of peasants in various political organisations, but in no trade unions" 2.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919 : Not a member of the International Labour Organisation.
1921  | Government Delegates only.
1922  | Government Delegates only.
1923 : **Workers' Delegate** : Mr. Janko SAKASOFF.
1924 : Government Delegates only.
1925  | **Workers' Delegate** : Mr. Gregor DANOFF, secretary of the
1926  | Bulgarian Federation of Free Trade Unions.

---


2 Communication to the International Labour Office.
CANADA

The distribution of land in Canada is as follows. Of the whole area of the country (comprising vast forest reserves) only about one-tenth, namely, 140,887,903 acres, is in occupied farms. The total number of occupied farms is increasing with the general increase in population, and in 1921 was 711,090. The average area of farms is also increasing, from 124 acres in 1901 to 198 acres in 1921; the increase in the average size of the farming unit is due to the employment of more powerful machinery, and also to the continued opening up of the prairie provinces with their extensive farming. The availability of land, the use of machinery for all agricultural operations, and the practice of extensive farming enormously increase the area of what would in other countries be smallholdings.

Disregarding holdings under 1 acre, there were in 1921 only 126,771 holdings (3,161,840 acres) held as farms of 50 acres or less, out of a total of 711,090 holdings in all covering 140,887,903 acres. In other words, about one-sixth of all farmers had really small farms, and the total acreage of their combined cultivation was about 2 per cent of the total area cultivated in the country. Even farms running between 51 and 100 acres are not so very numerous; the bulk of all holdings run well over 100 acres, and over one-half of the whole occupied area is held as farms of over 300 acres. It should be remembered, however, that occupied farms include much unimproved land, woodland, and natural pasture. The vast majority of farms are owned by the persons who cultivate them. On an average each farm supports just over six persons.

The rural population has been losing its absolute preponderance over the urban population in the course of the last twenty years. It still, however, in 1921, comprised slightly over half the total population, namely, over 4,400,000 persons. Agriculture is still the most important Canadian industry in respect of the number of workers engaged. In 1911 there were 917,848 men and 15,887 women engaged in that industry (including horticulture), being 34.3 per cent. of the whole number of persons engaged in all industries; these numbers include boys


and girls over 10 years of age, but exclude married women not doing paid work. The married woman on the farm in Canada, however, is often an important part of the labour force on the farm. Moreover, of the whole number of persons engaged in farming, over 103,000 were farmers' sons, presumably working on the home farm. Only about one-seventh of the total population occupied in agriculture, namely, just over 144,000 persons, were employed workers 1.

Over 42,000 persons are employed in forestry.

Agriculture is carried on throughout the country on the family farm system. The farmer himself, with the help of machinery as already mentioned, assisted by the members of his family, usually does the whole of his own work; in this sense farmers form one of the principal groups of independent workers in the country.

The hired labourer, however, exists and lives with the farmer on the farm and usually in the farmhouse; his contract is often for a year. By no means all farms employ such hired workers, although most farmers try to obtain some help for the harvest, in which case a contract which may run on for about six months is offered. The position of the hired worker is a somewhat special one, inasmuch as it is very unusual for a man to remain as a hired worker all his life; he usually manages to accumulate sufficient to rent or buy land on his own account and start as an independent farmer himself; or else he takes up another occupation. The following statement is presented from a Canadian source.

The status of the hired agricultural worker in Canada is entirely different from that of the agricultural labourer in European countries. In Canada we have practically no permanent agricultural labourer class. A very large percentage of the male population have been agricultural labourers at one time or another, but in almost every case such employment is engaged in with the idea that it will only be temporary. It is usual for new settlers intending to take up land to work for other farmers for a year or two for the purpose of gaining experience and saving money with which to make a start on their own account. There are also a considerable number of young men who work on a farm during the summer months to earn money with which to pay their expenses while studying at schools and universities during the winter. There are again men who work on the farms in the summer time and in lumber camps during the winter. In the fall of each year large numbers of extra men are needed for harvesting and threshing of the western grain crop. These are secured chiefly from the eastern provinces and

are carried to the west by special excursion trains on which a very low 
railway fare is charged. Some of these men remain in the west, while 
others return to their homes after the season's work. Harvest excursions are also run from British Columbia into Alberta.... While I have 
said that there is practically no permanent agricultural labourer class 
in this country, there are, of course, exceptions to this rule. There 
are, for instance, a number of large stock-raisers who employ permanent 
help consisting of skilled stock men. This, however, would be a very 
small percentage of the men employed 1.

The many important Provincial organisations of farmers 
accept hired workers as members, and it is very usual for 
hired workers to join; the membership may, of course, 
continue when such an employed worker begins to farm on 
his own account. In 1909 a National Canadian Council of 
Agriculture was established, in order to provide a channel 
through which provincial farmers might combine their efforts 
when dealing with national and inter-Provincial problems 2.

Organisations of agricultural workers as such do not exist. The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, the Canadian 
Federation of Labour 3, and the Federation of Catholic Workers, 
which have memberships embracing the whole country, do not 
note any affiliated organisations of agricultural workers. But 
many such workers are members in respect of their other occupa-
ations performed during other periods of the year, while, as 
already pointed out, workers doing agricultural work throughout 
the year are organised in the farmers’ bodies mentioned above.

REPRESENTATION AT THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

1919: Workers’ Delegate: Mr. P. M. Draper, secretary, Trades and 
Labour Congress; president of Ottawa Typographical Union.
1921-2: Workers’ Delegate: Mr. Tom Moore, president, Trades and 
Labour Congress, Ottawa.
1925: Workers’ Delegate: Mr. P. M. Draper.
1926: Workers’ Delegate: Mr. Tom Moore.

1 Communication to the International Labour Office from the Canadian 
Council of Agriculture.
2 History of farmers’ organisation in Canada in THE CANADIAN 
COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE: A Review of the History and Work of the 
3 The Canadian Federation of Labour, through its secretary, in a com-
munication to the International Labour Office, dated 2 February 1926, 
expresses itself as “endorsing” the Resolution for an enquiry into organ-
isation of agricultural labour accepted by the Seventh Session of the 
International Labour Conference and in consequence of which the 
present study has been drawn up, “not that it will affect the agricul-
tural workers of Canada for some time to come, but we are aware of the 
fact that in some of the European countries there are large organisations 
of this type”, and on this account the Federation desires to endorse 
the Resolution.
CHINA

In China agriculture supports the great mass of the people; about 80 per cent. of a population of 340 millions live by agriculture. The density of this population (in some districts 600 persons per square kilometre) is remarkable. The peasant farm predominates and, owing to the density of the population, is very small; in the plains it varies from 1.0 to 3.4 hectares, though larger holdings from 4 to 10 hectares, or even up to 50 hectares, also exist. Of fertile land 0.4 hectares is considered sufficient to support a family. In southern China holdings are still smaller, but cultivation is more horticultural than agricultural. Throughout the country share-tenancy is common. Human labour plays the principal rôle; even of animal labour only a limited amount is available.

There are three large groups of persons who may be classed as agricultural workers in China.

(i) **The owner of a small plot, usually a few mou in area.** — If such persons cultivate their plot with the help of their family, their children, from the age of 7 or 8 years, are put in charge of the animals, of picking and of watering, while the women carry on the garden work and look after the domestic stock. In some provinces, e.g. Canton, Kiangson, and Tchekiang, women do the same work as the men. Recourse is had to paid labour only at the rush seasons, i.e. during sowing and harvest. These small landowners form the bulk of the agricultural population, the division of the surface of the land into small holdings having been established from time immemorial.

(ii) **The tenant.** — Tenancy is also an extremely old institution and very widespread in China. The leasing of land does not imply that the tenant has any capital, and the tenant is often forced to go to outside persons for money to buy manure and tools, and even for the payment of such labour as he employs. The normal payment to the landowner is two-thirds of the produce of the tenancy.

(iii) **The agricultural worker properly so called.** — This class may be divided into three groups:

(a) The agricultural worker engaged on a long-term contract. A person who owns neither land nor money and has no credit

---

1 Dr. Wilhelm Wagner: *Die chinesische Landwirtschaft*. Berlin, 1926.
2 One mou = 674 square metres.
desires to hire out his services to landowners or land tenants. The minimum period of the employment contract is, as a rule, one year. Such contracts are renewed by tacit consent and often continue until old age sets in.

(b) The worker engaged by the month. During the harvest and other seasons a certain number of persons who are employed in occupations other than agriculture avail themselves of the opportunity of earning a little extra by hiring out their services to landowners or tenants. The employment contract is usually month by month.

(c) The day-labourer. Day-labourers in agriculture are casual workers; they work sometimes for one employer and sometimes for another, though this does not necessarily imply that they leave the confines of their village. They have no special training and are used for any sort of work, cultivation, husking and polishing of rice, and even on building work.

Up to the last few years agricultural workers, although they represent the great majority of the working population of the country, were unorganised. It was not until 1924 that a movement began for the organisation of peasants on the initiative, and under the patronage, of the Koumintang Party of Canton. Since then the development of the movement has been positively astonishing. A list of agricultural workers’ associations and of their membership, supplied by the Central Committee of Agricultural Workers, shows the prosperity of these workers’ organisations. In 1926 there were 5,153 associations with a membership of 1,045,442.

The first congress of agricultural workers was held at Canton on 1 May 1925, and a second congress on the same day in 1926. The first congress only covered the Province of Canton, and, indeed, only 21 districts in that Province, including a total membership of 200,000 persons. The second congress not only united delegates from the Cantonese unions representing over 600,000 members, but also delegates from similar unions newly established in eleven other Provinces. The congress was thus of a national character. The work of these newly-established unions has been carried out in a more businesslike

1 Tchun Kovo Lao Tong Wen Ti (The Labour Question in China). By Ma Tsaou Touen. 1925.
way; every Provincial union sends in a report and 31 resolutions were adopted at the congress.

In August 1926 an extraordinary Provincial congress of associations of agricultural workers of Canton met and accepted a resolution of "minimum demands of agricultural workers", including the following points: reduction of tenancy rents to a minimum of 25 per cent. of the produce of the tenancy; abolition of arbitrary taxation; legal restriction of the rates of interest on agricultural loans to a maximum of 20 per cent; establishment of agricultural State land banks; State encouragement to the formation of agricultural co-operative societies; annulment of contracts and customs unjust to the agricultural worker; establishment by Government action of equitable rules for tenancies, including the right of appeal in cases of breach of tenancy before a peasants arbitration court; the improvement of economic and social conditions of agricultural workers, and regulation of the labour of women and children in agriculture; right of agricultural associations to represent their members in a court of law; free education in rural districts.

The setting forth of these demands serves to show the intimate association of the interests of the paid labourer and the small share-cultivator.

Finally, it is to be noted that a struggle is beginning to develop between the agricultural workers' unions on the one hand, and the landed proprietors and local chambers of commerce on the other.

REPRESENTATION AT THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

1919: Government Delegates only.
1921-1926: " " " "

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Statistics on which a description of the distribution of land in Czechoslovakia has to be based date twenty-five to thirty years back. The statistics of 1896 show that about 30 per cent. of the total area belonged to properties of over 1,000 hectares, while 35 per cent. were held in farms of between 10 and 50 hectares (a little smaller in the eastern part of Czechoslovakia); the remainder was mostly held in dwarf holdings.
These statistics, however, count the big properties, i.e. properties over 200 hectares taxed for at least 200 Austrians crowns, as a unit, although, in fact, they frequently consist of several, even hundreds of, farms. In the statistics for 1902 these properties are divided up, and the single farms of which they consisted are each counted, with the result that many more holdings below 10 hectares, and especially between 2 and 5 hectares, appear in the census, so that these groups appear to be of greater importance than they were in the statistics of 1896.

This distribution of land has since the date of the censuses undergone a certain development — absorption of smallholdings by large estates, further distribution of the remaining smallholdings — but has been more definitely modified under agrarian reform legislation, which has made about 820,000 hectares of agricultural land available for enlarging existing dwarf holdings and creating new holdings. However, figures to show the present distribution of the total area of arable land and pasture in Czechoslovakia, amounting to 8,500,000 hectares, are not available.

The population engaged in agriculture was, according to the census of 1921, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holders of land</td>
<td>692,909</td>
<td>141,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working members of cultivators' families</td>
<td>383,080</td>
<td>233,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing staff</td>
<td>19,033</td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentices</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants and other long contract workers</td>
<td>280,736</td>
<td>168,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-labourers</td>
<td>288,027</td>
<td>214,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,665,625</td>
<td>759,343</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, the census of 1921 registered 1,164 men and 32,675 women being domestic servants employed on agricultural undertakings. Of the managing staff about 7,000, and of the workers 70,000, were engaged in forestry.

Smallholdings mostly employ farm servants engaged by the year. On the bigger holdings the staff consists of “depu-

---

tatists’¹ and day labourers graded according to the farm and
the kind of work they perform. The deputatist workers are,
in the official wage statistics, divided into dairyherdsmen
(the skilled dairyherdsman is said to be new in Czechoslovakia),
shepherds, horsemen, stockmen, and maids. To these must
be added, on the big estates, watchmen, forestry gardeners,
foremen, bailiffs, and other persons belonging to the managing
staff.

It has been stated, at any rate in reference to pre-war con­
ditions, that the large estate in Czechoslovak agriculture depends
more than in any other country on the labour of smallholders
who are not able to gain their living from their own holdings².
The smallholders, however, not only seek agricultural work on
other farms; they are often masons, gardeners, tilers (thatchers),
etc., or they seek forestry work or do homework, such as weaving.

All statements received from organisations of agricultural
workers and of smallholders in Czechoslovakia agree that,
as a rule, the smallholder must find, for a part of the year
at least, such paid work, and that a considerable number of them
even derive their principal income from paid work. Under
these circumstances the question of the organisation of
smallholders becomes very important.

The following organisations of agricultural workers (Social-
Democratic, National-Social, Christian) exist.

(1) The Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers (Svaz
zemedelskych a lesnich delniku) affiliated to the Federation of
Czechoslovak Trade Unions (Odborove sdruzeni Ceskoslovenske)
and to the International Land Workers’ Federation. The
Czech union participated, for the first time, at the fourth congress
of this Federation held in Geneva in September 1926.

The origin of this union was an Association of Agricultural
and Forestry Workers started in 1902 in Pilsen, which, in
1918, was changed into the Union of Agricultural Workers.
The union never entertained direct relations with industrial
workers, but operated independently for the improvement of
the conditions of wage earners in agriculture and forestry.

When Czechoslovakia was established as an independent
State, the union developed very rapidly; its membership reached

¹ See Section on Germany.
² INTERNATIONAL LABOUR OFFICE: The Eight-Hour-Day Act and its
Application to Agriculture in Czechoslovakia. 96 pp. Geneva, 1921.
300,000, and it employed as many as 80 officials. However, in 1920 the Communists broke up the organisation and the majority of the members joined the Third International. The present union was therefore created in 1921 with adherence to the Federation of Czechoslovak Trade Unions, affiliated to the Amsterdam International. The union is the largest organisation of agricultural workers in Czechoslovakia, with a membership of nearly 30,000. The union works in close relation with 28 co-operative societies formed from among those of its members who have acquired land. The union has had a membership of 53,000, but all members to whom holdings have been allotted under agrarian reform legislation have been transferred to smallholders’ unions.

(2) The Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers (Verband der land- und forstwirtschaftlichen Arbeiter) is affiliated to the Federation of German Trade Unions in Czechoslovakia (Zentralgewerkschaftskommission des Deutschen Gewerkschaftsbundes in der Tschechoslowakei), also to the International Land Workers’ Federation. It was founded in 1919. It is a continuation of the old Austrian Union of Agriculture and Forestry Workers; but, owing to the creation of the Czechoslovak Republic, it was necessary to found a new union. Any person of either sex engaged in agriculture, forestry, or domestic work can become a member of the union. The union has 172 branches and about 5,500 members.

This union states that all smallholders work at least a few weeks in the year on account of another person, as holdings are not large enough to provide them with the whole of their income, while a large number are even forced to obtain the principal part of their income by wage-paid work; under these circumstances, small tenants and smallholders are, of course, also entitled to membership and a large number have already joined the union.

There exists, however, a Central Union of German Smallholders (cf. below), and the intention of the two executive committees was to amalgamate the two unions. However, on examination it was found that the interests of the members of the two unions differed so much that the idea was abandoned, but where their interests are common they are considered in collaboration.

(3) A Union of Horticultural Workers (Gärtnerverband in der Tschechoslowakischen Republik) is also affiliated to the Federation of German Trade Unions in Czechoslovakia.
(4) A Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers (Vseod Borovy svaz zemedelského a lesního delnictva Ceskoslovenské strany sozialistické) affiliated to the Central Office of National-Social Trade Unions (Ceskoslovenska obec delnicka, ustredna odborovych organisaci) (the Central Office is the central body of the trade union movement of the National-Social Party). The Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers was created in February 1920. Before this date the members belonged to the Trade Union of Industrial, Agricultural, and Forestry Workers. It has now 23,000 members. The union states that as a result of agrarian reform legislation agricultural workers’ organisations suffered great losses. Many workers who acquired a holding changed their affiliation and, except in a few cases, joined the associations of smallholders; moreover, a number of former workers on large-scale estates who received money compensation for their loss of employment under this legislation left agriculture. All persons employed as paid agricultural workers have the right of membership in the union. The union states that in some places agricultural workers are members of smallholders’ associations, while in others smallholders are members of agricultural workers’ organisations. The reason is sometimes political sympathies and sometimes lower membership fees. When smallholders take factory employment they become members of trade unions of factory workers. They are never excluded from workers’ unions and are admitted on the same conditions as other workers. The union has made special efforts to get smallholders as members, for instance, by loaning them horses free. It is stated, however, that organisation of smallholders in the union is difficult, and that this is detrimental to the union, as smallholders are apt to take work at lower wages than the regular paid workers. On the other hand, the union admits that smallholders doing no paid work have no interest in joining the union.

The union does not collaborate on economic questions with smallholders’ associations: collaboration is limited to political action.

(5) The Union of Horticultural Workers (Odborové sdruzeni delniku zahradnickych a kvétinarskych priruci) is affiliated to the Central Office of National-Social Trade Unions.

(6) The Union of Agricultural Salaried Employees (Odborove sdruzeni zemskych zrizencu v Republice Ceskoslovenske) is also
affiliated to the same Central Office of National-Social Trade Unions.

(7) The Union of Czechoslovak Christian-Social Agricultural and Forestry Workers (Svaz Csl. Zemedelskych a Lesnich Zamestnancu), affiliated to the Czechoslovak Federation of Christian-Social Trade Unions (Risska Ceskoslovanska Vseodborova Komise Krestansko-Socialni), was founded on 12 March 1925 and has at present 12,093 members. The union does not comprise smallholders, who have their own organisation.

(8) The Union of Christian Agricultural and Forestry Workers (Verband christlicher Land- und Forstarbeiter) is affiliated to the Association of German Christian Trade Unions in Czechoslovakia (Verband der christlichen Gewerkschaften für das Gebiet des tschekoslowakischen Staates).

The existence is noted of two Czech Social-Democratic associations of smallholders and tenants, one in Prague with about 60,000 members, and one in Pilsen, and of a German Union of Smallholders. These unions are not real trade unions, but associations to take care of the economic interests of smallholders. They are, however, affiliated to the Social-Democratic political organisations and have very friendly relations with the trade unions of Agricultural Workers. The German Union of Smallholders (Zentralverband der deutschen Kleinbauern und Häusler in der Tschekoslowakischen Republik) was established in 1920. The union states that its members can only join a trade union when they do industrial or agricultural work for others against wages.

Representation at the International Labour Conference

1919 | Workers' Delegate: Mr. Rudolphe TAYERLE, deputy secretary of the Federation of Czechoslovak Trade Unions.
1921 | Workers' Delegate: Mr. Ferdinand STASTNY, Senator, president of the National-Social Trade Unions.
1922 | Workers' Delegate: Mr. Antoine CURIK, deputy general secretary of the Federation of Christian Trade Unions.
1924 | Workers' Delegate: Mr. Charles VIKTORA, secretary of the Czechoslovak Glass Workers' Federation, Teplice.
1926 | Workers' Delegate: Mr. W. I. François STEFKA, secretary of the Czechoslovak Seamen's and Sailors' Union.

DENMARK

Agricultural land in Denmark is mostly held as medium-sized farms. Thus, 57 per cent. of arable land is found in farms
of between 15 and 60 hectares, 19 per cent. in farms over this size, and 24 per cent. in smaller ones. The table below shows to what extent farms had to use permanent outside help in 1923.

**Number of farms using no permanent outside help:**
- using no permanent help at all: 84,706
- using the help of members of the cultivator's family over 15 years of age: 31,516
  
  Together: 116,222

**Number of farms using permanent outside help:**
- one worker: 30,523
- two workers: 21,181
- three workers: 12,672
- four workers: 7,065
- five workers or more: 8,292
  
  Together: 79,733

The number of farms using permanent outside help is: 195,955

The number of farmers employing more than three workers is small; the majority of workers are therefore farm servants. The table below shows the number of agricultural workers according to the population census of 1 February 1921.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaried employees:</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers and bailiffs</td>
<td>5,438</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant bailiffs, depot managers</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stock managers</td>
<td>6,405</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Together</strong></td>
<td>14,738</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wage-earning workers:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants</td>
<td>95,295</td>
<td>2,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural day-labourers</td>
<td>38,896</td>
<td>3,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Together</strong></td>
<td>134,191</td>
<td>5,615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of women workers engaged in agriculture is certainly too low in this table; there are not less than 82,000 female domestic servants in rural districts, of which a considerable number undoubtedly take part in agricultural work on the farm.

---

At the last census in 1921 there was a tendency, however, to class women servants as domestic servants. The statistical authorities themselves estimate that 20,000 women servants classed as farm servants in the census of 1911 had been classed as domestic servants in 1921. Again, many women are married to agricultural workers and are therefore quoted as dependants in the population census, though they work either as milkmaids or as seasonal beet and harvest workers. The Union of Agricultural Workers estimates their number to be 20,000.

To these groups of wage-earning and salaried workers must be added smallholders doing paid work for others. According to the census of 1921, 1,632 men and 40 women indicated themselves as being simultaneously smallholders and agricultural day-labourers. However, the special agricultural census in 1923 affords better material for showing to what extent smallholders work outside their own holding.

### SMALLHOLDERS WORKING FOR OTHERS ON A CERTAIN NUMBER OF DAYS IN THE YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Less than 50</th>
<th>50-150</th>
<th>150 and more</th>
<th>Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of smallholders . .</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>7,806</td>
<td>5,021</td>
<td>16,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of days worked per year . . .</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 5,000 smallholders work for half the year for others. In this connection it may be mentioned that the conditions under which a cultivator may be considered as a wage worker, and consequently has the right to enter the Unemployment Insurance Fund for agricultural workers, are the following:

1. He must be occupied as a wage worker in the employment of another person on at least 150 days a year.

2. He may not own more than 5,000 crowns if unmarried and 10,000 if married (thus conforming to the general rule of the fund).

---

1 Census cited, p. 84.
(3) His net income derived from his holding must not exceed 1,500 crowns a year.

(4) The value of his land (without buildings) must be under 3,000 crowns.

(5) He must not, in general, keep more than two cows and a heifer, nor must he own a horse standing higher than 10 quarters (1 quarter = 6 inches).

Types of agricultural work are not very varied. Most of the workers do all-round work. Male farm servants and married permanent day-labourers are engaged mostly on field work, but also in cattle tending; temporary workers do field work only. Milking is mostly done by married women.

(1) The Union of Danish Landworkers (Landarbejderforbundet i Danmark). Attempts to organise Danish agricultural workers are known to have taken place in various parts of the country as far back as the last decade of the past century, but not much is known of the details of these efforts. It is certain that these organisations did not last long and covered only a single district. A real beginning was not made until 1906, when the Union of Servants was established. It soon had a fair number of branches; members were mostly young male farm servants. The union was not very firmly organised. The present union describes it more as a movement than as a trade union. From 1909 to 1915 interior struggles weakened the organisation; from 1909 to 1913 and again from 1914 to 1915 it was divided into two unions. In the spring of 1915 these two unions met together with representatives from the Social-Democratic Party, the Federation of Danish Trade Unions, and the Danish Union of General Workers. On the recommendation of these representatives it was agreed to create a Union of Land Workers. Each of the three big associations obtained a seat on the committee of the new union and in return gave financial support. This arrangement lasted until 1921 and naturally greatly helped the new organisation.

Of great importance for the development of the union was the decision taken in the spring of 1917 that the land workers should create an unemployment insurance fund in connection with the union. This fund obtained State authorisation, and

1 Landarbejderforbundets Haandbog. Udgivet af Landarbejderforbundet i Danmark. Copenhagen-Valby, 1925.
special legislation in the autumn of the same year, passed on account of the extraordinary unemployment following the war, dispensed members of the unemployment insurance funds from the rule of having to complete twelve months' membership before being entitled to allowances. The effect was a rapid growth in the organisation of agricultural workers.

In 1918 the first collective agreement was signed with individual employers; in 1919 the first collective agreement for the whole country was made with the newly-created employers' organisation.

In the autumn of 1915 the membership of the union was nearly 2,000: on 1 April 1918, 8,000: on 1 August, 16,000. In 1919 the maximum reached was 32,000, but already by the next year there were only 25,000 members; bottom was finally touched with about 13,000 members. This number remained more or less stationary for the years 1922-1924, since when a slow but steady progress can be noted. The union has now about 15,000 members, of whom only a few hundred are women.

The union is affiliated to the Federation of Danish Trade Unions (De Samvirkende Fagforbund i Danmark), and to the International Federation of Land Workers. The present constitution states that the purpose of the union is to unite all workers employed in agriculture, and defines agricultural workers as those workers who are employed in purely agricultural work on farms, including waggoners, stokers, permanent handicraftsmen on large farms (Herregaarde), as well as workers who are engaged on purely agricultural work in addition to being engaged in another countryside occupation, such as municipal work, stone-splitting, drain-digging, turf work, soil and forestry work.

The union considers that the stock managers, who, in the population census, are classed as salaried employees, should come within the scope of the organisation. Smallholders who supplement their income by means of wage-paid work are also entitled to be members of the union and, in the case of those permanently employed, very largely take advantage of this right. No other organisation exists which takes care of the "trade union interests" of this class of smallholders.

(2) The Danish Union of General Workers (Dansk Arbejdsmandsforbund) has no members who are employed in purely agricultural work; it has, however, some who are engaged in forestry work, drain-digging, and road-repairing work. An
agreement at one time existed between this union and that of the agricultural workers, according to which the three types of work just mentioned might be carried out by members of both unions, while purely agricultural work was to be done by members of the Union of Agricultural Workers and work classed as general labour by the members of the Union of General Workers. The Union of General Workers has 83,000 members, 4,800 of whom are engaged in forestry work. This union has been, but is no longer, a member of the Danish Federation of Trade Unions.

The Danish smallholders are organised in about 1,100 local associations, with 82,000 members, which are again united in six Provincial associations. Every man or woman interested in the movement can become a member of a smallholders' association. The object of the associations is to further smallholding from an economic and social aspect and to do what they can to create better conditions for smallholders.

The six Provincial associations are again united in the Federation of Danish Smallholders' Associations, which, without depriving the single associations of their independence, aims at establishing the widest possible collaboration and harmony between them, and more especially represents them before the Legislature and Government authorities. The Federation is not represented at conferences or permanent organs of wage-earning workers and does not collaborate with the Union of Land Workers. It states that smallholders taking paid work do not, in general, avail themselves of their right to join the Union of Land Workers, because their principal income is derived from fairly independent holdings and their interests are therefore best taken care of through the smallholders' associations.

**REPRESENTATION AT THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE**

1919: *Workers' Delegate:* Mr. C. F. Madsen, president of the Federation of Danish Trade Unions.

1921: *Workers' Delegate:* Mr. P. Hedebol, secretary to the Federation of Danish Trade Unions. *Adviser:* Mr. Oscar Leviøn, president of the Trade Unions of Danish Agricultural Workers.

1926: *Workers' Delegate:* Mr. C. F. Madsen.

The nominations have been made in agreement with the Federation of Danish Trade Unions (*De Samvirkerne Fagforbund i Danmark*).
ESTONIA

Before the recent agrarian reform in Estonia 60 per cent. of agricultural land was held by small owners having an average farm of about 28 hectares, 15 per cent. was rented from the manors by small tenants holding an average of 20 hectares, the rest of the land was cultivated in large-scale estates.

The agrarian reform appropriated nearly all estates. Rather more than 30,000 new holdings, on an average of the same size as the old tenant farms, were created; but, as in some cases a holding was given to more than one family, the average area cultivated by a settlers' family is only about 17 hectares. On the other hand, it has been estimated that the standard farm, large enough to support a family and worked by two horses, should cover not less than 20 hectares of land, of which 9-12 hectares must be arable. In actual fact, more than 50 per cent. of Estonian farms are under this 20-hectare standard, but on some of these farms the soil may be above the average in quality.

Before the agrarian reform land workers fell into two distinct classes: (1) "estate" or manor workers, all married persons having their own household and partly paid in kind or by an allowance of land (the number of such families was estimated at about 36,000), and (2) unmarried farm servants lodged and boarded by the peasant farmer.

The table below shows the population engaged in agriculture according to the census of 22 December 1922:

---

Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers not employing workers</td>
<td>74,477</td>
<td>10,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers employing workers</td>
<td>22,483</td>
<td>2,838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working members of farmers' families:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wives or husbands</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>83,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>41,044</td>
<td>31,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td>12,975</td>
<td>33,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Together</td>
<td>54,403</td>
<td>158,917</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing staff</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage-earning workers and servants</td>
<td>33,365</td>
<td>38,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185,411</td>
<td>210,820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forestry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers not employing workers</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers employing workers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working members of farmers' families:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wives or husbands</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other relatives</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Together</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing staff</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage-earning workers and servants</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>6,045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Horticulture not included.

The majority of the wage-earning workers are to be found on the peasant farms. The large estate workers were, through the agrarian reform, deprived of their occupation; only a few thousands of them will be able to go on working on the small number of large farms which remain in existence. Yet only 4,224 of such workers had been allotted settlers' holdings up to the end of 1924. The majority of them now live as jobbing workers and compete for employment with the large number of smallholders who are themselves unable to live from the income derived from their holdings. It is estimated that the number of owners of holdings who are dependent on outside work for a livelihood is about two-thirds of the whole number of Estonian cultivators. The competition for employment is further increased by the need of work among adult members of artisan families in the villages.

Of interest for the organisation problem of agricultural workers is the special class of tenants who have rented from the peasants land on which they have constructed their own buildings. It was customarily considered that no notice could be given to such tenants; but after the constitution of Estonia as an independent State opinion changed, and it was necessary to pass tenant protection legislation, which was prolonged each year until the whole question was settled by an Act of 1926.

The Constitution of Estonia secures both the right of association and the right to strike. These rights can only be restricted

by legislation in the interests of public safety. On the other hand, the rulings of the old Russian Penal Code have been taken over, which limit the right to strike in some cases, among others, when it is a question of undertakings of so-called public utility, as undertakings of public utility are counted State and transport undertakings and, further, agricultural undertakings. The effect of the rulings is to impose sanctions (even imprisonment) for such offences as incitement of a fellow worker to strike, or incitement to a worker on another undertaking to do so or not to resume work, or even attendance at a meeting in support of a strike.

The general movement among Estonian workers preceding the Russian revolution of 1905 reached the agricultural workers. In the autumn of 1905 local groups of agricultural workers were formed which, by means of small strikes, obtained some improvement in their working conditions. At the same time the possibility of a congress of agricultural workers was discussed. The outbreak of the revolution brought all this to a stop, and it was not until after the revolution of 1917 that the agricultural workers' movement again became active. Local organisation once more became effective, and at the first Estonian Land Workers' Congress in May 1920 there were 88 local agricultural trade unions represented, which united into a Union of Agricultural Workers affiliated to the General Trade Union Federation. The local unions intended to organise forestry and other classes of rural workers as well as agricultural workers proper. The number of local branches of unions reached 180, with a total membership of 20,000. Centralisation, however, was never very strong, and already in 1922 membership began to decrease. It was the large-scale estate workers who had made up the backbone of the organisation. When these workers acquired settlers' holdings or became unemployed, as stated above, they left the organisation or became Communistically inclined. At the second congress in 1922 Communist views dominated and the political aims of the Union outweighed other factors. At the third congress in the same year only one-fourth of the branches were still represented. At the beginning of 1924 both the central union and the local organisations were dissolved as Communistic, the latter without regard to whether they still belonged to the central organisation or not.

In July 1925 a new organisation was created, viz. the Association of the Rural Working Population, which is considered
a continuation of the old land workers' movement. The bulk of its members are not, however, wage-earning workers proper, but come from the class of tenants mentioned above, the defence of whose interests has been taken up by the Socialist Party.

The existing Estonian organisations which need to be noted for purposes of the present study are as follows:

1. The above-mentioned Association of the Rural Working Population (Ueleriikline Maatööralwa Uehisus). This organisation was represented at the Baltic-Scandinavian Trade Union Conference in Stockholm in December 1926. It has lately taken part in the efforts to create a central trade union organisation in Estonia. At the present time it has 40 branches, with 1,000 members. All rural inhabitants who live by their own work, i.e. who do not themselves employ wage-earning workers, can become members of the union. Under these conditions holders of small plots and parcels of land can join the union.

2. Settlers having received a holding large enough to be considered a family holding have created their own organisation and even form a political party. Their organisation has no contact with the workers' organisations.

3. There exists, as a subsection of the General Union of State and Administrative Workers (Riigi-ja Ornavalilsuse teenijate keskliit), an Association of Administrative Workers in Forests (Eesti Metsateenijate Sells).

**representation at the international labour conference**

1919: Not a member of the International Labour Organisation.
1921: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Mikhel Martna.
1922: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Karl Ast.
1923-1: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Mikhel Martna.
1925: Workers' Delegate: Mr. August Gustavson, president of the Estonian Association of Masters and Deck Officers.
1926: Workers' Delegate: Mr. August Gustavson, president of the Estonian Association of Masters and Deck Officers.

In 1921 Mr. Martna was nominated in agreement with the Estonian Socialist Party. The following years the nominations were not made in agreement with a central organisation of workers, but with several trade unions, among which, however, there were no agricultural unions. In 1926 the nomination was made in agreement with the Federation of Seamen and the Estonian Association of Masters and Deck Officers.
FINLAND

Large estates are still important in Finnish agriculture. However, only 9 per cent. of the total area of the largest estates is cultivated land as against 25 per cent. of the total area of small holdings. Considerable portions of large estates are moreover leased out as separate farms, so that the picture obtained by studying the distribution of land among agricultural holdings shows a strong group of medium-sized farms. In 1920 there were 50,000 farms of between 10 and 50 hectares of arable land, accounting for nearly 50 per cent. of the total arable land; 54,000 farms of between 5 and 10 hectares of arable land, accounting for 19 per cent. of such land; and 140,000 farms of between 0.5 and 5 hectares of arable land, accounting for 14 per cent. In addition, there existed 85,000 houses, each with less than 0.5 hectares of land attached.

All holders of less than 10 hectares of arable land are considered smallholders. The number of employers proper in agriculture is estimated at 56,000 as a maximum.

In 1901 60 per cent. of the total number of all agricultural holdings were held as tenancies, this including practically all smallholdings and plots. The smallholders were torpare as in Sweden, i.e. tenant workers obliged to do a certain number of days' work for their landlord. The plots were generally let out to handicraftsmen or casual workers (backstugusittare). The agrarian reform has stimulated a process already begun before the war, and to a great extent former tenants have been able to acquire full ownership of the smallholdings and plots which they had been leasing. The next stage of agrarian reform, namely, the creation of new holdings and more especially the apportioning of more land to the holders of plots, has only just begun, so that no large decrease has yet taken place in the number of persons engaged in agriculture who are obliged to supplement the income derived from their holdings by carrying on wage-paid work on account of another, or, indeed, to support themselves almost entirely by such work.

3 Ministère d'Affaires Sociales de Finlande: L'Agriculture et la situation d'ouvriers agricoles en Finlande. 1923.
The table below shows the population engaged in agriculture on 31 December 1920.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heads of families or independent individuals</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Members of their families engaged in agriculture</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm owners and tenants</td>
<td>152,448</td>
<td>20,170</td>
<td>142,357</td>
<td>181,536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant-workers</td>
<td>44,296</td>
<td>6,516</td>
<td>37,872</td>
<td>49,045</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants with own household (statare)</td>
<td>15,261</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing staff</td>
<td>3,460</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>269</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants boarded and lodged.</td>
<td>22,103</td>
<td>42,044</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-labourers who possess their own dwelling (back-stugusittare)</td>
<td>72,547</td>
<td>28,037</td>
<td>21,757</td>
<td>32,984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day-labourers who do not possess their own dwelling</td>
<td>69,190</td>
<td>45,565</td>
<td>9,753</td>
<td>15,322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>379,305</td>
<td>143,210</td>
<td>213,836</td>
<td>281,578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of personal servants in agriculture was 380 men and 237 women. Further, 1,400 workers were engaged in sylviculture. The number of lumber workers (hewers and floaters) was 16,483 men and 169 women. These, however, are classified in Finnish statistics as industrial workers. The figures cannot include all workers engaged in lumber work. The number of floaters alone was indicated to be 47,000 in 1911. Floating and lumbering is seldom the principal occupation of the workers engaged therein. An official investigation into working conditions among lumber workers in the spring of 1921 showed that 61.4 per cent. of the workers had another income inasmuch as they were holders of land or members of the families of such holders. Even of landless workers engaged in lumbering only 50 per cent. perform such work the whole year round.

The classification of agricultural workers, as given by an official investigation into their working conditions, shows that the grouping of workers both according to their form of contract

---

1 Voionmaa, op. cit., p. 161.
and according to the type of work they perform is very similar to that in Sweden. The investigation distinguished between workers engaged for the year and day-labourers. The first are skilled workers (bailliffs, foremen, inspectors, skilled dairy-herds-men), farm servants and “deputatists”, called *statare* as in Sweden. Some of the farm servants are, however, only engaged for half a year, the so-called summer-servants. Among the day labourers a distinction is made between regular and casual workers. The first work at least eight weeks in the course of a year on the same farm; they seem to be under working conditions very like those obtaining in the case of workers engaged by the year. The Master and Servants Act has put difficulties in the way of organisation of agricultural workers. This Act was abolished by the Act of Labour Contracts of 1 June 1922.

The existing Union of Agricultural Workers (*Maatyöväen Liitto*) is not very important. The union was founded in 1917, but in March 1922 it has been reorganised. At a meeting where 20 local branches were represented, it was resolved to re-establish the Agricultural Workers’ Union, and its membership rose to between 700 and 800 and in 1926 to 1132. In September 1924 the first collective agreement in Finnish agriculture was signed between this union, as representative of the workers, on a farm belonging to the big co-operative society “Elanto”. The union is affiliated to the Finnish Federation of Trade Unions.

Two organisations of smallholders exist, of which one is the Union of Agricultural Leaseholders and Smallholders. It was originally a union of small tenant-workers only, but when the agrarian reform created many proprietors of smallholdings it was reorganised as the Union of Finnish Smallholders (*Suomen Pienviljelijäin Liitto*). The union had at the end of 1926 a membership of 4500. It was originally founded on social-democratic lines. It cannot be considered as a trade union, partly because it receives a yearly grant from the State. The other organisation of smallholders, the Central Union of Finnish Smallholders (*Suomen Pienviljelijäin Keskusliitto*), with 229 branches and a membership of 12,000, is non-political. The purpose of the union is to unite the smallholders of Finland in the intellectual and economic interests of their group. Amalgamation of the two bodies of smallholders has frequently been under discussion. This union also receives a State grant.
The relations between smallholders and agricultural workers are described in a letter of 10 August 1925 from the Finnish Social Board to the International Labour Office. In this letter it is stated that both proprietors and tenants of smallholdings had been members of the Union of Agricultural Workers, affiliated to the Finnish Federation of Trade Unions. At the date of writing it was impossible to obtain information as to the extent of such membership.

It is stated that during recent years the trade union movement had developed strongly and that smallholders had had a share in it. Smallholders (but not landless wage-paid workers) had also joined in large numbers the Finnish Agricultural Producers’ Central Organisation, a political body, and also the non-political Central Union of Agricultural Societies.

Representation at the International Labour Conference

1919 : Not a Member of the International Labour Organisation, but present at the Conference.
Workers’ Delegate : Mr. Matti Paasivuori, president of the Finnish Federation of Trade Unions.

1921 : Workers’ Delegate : Mr. Heikki Laakso, Union of Agricultural Leaseholders and Smallholders.

1922 : Workers’ Delegate : Mr. Emil Viljanen, Union of Agricultural Leaseholders and Smallholders.

1923 : Workers’ Delegate : Mr. Johan Helo, chief of the Financial Section in the Town Council of Helsingfors.

1924 : Workers’ Delegate : Mr. Aatu Halme, treasurer of the Finnish Federation of Trade Unions.

1925 : Workers’ Delegate : Mr. J. E. Huttunen, president of the Finnish Federation of Trade Unions.

1926 : Workers’ Delegate : Mr. Aatu Halme.

Both in 1921 and 1922 the Finnish Federation of Trade Unions (Suomen Ammattijärjestö) refused to participate in the nomination of a Workers’ Delegate to the International Labour Conference, and nomination was made in agreement with the Union of Agricultural Leaseholders and Smallholders.

France

The property census of 1892 (the last property census taken) gave 2,235,405 holdings under 1 hectare in extent, 2,617,558 holdings 1 to 10 hectares, 711,118 holdings 10 to 40 hectares, 105,391 holdings 40 to 100 hectares, and 33,280 holdings over 100 hectares; together 5,702,752 holdings in all. Of these the vast majority (4,852,963) included no more land
than sufficed for a very moderate-sized smallholding; indeed, nearly one-half of such holdings were really only little plots, much too small to be economic undertakings. These facts have an important bearing on the structure of the rural population of France; many persons who own a small amount of land have, or must seek, other means of support. An official enquiry in 1912 revealed the fact that nearly half the agricultural day labourers in the country owned a little land. In practice a smallholding is defined as one up to 6 hectares, and a medium-sized holding as one between 6 and 50 hectares.

In spite of the prevalence of smallholding in many parts of the country, large-scale farming is not unimportant, especially in the north and centre. Large-scale farms are sometimes cultivated by wage-paid labour, but are also very commonly let out into small share-tenancies or tenancies, an agent or “middle-man” (fermier général) acting as intermediary between the landowner and his tenants, almost as a manager intervenes between the owner of an industrial enterprise and his workers.

The census figures for 1921 give the total number of persons engaged in agriculture as 8,951,099, as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heads of undertakings</td>
<td>5,002,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent cultivators</td>
<td>1,110,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried employees</td>
<td>5,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage-earning workers</td>
<td>2,833,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,951,099</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Co-ordination of these figures with the figures of the property census noted above is difficult, both on account of the interval between them and because owners of land include persons who enter into the group of “heads of undertakings”, “independent cultivators”, and, as we saw above, of “workers”.

There is great shortage of wage-earning agricultural labour in France, which partly accounts for the splitting up of large estates into small share-tenancies, already referred to, a system which relieves the landowner of the responsibility for finding a large amount of direct wage-paid labour. As was explained in Part II of this study, the share-tenancy contract has many analogies with the labour contract; for instance, it is annual. It is a demand from the share-tenants themselves to have longer contracts and compensation for improvements on quitting.

The smallholder himself sometimes engages a single unmarried

---

resident farm servant, or where he does not do that employs what labour he can get during the harvest and sowing seasons. The employment of a strictly limited amount of help is not held necessarily to destroy his character as an independent worker.

The following classes of agricultural workers exist in France:

1. The agent or bailiff (régisseur): a person who manages a farm on behalf of the owner, receiving a fixed salary, a house, and usually certain allowances in kind.

2. The farm servants (domestiques de ferme or valets de ferme), who are perhaps the most important class of agricultural workers in France. The contract is usually for a year and implies residence, although if the farm servant is married residence is separate from the farmer's house. Farm servants either do the whole work of the farm, especially on the smaller farms, or specialise as foremen, waggoners, oxmen, cowmen, shepherds, and sometimes as cheesemakers. Women farm servants are often principally engaged on preparing food, etc., for the male workers. There is sometimes a principal farm servant or foreman (maître-valet). All contracts are individual; family contracts are unknown, but it is quite usual for the wife of a farm servant to work as a pieceworker. Wages are partly in cash and partly in allowances, and also often take the form of certain shares in the produce. When this is done the farm servant contract to some extent approaches that of the regular share-cultivator.

3. The day-labourers are also an important class of agricultural workers. Day-labourers usually live in villages, often in large villages, from which they proceed to their work for neighbouring farmers. Contract is irregular according to the nature of the work to be done, and wages are mostly paid by the day. A distinction must be drawn between regular day-labourers

---

1 Cf. in addition to works cited in other notes to this Section:
La main-d'œuvre agricole, 1920-1925.
Le Travailleur de la Terre, official organ of the National Federation of Land Workers (not at present being published).
Information sociale, Paris. Articles published by Mr. Rey during 1926.
who often receive board as well as cash wages, and pieceworkers, who are employed on special work, such as harvest work, etc.

In addition to the above classes of workers, there are a certain number of quite specialised workers such as vine-dressers, woodcutters, and resin gatherers. These specialised workers are, on the whole, the best organised, and interest therefore attaches to them. They are almost always paid on piece rates; the resin gatherers are usually at the same time share-farmers, as the resin harvest only occupies a portion of the year. Vinedressers are very highly organised and have from time to time bargained for the six-hour day. They sometimes work in gangs under a gang master. The market gardeners’ workers round Paris are also organised.

It is impossible to deal with the organisation of agricultural workers in France without dealing with the organisation of French agriculturists in general. French agriculture is very highly organised. The basic form of organisation is the syndicat, or general association. The modern agricultural association dates back to the Act on Associations of 1884 and even earlier; the period of formation was largely between 1875 and 1890, a period during which the phylloxera was making ravages and French agriculture was beginning to feel foreign competition on the home wheat market.

The agricultural co-operative movement, now very firmly established, is closely linked up with the associations, but is not by any means identified with them. The extent of both movements is shown by the existence, in 1925, of over 9,000 agricultural associations, with memberships varying from 10 to 30,000, but making up the large total of nearly a million and a half persons, and united in 176 federations. Of these associations 8 out of 9, i.e. over 8,000, act as co-operative societies, and, in addition, there are an unknown number, but between 3,000 and 4,000, other agricultural co-operative societies, with a membership of another half-million persons.

It is a principle, often quoted, of all agricultural associations to welcome the membership of all cultivators of the soil,

---

including agricultural workers. A well-known author on French agriculture, writing in 1926, states, however, that the membership of regular wage-earning agricultural workers in the agricultural associations is apparently negligible. There are, no doubt, a few workers inscribed as members of such associations; their subscriptions, according to this writer, are paid by their employers. This membership was at one time estimated at 5 per cent. of the membership of certain associations, but it is doubtful if it attains even that proportion 1.

But if wage-earning agricultural workers are not actual, they are often potential, members of such associations. The same author points out that a certain number of agricultural workers have very close personal connections with the groups owning land, or owning a small amount of land, and are eligible for membership in an agricultural association—and no doubt do so enter as members—either while working as agricultural employed workers or at some future period of their lives:

Agricultural workers are often owners of a small plot of ground who do a few days' work on a neighbouring farm; or they may be the sons of landholders and destined one day to be landholders themselves; or else they are share-farmers who with luck will one day be tenant-farmers or finally owners of land 2.

However, there are sufficient employed agricultural workers to give rise to a totally distinct organising movement, which draws its origin and its encouragement from the general organised trade union movement among industrial workers. This movement has a history of some twenty years, but has had many ups and downs, and cannot be considered one of the more stable or well-established workers’ movements of the country. A point to note is that this movement, when it manages to achieve a certain degree of local or national organisation (usually as the result of action directed by the industrial workers’ movement), is ready to incorporate into its ranks local organisations of share-farmers, etc. This is the counterpart of what was noted above as to the frequent identity of worker and small owner or tenant cultivator; there the worker was envisaged as smallholder; here the smallholder is looked on in his character as worker.

Numerous strikes of considerable local importance had already before the war taken place among French agricultural

---

1 Ibid., p. 67.
2 Ibid., p. 66. Cf. also p. 206.
workers. Mention may be made of the strike of wood-cutters in 1891-1892, and in subsequent years the strike of the Federation of Cultivators of the South in 1904, the strike in the Gard in 1911, and the market-gardeners' strike round Paris in 1910-1911.

(1) There was no one general union for agricultural workers for the whole of France until after the war. At the beginning of 1912 there existed as many as 628 local agricultural unions, but many of these were inactive. At the opening of the war there existed four regional federations of some importance, namely, the Federation of Cultivators of the South (Fédération des agricoles du Midi), established in 1903; the Federation of Woodcutters (Fédération des bûcherons), established in 1897; the General Union of Vineyard Workers of the Marne (Le Syndical général des ouvriers vignerons de la Marne), established in 1911; and the Agricultural and Horticultural Federation (La Fédération agricole et horticole), established in 1904. At the congress of Lyons, held under the auspices of the General Confederation of Labour in 1919, these four federations, together with the Union of Coopers (Syndical des feuillardiers du Centre) agreed to unite, and this decision was confirmed in the following year at the congress of Limoges. Meanwhile the united Federation, under the name of the Federation of Workers in Agriculture (Fédération nationale des travailleurs de l'agriculture), had actually been constituted on 1 January 1920 from 80 constituent unions, having a membership of 5,000; by 1 July 1920 there were 87 constituent unions with a membership of 45,000. The membership almost immediately began to decrease, and towards the end of the year had fallen to 30,000. As so often, the fluctuating membership is not a very good index of the rôle played by the Federation, and in the case of this Federation seems to be strongly affected by influences outside agriculture, especially by the activity of general trade union headquarters. An examination of the composition of 277 of the constituent (local) unions for 1920 shows that of these 85 were vine dressers' unions of the south of France, 47 were resin gatherers' and share-holders' unions of the Landes and Pyrenees, 43 were market-gardening and similar unions in the vicinity of Paris, 42 were woodcutters' unions, 9 were coopers' unions, and 27 were vinedressers' unions of the Champagne;

1 No information as to the present membership.
there were only 24 unions scattered over the rest of the country. It will be seen that the membership of the Federation is strongly localised and specialised.

From the very start of this movement for organising agricultural workers in France the share-farmer, small tenant, and smallholder has been welcomed into the ranks of the organisation. In 1900, at the fifth general congress of the General Confederation of Labour, the decision of the delegates was to undertake agricultural propaganda work and to admit as members of agricultural unions both “those who are wage-earning agricultural workers on whatsoever basis” and “those who, owning land, live from the proceeds of their labour without exploiting another person”. At the eighteenth general congress (1924), on the occasion of a reformulation of the minimum programme of the Confederation, the claims of agricultural workers were drawn up to include legislation for “compensation for improvements to tenants and share-farmers”. Moreover, when the National Union of Agricultural Workers was constituted in 1920, rule No. 14 of the constitution was formulated to admit to membership “smallholders, small tenants, share-farmers working independently together with members of their family”. The aim of the National Federation is at present defined as (a) support of the claims of wage-earning agricultural workers, (b) reform of legislation dealing with share-farming so as to hand over to the share-farmer the entire management of his holding, and (c) compensation for improvements to tenants and cultivators not being owners of land. However, to these aims is added, as a definition of a final and ultimate objective, the thesis that “in the revolutionary sphere, the Federation aims at substituting collective exploitation of the soil for agricultural individual craftsmanship”. In other words, the immediate protection of the smallholder in no wise contradicts the final principle of collective property.

At local congresses the demands of share-farmers are commonly taken up together with those of the wage earners.

2 L'artisanal agricole.
3 See throughout La C. G. T. et le Mouvement syndical; Paris, éditions de la C. G. T., 1925; 699 pp. Unions of share-holders are admitted directly to the Federation. See a pamphlet, Le Syndicalisme paysan dans les Pyrénées occidentales, 1894-1924; Paris.
The National Union of Agricultural Workers is, of course, affiliated to the General Confederation of Labour and has also recently joined the International Federation of Landworkers.

(2-5) There also exist the United Federation of Agricultural Workers (Fédération unitaire des travailleurs de l'agriculture) which is affiliated to the General Confederation of United Labour (Confédération générale des Travailleurs unitaires); and three unions affiliated to the National Federation of Civil Service Unions (Fédération nationale des syndicats des fonctionnaires): (a) the Union of Land Surveyors (Syndicat des Géomètres du cadastre), (b) the Union of Employees in the Water and Forest Administrative Departments (Syndicat des préposés aux Eaux et Forêts); and (c) the Union of Subordinate Officials attached to Stud Farms (Syndicat national des sous-agents des haras).

Representation at the International Labour Conference

1919: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Leon Jouhaux, general secretary to the General Confederation of Labour.
1921: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Leon Jouhaux. Adviser: Mr. Hodée, secretary to the National Federation of Agricultural Workers.
1922-1925: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Leon Jouhaux.

Nominations have invariably been made in agreement with the General Confederation of Labour (Confédération générale du travail).

Germany

The final results of the big population and industrial census undertaken in Germany in 1925 are not yet available, and use must therefore still be made of the agricultural census of 1907 and of the population census of 1910 in order to give a picture of the distribution of land and of population in German agriculture. The loss of national territory under the Treaty of Versailles had the effect principally of depriving the country of districts in the east where large-scale farming is carried on, and also of Alsace-Lorraine, where holdings under five hectares predominated to a degree higher than elsewhere in Germany. These changes must be borne in mind when reading the following paragraphs.
In 1907 the large estates, to the number of about 23,500, nearly all situated in Prussia and in the two States of Mecklenburg, covered 22 per cent. of the whole arable area, while 260,000 farms of between 20 and 100 hectares, and 1,000,000 farms of between 5 and 20 hectares, accounted respectively for 29 and 33 per cent. of that area. These types of farms were most important in Bavaria and the Kingdom of Saxony and some central German States. Another 1,000,000 holdings of between 2 and 5 hectares accounted for 10 per cent. of the arable area, while the rest, 5 per cent., was accounted for by nearly 3,400,000 dwarf holdings. It is, however, a characteristic feature in the economic structure of the agriculture of Germany that the majority of the holders of these small properties, who, of course, must gain the principal part of their income by other means, seek employment not in agriculture, but in the manufacturing industries and in mining. These persons join the industrial workers’ trade unions.

The preliminary results of the census of 1925 — now available for the following States: Free State of Saxony, Wurtemburg, Baden, Hessen, Hamburg, Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Oldenburg, Anhalt, Lübeck, Mecklenburg-Strelitz, and Schaumburg-Lippe — show that even in the group of farms of between 10 and 20 hectares the majority of farmers employ hired labour. Though this group is not specially distinguished in the census of 1907, it is evident from the figures quoted above that up to 75 per cent. of German arable land is cultivated under conditions which require hired labour. Thus the number of agricultural workers in Germany is very great, as is clear from the table quoted below, which shows both the active agricultural population as recorded at the census of the 12 June 1907 and the estimated figures for that population in 1920 over an area corresponding in all essential particulars to the present national territory. In these figures domestic servants are not included.

---

1 Kaiserliches Statistisches Amt: Statistisches Jahrbuch für das Deutsche Reich.
Forestry workers numbered about 100,000 in 1907.

Table II shows the number of agricultural workers in the three big geographical subdivisions of Germany.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working members of cultivators' families</th>
<th>Wage-paid workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Germany</td>
<td>626,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Germany</td>
<td>1,195,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Germany</td>
<td>1,566,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,388,892</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures not only correspond to the description of the distribution of land given above, but show that the number of wage-paid workers is considerable even in those parts of the country where smaller holdings predominate.

The census of 1925 shows that some interesting developments have taken place since 1907. In all States for which results have been published the number of persons occupied per 100 hectares of arable land has increased; only in Mecklenburg-Schwerin and in Anhalt have the figures gone down by a few per cent. This interesting fact is, however, the result of two distinct movements: a decline in the number of temporarily employed workers, both hired and members of cultivators' families, and an increase in the number of permanently employed persons in both these groups. The only important exception from this rule is Wurtemburg, where the number of permanent hired workers has decreased; here, however, the increase in the number of permanently employed members of cultivators' families is specially marked.
The nomenclature used for agricultural workers is not uniform throughout Germany; a multitudinous number of titles can be found for the same type of worker. However, it is possible to classify the workers according to their forms of contract in the following groups. In connection with each group is mentioned the district in which the group predominates.

(1) Farm servants; unmarried persons of both sexes boarded and lodged by the farmer (south Bavaria).

(2) "Deputatists", mostly married workers engaged per year who receive a dwelling, some land, and other payments in kind, and are allowed by their employer to keep stock; the total of these rewards in kind is known as the "Deputat". Under her husband's contract the wife has generally also to work on the farm and the chief contracting worker often has to put other additional labour at the disposal of his employer, either his own sons or other members of his family, or even an outside worker, the so-called Hofgänger; the Hofgänger lives with the "deputatist", whose wages in kind are calculated in such a way as to cover the board of the Hofgänger also; the Hofgänger, however, receives a separate cash wage from the employer (East Prussia, Pomerania, Mecklenburg, Schleswig-Holstein, and the north-eastern part of Brandenburg).

(3) "Wage cultivators" (Lohngärtner). The "wage cultivator", like the deputatist, is attached to the farm, and his wife is also under contract to do permanent work for the farmer. He receives, however, less wages in kind than the deputatist especially in respect to land and the right to keep stock (Silesia, south Brandenburg (Niederlausitz)).

(4) Resident day-labourers, who live in dwellings attached to the farm and receive principally wages in cash; if wages in kind are given they are not sufficient to cover the needs of the family. The wife and children often work on the farm, but are not under contract to do so, as they are in the two groups already mentioned (Province of Saxony, Anhalt, Brunswick, and south Hanover).

(5) Ordinary day-labourers, often called "free" workers (Freiarbeiter), who generally own a cottage and some land and whose employment contract with their employer or employers is essentially less rigid than those of the groups already mentioned.
(south Hanover, Oldenburg, the Rhineland, Hessen-Nassau, Thuringia, north Bavaria, Hessen, Palatinate, Baden, Wurttemburg).

(6) A special group of smallholder day-labourers are the Heuerleute, who are a class of tenant workers having leased land the rent for which they acquit partly in the form of labour; the number of days which they contract to work during the year varies from 30 to 250. A certain number, however, are under contract to render daily service; in this case the cultivation of their plots, which are very small, is left to the care of their wives and children (west Hanover, south Oldenburg, north Westphalia; a similar group are the Landinste in east Holstein).

(7) Migrant workers, who are workers engaged for the season, especially for beet work. They are often employed in gangs, under the leadership of a foreman. Migrant workers are mostly to be found on the big estates and are usually aliens, especially Poles. On peasant farms the migrant worker is rare, but when found is mostly German.

The classification of agricultural workers according to occupation is complicated, as may be expected in a country which includes large-scale farming. Besides the general workers employed on all types of operations, the following can be found:

(1) Foremen and other workers holding responsible posts, usually promoted from the ranks of the ordinary agricultural workers.

(2) Farm handicraftsmen, such as smiths, wheelwrights, cartwrights, masons, locksmiths, etc. These are permanently engaged by a farmer and work on his farm as required, but also do work for other persons in the district.

(3) Dairyherdsmen, called Schweizer, divided into three sub-groups, principals, assistants, and apprentices.

(4) Pig-men, horse-men, and other special workers, such as gardeners, coachmen, machine-men, stokers, motor drivers, etc.

The dairyherdsmen are a group of workers of special interest. Towards the end of the nineteenth century it became customary in Germany to engage workers from Switzerland to work
in the cowsheds, to be responsible for the care of stock, and to do the milking. These men called themselves Schweizer (Swiss). Later, when German youths were apprenticed to the Schweizer, and after one year's apprenticeship became assistants, the name Schweizer was retained.

Post-revolutionary legislation now gives agricultural workers exactly the same right to associate and to combine as is enjoyed by workers in other industries. Until 1918, however, the rights of agricultural workers were restricted. The following remarks refer to the state of affairs in Prussia, but in most of the other German States the Constitution was equally prohibitory.

The Industrial Code of Prussia, issued in 1845, forbade an agreement having the purpose of causing a stoppage of work. On the special request of the farmers this principle was extended in 1854 to comprise agriculture. While the new Industrial Code for the North-German Federation in 1869 acknowledged for industrial workers the right to create trade unions and also to declare a strike, the rule of 1854 remained in force for agriculture for another fifty years, until the revolution of 1918. Until that date agricultural workers were unable to create organisations desirous of promoting their aims by means of strikes. Apart from this, the general law of association was a hindrance to the development of trade unions, and it was not until 1908 that a Federal Act on the right of association was passed and the first organisations of agricultural workers came into existence. It may be noted that this Act, in spite of its general liberal tendencies, expressly stated that the Order of 1854 should not be affected.

As already stated, it was the revolution of November 1918 that first gave agricultural workers full freedom of association by abolishing the Order of 1854 (and all similar Orders throughout Germany). Other revolutionary legislation, e.g. by making obligatory workers' committees in all undertakings, including agricultural undertakings, employing 20 workers or over, exercised a favourable influence on the growth of trade unions in agriculture as in other industries.

Existing trade unions in German agriculture are as follows.

(1) German Agricultural Workers' Union (Deutscher Landarbeiterverband), affiliated to the General Federation of German

---

Trade Unions, and also to the International Land Workers’ Federation.

The German Agricultural Workers’ Union was founded in 1909; it has always had its head office in Berlin. Previously a few agricultural workers had been members of trade unions, mostly in the Union of Communal and State Workers (Verband der Gemeinde- und Staatsarbeiter), or in the Union of Manufacturing, Agricultural and Assistant Workers (Verband der Fabrik-, Land- und Hilfsarbeiter Deutschlands), now known as the Union of German Manufacturing Workers (Verband der Fabrikarbeiter Deutschlands). Efforts to create a separate union for agricultural workers date as far back as 1900, but it was not until the legislation on rights of association mentioned above was carried through in 1908 that a special union could be founded. Only a few agricultural workers took part in creating the union; in fact, the new organisation was carried through by the General Federation of German Trade Unions and by the German Social-Democratic Party. During its first years of existence the union received financial assistance from the industrial workers.

The founders of the union were of the opinion that activity would need to be concentrated on providing benefits and legal protection for members, since the strike was forbidden by law to agricultural workers. The development of the union, however, was not very different from that of unions in other industries. Even before the war the union succeeded in carrying through minor wage movements, which, according to the opinion of the executive, could very decidedly have been interpreted as contraventions of the Order of 1854. The sanctions of the Order were, however, never put into force against the organisation, although they were applied to individual agricultural workers 1.

When the war broke out the union had a membership of about 22,000, or one-half per cent. of the wage-earning agricultural workers in Germany. The organisation had its centres of gravity among agricultural workers proper in north Germany and among the forestry workers in south Germany. During the war the membership declined to a few thousands, later increasing to between 7,000 and 8,000 when the revolution

---

broke out. Membership then increased very rapidly indeed, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>499,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>680,000</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>626,000</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>185,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures show that the extraordinary progress of the first two or three years was followed by a big reaction. The drop in the figures is, however, somewhat misleading. It was only after some time that the central organisation got the necessary control over the local branches, of which there were nearly 10,000; the leaders of these local branches had often thought to make good propaganda for the union by indicating as high a membership as possible, without regard to whether their members had really paid their contributions or ought to be members of an agricultural union at all.

The violent drop from 1922 to 1923 was mostly due to the inflation of the currency, which shook the confidence of members and made them doubt the possibility of obtaining improvements in working conditions through their union, and which completely destroyed the finances of the union. Since the currency has been stabilised the union seems to have developed steadily, if slowly. The membership of the union appears small in comparison with the total number of agricultural workers in Germany, but the effects of its activities extend far beyond the ranks of its members. The number of persons who, as a result of the activities of the union, received an increase in wages, was 2,350,000 in 1924 and 1,600,000 in 1925. Of these nearly 40 per cent. were women, although, in 1925, only 33,000 of the 185,000 members were women.

The following groups of workers are admitted to the union under its constitution: agricultural workers proper, both resident and day-labourers, waggoners, drain-diggers, milkers, cattlemen, shepherds, stock-tenders and their assistants (Schweizer), farm-handicraftsmen, forestry workers, vineyard workers, peatworkers, etc., but, e.g., a peatworker engaged in a purely
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1 It is, of course, possible that different wage movements may have brought about improvements in the wages of the same persons, so that in these figures one person may have been counted several times.

industrial undertaking does not belong to the Union of Agricultural Workers.

Smallholders are not admitted to this union, with the exception of those called Heuerleute. Nevertheless, the union maintains friendly relations with the Union of Smallholders (see below), without, however, attempting to establish any common organs or other formal ties.

(2) Union of Gardeners and Horticultural Workers (Verband der Gärtner und Gärtner eiarbeiler), affiliated to the General Federation of German Trade Unions and to the International Federation of Landworkers.

(3) The General Union of Employees in Dairy Farms (Allgemeiner Schweizerbund), affiliated to the General Federation of German Trade Unions and to the International Federation of Landworkers, and in close relations with the German Union of Agricultural Workers.

This union was created in 1909 by twenty-four skilled dairyherdsmen, Swiss and German. From the beginning this union has not only acted as an ordinary trade union — the union was the first union which signed collective agreements for skilled dairyherdsmen — but has to a much greater extent than is normal among trade unions interested itself in the vocational education of its members. As early as 1911 the union founded a school for head dairyherdsmen (Oberschweizer) and has also organised other courses which are followed by examinations entitling successful candidates to diplomas, issued by the Chambers of Agriculture, as head dairyherdsmen, or as assistant dairyherdsmen. The union has also, by lectures and periodicals, contributed to the better training of dairyherdsmen, with the result that the demand for really skilled workers has increased and the interest among workers in vocational education has become greater.

The war and the inflation period, of course, affected this organisation. There are to-day in Germany 30,000 milkers and cattlemen who call themselves Schweizer, though they are not all fully-trained workers. Of these about two-thirds are members of this union. The head office of this union has always been in Leipzig.

(4) The Central Union of Agricultural Workers (Zentralverband der Landarbeiter) affiliated to the German Federation of Christian Trade Unions (Gesamtverband der christlichen
Gewerkschaften Deutschlands), and through it to the central body of the three federations of Christian workers (Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund) and to the International Federation of Christian Land Workers' Trade Unions.

As far back as 1902 the Congress of Christian Trade Unions discussed the question of the organisation of agricultural workers and recommended the creation of a special union for these workers. At the same time a certain number of agricultural and forestry workers in Bavaria joined the German Central Union of State Forestry, Transport, Assistant and other Industrial Workers (Zentralverband der Staats-, Gemeinde-, Verkehrs-, Hilfs- und sonstigen Industriearbeiter Deutschlands, head office at Aschaffenburg).

Forestry workers in other German States and some agricultural workers in Central Germany also joined this union, which was therefore considered as the proper union for agricultural workers wanting to organise. In 1906 and in 1907 the union signed the first collective agreement on behalf of agricultural and forestry workers. On 4 August 1912 the German Union of Vineyard, Forestry, and Agricultural Workers was founded, but it was only active in Rhinehessen and Rhinegau. At the same time, the idea was mooted of splitting up the Central Union mentioned above into separate unions. This was accepted the same year, and on 2 December 1912 the Central Union of Agricultural Workers was founded, incorporating the Rhinehessen and Rhinegau Union with its 424 members, and receiving 2,149 agricultural and forestry workers transferred from the Central Union in Aschaffenburg. Before the war the membership declined to 1,700. At first the union received financial help from other Christian trade unions. It was not until 1917 that the union succeeded in getting a footing in the purely agricultural eastern provinces of Prussia. The head office of the union was originally in Essen, later in Bielefeld, and since 1919 has been in Berlin. From the outset the union has tried to get all classes of agricultural workers organised within its ranks. For some years some small organisations of skilled dairyherds-men were affiliated, but this collaboration did not last. In 1916 the German (national) Horticultural Workers' Union was affiliated to the Central Union of Land Workers, and in 1920 the
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Union of Farm Servants’ Associations in Bavaria was amalgamated, which brought the Central Union into touch with the workers on peasant farms in south Germany.

The average membership of the Central Union has been:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>78,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>89,000</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>79,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>104,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be seen from these figures that at the outbreak of the revolution the membership of the union was nearly the same size as that of the Social-Democratic Union of Agricultural Workers, and in the case of the Central Union also there was a phenomenal increase, later followed by a drop. The oscillations in the membership have, however, been less; on the other hand, the decrease in membership continued rather longer, so that the recovery began only in 1925.

Any person of either sex, engaged in agriculture or forestry, or in subsidiary agricultural trades, can become a member of the union. The following are considered subsidiary trades: gardening, cultivation of fruit or vegetables, vineyard cultivation, stock-breeding. Road-repairing workers are also admitted. Smallholders are only admitted when they do paid work in agriculture or forestry, either permanently all the year round, or, if not all the year round, then work regularly recurring each year.

(5) German Horticultural Workers’ Union (Deutscher Gärtnerverband) affiliated to the Central Union of Agricultural Workers (Christian), see above.

(6) The Federal Union of Agricultural and Forestry Technical and Corporation Officials (Reichsverband land- und forstwirtschaftlicher Fach- und Körperschaftsbeamte), affiliated to the Federation of Non-Manual Workers (Gesamtverband deutscher Angestellengewerkschaften), and through this organisation to the central organisation of Christian Trade Unions (Deutscher Gewerkschafts Bund). It includes a section for estate managers (Gutsbeamte).

In addition to the agricultural trade unions mentioned, an organisation of salaried employees in agriculture (Verband land- und forstwirtschaftlicher Angestellten) existed until quite recently; this organisation was affiliated to the General Free
Union of Salaried Employees (Allgemeiner freier Angestelltenbund) and through it to the General Federation of German Trade Unions.

It is interesting to note that both the two big unions seem to have the majority of their members in districts where most wages are paid in kind. Whether or no this should be interpreted as a sign of special discontent with this wage form, it shows that the existence of rather old-fashioned forms of contracts is no hindrance to organisation.

An organisation of smallholders was mentioned above. This organisation was founded in 1922 under the name of the Federal Union of Agricultural Smallholdings (Reichsverband landwirtschaftlicher Kleinbetriebe). In the autumn of 1925 it changed its name to Federal Union of Agricultural Small and Medium Sized Holdings (Reichsverband der Klein- und Mittelbetriebe) to mark more distinctly that it represents the family holding. It unites thirteen organisations of small farmers, of which the oldest was founded in 1919. It is not a trade union, but an economic association. This organisation states that in the large-scale farming districts in Germany it is relatively easy to distinguish between a smallholder and an agricultural worker. In the western parts of Germany, however, it is not always possible, because the Heuerleute form an intermediate group between the independent farmer and the wage-earning agricultural worker. Smallholders doing paid work for others, not in fulfilment of any contract, but for economic reasons, because they cannot get a living from their holdings, are, according to the Union of Smallholders, considered as smallholders when the paid work is intermittent and temporary; when it is all the year round, e.g. for a part of each week, they count themselves as in the workers’ class.

The Central Union of Agricultural Workers, however, as was noted above, admits such smallholders, without regard to the length of their working period, provided that they work regularly each year, even if not all the year round. The principles laid down by this trade union therefore do not correspond exactly to those laid down by the smallholders’ organisation.

The Union of Smallholders states that no objection in principle exists to collaboration with the unions of agricultural workers, but that no permanent liaison committee has been established.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919: Not represented.
1921: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Rudolf Wissell, General Federation of German Trade Unions. **Advisers:** Mr. Georg Schmidt, president of German Agricultural Workers' Union; and Mr. Franz Behrens, president of the Central Union of Agricultural Workers.

1922: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Rudolf Wissell.
1923-1926: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Hermann Müller, general secretary of the General Federation of German Trade Unions.

For the years 1921-1923 the nominations were made in agreement with the General Federation of German Trade Unions (Allgemeiner Deutscher Gewerkschaftsbund) only; for the years 1924-1926, in agreement with the principal (massgebenden) trade unions.

**Great Britain**

1. **England and Wales**

Excluding holdings of one acre and less there were, in 1925, 405,705 agricultural holdings in England and Wales; of these 185,668 were of a size not exceeding 20 acres, while the number of quite small holdings (not exceeding five acres) was 75,283. These really small holdings have been declining in numbers during recent years, while holdings of between 20 and 50 acres have been increasing; in 1925 there were 79,119 of these. Altogether 46 per cent. of the whole number of holdings were under 20 acres, but these accounted for less than 6 per cent. of the total area, whereas holdings over 300 acres accounted for nearly 23 per cent. (1924).²

In general, while England cannot be accounted a country

---

¹ "Holdings" are not necessarily independent agricultural undertakings. The agricultural and census returns do not permit of drawing up statistics of the number of farm businesses.

predominantly of smallholdings, yet there seems to be recently a slight, though very slow, movement of increase in the number of smallholdings of a size to absorb completely the work of the occupier and his family and perhaps to make a call on some outside labour. These smallholders do not themselves commonly compete for agricultural employment on the labour market ¹, and the distinction between the farmer who is an employer, the smallholder, and the employed worker is usually clear. There is probably not a great deal of movement from one class into another ². It is a marked feature of the English smallholding movement that smallholders are so largely recruited from classes other than agricultural workers ³, though some interesting statistics lately collected in Wales (where there is a good deal of smallholding) shows a number of small farmers who have been agricultural employed workers, or who are the sons of such workers ⁴. The typical farmer in England, however, is still the employing farmer whose father before him was also an employer. The encroach of urban areas, which results in the cutting up of holdings, the disappearance of genuine smallholdings, and the creation of allotments and separate parcels of land, complicate the statistics on smallholding.

According to the census of 1921 ⁵ the persons occupied in the agricultural industry in England and Wales (excluding horticulture) can be classified as follows:

¹ A few instances only are noted in Lincolnshire and elsewhere. Board of Agriculture and Fisheries: Wages and Conditions of Employment in Agriculture; Vol. I, General Report, p. 82; London, 1919.
² The pro and con of the smallholding movement has been much discussed both in official and in other publications on English agriculture. See, inter alia, Final Report of the Agricultural Tribunal of Investigation, pp. 41-42 and 124-134; London, 1924.
⁵ Numbers of the agricultural population in England and Wales are obtained from two sources (a) the census, (b) the annual returns of the Ministry of Agriculture. The last population census was in 1921, and workers are classified both according to the occupation they themselves indicate, and according to the business of their employer (i.e. all persons employed by a farmer on his farm would be indicated as agricultural employees). The annual returns of the Ministry are based on information supplied by the occupiers of farms. The relation to each other of the results obtained by these various methods is very clearly discussed in the official publication already mentioned in the second note to this Section.
(a) Farmers, graziers . . .
(b) Working members of farmers’ families . . . . .
(c) Workers :
   Farm bailiffs, foremen . .
   Shepherds . . . . . .
   Agricultural labourers and farm servants . . . . .

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Farmers, graziers</td>
<td>244,653</td>
<td>19,440</td>
<td>264,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Working members of farmers’ families</td>
<td>80,257</td>
<td>15,384</td>
<td>95,641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (c) Workers :
   Farm bailiffs, foremen | 22,462 | 217   | 22,679   |
   Shepherds | 11,240 | 42    | 11,282   |
   Agricultural labourers and farm servants | 549,329 | 32,265 | 581,594 |
| Together | 583,031 | 32,524 | 615,555 |
| Total | 907,941 | 67,348 | 975,289 |

1 Too much dependence must not be placed on the figure for female relatives assisting in 1921, as in 1901 there were 18,618 and in 1911 there were 56,856. These changes would appear to be abnormal.

Further, in 1921 horticulture employed (employers included) nearly 95,000 persons, and forestry nearly 44,000, while there were some 24,000 rural artisans employed on agricultural undertakings, so that the total number of all persons engaged in agricultural occupations was over a million.

There has been a steady decline in the number of male workers in agriculture for a long time past, which decline between 1901 and 1921 was about 8 per cent. of the total number. Among the reasons are the decrease in arable cultivation in favour of grass farming, which, of course, requires less labour per unit area, and the increasing use of machinery. There has been a considerable increase in the number of regular women workers recently, which is probably due to the number of women who took up land work during and after the war; this to some extent lessens the total decline in the number of all agricultural workers during the course of the last twenty years. In any case, the number of women workers of all classes in agriculture would appear not to be adequately indicated by the census. The annual agricultural returns of the Ministry of Agriculture for 1921 indicate nearly 126,000 women workers in agriculture, of whom over 52,000 are stated to be casual.

1 The number of workers in charge of agricultural machinery has increased from 5,085 in 1901 to 9,770 in 1921.

2 A very considerable social prejudice amongst the workers themselves against women’s work in the fields (as apart from work at or about the farmhouse) was for long a feature of English village life; it is probably a reminiscence of the great evils of the "gang" system of employment of women and children, which was regulated by legislation in 1867 and has now practically died out. See Lord Ernle: *The Land and the People*; Chapter VII, "Women on the Land"; London, 1925; 257 pp. For gangs see under that word in Palgrave’s *Dictionary of Political Economy*, Vol. II, London, 1917.
workers. In fact, the enumeration whether of such casual women workers (fruit gatherers, hop pickers, potato planters, etc.), or of the wives and daughters of farmers assisting, or of domestic servants at the farmhouse, is uncertain.

Since 1921 there has been a further decline in all classes of agricultural labour.

Comprehensive Government enquiries into the state of employment in agriculture have been held from time to time. The latest (not the latest enquiry into agricultural conditions generally) was published in 1919. It examines in detail the permanent factors in the employment situation, and is not confined to a review of the special war or post-war situation.

The agricultural employment market of Great Britain has for a century been dominated by the superior attractiveness to the worker of employment in the great industrial towns. It is a very old complaint that the best workers are drawn to the towns away from the countryside; or they prefer the better-paid railway employment at a country station, etc., to employment on a farm. The effects of this loss of the most vigorous elements on the capacity of the agricultural workers to organise has been very marked. The rate of the decline in the total agricultural labour force was given above. Emigration to the British Dominions, especially assisted emigration since the war, affording to the worker at least the chance of independent farming, has also its attractions.

On the other side must be mentioned the powerful impetus given to organisation by the local wages committees or wages boards, first set up under Part II of the Corn Production Act, 1917, later abandoned, and recently reintroduced under the Agricultural Wages (Regulation) Act, 1924; though, in the opinion of some workers, the legal recognition of a minimum wage can also have an injurious effect on organisation of workers.

The types of farming pursued in England and Wales deal with very different cultivations and differ a good deal from one district to another, though, broadly speaking, there is mixed farming throughout the country. Different sizes of farms are
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1 Board of Agriculture and Fisheries : Wages and Conditions of Employment in Agriculture. 2 Vols. 202 and 504 pp. London, 1919. (The second volume consists of the reports of the district investigators.)

2 See below, Section on Scotland.
also found in almost all districts. The result is a very great variety of types of employment. Especially to be noted is the difference in the degree of specialisation required in different districts. For instance, in some sheep-breeding districts the shepherd is the absolutely premier worker and ranks even above the overseer or steward; in other districts the head cowman would be the first worker; in others again the ploughman.

Classified by the nature of their work, agricultural workers would perhaps fall into two big groups, those in charge of animals and those not, the latter being the less skilled; but on large arable farms, on the contrary, there is a very high degree of specialised skill not directed to the care of animals. It is thoroughly characteristic of English agricultural life that the many degrees of skill and differences of pay and grade of work are entirely obvious to those in the district and always most carefully observed, making up the whole complex social organisation of English rural life. Another distinction is between those in permanent employ and those in less permanent employ, the latter class almost verging on the class of true casual labour; but this factor again is much modified by the practice of assigning a "tied" cottage to a worker who legally may be on a weekly contract. This practice has a very restrictive influence on the worker's freedom of movement, so that it has not been unusual for workers who are ostensibly on weekly
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1 The following descriptions of agricultural workers are mentioned: land agents (managers of large estates including a number of farms); farm bailiffs, stewards, overseers, foremen; shepherds; cowmen, stockmen (byremen), yard men; head horsemen, single horsemen, hinds; waggoners and horse-keepers; ploughmen, ploughmen stewards, milkers, carters; farm servants; general labourers; dairymaids; pea-pickers; hop-pickers, fruit-pickers. There are many other appellations used in different parts of the country. Of those mentioned the head ploughman, head horseman, cowman, stockman, and, as already stated, the shepherd, in addition, of course, to stewards, overseers, and foremen, occupy important positions and take precedence according to the type of farming carried on. An important, though small, group of specialised workers in some counties are the hedgers, thatchers, and ditchers. Workers employed on machinery are not enumerated in the above list, which, in any case, is not exhaustive. In the last Report of Proceedings under the Agricultural Wages (Regulation) Act, for the Year ending 30 September 1926 (London, 1927; 61 pp.), the grouping of workers is: ordinary workers; foremen and bailiffs; horsemen; cowmen and shepherds; market gardeners and nursery workers; seasonal market gardeners and nursery workers; seasonal earnings; female workers; casual male workers (pp. 27-29). This is a rough classification for the whole country, which was suggested to serve as a practical basis for the computation of average minimum rates of wages. The variety in these rates of wages for each group was, however, very marked.
engagements to remain twenty or even thirty years in the same employment.

To sum up. Characteristic of English agricultural employment are well recognised degrees of distinct skill and the absence of mass employment; the absence of true seasonal labour except for rather minor crops, of which the most valuable is the hop crop; the verbal weekly engagement; the separate cottage (plus garden) which, when a tied cottage, and even when not, owing to shortage of rural housing, has the effect of rendering agricultural labour rather immobile; residence in a village of moderate size within reach of the day’s work. To every one of these statements exception might be drawn. Thus there is a sort of mass employment for potato work in the north, and almost everywhere for haying and harvest work; there is absence of the recognition of skill in the very frequent employment of all-round “general labourers”; yearly to half-yearly contracts are quite well-known, even written contracts; again, there are a quantity of “free” cottages, and some workers are lodged and boarded at the farmhouse. It remains to be added that there is a considerable difference between north and south England, agriculture in the northern counties in many respects having strong affinities with Scottish agriculture.

In one point agricultural employment in England differs markedly from agriculture in the rest of Europe (even from that in Scotland), and that is the entire absence of the use of land: there are no classes as part of the agricultural labour contract:

1 Thus even the distinction between casual and permanent workers is not easy to draw, though there is one special, very well defined class of casual worker (often women), namely, pea-pickers, hop-pickers, fruit-pickers, etc., who are often not true agricultural workers, but either drawn from the towns for the time being, or even vagrants; but here again it should be mentioned that a very large amount of such light summer work is one by the wives and female relatives of domiciled country workers, the two sets of workers, the “home” workers and the “foreigners” (as they are called) keeping themselves perfectly distinct.

2 Allotments, even rural allotments (which can be quite large) are not the same thing as a tenancy-labour contract. An agreement to hold an allotment is undertaken apart from the labour contract and the land for the allotment is frequently held from a third party (often a public authority). That the English agricultural labour contract is quite disconnected from the holding of an allotment is clear from the fact that no arrangements are made to give the worker time for his own cultivation: he has to use his Sundays or evenings, whence frequent complaints that an allotment means serious overwork.

3 Other allowances in kind are normal and are recognised under the Agricultural Wages (Regulation) Act, 1924. The basis for wages, however, is the cash basis, and it is part of the duties of local wages boards to put a cash value on allowances.
which correspond with the share-farmer in France, the Swedish torpare, etc. Tenancy and labour contracts are two totally distinct things, at law and in practice. The absence of these "intermediate" groups of cultivators means the absence of a link between the smallholding movement and the worker, and may account for the very small liking shown by English agricultural organised workers to the smallholding movement.

The modern organisation of English agricultural workers may be said to start with the attempt of a Warwickshire agricultural worker, Joseph Arch, who founded the National Agricultural Labourers' Union in 1872. The union was started without any connection with the organised trade union movement of the country. The union suffered severely from the very strong feeling which still lingered against combination among agricultural workers; in 1832 six Dorset labourers had been deported for an attempt at "combination" to raise their wages. During the whole of the middle of the nineteenth century the conditions of agricultural workers were wretched. The objects of the union, which enrolled a large membership, were a general betterment of those conditions; it had recourse to direct action, but an initial success in 1872 (whether really due to the efforts of the union or to other causes) in raising wages somewhat had the unfortunate effect of causing many members to drop out, on the grounds that the objects of the union had now been achieved. The employers began to organise themselves. An important lockout by agricultural employers in Suffolk and Essex in 1873, and again in 1874 in other counties, lasted no less than 18 weeks and cost the union £24,000. The employers' action was directly aimed against the workers' right of combination. The lockout, followed by the agricultural depression of the eighties, was disastrous to the union, which practically disappeared. Arch himself helped agricultural workers to emigrate overseas in despair at any chance of better-
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1 See, for instance, the Land Worker, Sept. 1925.
3 Green, op. cit., p. 60.
ing their conditions. By 1890 fresh local societies began to be formed, but remained without much influence until just before the war. The war and post-war periods have witnessed a remarkable development of the organisation of agricultural workers.

(1) The National Union of Agricultural Workers was founded in 1906, under the title of the Eastern Counties' Agricultural Labourers' and Rural Workers' Union, which became in 1912 the National Agricultural Labourers' and Rural Workers' Union. In July 1920 the organisation assumed its present title. In the constitution the objects of the union are defined as “to secure the complete organisation of all workers on or about the land”, and the union admits, besides horticultural workers, workers on the roads, though at a recent conference it was decided to maintain the present title and not to introduce the phrase “rural workers”.

During the high-wage period in the war it is claimed that nearly 50 per cent. of agricultural workers were organised in this union and in the Workers' Union (see (2) below), the National Union having increased its membership more than any other existing union. But this growth was too rapid. There was a drop in membership during the bad years, and then a slower rise, until in 1925 the membership was about 30,000. The union admits horticultural workers. The union publishes a monthly paper, The Land Worker, and is in intimate relations with the general trade union movement in the country. It is affiliated to the Trades Union Congress General Council, and in 1920-1921 the secretary of the union was president of the congress. In conjunction with the Labour Party the union has lately undertaken a big propaganda campaign for the organisation of agricultural workers throughout the country. The union is represented on the Central Agricultural Wages Board, and takes a principal part in representing the workers on the local committees under the 1924 Wages Act. The Union is affiliated to the International Union of Landworkers.

1 The Land Worker, Aug. 1926, p. 5.
2 J. W. Robertson Scott: The Dying Peasant, p. 74; London, 1926; quoting the Wages Board Gazette, 1919. The Ministry of Labour Gazette, 1922, p. 388, and 1923, p. 383, states the membership of agricultural trade unions to have been 210,000 persons in 1920, 149,000 persons in 1921, and 91,000 persons in 1922. In 1923 there is mention of a membership of 350,000 persons between the two principal unions catering for agricultural workers (Labour Magazine, May 1923).
(2) The Workers' Union is a general trade union which admits members in any craft or industry, and which has an important agricultural section. The total membership of the union is large, 146,500 in 1925. The union publishes the _Workers' Union Record_; it is affiliated both to the Trades Union Congress General Council and, in respect of its Scottish membership, also the Scottish Trades Union Congress. The union is represented on the Central Agricultural Wages Board and is otherwise active in protecting the interests of its agricultural membership.

II. Scotland

The total number of holdings\(^1\) in Scotland in 1925, exclusive of holdings under 1 acre, was over 76,000. Of these over 45 per cent. were holdings of less than 15 acres, while another 11 per cent. were between 15 and 30 acres; in area, however, these two groups of holdings made up only about 9 per cent. of the total area of all holdings. Holdings somewhat larger, but still to be classed as fairly small holdings, namely, those between 30 and 50 acres, made up another 8 per cent. of all holdings, and covered over 5 per cent. of the total area. By far the larger number of farmers are tenants (sometimes holding more than one farm), but in many cases landlord's capital does not play quite such an important part as in England, as, e.g. on sheep runs, capital lies in the form of stock rather than in that of the land itself.

General agricultural conditions differ considerably in different parts of the country, and this has an important bearing on the size of farm and type of farming. Scotland is far from being predominantly or even to any great extent a smallholding country, and the farm which employs wage-paid labour is the normal type of farm. At the same time the survival of a real smallholding tradition distinguishes Scottish from English agriculture, and it is further to be remarked that the smallholding class is apparently much more largely recruited from the class of agricultural workers than in England.

A special type of smallholding is the "croft" in the Highlands districts. Crofters are occupiers of very small holdings by no means always of an area sufficient to support a family, who draw their living partly from cultivation of this holding and from the

\(^1\) See note on p. 138.
use of common grazing rights connected therewith, but sometimes also from another occupation or even from the earnings of members of their family in other parts of the country. The historical background of the smallholdings question has had some influence, and since 1911 holdings under 50 acres or not rented at more than £50 per year have been assimilated to crofting holdings, which are protected against absorption, against subdivision, and against termination of the occupant’s lease. The conditions under which crofters work are nevertheless often very poor, and their competition for employment in the agricultural labour market can have a depressing effect on the wages of regular agricultural workers.

In the 1921 census the distribution of the population actively engaged in agriculture was as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Farmers</td>
<td>31,556</td>
<td>2,349</td>
<td>33,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofters</td>
<td>14,964</td>
<td>2,550</td>
<td>17,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Working members of farmers’ families</td>
<td>3,768</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>4,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working members of crofters’ families</td>
<td>2,288</td>
<td>1,439</td>
<td>3,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Workers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing staff</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage-paid workers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiffs, grieves, foremen</td>
<td>5,230</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherds</td>
<td>7,442</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other wage-paid workers</td>
<td>75,423</td>
<td>14,882</td>
<td>90,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers: together</td>
<td>88,923</td>
<td>14,914</td>
<td>103,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>141,499</td>
<td>22,244</td>
<td>163,743</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, there were some casual workers and several miscellaneous groups, including some horticultural groups, making up a total of all persons engaged in the industry of about 177,000 persons, of whom about 25,000 were women.

---


The bulk of agricultural work in Scotland is done by permanently engaged, regular workers; casual labour (except for potato work, raspberry picking, and a few other tasks) is not very important. Contracts are verbal and are for longer periods (see below). Allowances in kind, including potato ground or a share in the potato harvest, are much more important than in England, and to some slight extent enable a distinction to be made between the wages of the head of a household and of single workers in certain districts. A special form of family-contract, called "double-hinding", survives in the south-east; the effect is the same as in other similar systems — it keeps the family together, but the injustice to the younger generation can be marked, and contributes to the frequent loss to agriculture (by emigration, etc.) of intelligent younger men and women. In general, the rural exodus has been marked in recent years; the Dominions attract some of the best Scottish agricultural workers.

Another feature of Scottish agricultural life is the regular employment of women on general, not merely on dairy, work (women, however, seldom deal with horses). Moreover, the seasonal gang work of women (usually Irish) from June to November is frequent in the south-west and centre. Women agricultural workers (except the Irish workers) are almost always the relatives of men at work on farms or of former agricultural workers; their employment in no way breaks down the noticeable separation between the agricultural and other classes of workers in the country.

In general, the great skill and efficiency of the Scottish agricultural worker is frequently remarked. The type of the super-skilled worker is the hill shepherd, who has work of very great arduousness and very great responsibility; hill shepherds form almost a population apart, marrying within their own group. On the crop and stock farm the standing of the worker according to seniority and skill is most carefully observed. The classification of workers is usually: grieves and stewards; ploughmen; cattlemen; shepherds; dairymen; orramen (skilled men ready to do any work); in the absence of a grieve or steward (who is a foreman), a married ploughman is usually the principal worker.

The unit of agricultural economy on Scotland is neither the
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1 The Scottish Farm Servant, May 1925, p. 17, and June 1925, p. 39.
landowner’s large estate, let out in a number of farms, nor the village, but the separate farm itself (this tends to distinguish Scottish farming from English). The separate, and often rather isolated, farm implies a separate and rather isolated life for the workers on it, and the system of housing, in cottages on the farm for married men, frequently in “bothies” or dormitories for single men, without any community life, has a very marked effect on the workers’ lives. The complete absence of any home life, and indeed of any ordinary comfort, in the bothy system is much commented on.

Another distinguishing feature of the Scottish farm worker’s life is its migratory character. The curious result of labour contracts (six months or a year), which are longer than in England, is not to keep the worker in one place, but to cause frequent “shifting”, estimated to take place once every three years on an average in each worker’s life; but in many cases workers “shift” much more frequently. The cause is often stated to be the comfortless character of the dwelling provided, until the practice becomes a sort of habit. But the isolation of the farm also makes it often impossible to obtain employment for growing sons and daughters 1.

Farm workers’ contracts are still master and servant contracts under common law, and workers cannot leave except at the “term” (spring and autumn); prosecutions occasionally take place against an offending employer for “harbouring” (i.e. taking into his employ) a “deserting” servant, and there are frequent disputes over other points in the law courts 2. The Act would be of obvious importance in the event of any strike or similar movement, and incidentally the absence of freedom to contract at any period of the year has the important effect of separating off agricultural workers from the general industrial labour forces of the country and making them a class apart.

The Scottish Farm Servants’ Union. — A Ploughmen’s Federal Union of Scotland existed from 1886 to 1896 and at one time


2 The Scottish Farm Servant, June 1925, pp. 36 and 37.
had branches in most counties. There had been previous efforts to educate, rather than to organise, farm servants which go very far back\(^1\) (in any case, the general standard of education in Scottish rural districts has always been high). Between 1896 and 1912 no effort to organise land workers was made. The Scottish Farm Servants' Union was founded only two years before the war, in 1912. After a preliminary period of depression due to the outbreak of the war its membership rose from about 6,000 in 1916 to 23,000 in 1919, but this very rapid increase, due to the stimulus of the war, as in other countries, was not wholly maintained and the membership now stands at about 10,000. This implies a higher percentage of organised agricultural workers, namely, about 15 per cent. of all wage-paid agricultural workers, than in many other countries. The membership consists of "all classes of agricultural and rural workers of either sex" and includes farmers' sons working in agriculture. Difficulties of organisation are very much increased by the constant "shifting" of the agricultural workers and by the drain of emigration. On the other hand, there were long before the war the beginnings of organisation in the well-known hiring fairs (open-air fairs held for the engaging of workers at the "term"), which amounted to a rudimentary form of employment exchange and collective bargaining.

In 1918 the fixing of (local) minimum wages for agricultural workers was introduced under Part II of the Corn Production Act and lasted till 1921. This Act was not supported by the agricultural workers for reasons which are set out by the secretary of the union\(^2\); the union expressed its preference for trusting to its own efforts, and still considers that greater advantages can be gained in that way, and that statutory fixing of wages has a tendency to make the workers pay less attention to their own organisation.

In the opinion of the union not low wages, but long hours and absence of leisure are the principal disadvantages of the position of the Scottish agricultural worker, and the earliest efforts of the union, and one of its initial successes, was the negotiation of a Saturday half-holiday in certain districts\(^3\). After having successfully negotiated many local agreements

\(^1\) The Scottish Farm Servant, Jan. and Feb. 1927, pp. 171 and 198.
\(^3\) The Scottish Farm Servant, Nov. and Dec. 1926, pp. 128 and 146.
with agricultural employers, the first attempt at a national agreement was made by the union in 1919 and concerned hours and holidays; owing to a dispute as to the classes of workers to which it was meant to apply it had to be abandoned, but its terms were freely adopted in many districts.

The union has recently made efforts to get hiring fairs better organised. It continues to be very active in promoting organisation among agricultural workers, both men and women, and is especially interested in the question of housing. The union publishes a monthly journal, The Scottish Farm Servant. It is affiliated to the Scottish Trades Union Congress, the National Labour Party, and the International Land Workers' Federation.

**Representation (Great Britain) at the International Labour Conference**

1919: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. George Harold Stuart-Bunning, ex-chairman of the Parliamentary Committee of the Trade Union Congress.

1921: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. E. L. Poulton, vice-chairman of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, general secretary of the National Union of Boot and Shoe Operatives. **Advisers**: Mr. Joseph Forbes Duncan, general secretary of the Scottish Farm Servants' Union; Mr. Robert B. Walker, chairman of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress, general secretary of the National Union of Agricultural Workers.

1922-1925 **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. E. L. Poulton.

1926: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. Arthur Pugh, J. P., chairman of the General Council of the Trades Union Congress; secretary of the Iron and Steel Trades Confederation.

In 1919 the nomination was made in agreement with the Parliamentary Committee of the Trades Union Congress; in all other years in agreement with the General Council of the Trades Union Congress.

**Hungary**

Hungary has always been known for its enormous land properties. It is stated by a recent authority that large-scale farming, i.e. of estates over 1,000 cadastral yokes, occupies 6 million out of the total area of 16 million cadastral yokes of national territory, and large-scale farming positively "suffers from having to deal with excessively large farming areas, which have to be divided up or leased as smaller tenancies in
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1 1 yoke = 1.422 acres.
order to form economic farming units”. This system of large-scale landownership became relatively even more important after the war, as the territories resigned to other countries under the Peace Treaty were those where smallholdings were most common.

The census of 31 December 1920 gives the following figures of agricultural population:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owners holding more than 100 yokes of land</td>
<td>6,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants</td>
<td>1,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholders and small tenants holding from 10 to 100 yokes of land</td>
<td>166,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallholders and small tenants holding less than 10 yokes</td>
<td>359,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share-farming tenants</td>
<td>18,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other cultivators</td>
<td>2,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of owners or tenants of land</td>
<td>556,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working members of cultivators' families:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>303,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>270,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing staff</td>
<td>5,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants</td>
<td>228,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural workers:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 16 years of age</td>
<td>666,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 16 years of age</td>
<td>87,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of workers</td>
<td>1,561,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of persons engaged in agriculture</td>
<td>2,118,145</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the taking of the 1920 census agrarian reform has been carried out, but it is improbable that it has influenced these figures fundamentally, though the proportion of land held as holdings up to 100 yokes shows an increase from 44.2 to 50.2 per cent. between 1913 and 1925. It is estimated that agrarian reform, when completed, will have comprised 1,100,000 yokes out of a total area of arable land of 9,143,808 yokes; but of the 850,000 yokes so far distributed, from 180,000 to 190,000 only have been allotted for the purpose of increasing the size of the dwarf holdings; of these about 90,000
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have been enlarged up to a maximum of 15 yokes. The remainder of the area distributed has been allotted to disabled exsoldiers, war widows, and landless agricultural workers, and the maximum area given to any of these persons has been three yokes, which, even in the best conditions, is far from sufficient to support a family. The number of newly-created dwarf holdings (up to 3 yokes) was, up to 15 November 1925, 181,836; thus this number of persons has been moved from the class of pure wage earners to the class of dwarf holders; some of these dwarf holdings were allotted to non-agricultural wage-earners.

The group noted above as “smallholders and tenants holding less than 10 yokes” are actually described in the census by two expressions (a) “smallholders and small tenants”; and (b) “smallholding day-labourers and small tenanting day-labourers”; the second description clearly implies the identity in many cases of small cultivator and wage-paid worker. Persons themselves claiming to be simply “day-labourers” were accepted as such when holding or tenanting less than 5 yokes; when holding or tenanting between 5 and 10 yokes they were moved up into sub-group (b), i.e. as “smallholding or small tenanting day-labourers” — the classification shows the degrees by which the labourer advances into the ranks of the holders or tenants of land.

Further, electors under Act XVIII of 1920 (Representation of Agricultural Interests) are divided into five sections, of which one comprises representatives of agricultural workers and servants and one of holders of undertakings of an area of less than 10 yokes.

Of agricultural workers proper several groups exist and these are distinguished at law. Act XXVII of 1900 regulates the contract of service of salaried employees in agriculture. Act XLV of 1907, concerning the conditions of employment of farm servants, defines as a farm servant a person who contracts to render personal and continuous service in an undertaking against remuneration for at least a month. In practice such workers are engaged either by the year or by the month (seasonal workers). The Act states expressly that those who engage themselves for agricultural work against payment per day or against a share in output, e.g. day-labourers, piece-rate workers, share-produce workers, are not farm servants. These workers come under Act II of 1898. This Act again distinguishes
between workers hired for the job and day-labourers paid by time.

In practice it is also common to differentiate between what are called "occupational" and "non-occupational" agricultural workers. To the first category belong all persons who derive their principal income from paid labour, even if not always from labour in agriculture; to the other all whose principal labour is derived from sources other than paid labour. To this group belongs the smallholder whose farm is big enough to support him in the main, but the limit between the two groups is, of course, often difficult to draw.

The following list shows the groups of agricultural workers when classified according to the nature of their work.

**Permanent workers.** — Mechanician; steam-plough mechanician, stoker, and driver; miller; miller's loader; wheelwright; smith; saddler; bricklayer; locksmith; joiner; carpenter; well-digger; granary watchman; depot-foreman; field watchman; forester; principal farm servant; farm servant's boy; cowman; stableman; milker; horseman; horseman's boy; cattle foreman; cattleman's boy; store cattleman; farm workers' cattleman; farm workers' cattleman's boy; foreman shepherd; shepherd's boy; foreman swineherd; swineherd; swineherd's boy; farm workers' swineherd; farm workers' swineherd's boy; thresher; coachman; staff coachman; ox driver; coachman's boy; waggoner; fleshier; flayer; hempman; tobacco man; vegetable gardener; vinedresser; vinedresser's boy; cellarman; milk manager; irrigation overseer; feeds overseer; house servant; night watcher; boundary watcher, etc.

**Temporary workers.** — Harvest and threshing workers (mostly on a share-produce contract); roots (cultivation and lifting) workers; maize workers; potato workers; vineyard workers; tobacco men; forestry workers; general labourers (for navvy work and irrigation, road, and railway work connected therewith, and for harvest work); helpers, etc.

It is only in countries with large-scale farming that such a variety of agricultural tasks can be found. It is perhaps extending the description of agricultural work very far when
ordinary navvy work is considered as falling under agriculture; but all these groups are admitted by the agricultural trade unions.

The Hungarian trade unions are restricted in their activities under Hungarian law. An organisation to be legally established must obtain the authorisation of the Minister of Home Affairs, and it cannot legally establish branches without the permission of the local authorities. Authorisation is not given when the rules of the union aim at an organisation of, or support to, collective action (other than collective bargaining). The penalties for disobeying the many restrictions imposed on trade unions are numerous, but in the case of agricultural workers they are specially severe.

Though the Act on the Rights of Associations introducing the principles still followed dates as far back as 1875, it was not until thirty years later that the first Social-Democratic trade union of agricultural workers was approved. In the years 1894, 1897, and 1906 great harvest strikes took place. In 1905 the Union of Agricultural Workers (Magyarországi földmunkások Országos Szövetsége) was founded with the authorisation of the Minister of Home Affairs and is thus one of the oldest existing organisations of agricultural workers in the world. It still, however, has difficulties in getting the authorisation of the local authorities to the formation of branches and in avoiding dissolution itself. This organisation developed rapidly in the months immediately after the war. In March 1919 it had no less than 1,700 local branches with 500,000 members. During 1919 and 1920 all these branches, with the exception of four, were dissolved, without regard to the fact that many of them dated from before the war. At the end of 1924 the organisation again had 41 branches; according to the reports of the union for 1922 and 1923, 127 new branches had been established during these two years, of which 97 were again forbidden; 1922 is considered by the union as the year in which their difficulties reached their maximum. In that year the periodical of the union was forbidden and has not been published since. In 1925 53 local branches were dissolved and 18 constituent assemblies forbidden. The organisation has now 68 branches with 10,000 members.

---


2 Reports cited in La Vie Ouvrière, 11 April 1924.
The constitution of the union states that membership is open to:

- all workers of the soil in Hungary, of either sex, or all persons engaged on work allied to agriculture, day-labourers, share-reapers, resident farm and other servants, navvies, shepherds, vineyard workers, waggoners, small tenants, drivers, and also all persons employed in a town against daily, monthly, or yearly wages, without regard to their trade, in so far as they were originally agricultural workers, not possessing any other vocational training and thus always able to return to their original occupation.

The union does not distinguish between smallholders and small tenants on the one hand, and agricultural workers on the other, nor do separate sections for these groups exist inside the union. The standpoint of the union can be seen from the provision of the constitution adopted in February 1925, which, however, has still to be approved by the Ministry of the Interior. The revised Article runs as follows:

All members of either sex can become ordinary members of the union, who are employed in agriculture, forestry, horticulture, or in any other branch of primary production, whether permanently or temporarily, against daily, monthly, or yearly wages, more especially persons who are agricultural workers or persons engaged for several months but not belonging to the regular resident farm or house servants, share-reapers, navvies, vineyard workers, horticultural workers, forest workers, carpenters or woodcutters, resident farm servants, stockmen, waggoners, shepherds; further, smallholders, small tenants, and dwarf holders who cultivate their land alone or together with their families employed in any of the above occupations.

The revised constitution lays down the creation of separate sections for agricultural workers, navvies, horticultural workers, forestry workers, assistant workers, smallholders and dwarf holders, resident farm and house servants. This organisation is affiliated to the Union of Hungarian Federations of Trade Unions (General Council) (Magyarországi Munkasegyesületek Szövetsége) (Szakszevezeti Tanacs), and also to the International Federation of Trade Unions.

(2) There also exists a Union of Christian-Social Land Cultivators and Agricultural Workers (Keresztényszocialista Földmunkasok és Földmivesek Országos Szövetsége). The union states its membership as 30,000.

The union was founded in 1908. Its first efforts were directed to organising workers and smallholders in the separate local districts. The earliest form of organisation was known as the Christian Social Union, which devoted itself to the improvement of agricultural labour conditions. Mutual aid associations were
formed within the framework of the unions and these associations in many places developed into credit societies: here and there distributive co-operative associations and funeral benefit societies were also formed.

In several places, moreover, some very excellent joint tenancy societies were formed, which are still functioning in more remote districts. In general, the local associations took an active part in local life and got their candidates elected on to local and educational bodies. These activities were almost entirely destroyed by the war and by the revolution. After the Communistic period the form of organisation changed and trade union branches were formed which operated chiefly with an economic purpose. The objects of these branches were particularly to assist their members to acquire sites for dwelling places and parcels of land under the terms of the reform of property legislation.

Efforts to improve labour conditions were also made, but the surplus of labour in agriculture made this of little avail. The present programme of the national union embraces both economic purposes and reform by means of legislative action.

The constitution admits not only agricultural workers, but also smallholders and farmers; even holders of large farms, when they agree with the objects of the union, can become members. Every farmworker, peasant, day-labourer, farm servant, or worker employed in an allied occupation, who is over 16 years of age and lives a moral life, can become an ordinary member. This union is affiliated to the Federation of Christian Trade Unions (Keresztényszocialista Orszagos Szakszervezetek szövetsége).

Other organisations of agricultural workers or smallholders do not exist. It is thus be seen that it is only a proportion of all agricultural workers in Hungary who are organised.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919: Not a member of the International Labour Organisation.
1921: Not represented.
1922-1926: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Samuel Jászai, secretary-general of the Hungarian Trade Unions (General Council).

**Irish Free State**

Ireland has always been a country of small and of dwarf holdings. However, a great deal of consolidation has been effected by measures taken over a long period of years to
relieve "congested" districts. Neglecting holdings under one acre, which are of little agricultural significance, we find in 1911 the bulk of holdings under 50 acres in extent; holdings over 100 acres made up only 6.2 per cent. of all holdings.

Both the smallest and the largest holdings show a continuous decline, while holdings between 15 and 100 acres tend to increase; this is the result of the legislation referred to, the decline of population, and the change over to dairy farming (see below). The total number of holdings (over one acre) has also decreased, e.g. from 438,613 in 1914 to 354,484 in 1923. Greater changes have taken place in the number and size of holdings than are generally realised, but the following table will suffice to show the decline in the smallest type of holding, which, no doubt, have been principally affected by consolidation measures. The figures for 1841-1909 refer to the whole of Ireland and those for 1923 to the Irish Free State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of holdings 1-5 acres</th>
<th>Percentage of all holdings over 1 acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>310,400</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>85,500</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>63,500</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>61,900</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>35,176</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of persons actively engaged in agricultural occupations in 1911 was 780,867 (721,669 men and 59,198 women). Apart from horticulture, forestry, horsebreeding, and some minor occupations the majority of male persons engaged were classified as follows:

- Farmers and graziers: 328,473
- Working male members of farmers' and graziers' families: 169,246
- Farm bailiffs: 1,519
- Wage-earning workers:
  - (a) agricultural labourers, cottagers, shepherds: 133,397
  - (b) farm servants (indoor): 62,467
- Others: 1,400

Total: 696,502

5. Excluding working wives and female relatives of farmers.
In addition it is stated that of 148,770 general labourers (not entered in the above table), "the majority may be assumed to be agricultural labourers although not having returned themselves as such".

The industrial and agricultural development of Ireland was during the nineteenth century and the first twenty years of the present century very much affected by a continuous emigration movement, which resulted in a decline of the total population by one-half over a period of about seventy years. The change over from cereal to dairy grass farming (which still predominates) was the result of the introduction of free trade in the middle of the nineteenth century. Since manufacturing industries were insufficiently developed to absorb the surplus rural population, the only relief was found in this emigration. A large number of persons, however, remained on the land on holdings which were far from capable of supporting them and their families with any degree of comfort. These small peasant proprietors still form the bulk of the Irish rural population. According to the (majority) report of the 1922 Commission on Agriculture there is "insufficient land to give every existing occupier an economic holding". Moreover, "it is apparent that all rural districts in Ireland suffer through a lack of subsidiary employment which can be offered to labourers who are not fully engaged on farm work throughout the year". A large part of the Irish agricultural population, therefore, is half peasant, half labourer. The Irish cultivator has been defined as "neither in the position of the farmer nor of the labourer. He is the occupier of a piece of land on which he builds his cabin, and pays a rent which is supposed to be agricultural, but which is really not earnable out of the land, but out of whatever other supplementary income he is able to obtain by migratory labour or by contributions from outside sources". He employs no wage-paid labour.

The migratory labour referred to is that which can be obtained each year in north England and west Scotland from the beginning of the hay-making to the end of the potato-
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1 Census for Ireland, p. 10.
2 Leabhar na hÉireann, 1922 (The Irish Year Book), p. 3. Dublin, 1922.
4 Bailey, op. cit., p. 37.
lifting season. About one-half to three-quarters of the earn­
ings are saved and help the worker to support his family in
Ireland during the rest of the year. In 1915 of 7,354 migrants
(the number during the war was very low), 1,578 were land­
holders, and 4,760 were sons or daughters of landholders ¹.

The practice of paying wages largely in kind, especially as such
wages often include the provision of land cultivated and tilled, or
even cultivated, tilled, manured, seeded and crop-lifted for potato
growing, and the use of grazing for animals, etc., tends further
to obscure the line between the small peasant and the paid
worker ².

It follows that a large proportion of Irish workers in agricul­
ture are organised quâ cultivators and not quâ paid labourers.
The Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, founded over
thirty years ago, concerns itself with the welfare of all Irish
cultivators, but perhaps chiefly with the welfare of the small
farmers, who are estimated to form 85 per cent. of the total
number of farmers. It has stated that the paid labourer
"would be the society's chief concern were it not that so many
more of the actual workers upon the land of Ireland either
own or rent their own farms than are in receipt of wages" ³.
The society, while desirous of forwarding the relations of employ­
ers and employed, does not profess to organise these interests
separately, but its "general purposes" co-operative societies
are always open to the membership of the paid worker ⁴.

The Irish Transport and General Workers' Union, founded
in 1909, organises, in its rural areas, both agricultural workers
and the closely-allied class of road workers employed by local
authorities. The membership of the union, which is large, is
not, however, by any means confined to agriculture, but embraces
a very wide range of industries and occupations. In the
larger towns it embraces most of the manual workers outside
the skilled trades, and in the smaller towns it is often the only

¹ DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND TECHNICAL INSTRUCTION :
Agricultural Statistics, 1915 : Report and Tables relating to the Irish
² "Report on the Operations of the Agricultural Wages Board for
Ireland during the period September 1917 to September 1921", reprinted
in Twenty-First Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture and
³ The Coming-of-Age of the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society,
⁴ Annual Report of the Society, especially for 1919, pp. 38, 12, and 33;
also for 1920, pp. 17, 43, 44; for 1921, p. 10; for 1922, pp. 16 and 39.
union at work. The union is affiliated to the Trade Union Congress (the National Centre), and its local branches are in many places affiliated to the trades or workers' councils, which are local federations of trade union branches in their turn affiliated to the National Centre.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919-1922: Not a member of the International Labour Organisation.

1923: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Tomas LacLoin (Thomas Johnson), secretary of the Irish Labour Party and Trade Union Congress.

1924: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Tomas O'Fuarain (Thomas Foran), member of the National Executive of the Irish Labour Party and Trade Union Congress and general president of the Irish Transport and General Workers' Union.

1925: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Denis Cullen, vice-chairman of the Irish Labour Party and Trade Union Congress; general secretary of the Bakers', Confectioners' and Allied Workers' Amalgamated Union.

1926: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Luke Joseph Duffy, member of the National Executive and past president of the Irish Labour Party and Trade Union Congress; general secretary of the Irish Union of Distributive Workers and Clerks.

All these nominations have been made in agreement with the Irish Labour Party and the Trade Union Congress.

**Italy**

There are no very recent statistics of the distribution of property in Italy. In 1921 an enquiry into smallholding in Italy was held, and the following figures were referred to. The number of holdings was estimated at the end of the last century at nearly 5 millions. Of these actually 3 1/4 million were dwarf holdings of less than one hectare, while over 600,000 were between one and two hectares; there were 450,000 smallholdings between 2 and 4 hectares, over 340,000 medium-sized holdings between 4 and 8 hectares, and the remaining 250,000 holdings were over 8 hectares. Since then further subdivision of property has taken place, and the number of holdings is now estimated at 9 1/2 million, the number of owners at 8 million, the ratio of holdings to owners being roughly 6 to 5. The line between dwarf, small, and medium-sized holdings varies very much according to the intensity of the farming practised, but

---

the average area cultivated by one person is obviously very small, while there are an enormous number of parcels which cannot possibly support their owners.

According to the census of 1921 the total population occupied in agriculture was over 10 million, which is over 50 per cent. of the total occupied population, and was distributed as follows. In each group are included relatives occupied in agriculture 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Owners cultivating their own land</td>
<td>2,292,308</td>
<td>1,135,214</td>
<td>3,427,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life tenants</td>
<td>25,774</td>
<td>9,772</td>
<td>35,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other tenants</td>
<td>485,602</td>
<td>172,516</td>
<td>658,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share-farmers and similar groups</td>
<td>1,088,970</td>
<td>501,006</td>
<td>1,589,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (horticulturists, etc.)</td>
<td>64,431</td>
<td>14,457</td>
<td>78,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,034,185</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,853,483</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,887,668</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaried employees</td>
<td>20,234</td>
<td>2,420</td>
<td>22,654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage-earning workers</td>
<td>3,010,829</td>
<td>1,258,408</td>
<td>4,269,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total: all workers</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,031,063</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,260,828</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,291,891</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,085,482</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,116,731</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,202,213</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison with the 8 million holders of land will show that only about one person in every five in Italy is entirely without any land. The 3 million odd holders of dwarf holdings, and even some of the holders of smallholdings, are undoubtedly at the same time wage-earning workers either in agriculture or in another industry.

It is a fact that Italian agriculture is the most varied agriculture in Europe and includes almost every size of farm and every type of farming. The result is also a very great variety in the types of agricultural labour contract. Nevertheless, some big groups are easily discernable, namely, the resident farm servant, the worker on a permanent contract, the day-labourer under obligation to render service if required (obbligati), and seasonal workers; outside these groups come the shareholders, whose place in the general organisation of agricultural work in south and west Europe has already been described in the Section on France: they replace

---

"directly" employed labour under a variety of circumstances and form an important section of the agricultural community. Outside this group again come the small tenants, and finally the smallholders who are owners of the parcels they cultivate; the present position of the first of these two groups is discussed below with reference to their claim to be considered workers. Certain other groups, such as the boari\(^1\) (foremen-tenants), coloni, etc., scarcely require separate mention, as they are covered by the general designation used in this study of "intermediate" groups \(^2\). The distinction between these groups and the sharefarmers proper is that while the latter cultivate a holding which is self-sufficient from the agricultural point of view — a real farm — the other intermediate groups like coloni, etc., cultivate a parcel of land which forms a portion only of an agricultural undertaking proper.

The farm servant (garzone or famiglio da spesa) is a resident worker, usually on a small or medium-sized farm, who is employed on all operations indifferently; he is usually the only employed worker on the farm, and supplements the family labour; herein he differs from the domestique de ferme in Belgium and in France, of whom there may easily be more than one and who, therefore, are often specialised workers. The farm servant receives his principal wage in kind and is on a yearly contract. He is usually unmarried, but if married his family resides elsewhere than on the farm, and he visits them about once a week.

The workers on permanent contract (salariali), of whom there are usually more than one on the same farm, are specialised and skilled workers (corresponding nearly to the domestiques de ferme in other Latin countries). These workers also are on a yearly contract, and are boarded and lodged (in separate dwellings on the farm if married). They receive a large number of allowances, mostly including a vegetable garden and one-third of the produce of a parcel of land cultivated by themselves; the forms of these allowances are very various and often thus approach share-produce arrangements, e.g. where a contract includes on behalf of the worker the right to half the profits of a certain number of silkworms allotted to him and reared by him and his family.

\(^1\) This applies to the boaria in the province of Ferrara.
As will easily be grasped, the permanent worker is largely concerned with the skilled, all-the-year-round work necessary in care of animals, or in such special tasks as cheese-making, irrigation and drainage supervision, and indeed in supervisory tasks of all kinds. He works manually, but the bulk of the field work, and especially the laborious processes involved in rice cultivation, are not performed by him, but by the two groups of day-labourers.

The chief distinction between day labour and permanent work in Italy is that the former is paid in cash by the day or hour.

The day-labourers on a "free" contract (avventizi or braccianti, "hands") include all those who, residing in rural districts, from time to time offer their services to neighbouring farmers for field or harvest work; agricultural operations in Italy involving a great deal of terracing and irrigation, they are also employed on such operations; indeed, a feature of the Italian labour market is the collective winter contract made on a cooperative basis by a group of day-labourers for the carrying out of such operations during the season when agricultural work proper is not available.

In addition to the day-labourers who are free to offer their services where they will, there are others (obbligati) who bind themselves to be at the disposal of a certain employer, who thus ensures to himself a certain supply of labour at critical periods of the year. Whole families may be under this form of contract. They are paid by the day or by the hour, like other day-labourers, though usually at a lower rate; on the other hand, they generally receive a low-rented house, a garden, and are accommodated with land on which to keep a certain number of animals; moreover the employer is himself bound to offer them the first chance of work, and in view of the seasonal and general agricultural unemployment in Italy, this is no small advantage to the worker. Relatives of married workers on permanent contract are sometimes bound to offer service to the farmer who employs the head of the household.

Seasonal workers (often women for rice work) move about from one part of the country to another, but not usually over wide distances. They are very much in demand for certain weeding and harvesting operations.

The history of the organisation of agricultural workers in Italy is long and complicated, and only the briefest outline
can be given here. The movement for forming Leagues for Betterment or Leagues for Defence (leghe di miglioramento, leghe di resistenza) began to take definite shape in 1884, especially in the provinces of the Valley of the Po. At first each class of workers, day-labourers, men or women, permanent workers, etc., made their own league, and these leagues were strongly localised. The contrasts between the conditions obtained in a number of neighbouring villages by such separate bodies led to a desire for national organisation. The first joint congress of the leagues was held in 1900 and the National Federation of Land Workers (Federazione nazionale lavoratori della terre) was established in 1901, with headquarters at Bologna; subsequent congresses were held in 1906, 1908, 1911, and 1919. This Federation early came to rely for support on the Socialist Party, and other organisations were accordingly formed under the influence of other political parties. The employers followed suit, though their organisation was not put on a national basis until much later, 1918. As a matter of fact, practical work on behalf of agricultural workers was carried out on a local or provincial basis, owing to that variety of agricultural conditions in different parts of the country to which reference has already been made. The practice of collective bargaining became practically universal, and was applied also to the conclusion of share-farming contracts, which in Italy are on a yearly basis. Many other interesting developments followed, and much assistance was derived from an important agricultural co-operative movement.

The Fascist Act of 3 April 1926 on Corporations reorganised the agricultural industry in common with the whole of the rest of the industry of the country. The right of concluding collective agreements in agriculture now passes exclusively (on the workers' side) to the Provincial Federations of Fascist Trade Unions in Agriculture. Other workers' organisations can continue to exist, but have not the capacity to take part in collec-

1 For a somewhat longer account, see International Labour Review, Vol. XIV, No. 5, Nov. 1926, pp. 671-677. (The date of the foundation of the National Federation of Land Workers, quoted there on p. 675 as 1921, should be corrected to 1901.)


3 International Labour Review, Vol. XIV, No. 3, Sept. 1926: "Trade Union Reform in Italy", by G. ARIAS.
tive bargaining; their members are, in any case, compulsorily covered by the terms of the agreements made by the Fascist organisations.

The essence of the Act is that all workers (and all employers) have to be ranged in their appropriate organisations, and one result of the application of this principle has been the definite classification of share-farmers as workers and the holding of an enquiry (still pending) into the position of small tenants.

The discussion as to the exact position of the share-farmers, i.e. the share-farmers proper and other similar groups, has been going on for some time in Italy. Reference was made to the general lines of the discussion in Part II of the present study. The new Act on Corporations made it necessary to take a decision and under Regulations issued by Royal Decree on 1 July 1926 it was laid down that share-farmers should constitute separate organisations ranking with the higher-grade agricultural workers' associations.

The controversy is now transferred to the question of small tenants. Both employers and workers claim the small tenants for their organisations as constituted under the Act, the employers because such tenants really are occupiers of land, the workers because the letting out of land in tenancy is often only an alternative to employing wage-paid labour and because the conditions under which small tenants work are often indistinguishable from those under which the share-farmer, or even the wage-paid worker, works; it is further argued that the entry of small tenants into the employers' organisations deprives them of any separate organisations through which they could conclude collective agreements governing tenancies, or defend their interests against their landlords. The Regulations referred to, however, classed the small tenant with the employer. From the legal point of view such a decision was to be expected. The trouble is that, for the reason stated, the correct economic classification seems rather to put the small tenant with the small share-farmer and certainly not with the employers.

The results have been protests, of which the following is perhaps the most important, embodied in a resolution of the agricultural workers of southern Italy on 17 March 1917:

---


The Congress of Fascist Agricultural Unions, having examined the special situation of the agricultural industry in certain provinces, and aware that the assimilation of the employer to the worker is prejudicial to the revival of agriculture in south Italy, declares that the tenancy contract should be looked on as a true labour contract.

The suggestion to include the small tenant as worker has also received the support of so well-known an authority as Professor Serpieri, formerly Under-Secretary of State for Agriculture, who writes:

No one can get rid of the basic fact that in the position of the small tenant, as in that of the wage-paid worker, it is labour and not capital which is the dominant element.

In view of the complexity of the question the Government has decided to appoint a committee of three persons, one representing the Government (the chairman), and one each representing the National Fascist Confederation of Agriculturists (the employers), and the National Federation of Fascist Trade Unions in Agriculture (the workers), to study the question in the different districts. Meanwhile any person already admitted to membership of any organisation will retain his membership.

The following agricultural workers' organisations are at present in existence in Italy, or, though no longer in existence, are here briefly mentioned in view of their importance in the history of the agricultural labour movement.

(I) The National Federation of Land Workers (Federazione nazionale lavoratori della terra), founded in 1901 (see above), had in 1920 a membership of about 850,000; the years immediately after the war were years of maximum activity. The organ of the Federation was La Terra. The co-operative interests of members were looked after by the National Federation of Agricultural Co-operative Societies (Federazione nazionale delle cooperative agricole, ceased to exist in 1922), the membership of whose constituent societies was recruited from the membership of the Land Workers' Federation; some of these constituent societies were associations for the common exploitation of an agricultural undertaking.

From its foundation the question of small ownership was vehemently debated at the congress and meetings of the Federation; on the one hand, there was a great desire to include

---

2 Ibid., 27 March 1927.
3 Ibid., 1 April 1927.
in the organisation this great mass of small cultivators throughout
the country; on the other, the Federation held very strong
theoretical views on the socialisation of landownership. A
solution was effected at the first congress by voting the ad­
mission of smallholders (owners as well as tenants) provided that
they accepted the theory of socialisation of the land. Practice
in admitting or excluding smallholders from local organisations
was somewhat fluctuating, and depended on the decision of the
local organisers.

The Federation was affiliated to the International Land
Workers' Federation.

The Federation ceased to exist towards the end of 1926.

(2) The Italian Federation of Agricultural Workers (Federa­
razione italiana lavoratori agricoli) (Cath.) had in 1923 a mem­
bership of about 27,000.

(3) The National Federation of Fascist Trade Unions
in Agriculture (Federazione nazionale dei sindacati fascisti dell'
agricoltura).

Under the terms of the Fascist Act of 3 April 1926, already
referred to, only one registered workers' organisation of each
occupation may exist in each district, capable of acting for the
workers in collective negotiations with the employers. Such
registered organisations must have a membership of ten per
cent. of all the workers of that occupation living in that district.
The registered local organisations of agricultural workers are
now federated in provincial organisations which constitute
the National Federation of Fascist Trade Unions in Agriculture
with headquarters at Rome. The membership is stated at 700,000.
There are separate local organisations for each of the following
classes: workers on a permanent contract; day-labourers
(two groups); share-farmers. Il Lavoro d'Italia is recognised
as the organ used by the Federation. The Federation is affili­
ated to the National Confederation of Fascist Trade Unions
(Confederazione nazionale dei sindacati fascisti), and thereby
becomes a part of the whole of organised Italian industry.

Representation at the International Labour Conference
1919: Workers' Delegate: Mr. G. BaldeSì, secretary of the General
Federation of Labour.

1 Altobelli: La Fédération nationale des travailleurs agricoles d'Italie
— Histoire, Vie, Batailles. Bologna, 1920. 32 pp. (Also in Italian.)
1921: **Workers’ Delegate:** Mr. G. Balsei. **Advisers:** Dr. O. Gorni, secretary of the National Federation of Agricultural Co-operatives; Mrs. Altobelli, secretary of the National Federation of Land Workers.

1922: **Workers’ Delegate:** Mr. O. L. d’Aragona, general secretary of the General Federation of Labour.

1923-1926: **Workers’ Delegate:** Mr. E. Rossini, general secretary of the Confederation of National Corporations (National Confederation of Fascist Trade Unions).

For protests against some of these nominations, see above pp. 64-65 of this study.

**JAPAN**

The area of arable land in Japan (6,067,015 cho in 1925) is less than one-fifth of the total area of the country; the remaining four-fifths are forest and wild land. Owing to the great density of the population the average amount of land available for each family is small. Of over 5½ million farm households in 1925 not far off 2 million had less than 5 tan of land (about ½ hectare or 1 3/4 acres), over 1¾ million had less than 1 cho (about 1 hectare or 2½ acres), while over another 1¾ million had less than 2 cho (about 2 hectares or 5 acres). Only just over ½ million household had farms over 2 cho in area. It is therefore not surprising that a large proportion of farm households have to engage in pursuits other than agriculture, though it must be remembered that intensive cultivation of rice permits subsistence on a plot which is astonishingly small when compared with the minimum areas of subsistence in wheat-growing countries. Figures are given for “farm households”1; the figures for tenancy are added, as tenancy has an important bearing on the question of agricultural labour (see below).

### 1925

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm households: total</td>
<td>5,548,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) cultivating:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>less than 5 tan</td>
<td>1,951,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“” 1 cho</td>
<td>1,877,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“” 2 cho</td>
<td>1,185,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“” 3 cho</td>
<td>322,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“” 5 cho</td>
<td>137,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“” over 5 cho</td>
<td>74,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Principally engaged in agriculture</td>
<td>3,880,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally engaged in agriculture</td>
<td>1,668,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Cultivating their own lands</td>
<td>1,725,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenants</td>
<td>1,525,656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combining tenancy and ownership</td>
<td>2,297,909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 A “farm household” is a “household” (which may consist of one person) engaged in agriculture.

Figures are also available on the agricultural population reckoned as individuals, but this question is difficult to deal with until the results of the 1925 census are known. Figures provided by the Statistical Bureau in 1920 give a total agricultural population (i.e. including dependants) of nearly 27 millions (nearly 50 per cent. of the whole population) and a “working” agricultural population of over 9 millions. However, this so-called working population is not necessarily to be taken as working in agriculture. The Department of Agriculture and Commerce in October 1920 quotes as workers in agriculture 3,117,582 persons, of whom 373,024 are described as “labourers” and 2,744,558 as “others” (tenants engaged in part-time employment?). The relation of these 3 million persons to the 5½ million “farm households” mentioned above is not known, though it is clear that many farm householders and many of their adult relations would be at any rate part-time workers in agriculture. In any case it is certain that the number of permanently employed agricultural workers working on account of another person is very small, only 373,024 persons.

The vast mass of agricultural operations in Japan are therefore performed by peasants who are smallholders or dwarf holders. From ancient times peasant organisations seem to have existed in Japan, aiming both at the improvement of agricultural methods and the promotion of friendly relations among the members. A new feature is the more active organisation of tenant-cultivators in defence of their common interests. Tenancy is always on the share-produce system and corresponds to the métayage system of Europe, except that the capital advanced by the landlord is more obviously in the form of land than of anything else ¹.

As will be seen below, the tenants’ movement during the past three or four years has been intimately connected with the labour movement of the country. Whatever may be the legal status of the tenant from the employment point of view, there can be no doubt but that in practice the principal agricultural work of the country is carried on by him. Operations are carried on by human or animal labour (sometimes by human labour only) and machinery other than tools is scarcely used.

(1) The Japan Farmers' Union. The organisation of tenants' defence unions started unsystematically from a number of local associations, which show a continual increase. At the end of 1925 there were 3,313 such local associations (*Kosakunin Kumiai*), with a membership of 307,104; by November 1926 they had increased to 4,065 and the membership to 368,424. There was at first no one large representative organisation, but in 1921 a body, the *Nihon Nomin Kumiai*, generally known in English as the Japan Farmers' Union, was formed and has since played a very important part in the labour movement of the country. The union admits to membership both tenant-cultivators and agricultural day-labourers.

The following information is taken from a Japanese source:

The agricultural workers in Japan are organised in a single national union, the Japan Peasants' Union (*Nihon Nomin Kumiai*), founded in 1921. It is one of the most important organisations, with 788 branches in local provinces and a total membership of 53,130 as on 8 October 1925. The formation of a trade union of agricultural workers, comprising smallholders and tenant-farmers was initiated during 1921, and the first annual congress was held on 9 April 1922, at Kobe, when a membership of about 20,000 was reported. It was not the first organisation representing agrarian workers, but since its inception various other organisations were driven to the background. At present the Japan Peasants' Union is numerically the biggest organisation representing the working class interests. Mr. Suzuki, president of the General Federation of Labour, is also chairman of the Kanto Confederation affiliated with the Japan Peasants' Union. The Japan Peasants' Union with its 788 local branches all over the country represents the organised labour in agriculture, and is making valuable contributions to the progress and development of the Japanese labour movement as its integral part.

The union has headquarters in Osaka and in 1925 had local centres in Tokyo, Kyoto, Nara, Miye, Hyogo, Okayama, Kagawa, Kukuoka, and Tottori, and 508 branches in 2 Fu (urban prefectures) and 32 prefectures; the total membership is now 53,000. A congress is held once a year.

The union has had enormous influence especially in rural districts, and has been very active in the political sphere. In fact, in Japan the rural proletariat has played a premier rôle.

---

3 *The Shakai-Seisaku Jiho* (Social Reform), No. 65, Feb. 1926.
4 The same as the Japan Farmers' Union just mentioned.
in the political labour movement of the country. (See also below, under: "Representation at the International Labour Conference").

The following two organisations also require mention.

(2) The National League of Farmers' Unions (Zen Nihon Nomin Kumiai Domei) is composed of unions of agricultural tenants and farm labourers who withdrew from the Japan Farmers' Union in April 1926. Chief leaders are Professor Shinjiro Kitazawa, of Waseda University, Mr. Kaiten Sugai, and others. It was this organisation which led the movement for the formation and inauguration in October 1926 of the Japan Farmers' Party (Nihon Nomin To), which stands on the extreme right wing of existing political parties of workers. While the membership of the Japan Farmers' Union is spread out all over the country, that of this league, which counts about 15,000, is centered chiefly in the prefectures of Niigata, Yamanashi, Gifu, and Fukuoka.

(3) Central Japanese Farmers' Union (Chubu Nihon Nomin Kumisi), organised in April 1924, with headquarters in the city of Gifu, is a union of about 12,000 farmers and tenants, Mr. Benjiro Nakazawa is the president and Mr. Bunsuke Yoshi-kawa, the chief secretary. Politically the union is non-partisan, though in sympathy with the Social-Democratic Party.

**REPRESENTATION AT THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Workers' Delegate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Mr. Uhei MASUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Mr. Keiichi MATSUMOTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Mr. Yoshiharu TAZAWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>Mr. Riyemon UNO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-25</td>
<td>Mr. Bunji SUZUKI, president of the General Federation of Labour, and president of the Kanto Confederation affiliated with the Japan Farmers' Union.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Mr. Itaro NARASAKI, president of the Japanese Seamen's Union.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1919, 1921, 1922, and 1923, protests were made against the credentials of the Workers' Delegate; the credentials were, in each case, confirmed. In 1924 and 1925 nominations were made in agreement with the trade unions.

1 For the political history of the union (which is very important), and for the formation and dissolution of the Farmer-Labour Party, and the formation of the Labour Party, and other "farmer" Parties still existing, the reader is referred to *Industrial Conditions and Labour Legislation in Japan*, pp. 95 et seq. The formation of new organisations goes on continuously, and the list of organisations given must not be taken as final.
In 1924, the Government adopted a new method of selection of the Workers' Delegate to the International Labour Conference. Workers' unions with a membership of more than 1,000 were invited to vote for the Workers' Delegate, and the Government was to appoint officially the Delegate by selecting, from among the three candidates who received the highest number of votes, the one who was deemed to be best suited in consideration of the nature of the agenda of each particular Conference. The Japan Farmers' Union, however, has been excluded from participation in the voting and in view of its great importance, especially in the rural districts of Japan, the history of this exclusion is here given in some detail.

When the new policy of the Government was published early in 1924 and workers' unions were invited to propose the names of the Workers' Delegate and Advisers to attend the Conference, the Japan Farmers' Union at its annual meeting decided to take part in the vote, and in due course sent in the names of its candidates to the Government. Shortly after, however, it was understood that the Government decided not to take into account the vote of that union, mainly on the grounds that the items on the agenda of the Conference had nothing to do with agriculture; and also that the tenant-farmers, who constitute a great proportion of the Japan Farmers' Union, could not be considered in the same category as wage earners engaged in industry.\(^1\)

However, protests were immediately raised against the decision of the Government. At the third conference of the Japanese Farmers' Union, held in Osaka from 28 February to 1 March 1924, resolutions were adopted\(^2\), demanding among others the admission of the union in the vote, and deciding on the one hand that the International Labour Office should be requested

---

\(^1\) The Government's position appears to have been that in Japan the questions as to whether or not tenant-farmers were agricultural workers and whether the Japan Farmers' Union was an organisation of agricultural workers were unsettled, and in this connection it was pointed out that tenant-farmers' unions in Japan were not affiliated with workers' trade unions as in some foreign countries, but had separate or independent existence. Then the fear was entertained, further, that the Japan Farmers' Union, claiming a membership which exceeds that of any trade union organisation of industrial workers, would, if admitted to vote, dominate the election by the overwhelming number of votes of agricultural tenants and farm labourers; thus it was felt by the Government that it would not be just to allow in the election the domination of any organisation as long as the question whether that organisation was a workers' trade union remained doubtful.

\(^2\) Nihon Rodo Nenkan (Japan Labour Year Book), 1925, p. 321.
to state clearly that the tenant-farmers' unions are entitled to take part in the International Labour Conference, and, on the other hand, that the Japanese Government should be induced to take up a definite attitude towards tenant-farmers in accordance with the spirit of the International Labour Convention. Shortly after, the General Federation of Japanese Labour, the Japan Farmers' Union, and the General Federation of Workers in State Enterprises jointly sent in to the Government on 15 March 1924 a series of questions among which they demanded the explanation for the exclusion of the Japan Farmers' Union, pointing out the fact that the Third Session of the International Labour Conference had already recognised the tenant-farmers on the same footing as wage-earning workers. A similar demand was made by the Federation of Navy Workers' Unions on 25 March 1924 in a series of questions addressed also to the Government, and finally, on 6 April, the Japan Farmers' Union published a manifesto protesting against the measure taken by the Government. The protest of the union was duly transmitted later to the Credentials Committee of the 1924 Session of the International Labour Conference by the Workers' Delegate of Japan, Mr. Bunji Suzuki, as a document questioning his own qualification. This incident, which seems singular at first sight, came to pass because, on the one hand, Mr. Suzuki, then officer of the Japan Farmers' Union, supported the view of the union, and on the other hand the union had in fact entrusted him with the mission of bringing up the matter at the International Labour Conference. Under these conditions the Credentials Committee reported to the Conference as follows:

The request transmitted to the Conference on this question was not an objection against the credentials of the Japanese Workers' Delegate, the objecting organisation having itself recognised that Mr. Bunji Suzuki was in fact entitled to represent the Japanese workers. The Committee therefore is of opinion that no action need be taken on this request.

The Conference having approved this report, the protest of the Japan Farmers' Union against the Government for having

---

1 The Convention referred to here is obviously the Draft Convention concerning the right of association of agricultural workers, adopted at the Third Session of the International Labour Conference in 1921.

2 *Nihon Rodo Nenkan* (Japan Labour Book), 1925, pp. 595-597.

3 Besides being the president of the General Federation of Japanese Labour, Mr. B. Suzuki was then the president of the Eastern Federation of the Japan Farmers' Union.

excluded it from the vote took no practical effect, and ever since the Japanese Government has consistently maintained the same policy as regards this question, so that the tenant-farmers’ unions have not been allowed to participate in the election of the Workers’ Delegate and Advisers to the International Labour Conference. However, the Japan Farmers’ Union has continued its protest and particularly in 1925 it addressed a letter of protest to the International Labour Office, the gist of which was as follows:

The Japan Farmers’ Union does not deny the qualification of Mr. Bunji Suzuki as the Workers’ Delegate, but it wishes to know whether the Conference approves the method of selection of the Delegate adopted by the Japanese Government, and also whether the Conference would also exclude the Japan Farmers’ Union. There is no longer any question to-day as to the fact that the Japan Farmers’ Union is a workers’ organisation, and therefore, believing that the exclusion of our union from the election is contrary to the spirit of the International Labour Conference, we plead with the International Labour Office to recommend to the Japanese Government the admission of the Japan Farmers’ Union to the election.

For some reason or other, the letter did not reach the International Labour Office, but it will not fail to be of interest to note in this connection the wording of the Resolution printed on p. 5 of this study, which was proposed for the acceptance of the International Labour Conference by the Japanese Workers’ Delegate.

Finally we must add that the Japanese Association for International Labour Legislation has taken up this matter. The second general meeting of the Association held in Tokyo on 6 November 1926 adopted the following resolution:

Considering that the Draft Convention adopted at the Third Session of the International Labour Conference concerning the right of association of agricultural workers purports to regard the Japanese tenant-farmers in the same category as agricultural workers, and

Considering further that the interests of the tenant farmers who live by agricultural labour should, of course, be represented at the International Labour Conference,

Be it resolved:

That this Association request the Government to grant to the organisations of agricultural labourers, including tenant-farmers, the right of election of the Workers’ Delegate to attend the International Labour Conference.

LATVIA

The present agricultural situation, and the history of its development, is nearly the same in Latvia as in Estonia, in the Section on which country a description has already been

1 Nihon Rodo Nenkan, 1926, pp. 474-475.
given. The agrarian reform has done away with the large estates and about 85,000 new holdings have been created. The distribution of land is pretty nearly the same as in Estonia. Statistics with regard to the number of persons engaged in agriculture are not known. From the workers' side the total number of workers in agriculture was estimated at the end of 1924 to be about 180,000.

Information in the possession of the International Labour Office concerning existing organisations of agricultural workers is as follows.

(1) The Federation of Agricultural Workers of Latvia (Latvijas Laukstradnieku savienība). During the fight for the introduction of the agrarian reform this union had 16,000 members, at the end of 1924 11,800, and at the present time has about 9,000. The decline is mostly due to the resignation from membership of agricultural workers who have become independent smallholders. It has, however, been recently stated that agricultural workers who have not benefited by the agrarian reform are again joining the union in increasing numbers.

(2) The Union of Agricultural Workers (Lauku stradnieku arodbiedriba) was founded after 1923. It is affiliated to the Central Bureau of Latvian Trade Unions (Latvijas Arodbiedribu Centrālbirojs). Its present membership is 650.

Representation at the International Labour Conference

1919: Not a member of the International Labour Organisation.
1921: Workers' Delegate: Mr. T. Rudzits, Agricultural Workers' Federation.
1922: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Janis Svembergs, secretary to the Printers' Trade Union.
1923-1926: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Janis Visna, vice-chairman of the Central Office of Trade Union Organisations.

In 1921 the Central Bureau of Latvian Trade Unions protested against the nomination of the Workers' Delegate as not having been chosen in agreement with itself. The Delegates of the Latvian Government stated at the Conference that the Workers' Delegate had been chosen in agreement.

2 Bulletin of the International Land Workers' Federation, No. 8, 15 March 1925.
with two trade union organisations uniting 21,000 members (the total number of trade union members organised in Latvia being 26,000), in particular with the Federation of Agricultural Workers of Latvia (Latvijas Lankstradricku savieniba), which, according to the statement made, was affiliated to the Central Bureau of Latvian Trade Unions. Since 1922 the Federation of Agricultural Workers has appeared to be an organisation independent of the Central Bureau.

LITHUANIA

The agrarian reform carried out in Lithuania was a little less radical than the reform carried out in Estonia and Latvia. To begin with, only estates over 150 hectares were set down for expropriation in the first instance, and, as a second stage, estates between 80 and 150 hectares. Statistics with regard to the present distribution of land are not available, but the fact that the Act of 12 February 1924 on the Engagement and Dismissal of Workers Paid in Kind applies only to farms with more than 80 hectares of arable land shows that conditions are a little different from those in the other two Baltic States.

The number of persons engaged in agriculture (horticulture not included) and forestry at the census on 17 September 1923 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Forestry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holders of land</td>
<td>214,563</td>
<td>34,504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working members of landholders' families</td>
<td>180,661</td>
<td>426,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing staff</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage-earning workers</td>
<td>114,459</td>
<td>114,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>509,821</td>
<td>576,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The right of combination is unrestricted in Lithuania when the objects of an association are not contrary to law. The rulings of the Russian Penal Code concerning strikes are still in force.

The trade union movement in Lithuania began with the establishment of the country as an independent State. The largest organisations were those founded by the agricultural workers. This peculiar fact, that the agricultural workers founded the trade union movement, finds its explanation in the overwhelming importance of agriculture in the economic life of Lithuania; 70 per cent. of the population live from agriculture and only 10 per cent. from industry. The trade union movement culminated in 1920; then it nearly disappeared. The fight against Communism involved the trade unions. In 1923, however, a new upward movement began, and again it was more especially the land workers who organised.

By letter of 3 June 1925, addressed to the President of the Seventh Session of the International Labour Conference, the Lithuanian Government explained the situation of the workers’ organisations in Lithuania in the following way:

As Lithuanian industry is very little developed, practically no industrial workers’ class exists. Organisation of agricultural workers in Lithuania is still not definitely established...

(1) The Union of Agricultural Workers in Lithuania (Lietu vos Zemes ukio Dartruinku Profesino Sąjunga) is the only union of agricultural workers existing. It was founded in 1923, when several unions of agricultural workers created in 1919 were united. The union has friendly relations with other trade unions in Lithuania, especially on questions of general interest to the workers, such as employment, rights of associations, etc. These relations take the form of periodical meetings of representatives.

The union is a member of the International Land Workers’ Federation and also has relations with the Federation of Agricultural Workers in Latvia.

Agricultural workers, men and women, can become members of the union on the recommendation of two members, and by paying an entrance fee. The union has 59 branches, with 2,200 members. The smallholder who does not employ paid labour other than that of his own family can become a member of

1 See Section on Estonia.
the agricultural workers' union. It is stated, however, that few avail themselves of this privilege and that, when they do so, they act from idealistic motives and not in order to obtain economic advantages.

(2) Many agricultural workers have recently become smallholders as a consequence of agrarian reform legislation, and have founded two new trade unions. One of these, under the name of the Union of "Landless and Landpoor" and New Settlers works in connection with the Social-Democratic Party of Lithuania, the other in connection with the clerical parties.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919: Not a member of the International Labour Organisation.
1921: Not represented.
1922-26: Government Delegates only.

**NETHERLANDS**

There existed, in 1921, 222,000 agricultural undertakings in the Netherlands of more than 1 hectare in size. Of these 113,000 were of an area of 1 to 5 hectares each, 35,000 of an area of 10 to 20 hectares, and 23,000 of an area of 20 to 50 hectares. The number of farms over 50 hectares was less than 3,000. Of the 222,000 exploiters of land 163,000 are designated as "farmers"; the rest were either horticulturalists, cultivating land workers, or other persons. In view of the great intensity of Netherlands agriculture, it must be explained that even plots under one hectare can contribute considerably to the living of a wage-paid worker. It is worth noting that the average area held by cultivators of holdings between 1 and 5 hectares in size has increased; this is interpreted as a sign that cultivating land workers have, many of them, acquired a little more land and become small independent farmers. This tendency is in agreement with the state of affairs aimed at in the Agricultural Workers Act of 20 April 1918, the purpose of which is to make it possible for agricultural workers to obtain either an agricultural allotment plus a dwelling house in ownership, or agricultural land without a dwelling place in tenancy.

The population engaged in agriculture, including horticulture,
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sylviculture, soil improvement work, etc., at the date of the census on 31 December 1920, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heads of undertakings</td>
<td>185,983</td>
<td>29,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing staff, foremen, etc</td>
<td>6,088</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage-paid workers</td>
<td>339,986</td>
<td>59,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>531,957</td>
<td>89,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is not possible to give any figure showing the whole number of women working on farms. The number quoted is rather low. Now the total number of female domestic servants in the Netherlands at the date of the census was 210,981, and it is uncertain how many of these were domestic servants with agricultural employers (and therefore probably partly employed in agricultural work), but the distribution shows that female domestic servants are very numerous in districts which are chiefly agricultural.

When the preponderance of smallholding in the Netherlands is remembered, the number of agricultural workers seems very high, but this is, of course, the result of the very great intensity of Dutch agriculture.

The Act of 1918, mentioned above, defines as an “agricultural worker” any person employed in agriculture, horticulture, forestry, stock-breeding, or peat work, whose principal source of income is derived from employment in any of these industries. Three groups of agricultural workers must be distinguished:

1. Resident male and female farm and domestic servants.
2. Permanent workers, not resident in the farmhouse.
3. Casual workers.

A decrease in the number of resident farm servants, and in a lesser degree of permanent workers, was noted even in 1906. This was due to the modernising of the agricultural industry, the increased use of machinery, and the extension of the industrialised manufacture of dairy produce, together with other factors, including the extension of smallholdings. In many cases smallholders are employed periodically as casual workers, and this more commonly in sandy regions than in regions with a clay soil. There is a good deal of internal seasonal migration, and in all the provinces at certain seasons of

---

the year workers are employed from other districts. Agricultural workers also find employment in factories in industries requiring labour during periods when there is less demand for workers on the land. Examples are the beet-sugar and potato-flour industries and to a decreasing degree the chicory industry.

Agricultural workers also add to their earnings by certain forms of home industries and by employment in transport, drainage, and in roads and dyke work. Women in some districts and at certain periods are employed to a certain extent on light work in the fields. The latter form of employment has steadily diminished since 1906, and they are now generally employed as servants and in milking.

The trade union movement in Dutch agriculture dates further back than in most other countries. Organisations existed at least as far back as 1896; on the other hand, only a small percentage of agricultural workers are organised, even relatively fewer than in several other countries. On 1 January 1925 a total of 21,053 workers were organised, and on 1 January 1926 20,077. Again, however, as e.g. in Germany, it is claimed that the effects of organisation extend far beyond the ranks of membership. The following organisations exist:

(1) The Netherlands Union of Workers engaged in Agriculture, Horticulture and Dairying (Nederlandsche Bond van Arbeiders in het Landbouw-, Tuinbouw-, en Zuivelbedrijf) is affiliated to the Netherlands Federation of Trade Unions (Nederlandsche Verbond van Vakvereenigingen) and to the International Land Workers' Federation. This union is an amalgamation of the former Dairy Workers' Union and the Netherlands Union of Land Workers. The Dairy Workers' Union was founded in 1900 and in 1909 was amalgamated with the then newly-formed Land Workers' Union. On 1 July 1920 the membership amounted to 15,687 (of whom 341 were women); on 1 January 1926 the membership was 5,988. The union organises agricultural workers, market gardeners, peat cutters, and workers engaged in dairies and potato-flour mills. This union has stated that hitherto it has not officially dealt much with the question of the admittance of smallholders; smallholders or tenants who do work on account of another during
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1 Central Bureau Voor de Statistiek: Jaarcijfers voor Nederland 1925-1926. The Hague, 1927.
part of the year can, however, become members of the organisation, and to some extent do so.

(2) The Netherlands Christian Union of Agricultural Workers (Nederlandsche Christelijke Landarbeidsbond) is affiliated to the Netherlands Federation of Christian Trade Unions (Christelijke Nationaal Vakverbond in Nederland), and to the International Federation of Christian Land Workers’ Trade Unions. The union was founded in February 1914 and had in 1926 5,646 members. All persons engaged as wage-paid workers in agriculture, horticulture, floriculture, dairying, and peat-extraction can become members. Smallholders are considered as “independent cultivators” (eigenwerkers) and are therefore not allowed to become members of the union. A few of them are members, but only out of interest in the movement.

(3) The Roman Catholic Union of Floricultural, Horticultural, Peat Digging, and Agricultural Workers (Roomsch-Katholick Bond van Bloemis-, Tuin-, Veen- en Landarbeiders) is affiliated to the Roman Catholic Workers’ Federation (Roomsch Katholick Werkliedenverbond in Nederland) and to the International Federation of Christian Land Workers’ Trade Unions. The membership was 6,845 in 1926.

(4) The Union of Agricultural, Horticultural, Peat Workers, and Workers engaged in Similar Occupations (Land-, Tuin-, Veen- en anverwaante Vakarbeiders), affiliated to the Netherlands General Trade Union Federation (Algemeen Nederlandsch Vakverbond) had 100 members in 1926.

(5) The Organisation of Agricultural Workers (Organisatie Landarbeiders), affiliated to the National Labour Secretariat (Communist) (National Arbeids-Secretariat), had 247 members in 1926.

(6) An organisation with 71 members affiliated to the Netherlands Syndicalist Federation.

Finally, 1,180 agricultural workers are members of organisations not affiliated to a central body.

Representation at the International Labour Conference

1919: Workers’ Delegate: Mr. Oudegeest, president of the Netherlands Federation of Trade Unions.

1921: Workers’ Delegate: Mr P. J. S. Serrarens, member of the Roman Catholic Workers’ Organisation Board. Advisers: Mr. M. Eichner, secretary, Union of Agricultural, Horticultural, Peat Workers, and Workers engaged in
Similar Occupations; Mr. P. HIEMSTRA, president, Netherlands Union of Workers in Agriculture, Horticulture and Dairying; Mr. A. J. LOERAKKER, president, Netherlands Roman Catholic Union of Workers engaged in Floristry, Gardening, Peat-Extraction and Agriculture; Mr. R. STEIMENS, president, Netherlands Christian Union of Agricultural Workers.

1922: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. E. KUPERS, secretary to the Committee of the Netherlands Federation of Trade Unions.

1923: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. J. NANTA, secretary to the Federation of Christian Trade Unions.

1924: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. E. KUPERS.

1925: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. P. J. S. SERRARENS.

1926: **Workers' Delegate**: M. J. Zwaga, secretary of the Dutch League of Roman Catholic Workers.

In 1919 the nomination of the Workers' Delegate was made in agreement with the Netherlands Federation of Trade Unions. In 1921 nomination was made in agreement with the Federation of Catholic Trade Unions, the Netherlands Federation of Protestant Trade Unions, and the Netherlands General Trade Union Federation; the Netherlands Federation of Trade Unions protested without success¹. During the following years nominations have been made in agreement with the last-named Federation also.

**NEW ZeALAND**

A great deal of land in New Zealand, although occupied, is not yet cultivated. Holdings are very large, indeed enormous, and agriculture is predominantly a pastoral and dairying industry. Of the 43 million acres of occupied land (of which 25 million are unimproved and include barren land, virgin soil, etc.) only 2 million are taken up by agricultural holdings, while 35 million are taken up by pastoral holdings (sheep runs), and 6 million by dairy holdings (1922-1923). The size of holdings is as follows: 68 per cent. of occupied land is held in areas of over 1,000 acres and 42 per cent. in areas of over 5,000 acres. Holdings as large as 50,000 acres and over are scheduled; these very large holdings, however, are decreasing in number and there is a general tendency to concentrate and intensify farming. Only 13½ per cent. of all occupied land is held in holdings “not more than half a square mile in area”; but, though the aggregate area thus held is not very large, the number of holders of these smaller holdings makes up 75 per cent. of all holders

¹ This objection eventually gave rise to an application (by the International Labour Organisation) before the Permanent Court of International Justice.
of land. Over 40 per cent. of occupied land is held from the Crown.

The total number of persons occupied in agriculture was over 132,000 in 1921. Figures are available from the census of 1921, as follows. The figures include horticulture, but exclude forestry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers</td>
<td>25,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers working themselves but not employing labour</td>
<td>41,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of farmers' families occupied in agriculture</td>
<td>10,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed workers (salaried and wage-earning)</td>
<td>55,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132,078</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dairy farming occupies the largest number of persons, namely, over 57,000, and here there are more than 2 employed persons to every 3 farmers; in the two next largest groups, namely, sheep-breeding (over 32,000 persons) and "agricultural", i.e. crop farming (over 16,000 persons), there are rather more employed persons than farmers. Bush-felling and other clearing operations, forestry, and saw-milling account for about 10,000 persons (not included in the figures given above).

Agricultural workers fall into two groups, namely, general farm workers in permanent employ, often living at the farm-house, and skilled seasonal workers, namely, shearsers, shed-hands, musterers, packers, drovers, threshing-mill employees, etc. The general farm workers, who are often young workers and live isolated on farms great distances apart, are very difficult to organise, especially as the bulk of general farm work is done by the farmer himself or his sons. The skilled seasonal workers, on the other hand, especially the shearsers, owing to the great size of the pastoral industry, though not so very numerous, are a most important group of workers inasmuch as the success of the season's operations depends on them. They are sufficiently organised to enable them to benefit by awards under the Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act, the last consolidation of which was made in 1925. A number of shearsers', drovers' and packers' and other awards have been made by the Court of Arbitration, regulating conditions
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1. *New Zealand Official Year Book, 1925*. Wellington, 1925. 989 pp. The figures do not include forestry.


3. *Results of a Census, etc., pp. 33, 34.*
of labour for these groups in a detailed way. But so far every attempt to get an award for general farm workers has failed. A recent attempt, made in 1925 for the Otago and Southlands district, was refused by the court on the ground that not enough of the farm workers in the district were organised in the trade union making the application. Previous applications were refused in 1908 and 1919.

The importance of the seasonal worker is due to the remarkable seasonal organisation of the whole agricultural industry. Sheep-breeding itself is divided into two distinct types. The greater part of the industry is carried on on high, hilly, and unploughable ground, where the sheep are left undisturbed for six months in the year. Lower down is semi-cultivated country, and here the second part of the industry is carried on, namely, the fattening of lambs; this is combined with cropping in mixed farms. Shearing operations over the whole industry last for about four months, and this busy period coincides with the slack period of crop cultivation. Crops are sewn before and after the shearing season, in spring and autumn. In January, when shearing begins to slacken, the crops begin to ripen; also lambs are then fit for killing, and the important freezing industry draws off labour for about six months. Some labour is also wanted after the threshing for general work, fencing, ditching, ploughing, etc. Thus there is a continuous movement of labour throughout the year along well-defined channels. The busiest season is the summer, when musterers and packers are wanted in the hilly pastoral districts, and shearers are required everywhere. They work in gangs and are accommodated in temporary buildings, subject to inspection. The different character of the sheep shorn in different parts of the country, some requiring hand-shearing, while others can be machine-shorn, is a cause of difficulty in the drawing up of awards for wages. Another great difficulty is the fact that awards have to be made in seven different districts; for a national industry like shearing, where workers move freely about the country during the whole season, this is a great drawback. In general, however, New Zealand is undoubtedly a country where seasonal agricultural work is much better

---

1 Industrial and Labour Information, Vol. XVI, No. 13, pp. 616-619. In disputed cases the Court of Arbitration has to decide whether an agricultural worker comes within the class of skilled workers mentioned in an award.
organised and better paid than permanent agricultural work. The intense demand for labour during the shearing season induces a certain number of smaller farmers and their sons to offer their services as shearers. Such smaller farmers refuse to join the workers' unions, which sometimes complain that the services of their members are undersold in this way; many smaller farmers are members of an employers' union.

As New Zealand is a recently-developed country some interest attaches to the custom of a share-contract in the milking industry, which has in the past given workers starting without capital a chance to work their way up to independence. The share-milking contract is a share-profit contract, made for a year. In a model draft agreement drawn up by an important dairy association, it is expressly stated that the share-milker is neither partner nor tenant of the person with whom the agreement is made. A farm and so many head of cattle are let out to the share-milker, who, under instructions from his principal, carries on a milking business for the period of the contract. It should be observed that the share-milker, while in many respects he is an employee of his principal, can also employ other persons on his own account. The census of 1921 showed 730 share-milkers (including 62 women). Of these 150 were themselves employers of labour, 355 were working on their own account but not employing others, 38 had relatives assisting them unpaid, and 180 were working for wages (in addition to their share of the profits). This seems to show that the share-milking contract is in its nature a profit-sharing contract which has nothing to do with the status of the person entering into it. The share-milking contract implies occupation of a house and farm, and from the worker's point of view provided him with living for his family during a period when living was particularly expensive; its disadvantage was that the share-milker was accustomed to move from one farm to another on a fresh contract. With the development of more continuous and scientific dairy farming it is to be assumed that share-milking contracts will cease to be used. They have been of interest as a "stepping stone for many a man to get a farm on
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1 Information supplied by the secretary of the New Zealand Labour Party.

2 New Zealand Worker, 19 Aug. 1926, and New Zealand Herald, 4 Sept. 1926.

3 New Zealand Official Year Book, p. 764.
his own account”. The share-milking contract has some resemblances to the share-farming contract of south Europe; the difference is that the capital supplied by the principal is in the form of stock rather than in the form of land.

In general, it cannot be said that the agricultural workers of New Zealand are effectively organised. Of 55,549 wage-earning agricultural and pastoral workers noted in the census of 1921 only 1,798, or about 3 per cent., were organised in registered unions; the lowest percentage of registered organisation noted in any other industry was 24 per cent. (hotels and restaurants). Saw-milling and forestry is a separate industry, and of 12,904 wage-earning workers 4,656, or 36 per cent., were organised in 1921, by far the larger proportion in saw-mill works.

(1) The New Zealand Workers’ Union is the only national union which makes provision for agricultural workers throughout the country. It has organised shearers and shed-hands, musterers, packers, and drovers, and has partially organised farm labourers, ploughmen, shepherds, harvesters, and threshing-mill employees; it is owing to this organisation that the awards referred to above have been obtained. Its total membership (6,000) also includes road and construction workers. The union is affiliated to the New Zealand Alliance of Labour. Recently an agreement has been arrived at between the union and the Freezing Workers’ Federation for the issue of a universal ticket, which will carry a worker into both industries.

(2) Flax workers are organised into four unions at Auckland, Wellington, Westland, and Southland.

REPRESENTATION AT THE INTERNATIONAL LABOUR CONFERENCE

New Zealand has not been represented at the Sessions of the Conference.

POLAND

Polish official statistics distinguish between smallholdings and large holdings; the line is drawn at 50 hectares of land (total area). According to censuses taken in 1920 and 1921, 64
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1 Information supplied to the International Labour Office by the agency of the secretary of the New Zealand Labour Party.

2 Statement supplied by the secretary of the New Zealand Labour Party.
per cent. of Polish territory is held in smallholdings, to the number of 3,300,000; of these pretty nearly one-third cover less than 2 hectares of land, the second third, between 2 and 5 hectares, and the remaining third between 5 and 20 hectares. Again, there are only 107,500 farms of an area between 20 and 50 hectares and 6,254 between 50 and 100 hectares. Moreover, while the aggregate area of the last class is only 436,466 hectares, 8,948 estates of between 100 and 500 hectares make up an aggregate area of 2,121,000 hectares, and 4,250 estates of over 500 hectares an aggregate area of 7,936,000 hectares. In other words, farms of medium size play no great rôle in Polish agriculture.

Further, 3,800,000 hectares are held by the State or public institutions.

Part of the land belonging to large estates has been let out to tenants, but as a different system has been applied when taking the census of small and of large estates these holdings have sometimes been counted twice.

Up to the end of 1925 6,886 estates with an area of 608,219 hectares had been parcelled out under agrarian reform legislation.

In 1920 135,000 holdings were granted to agricultural workers and domestic servants as part wages; 120,000 of these were less than 1 hectare in size. Holders of dwarf farms (up to 2-3 hectares) gain their principal living by outside work; holders of farms from 3 to 7 hectares their principal source of income by work on their farm, but wage-paid work is still necessary. Farms of 7 to 15 hectares are real family holdings completely absorbing the work of the farmer and his family. On farms of 15 to 100 hectares the farmer, beside his own and his family's manual labour, must also employ wage-paid workers.

The census of large estates taken in 1920 gave some information with regard to the number of workers engaged on these
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estates; the total number of workers so engaged was 620,000 \(^1\); for details see table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of estates</th>
<th>Supervising staff</th>
<th>Employed on crops</th>
<th>Employed about animals and on general farm work</th>
<th>Farm servants</th>
<th>Rural artisans</th>
<th>Seasonal workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private estates</td>
<td>15,983</td>
<td>30,367</td>
<td>177,267</td>
<td>136,868</td>
<td>49,685</td>
<td>26,904</td>
<td>180,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church lands</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>1,811</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>4,439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public property</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>1,267</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>2,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16,713</td>
<td>31,325</td>
<td>181,110</td>
<td>139,402</td>
<td>59,620</td>
<td>27,405</td>
<td>188,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The groups of agricultural workers, to be found in Poland are not uniform throughout the country. On the contrary, they differ according to whether they date back to the period when the present territory of Poland was divided up between three States. A general description cannot therefore be given; the following remarks apply particularly to the territory formerly part of Russia.

On the small farms only unmarried workers are engaged, who are lodged and boarded by the farmer and who receive, in addition, some wages in kind. This group exists also on the large estates, but is not very important (cf. table above). It is stated that this class is disappearing, because the employers prefer married workers who have their own household and who are mostly paid in kind. This class, the "deputatists", forms the most important group of agricultural workers. They receive, as part of their wages in kind, a dwelling (sometimes in a block-building), a plot of land for potatoes, and the right of keeping one or two cows. They are engaged per year. The members of their family working on the estate are paid per day.

Another group are the "komorniks", who receive a dwelling, half as much potato land, and half the amount of other wages
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\(^1\) Statistique de la Pologne publiée par l'Office Central de la Statistique de la République Polonaise. Tome V, "Grande propriété foncière". Warsaw, 1925.
in kind received by the "deputatists"; on the other hand, they receive a higher cash wage.

The day-labourers proper, sometimes called "free workers", are mostly smallholders, whose families are not able to live from the produce of their holding. They are mostly employed in forestry work and for harvest work. Besides this type of cheap labour there is a group of seasonal workers engaged from April to October. These workers are lodged by the employer, often in block-buildings, but not boarded by him; they receive part of their wages in kind. They are mostly migratory workers, coming from the mountainous parts of the country.

The wages and allowances of all groups are covered by collective agreements.

The history of the organisation of agricultural workers is not known. In West Poland it is, of course, that of the German organisation before the war. With regard to Galicia, it is stated that even in 1919 agricultural workers possessed no trade unions\(^1\).

At present there exist three unions of agricultural workers, each affiliated with a central organisation, and one independent union of horticultural workers. The unions are:

(1) The Trade Union of Agricultural Workers in the Polish Republic (Związek Zawodowy Robotników Rolnych), which is affiliated with the Federation of Trade Unions in Poland (Związek Stowarzyszeń Zawodowych w. Polsie, Soc-Dem.). This union is also a member of the International Land Workers' Federation, and has 64 branches, with about 72,000 members, of whom 52,000 are stated to be regularly contributing members. Smallholders are admitted to this union on an equal footing with agricultural workers if they perform paid work in agriculture, forestry, or similar industries on account of another person in addition to cultivating their own holdings. The committee of the union prefers, however, to organise these smallholders in separate sub-sections. In a circular to the local branches of the union an invitation was given to create smallholders' sub-sections, at the same time pointing out the need for attracting this type of cultivator.

(2) The Union of Agricultural and Forestry Workers (Związek Zrobotników Rolnych i Lesnych), which is affiliated with the Federation of Trade Unions (Zjednoczanie Zawodowe Polskie,

National). The union has five principal branches with 86,000 members. This union also admits smallholders, but again only when they perform paid work on account of another.

(3) The Christian Trade Union of Agricultural Workers (Chrzescijanski Związek Zawodowy Robotników Rolnych) affiliated with the Federation of Christian Trade Unions (Chrzescijanski Zjednoczenií Zawodowe w Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej); this union has about 21,000 members, of whom one-half are stated to be regular contributing members.

(4) The Union of Horticultural Workers (Polski Związek Zawodowy Ogrodniców), not affiliated with any central Federation.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. Bernatowicz, president of the Polish Workers' Union.

1921: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. Waszkiewicz.

1922: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. Andrzy Teller, secretary-general to the Metal Workers' Federation.

1923: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. Aloytz Kot, vice-president of the Miners' Trade Union at Kartovice.

1924: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. Andrzy Teller.

1925: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. León Lesniewski, president of the Agricultural Workers' Association in the Polish Trade Union Federation.

1926: **Workers' Delegate**: Mr. Andrzy Teller.

All nominations have been made in agreement with the National Polish Trade Union Federation.

In 1921 the Credentials Committee had to consider a protest made against the nomination of the Workers' Delegate; the credentials were confirmed.

**Portugal**

Figures of the exact distribution of land in Portugal are not available. Large properties dominate in many districts, especially in the mountainous districts of the North and South, and the dry plateau towards the centre of the Iberian peninsular. Medium-sized and small properties are frequent in the vineyard districts of the valley of the Douro and in the sea-coast districts where fruiticulture is carried on. Large properties are principally devoted to stock-keeping, while mixed farming is carried on in medium-sized properties. According to the census of 1911, the total agricultural population was nearly 3½ million...
persons, out of a total population of not quite 6 millions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employers, independent workers, paid workers (other than farm servants)</td>
<td>1,107,948</td>
<td>334,416</td>
<td>1,442,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of cultivators' families</td>
<td>533,951</td>
<td>1,404,867</td>
<td>1,938,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants</td>
<td>16,690</td>
<td>42,204</td>
<td>58,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,658,589</td>
<td>1,781,487</td>
<td>3,440,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The large estates devoted to stock-breeding employ wage-paid workers in charge of their stock and engaged during the whole of the year, and, in addition, day-labourers for the periods of the sowing and the harvests. Both permanent workers and day-labourers seem often to be attached to the farm by a contract of tenancy for a small parcel of land, the cultivation of which they combine with their work for an employer. The regular share-farming system does not seem to be very frequent; payment of rent for the parcel is, however, a payment in kind, either on a fixed or a variable basis. The medium-sized farms also engage, from time to time, day-labourers, and, if of a certain size, may even employ a permanent worker or workers. Workers, if engaged by the small farmer during special pressure of work, are paid by the day, with or without board.

The organisation of agricultural workers is regional and a certain number of organisations, each called Associacão dos trabalhadores rurais, are noted, with headquarters at Lisbon, Cabeça, Moura, Santo Bartolomeu de Messines, and Soncel.

These organisations confine their membership to the class of day-labourers and do not appear to touch the group of real small tenants. The organisations hold congresses from time to time. At one congress, which was held in September 1925, the demands were entirely devoted to the improvement of conditions which affect workers working on a contract of labour and not by way of tenancy, e.g. a demand for the eight-hour day in agriculture, against payment by piecework, and for the protection of women and children. Further demands were for the nationalisation of land, machinery, etc. The movement stands entirely to the Left.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Alfredo Franco.
1921-1926: Government Delegates only.

---

The distribution of land in Spain is a question of great importance which has given rise to many difficulties. The under-cultivation of certain areas has gone on simultaneously with the existence of great unemployment among the rural population, An important Settlement Act of 1907 has had as a result the redistribution of certain areas and their closer settlement.

The following figures are given as to the distribution of land in Spain.

In all 6,662,546 holdings have been surveyed, of which nearly 5,000,000 were less than 1 hectare and presumably cannot be counted as independent undertakings. Of holdings over 1 hectare over 1½ millions were in the group 1-10 hectares, and over 110,000 in the group 10-50 hectares. This clearly shows that smallholding is very common in Spain. As a matter of fact, large and small property is much mixed, but a rough line of demarcation can be drawn separating off a broad area, largely devoted to culture of fruits and vegetables, to the north, east, and south-east of the country, where smallholding is prevalent. Large estates, often fringed round with smallholdings, predominate in the drier centre and the west, where cereals and vine are grown.

Nearly 40 per cent. of the aggregate area surveyed was held on lease, though the proportion of the area so held differs very much in the different provinces. Share-farming is not very common and covers only 6 per cent of all holdings.

As was shown above, smallholdings are often of the nature of dwarf holdings, totally insufficient to support a family. Certain figures collected in 1924 and applying to about one-third of the country showed no fewer than 847,548 holdings producing an average income of less than one peseta a day, while another 147,710 holdings produced less than 5 pesetas a day; by contrast only 31,164 holdings produced over 5 pesetas a day. The population engaged in agriculture was, on the census of 1910, 4,220,518 persons (3,861,089 men and 359,429 women).

3 Los Ríos, op. cit.
In general, it may be said that the line between the owner of land and the wage-paid worker is not very clearly drawn. Smallholders and "intermediate" groups of cultivators are very common, and the tenancy or other contracts by which the occupation and cultivation of their plots are regulated show an enormous variety. Referring to these groups the Spanish Government has recently stated:

Spain is a country which has a very high percentage of independent workers whose economic position is not appreciably better than that of workers in many wage-earning occupations. Artisans and small tradespeople are very numerous and so are small agricultural proprietors. Each year these groups increase and it may be anticipated that in some districts new sections of small proprietors will be created. Besides, there are more than 600,000 families which cultivate land belonging to someone else without being paid wages (tenant farmers, share-farmers, etc.).

The General Union of Agricultural Workers (Union general de Trabajadores de Espana), which is one of the principal national organisations of workers, includes unions of agricultural workers. In 1926 the General Union held an enquiry among 41 of its agricultural unions in the provinces or districts of Andalusia, Aragon, Catalonia, New and Old Castile, Extremadura, Levante, Murcia, Navarre. Membership of these unions, where given, varies within the limits of 20 and 500 persons; all the unions are thus seen to be local unions. Some of them are affiliated to provincial federations. The dates of foundation of these unions are all (with one exception) subsequent to 1900, the period of greatest expansion being apparently toward the end of, and after, the war.

In reply to the specific question as to whether these unions admitted smallholders, etc., 36 answers were received, of which 12 were in the affirmative and 24 in the negative. Of the 12 unions answering in the affirmative, 2 noted that small cultivators admitted to the union worked their own holding only, and 9 noted that they took paid work on other holdings as well; 1 did not answer this question. No union had a separate section for small cultivators as distinct from wage-earning workers. Relations with smallholders in general were frequently described as "good" or "cordial".

---


Of the 24 unions which refuse to admit small cultivators, 16 noted that small cultivators in their district were accustomed to seek wage-paid work. Some of the answers were critical of the practices of small cultivators in this respect. The union of Alicante states that small cultivators are opposed to their organisation and work very long hours. The union of Acenchal (Extremadura) states that small cultivators exploit themselves in working for others. The union of La Neeva Era of Cadiz states that small cultivators often ignorantly assume the attitude of employers.

The present programmes of Spanish workers lays great stress on the need for land-tenure reform, including the need for better cultivation of under-cultivated areas, conciliation committees as between landowners and small tenants, etc., and extension of social protection legislation to wage-earning agricultural workers and to small cultivators.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919: Workers' Delegate: Mr. Francisco Largo Caballero, secretary of the General Union of Spanish Workers. 1921-1926

Workers' Delegate: Mr. Caballero.

Mr. Caballero has been nominated in agreement with the General Union of Spanish Workers (Union general de Trabajadores de Espana).

**Sweden**

It is the medium-sized and the small holding which predominate in Swedish agriculture. Nearly 50 per cent. of the arable land is cultivated in holdings having an area from 10-50 hectares, 30 per cent. in holdings over this size, and the remainder is distributed over a limited number of large estates, about 8,000. Many of these are not in the hands of private persons, but are owned by industrial companies, e.g. by saw-mill companies, iron-works, etc. There exist no less than 120,000 holdings of less than 2 hectares, whose owners or tenants must obtain their principal living from wage-paid work; in addition, many of the cultivators of the 200,000 holdings between 2 and 10 hectares

---


in area must at least supplement what they derive from their holding in the same way. But some persons classed as workers holding land have so much land that they need not seek other employment. In few countries is the line between worker and independent farmer more difficult to draw than in Sweden.

The total population engaged in agriculture in Sweden is over 1,000,000, which, according to the census of 31 December 1910, can be grouped in the following way:\(^1\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landowners and tenant farmers</td>
<td>275,212</td>
<td>27,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofters</td>
<td>59,650</td>
<td>4,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottars and other holders of small plots</td>
<td>22,658</td>
<td>10,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: occupiers of land</td>
<td>357,520</td>
<td>41,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewards, inspectors, book-keepers, etc.</td>
<td>3,092</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural apprentices</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailiffs and foremen</td>
<td>6,120</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: agricultural administrative staff</td>
<td>10,099</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married farm servants</td>
<td>25,423</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>38,289</td>
<td>51,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattlemen</td>
<td>4,961</td>
<td>2,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other agricultural workers</td>
<td>106,451</td>
<td>25,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: wage-paid workers</td>
<td>174,127</td>
<td>78,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working members of the families of:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners and tenant farmers</td>
<td>153,946</td>
<td>142,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crofters</td>
<td>28,327</td>
<td>26,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottars and other holders of small plots</td>
<td>6,605</td>
<td>8,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married farm servants</td>
<td>3,930</td>
<td>4,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: working members of families</td>
<td>192,808</td>
<td>182,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>734,551</td>
<td>302,636</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of forestry workers and timber floaters at the date of the census was 31,300. On the other hand, the Swedish Social Board estimates the number of persons finding winter employment in the forest districts to be between 100,000 and 150,000, districts of minor importance not being taken into consideration.\(^2\)

It has already been stated that some of the landowners and tenants are partly employed persons; they therefore form the bridge to the class of crofters, cottars, and holders of plots. "Crofter" is the designation used by the Swedish authorities in their English publications for a tenant-worker, called in

---


Swedish a *torpare*. Originally the crofter was a person hiring a holding and paying the rent on that holding by doing a certain number of days' work on his landlord's farm. This form of contract was in 1910 only in force on 33 per cent. of crofters’ holdings; on 10 per cent. the rent had been partly commuted for money, and on the remaining 57 per cent. wholly so commuted; this calculation did not include the crofters in Northern Sweden, who are called crofters but really own their holdings. The “cottars” are tenants of cottages without any formal obligation to carry out work for their landlords. A few generations ago they were a very poor class, but are now better off, especially in the industrialised tracts, and do not differ from the smallholding day-labourer class found in other countries. Of the crofters, cottars, and other smallholders, about one-fifth are estimated to have a holding large enough to maintain themselves and their families.

The permanent workers themselves include a group which is not without land, namely, the married farm servants. They have their own household and receive a part of their wages in kind, the so-called *stat* (whence their name *statare*), which always consists of a dwelling, usually with a plot for potatoes, and sometimes, instead of milk, an allotment for pasturing a cow.

It may be noted that there are a large number of women farm servants. It is indicated that there are 3,634 (111 men and 3,523 women) servants engaged in personal service. Swedish statistics have, of course, had to deal with the difficulty of classifying servants as either domestic servants or farm servants. “The line between farm work and domestic work is extremely vague. Nevertheless it would seem that male servants work to a predominating extent on farm work proper, while female servants are mainly employed for domestic work at the farm-house.”

In the table the group “other agricultural workers” includes

---

1 Crofters who have wholly commuted their obligation to labour for a money rent often continue to work on their landlord’s farm; although the formal connection between tenancy and obligatory work for the landlord-employer has been abolished, its influence still subsists in practice. It keeps the rent low, but at the same time tends to depress wages below their free market value. See: *Arbetartillgång, arbetsstid och arbetslöshet inom Sveriges jordbruk ar 1922 jämte specialundersökning vissa löne- och arbetsförhållanden* (Del. 1); *Idem* for 1923; (Del. 2). *Sveriges officiella Statistik; Socialstatistik Stockholm*, 1925. Summarised in the *International Labour Review*, Vol. XII, No. 4.

2 The *Swedish Agricultural Labourer*. 

members of the family of such workers engaged in agriculture; members of the family of holders of land and of married farm servants are classified separately, because it is impossible to estimate whether the work carried out by these persons is done on the farm at which they reside or whether they only lived at home and worked on the farms of others. This depends, of course, mostly upon the size of the holding.

The total estimated number of agricultural workers, when excluding smallholders on holdings of a size sufficient to support a family, and including working members of cultivators' families (but not of landowners' or tenant farmers' families) is about 400,000, but "of these only 100,000 are employed on large farms (of 50 hectares and over of arable land), and can be regarded as giving rise to agricultural labour questions in the proper sense of that term".

Swedish statistics classify agricultural workers by occupation into four principal groups, again divided into sub-groups:

(a) **Stable and cattle-shed staff**: stable foremen and cattle-shed foremen; grooms, dressers, shepherds, swineherds, etc.

(b) **Field workers**: farm foremen, head drivers, drivers, ordinary field workers.

(c) **Skilled workmen and specialised workers**: gardenerforemen, smiths, joiners, carpenters, engineers, motor mechanics, machinery mechanics, motor drivers, forestry workers, gardeners, labourers, drain-diggers, apprentices, etc.

(d) **Other workers**: lumber workers, wood-cutters, etc.

The more detailed classification does not apply to women workers; the only sub-grouping of women workers is of stable and cattle-shed staff into milkmaids and other workers.

The right of combination is unrestricted in Sweden for agricultural workers as for other workers, but until recently the Master and Servants Act of 1833 bound agricultural workers engaged under that Act to their service a whole year, always running from 24 October. This date was thus the only date on which a strike comprising all organised agricultural workers could begin; as it was just before the winter such a strike
promised small success. This Act was repealed on 25 May 1926.

In 1898 agricultural workers in Scania created a trade union in order to obtain better wages, but when those better wages were obtained the union was dissolved. In 1904 a Union of Land Workers in Scania was created, with the assistance of organised workers in Malmö. This organisation progressed rapidly in the next four years, and succeeded after several strikes, which in some cases lasted a long time, in getting collective agreements for wages and labour conditions in certain districts. The Union of Land Workers in Mid-Sweden, created in 1906, was independent of this union. Its membership was specially drawn from workers on farms belonging to industrial undertakings. The two unions were amalgamated in 1908 to form the existing Union of Swedish Farm Workers, which asked for, and was admitted to, affiliation with the Confederation of Trade Unions in Sweden. It had at that time about 10,000 members. Then came the reaction. After the agricultural workers had obtained some improvement in their wage conditions through their union, they showed less interest for their organisation and, partly owing to the influence of a strike of municipal workers in Malmö in 1908, and especially as an effect of the general strike in 1909, left the union in such numbers that its finance was undermined and further progress made impossible. The union had to withdraw from the Confederation, and it was not until ten years later, in October 1918, that, through the initiative of the Confederation, a reconstruction took place, or rather that a new Union of Swedish Farm Workers was created by amalgamation of local unions.

A year later the union had again 10,000 members. In 1918 there had also been created the Uppland Union of Farm Workers with about 4,000 members, and in 1919 for the first time a national collective agreement in agriculture was signed in Sweden. But already in the same year the agricultural workers in Mid-Sweden left the Union of Swedish Farm Workers and created their own organisation. At the same time there existed a few other small unions of agricultural and forestry workers. However, in the winter of 1921-1922 amalgamation of all these unions took place, with the exception of the Uppland Union, which is still outside the Union of Swedish Farm Workers.

---

1 K. Socialstyrelsen: Sociala Meddelanden, 1919, No. 7-8; 1921, No. 1.
A lack of centralisation seems always to have been a weakness of the land workers' unions in Sweden.

The present state of affairs is as follows.

The organisation plan laid down by the Confederation of Trade Unions (Landsorganisationen i Sverige) would assign to the Union of Swedish Agricultural Workers all crofters (torpare) and workers who are engaged in agricultural work, namely, day-labourers, gardeners, and similar persons such as smallholders and forestry workers not being employed in work which would cause them to be assigned to the Union of Forestry Workers and Timber Floaters; and to the Union of Forestry Workers and Timber Floaters all workers engaged in forestry work, such as hewers, drivers, etc., as well as timber floaters.

(1) The Union of Swedish Agricultural Workers (Svenska Lantarbetareförbundet) aims at uniting all workers engaged in Swedish agriculture in one general organisation. Every man or woman of 15 years of age, being either a farm servant, crofter, or other small cultivator, groom or cattle tender, dairy worker, day-labourer, farm-smith, farm joiner, gardener, forestry worker, etc., has the right to join the union. The union has 160 branches, with a total membership of 6,205, namely 6,131 men and 74 women. The union states that it is exceptional for smallholders who own their holding to join the union, but they are entitled to do so. On the other hand, it is very common for a crofter or tenant, provided he is forced to work, to become a member of the organisation, together with his own employees. At its last conference the union decided to join the General Confederation of Swedish Trade Unions as soon as it was found possible. The union is a member of the International Federation of Landworkers.

(2) The Uppland Union of Farm Workers (Upplands Lantarbetareförbund), with which the Union of Swedish Agricultural Workers earlier collaborated (see above). Decisions have lately been taken to examine the possibilities of a renewed collaboration.

(3) The Union of Forestry Workers and Timber Floaters (Svenska Skogs- och Flottningsarbetareförbundet) was founded early in 1918. The preamble of its constitution states that the union is an organisation which, in accordance with the organisation plan of the Confederation of Trade Unions, shall
cover the whole country and shall comprise all workers engaged in forestry and timber floating and all subsidiary work, whether they are landless workers, crofters, settlers, tenants, or owners of farms. The union has 450 branches and nearly 20,000 members. The union itself states that it operates almost entirely outside regular wage-paid labour in Swedish agriculture. Over 90 per cent. of the population group which the union tries to organise is composed of small farmers and other small cultivators, who spend a portion of their time in paid forestry or timber-floating work. These largely make use of their right to join the union; an investigation made some years ago showed that 60 per cent. of the members were either farmers or sons of farmers.

The union adds that organisations of farmers collaborating with workers’ organisations do not exist in Sweden, but that they themselves seem to have succeeded in establishing collaboration between landless and landholding persons as far as concerns the taking care of common interests in forestry and timber-floating work.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919: *Workers’ Delegate:* Mr. Herman Lindquist, president of the Federation of Trade Unions in Sweden.

1921: *Workers’ Delegate:* Mr. Edvard Johansson, secretary to the Federation of Trade Unions in Sweden. *Adviser:* Mr. Albin Hansson, secretary of the Swedish Agricultural Workers’ Union.

1922-: *Workers’ Delegate:* Mr. Arvid Thorberg, president of the Federation of Trade Unions in Sweden.

1924: *Workers’ Delegate:* Mr. Edvard Johansson.

1925-: *Workers’ Delegate:* Mr. Arvid Thorberg.

1926: *Workers’ Delegate:* Mr. Arvid Thorberg.

All nominations have been made in agreement with the Confederation of Trade Unions in Sweden.

**Switzerland**

The wage-earning agricultural worker plays only a small rôle in Swiss agriculture. The reason is that smallholding predominates, and the majority of persons engaged in the industry are holders of land and their families. Smallholdings are defined as holdings less than 5 hectares, and anything over 15 hectares is considered a large holding. In 1905 only

---

1 Thus, for example, in the annual reports on farm accounts issued by the secretariat of the Swiss Farmers’ Union (*Secrétariat de l’Union des paysans suisses*).
10 per cent. of all holdings had an area of more than 15 hectares of arable land, and only 3 per cent. one of over 30 hectares of such land. 

In the years before the war the farming population steadily declined, but the number of wage-earning agricultural workers even more markedly. In 1888 agricultural workers had made up 29 per cent. of all persons engaged in agriculture; in 1910, only 21 per cent. In 1920 the decline, both in total farming population and in number of wage-earning workers, came to a stop, but whether this marked a real change or was only the effect of the war it is as yet too early to judge.

In 1920 the number of persons engaged in agriculture was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers, i.e. landowners, tenants, share-farmers</td>
<td>206,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working members of farmers' families</td>
<td>155,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical and managing staff</td>
<td>1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm servants, agricultural day-labourers</td>
<td>96,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>459,683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the wage-earning agricultural workers 85,518 were men and 11,050 women: it is possible that, in addition, some of the 13,989 female domestic servants on farms are partly engaged in agricultural work.

The number of wage-earning workers engaged on each farm is very small and the aim of many is to become independent farmers and not to remain employees all their lives. Most agricultural wage-earning workers are unmarried; the engagement of married workers as farm servants is very rare, "but they play a rôle as day-labourers in certain districts".

Under the circumstances both the possibility of, and the need for, an organisation of agricultural workers is small. Both the Christian Federation of Swiss Trade Unions (Christlich-nationaler Gewerkschaftsbund der Schweiz) and the Federation of Swiss Trade Unions (Union syndicale suisse) state that no organisation of agricultural workers exists in Switzerland, and

---


3 E. Tschumi: "Die heutigen Arbeiterverhältnisse in der Landwirtschaft". Schweizerische Landwirtschaftliche Monatshefte, 1927, No. 3.
the last-named union adds that no attempt has ever been made in this direction. Only small groups of gardeners in 1926, about 200 in all, are affiliated to the Federation of Commercial, Transport and Food and Drink Workers (Fédération des ouvriers du commerce, des transports et de l'alimentation), which again is affiliated to the Union of Swiss Trade Unions and to the International Land Workers' Federation.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919: *Workers' Delegate*: Mr. Conrad ilg, secretary of the Swiss Federation of Metal and Clock Workers.

1921-1926: *Workers' Delegate*: Mr. Schürch, secretary of the Swiss Federation of Trade Unions.

**Union of South Africa**

Agriculture is the most important industry in the Union of South Africa. The non-European population is predominantly supported by it, and a very considerable section of the white population is also engaged therein. Of the white population over 168,000 persons (4,000 women) were occupied in agriculture (including forestry and horticulture) in 1921; this was roughly one-third of the whole white population (including wives of farmers). Of these over 121,000 were farmers, while there were between 12,000 and 13,000 wage-paid workers and about 3,000 salaried employees; the remaining 30,000 persons were working members of farmers' families.

The facts for the non-white population are still more striking. Agriculture is by far the most important industry for the non-whites, who are engaged both in farming on their own account and as workers on farms owned by whites. In the census of 1921 over 2½ million natives were entered as engaged in agriculture; the bulk were cultivators, but 368,000 were classed as farm labourers; all other occupations together absorbed less than 1 million persons. There were also nearly a million persons of Asiatic or mixed race engaged in agriculture.

Farms are usually large and there is much undeveloped pasture. The majority of farms are owned, but nearly 20,000 farms are leased and there are some share-tenancies. Figures as to areas of farms are not available.

Apart from the white farmers who are owners and tenants

---

of land, and who, as they usually employ labour, form an easily recognized group, it is not easy to classify persons engaged in agriculture in South Africa. White employees are usually managers or overseers; they receive, besides a monthly cash salary, rations and quarters, or else are accommodated in the farmer's house. There are also white foremen, usually known as "knechts".

These are, however, the only groups whose remuneration is on a regular cash basis. Contracts of labour with other agricultural workers, both native and white, are more complicated:

The industry is not yet generally on a cash basis, or even on a wage basis. . . the grades of labourer, from share-tenant to pure wage-earner, are too numerous for the rough and ready regulations which a wage authority imposes 1.

The contracts of tenancy made with the white bywoners ("neighbours") are in practice partly contracts for a supply of labour. Bywoners are cultivators who are allowed by the farmer to occupy a holding attached to his farm on condition that they cultivate the land they occupy. The continued maintenance of the bywoner system is due to a general shortage of agricultural labour, which makes it quite impossible for the farmer to cultivate his whole estate directly. The bywoner contract in this and in other ways resembles the métayage or share-tenancy contract in Europe, except that its terms are usually much less well defined, and that the bywoners do not, as do share-tenants in Europe, combine among themselves to secure better conditions:

In South Africa white labourers for wages or salaries are few in number; so are tenants at a money rent; instead there is a peculiar class, which partakes of the character both of employee and tenant. We refer to the bywoner. The terms on which the bywoner occupies land vary widely and are constantly changing. He is the natural product of the increase of population in a self-contained, almost patriarchal, pastoral community. He finds support for himself in the produce he is enabled to raise with his patron's assistance on land assigned to him by his patron; while the latter secures a more or less effective use of land that he could not effectively use himself, and a number of white assistants, without whom he would be entirely dependent on native or coloured labour. The relation under favourable conditions is one that, even to-day, meets the needs of both parties; and the system should be reformed and developed rather than extinguished. But it is often an indeterminate relation; the bywoner has security neither of tenure nor of status 2.

---

2 Ibid.
The recent report of the Economic and Wage Commissioners forecasts that the bywoners will eventually become either wage-paid labourers or regular tenants of land on a cash basis; this sufficiently shows the double character of the present contract.

With the increasing tendency towards intensive as opposed to extensive farming and the decreasing size of farms, the position of the bywoner is becoming more and more precarious. The bywoner system is being adapted to new conditions in a variety of ways. In some instances men are being taken into the employ of farmers on the basis of a share of the crops with or without a money wage, their position thus approximating to that of a farm labourer. Several instances were cited to us of bywoners who had been successful on these terms in saving sufficient to acquire for themselves a plot of land upon which to start farming on their own account.

The definition, by formal contracts, of the terms of work and conditions of tenancy, will tend to convert the bywoner into a worker for wages or into a tenant farming independently and paying a fixed rent. It will be to the advantage of all parties to hasten this transaction 1.

There are roughly 1,600,000 natives on European lands.
These natives are:
(i) squatters,
(ii) labour tenants, or
(iii) full-time servants.

The squatters still form the majority of natives on European lands. They have no fixed status, but are by custom allowed to graze so many head of cattle or to cultivate so much ground on the European’s farm, in return for which either rent is paid or more usually the head of the family contracts to serve on the European farm for a small remuneration. It is stated that squattting "involves important principles of agricultural labour no less than the leasing of land" 2.

The labour tenant may roughly be described as a labour-paying squatter whose position is regularised by a definite contract with his landlord-employer. Under the Natives Land Act, 1913, a definite contract may be drawn up under which a native can have the use of land from a white landlord-employer in consideration of binding himself to render 90 days’ service a year; he is forbidden to pay "rent... or valuable consideration of any kind other than service"; payment of a share of

1 Ibid.
2 Report of the Native Affairs Department for the Years 1922 to 1926. Cape Town, 1927; 24 pp. This publication (pp. 4-7) gives an account of the present state of landholding among natives in each of the four Provinces of the Union.
the produce is also excluded. Thus his occupation of land is
dependent on the rendering of service. Should the Native
Lands Act (Amendment) Bill now before Parliament become law
in its present form, the labour tenant will be defined as a person
"necessary" to his employer, will have to render not less than
180 days' service a year, and will be brought under the scope
of the Master and Servants Acts, under which Acts he will be
liable to penal sanctions.

Where either squatters or labour tenants (called in the 1913
Act "farm labourers") are employed as farm workers, every
sort of arrangement as to allowances (lodging, food, wine,
tobacco, coffee, sugar, shoes, old clothing, garden ground, meal,
mealies (maize), milk, meat, occasional slaughter animals,
grazing, free dipping for sheep) are made and the combinations
are endless 1. Wages wholly in kind are not exceptional, though
usually a small cash wage is given.

In recent years there has been a great change in farm labour
conditions, at any rate in the Transvaal, where the progressive
farmer prefers full-time paid labour. Such labour is governed
by the Master and Servants Acts, which exist in approximately
similar forms in each of the four Provinces. Their general
effect is to import penal consequences into what in common
law is a purely civil contract, so that the party, whether master
or servant, who commits a breach is exposed not only to an
action for damages, but to a criminal prosecution (disobedience,
wilful breach of duty, absence without leave or legitimate
excuse, drunkenness on duty, etc., on the part of the servant
and failure to pay wages or to supply food, unreasonable pro-
secutions, etc., on the part of the master).

(1) Native and coloured (i.e. mixed blood) agricultural
workers are admitted to the Industrial and Commercial Workers' 
Union. When the union was first founded in 1919 it concen-
trated on the organisation of town workers, but states that it
has recently begun to organise agricultural workers, and that
of its present membership of 60,000 one-third are employed in
agriculture. The union is not affiliated to any organisation in
South Africa, but recently became affiliated to the International
Federation of Trade Unions, Amsterdam, on condition that

1 Ibid. See Industrial and Labour Information, Vol. XIX, No. 1,
July 1926, where a short abstract of the information in the Economic 
and Wage Commission Report is given.
it agrees to unite with any national federation of trade unions of white labour that may be formed.

The policy of the union is to press for better conditions for agricultural workers, especially in regard to the legal validity of the agricultural labour contract and proper notice of its termination, and also to advocate the inclusion of agricultural workers under the Minimum Wage Act, 1925, an Act under which that industry (and domestic service) are excepted from the application of the principle of the minimum wage.

**Representation at the International Labour Conference**

1919: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Archibald Crawford, secretary to the South African Industrial Federation.

1921: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Archibald Crawford.

1922: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Archibald Crawford.

1923: **Government Delegates only.**

1924: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. Archibald Crawford.

1925: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. H. W. Sampson, ex-president of the South African Typographical Union.

1926: **Workers' Delegate:** Mr. John Curran, South Africa Mines Workers' Union.

A protest has been made at each Session of the Conference from 1919 to 1925 inclusive against the credentials of the Workers' Delegate, but the credentials have always been confirmed by the Conference.
APPENDIX

LIST OF WORKERS' DELEGATES IN STATES NOT DEALT WITH IN PART III OF THIS REPORT

A. States never represented at the International Labour Office: Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ethiopia, Liberia.

B. States represented at the International Labour Conference, but which have never sent Workers' Delegates: Albania, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Persia, Salvador, Siam, Uruguay, Venezuela.

C. States sending Workers' Delegates to the International Labour Conference, and Names of these Delegates

Brazil.
1919 : Dr. Fausto Ferraz.
1926 : Mr. Carlos Dias, member of the Committee for the Reorganisation of Printing and Newspaper Workers.

Chile.
1925 : Mr. Galileo Urzua.
1926 : Mr. Alejandro Gallegos.

Cuba.
1924-26 : Dr. Francisco Domenech Vinajeras (from the National Association of Teachers).

Greece.
1919 : Mr. Timoleon Lambrinopoulos, assistant secretary of the Greek General Confederation of Labour.
1921 : Mr. D. Cremesis.
1924-25 : Mr. Timoleon Lambrinopoulos.
1926 : Mr. Jean Kalomiris, member of the Executive Committee of the General Confederation of Labour.

Guatemala.
1919 : Mr. Manuel Moreno.

India.
1919-22 : Mr. Narayan Malhar Joshi, secretary, Social Service League, Bombay.
1922 : Mr. K. C. Roy Chowbury.
1924 : Mr. Joseph Baptista, M.L.C., vice-president of the All-India Trade Union Congress; president of the Bombay Provincial Trade Union Congress.
1925 : Mr. Narayan Malhar Joshi, joint general secretary of the All-India Trade Union Congress.
1926 : Mr. M. Daud, M.A., B.L., M.L.C., general secretary, Indian Seamen's Union, Calcutta.
Luxemburg.
1921 : Mr. Jean Wirtgen.
1925 : Mr. Pierre Krier, secretary of the Trades Union Committee of Luxemburg.

Norway.
1919 : Mr. Jens Teigen, secretary of the Norwegian Workers' Trade Association.
1921-22 : Mr. Erik Kleve (smallholder).
1925 : Mr. Jens Teigen.
1926 : Mr. Lars Chr. Steendal, secretary-general of the Association of Engineers in the Mercantile Marine.

Panama.
1919 : Mr. Andres Mojica.

Peru.
1919 : Mr. Victor Pujazon, Central International Union of Labourers.

Rumania.

Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom.
1919 : Mr. Sveta Frantz, secretary to the Labour Union of Ljubljana.
1921 : Mr. Velim Boukcheg, General Federation of Labour.
1922 : Mr. Bogdan Krekitch, secretary to the Federation of Railway Workers.
1923 : Mr. Vladima Pfeifer.
1924 : Mr. Bogdan Krekitch, secretary to the General Federation of Labour.
1925-26 : Mr. Givko Topalovitch, secretary to the Central Office of the Workers' Trade Unions.