### Newsletter on the Common Agricultural Policy

No. 8

June 1968

### Contents

The agricultural labour force in the EEC

			Page
Τ	"Inta	l population and civilian labour force	6
ſ I	The a	agricultural labour force: structure and trends	10
	1	Definition	10
	?	Grends by industrial status	10
	2 a	Entroduction	10
	Ъ.	Developments	13
	2	"to trend by age group	22
	ۍ د ا	The spectation of a second of	22
	? ŀ	"Generation pressure"	27

Council	<u>directiva</u>	on the	markuting -	5 <u>?</u>	material	l`or	the				
nsexual	multiplic:	ation o	f vinestock				: <b>0</b>	• •	••	<b>e</b> 13	33

Published by the Division for Agricultural Information in collaboration with the Directorate-General for Agriculture of the European Communities Commission — 129, rue Stévin, Brussels 4

- 2 -

### TABLES

### Page

1	Total population on 1 January 1967, by country and for the	
	whole Community	6
2	Civilian labour force by sector in 1965 (%)	7
3	Working population in the EEC, by sector (numbers and %) 1960-65	8
4	Working population in agriculture in the member countries (numbers and %), 1960-65	9
5	Permanent agricultural labour force, by sex (numbers and annual average % decline, 1950-63)	11
6	Permanent agricultural labour force in the EEC, trend between 1950 and 1963 and relation between categories	٦٨
		*4
7	Permanent labour force by industrial status	15
8	Farmers, by country and sex (numbers and $\%$ )	16
9	Family workers (numbers and %)	17
10	Paid workers (numbers and $\%$ )	18
11	Permanent labour force by industrial status	19
12	Age groups in farm population	25
13	Agricultural labour force, by age, sex and industrial status	23
14	Data relating to "generation pressure"	27
15	Ceneration pressure in EEC member countries	28
16	Average decline, by industrial status (%)	32

PREFACE TO PART A

- 3 -

The problems of agricultural structure in the European Community are rousing more and more interest. The adjustment of the structure of farms and production to the altered situation on a large unified market demands all our efforts.

Before this can be tackled at Community level, we must have a general view of the current situation and the natural trend.

In Part B of this study, to be published later, an attempt will be made to draw preliminary conclusions from this survey that can be related to the common agricultural policy.

The Editors.

,

A. Pays du Benelux - de Benelux-landen - Paese del Benelux - Bonelux-Länder prov. = provence(s)/provincie(s)/provincia(e)/Provinz(en) N 1 prov. Friesland, Groningen, Drente N 2 prov. Overijssel 4 Gelderland N 3 prov. Noord-Holland, Zuid-Holland, Utracht N 4 prov. Zeeland N 5 prov. Noord-Brabant, Limburg. Bl prov. Antwerpen, Limburg B 2 prov. West-Vlaanderen, Oost-Vlaanderen B 3 prov. Brabant B 4 prov. Henegouwen, Namen B 5 prov. Luik, Luxemburg Le Grand Duché Luxembourg/Groothertogdom Luxemburg/Gran Duca Lussemburgo/ L Grossherzogtum Luxemburg. B. République fédérale d'Allemagne - de Bondsrepubliek Duitsland - Repubblica federale di Germania - Bundesrepubliek Deutschland Reg.bez. = Regierungsbezirk/Regierungsbezirk/Regierungsbezirk/Regierungsbezirk D 1 Schleswig Holstein D 13 Reg.bez. Koblenz, Montabaur, D 2 Hamburg Trier D 3 Reg. bez. Lüneburg, Stade D 14 Reg.bez. Pfalz, Rheinhessen D 4 Bremen D 15 Saarland D 5 Reg.bez. Oldenburg, Aurich D 16 Reg.bez. Nord-Baden, Nord-Wirt-D 6 Reg. bez. Osnabrück, Detmold temberg D 7 Reg.bez. Hannover, Münster D 17 Reg. bez. Süd-Baden, Süd-Württem-D 8 Reg.bez. Hildesheim, Braunschweig berg D 9 Reg.bez. Düsseldorf D 18 Reg.bez. Unterfranken D 10 Reg.bez. Köln, Aachen, Arnsberg D 19 Reg.bez. Mittelfranken, Oberfran-D 11 Reg.bez. Kassel kən D 20 Reg.bez. Oberpfalz, Niederbayern D 12 Reg. bez. Wiesbaden, Darmstadt D 21 Reg.bez. Oberbayern, Schwaben C. France: Répartition en "régions programmes" (le département de la Corse est détaché de la région programme F 21) Frank-: Indeling in "régions programmes" (het departement Corse is apart beschouwd van région F 21) rijk Francia:Ripartizione in "régions programmes" (dipartimento delle Corsica e distaccamento delle regione programma F 21) Frank-: Einteilung in "régions programmes" (das Departement Korsika ist getrennt reich vom Region F 21 aufgeführt) F 1 Nord F 12 Bourgogne F 2 Picardie F 13 France Comté F 3 Haute Normandie F 14 Poitou Charente F 4 Région Parisienne F 15 Limousin F 5 Champagne F 16 Auvergne F 6 Lorraine F 17 Aquitaine F 7 Alsace F 18 Midi Pyrenées F 8 Bisse Normandie F 19 Languedoc F 20 Rhône Alpes F 9 Bretagne F 21 Provence Côte d'Azur F 10 Pays de la Loire F 22 Corse F 11 Centre

D. Italie : Répartition en "regioni" (le Val d'Aoste est joint au Piemont) Italie : Indeling in "regioni" (Valle d'Aosta is bij Piemont gevoegd) Italie : Ripartizione in "regioni" (la Val d'Aasta è giunta al Piemonte) Italien : Einteilung in "regioni" (Valle d'Aosta wurde Piemonte hinzugefügt) I l Piemonte I 10 Umbria I 2 Liguria I 11 Lazio I 3 Lombardia I 12 Campania I 4 Trentino - Alto Adige I 13 Abbruzzo Molise I 5 Veneto I 14 Puglia T 6 Friuli - Venezia Giulia I 15 Easilicata I 16 Calabria I 7 Emilia Romagna I 8 Marche I 17 Sicilia I 9 Toscane I 18 Sardegna নন্দ্র D'1 D2 D3 D22 △ B = Belgique D7 D6  $D = B_R$ D8 N4, Deutschland D9 B D11 82 D10 F = FranceB3 F1 I = Italia 84 D12 D13 D18 L = Luxembourg F2 D19 F3 D14 N = Nederland F8 D 20 D16 F5 F6 F4 F 9 D17 D21 F10 F11 F12 F 13 F14 Ι6 F 15 F16 13 I 5 F 20 11 17 F 17 Ì2 F 18 F21 F 19 19 I 11 530 I18 I16 I 17

- 5 -

6 \_ 7 368/X/68\_E

### THE AGRICULTURAL LABOUR FORCE IN THE EEC

### I. Total population and civilian labour force

The total population of the EEC on 1 January 1967 was approximately 184 million - a 0.9% increase on 1966.

There are considerable differences in the annual growth rate of population from one member country to another, as can be seen from the table below.

Table 1: Total population on 1 January 1967, by country and for the whole Community

	Total ('000)	%	increase on 1966	Births (per '000 popula- tion)	Deaths (per '000 popula- tion)
Germany	59 793	+	0.8	17.9	11.5
Belgium	9 5 <b>5</b> 6	+	0.6	15.9	12.1
France	49 650	+	1.0	17.4	10.6
Italy	52 150	+	0.7	18.5	9.3
Luxembourg	333		-	15.7	12.2
Netherlands	12 -535	+	1.3	19.2	8.1
EEC	184 017	+	0.9	18	10.5

Source: EEC, Exposé sur l'évolution de la situation sociale dans la Communauté en 1966.

The factors affecting population trends vary considerably, of course. Here, however, the emphasis will be placed on economic and social factors.

Particularly when considering the trend of the civilian labour force, it can be assumed that economic factors have played a major part. The civilian labour force in the EEC totalled 74.3 million in 1966. Developments between 1960 and 1965 are given in Table 3, which shows that the increase lagged behind

(%)

that of the total population. In 1966 the civilian labour force was 40% of the total population. This figure is a point on a declining curve.

- 7 -

The following table shows that there are substantial differences between Community countries in the distribution of the labour force among the various sectors.

			n an
Agriculture	Industry	Services	Unemployed
			- <b>Manada ya kutu kutu kutu kutu kutu kutu kutu kut</b>
11	49	39	1
6	45	47	2
18	39	42	1
25	39	32	4
14	45	41	-
9	42	48	1
3	47	47	1
6	31	58	5
	Agriculture 11 6 18 25 14 9 3 6	Agriculture         Industry           11         49           6         45           18         39           25         39           14         45           9         42           3         47           6         31	AgricultureIndustryServices11493964547183942253932144541942483474763158

Table 2: Civilian labour force by sector in 1965

Source: SOEC, Basic Statistics of the Community 1966.

Figures are given for Britain and the United States to give an idea of how the situation may develop in the member countries.

Agriculture accounts for a bigger share of the labour force in Italy and France than in the other member countries, where the percentage employed in farming is already considerably lower.

	Numbers	('000')	% of	total	Average annual % change
	1960	1965	1960	1965	1965/60
Agriculture	14 210	11 873	19.6	15.9	- 4.4
Industry	30 367	32 465	42.0	43.5	+ 1.3
Services	27 791	30 345	38.4	40.6	+ 1.8
Total	72 368	74 638	100.0	100.0	+ 0.6

## Table 3: Morking population in the EEC, by sector

Source: Forecasts of economic trends in the EEC until 1970 (Report, April 1966)

7 368/x/63-5

.

From the figures in Table 3, we can see that industry and services are taking a growing share of the total working population while the share of agriculture dropped 4.4% between 1960 and 1965.

9

There are substantial differences in the trend from country to country, as the following table shows.

	Numb	pers ('000)	% of t	otal	% change
	1960	1965	1960	1965	1965/60
Germany	3 623	2 970	13.8	10.9	- 3.9
France	4 029	3 370	20.7	17.0	- 3.3
Italy	5 850	4 950	30.8	25.3	- 5.6
Netherlands	429	356	10.4	7.9	- 4.2
Belgium	257	208	7.7	5.9	- 4.4
Luxembourg	21.9	18.7	16.4	13.5	- 3.2
EEC	14 210	11 873	19.6	15.9	- 4.4

### Table 4: <u>Working population in agriculture</u> in the member countries

Source: Forecasts of economic trends in the EEC until 1970 (Report, April 1966)

The annual decline ranges from 3.2% to 5.6%. The biggest decline between 1960 and 1965 was in Italy, which is also the country with the biggest proportion of the labour force in agriculture. Belgium, where the proportion is smallest, also shows a rapid decline corresponding to the EEC average.

A more detailed analysis of trends in the agricultural labour force is given in the following section.

### II. The agricultural labour force: structure and treads

### II. 1. Definition

Before undertaking a closer analysis of the structure of and trends in the agricultural labour force, we should perhaps define the major categories used in the statistics.

We will mostly be referring to the <u>permanent agricultural labour force</u>. This means those employed regularly in agriculture for at least half of their working year of 2 400 hours.

The major categories in the breakdown by industrial status area farmers - those responsible for the day-to-day operation of the farm; <u>family</u> <u>workers</u> - all those related to the farmer who normally live on the farm and do agricultural work without receiving regular remuneration; <u>paid agricultural</u> <u>workers</u> - those doing agricultural work on the farm for which regular wages are paid.

### II. 2. Trends by industrial status

### II. 2 a Introduction

Between 1950 and 1963 there was a general sharp decline in the permanent agricultural labour force - from 16.4 million down to 9.9 million. This was a

Table 5:	Permanent	agricultural	labour	force,	by	sex
----------	-----------	--------------	--------	--------	----	-----

						*****			('000')	
	Mal	Le		Female	9			Total		
	1950 1960	1963 Change 1963/50	1950	1960	1963	Change 1963/50	1950	1960	1963	Chang 1963/50
Germany	2 275 1 471	1 294 - 981	1 329	834	<b>9</b> 86	- 343	3 604	2 305	z 280	- 1 324
France	3 252 2 635	2 090 - 1162	1 960	1 436	849	- 1111	5 212	4 071	2 9 <b>39</b>	- 2 273
Italy	5 185 3 841	3 032 - 2153	1 363	1 400	1 012	- 351	6 548	5 241	4 0 <b>44</b>	<del>-</del> 2 502
Netherlands	4 091 352.2	310 - 3781 l	66.6	53	45	- 21.6	475.7	405.2	35 <b>5</b>	- 120
Belgium	326.9 226.7	190.3 - 136.6	187.1	112.5	66	- 121.1	514 <sup>.</sup>	339.2	256.3	- 257
Luxembourg	18.3 12.9	10.8 - 7.5	17.2	9.5	8.7	- 8.5	35.5	22.4	19.5	- 16
EEC	11 466 8 539	6 927 <b>- 45</b> 39	4 923	3 845	2 967	- 1965	16 389	12 384	9 <b>8</b> 94	- 6 495
Source: SOEC	, Agricultural St	atistics 1965/5.								
		Annual ave	rage % dec1:	ine					•	
		Male		Femal	e			Total	-	
Jermany France Italy Notherlands Belgium		4.1 3.4 4.1 4.0		2.3 7.8 6.3 2.3 5.0				3.5 5.2 4.4 3.6 4.5 2.2	• •	
Luxembourg EIC		2.2		2.8			-	3.8		

----

`---

- 12 -

drop of 40% - an annual average of 3.8%. Table 5 shows that the decline affected all Community countries, though the percentage varied from one country to the next. Mith some reservations this can be termed a favourable trend. To gain some insight into the factors determining this trend, we should first consider the situation on the farms themselves. Since the war there have been substantial technical developments in agricultural production, resulting in a large increase in output and productivity. The movement of wages and incomes in agriculture, but even more in industry and services, has radically altered the position of workers. Job opportunities outside agriculture were very numerous for a long time. Living conditions and the social position of the farming population consequently underwent considerable changes: the traditional patterns and set structures of rural society were disrupted.

On the whole, the isolation of the countryside was brought to an end mass communications and improved transport made it much easier for contacts to develop between life and work in the towns and on the farms. First of all this made people mor aware of existing differences and then induced them to endeavour to level the differences out. 13 - 7 368/X/68-E

This trend could be seen in the changeover from agricultural to nonagricultural occupations and in the flow of people leaving the land and settling in the towns.

Seasonal variations ensure that the trend does not proceed at a steady rate. Opportunities to find work outside agriculture are closely bound up with the increase in the number of ovacancies in industry and services. Account must also be taken of appreciable differences in the impact of these developments according to industrial status, sex and age. Although we do not go into this matter here, it can be assumed that developments will also vary according to region and type of farm within the Community (see Map IV).

### II. 2 b Developments

The proportion of farmers to other categories of worker is going up in all Community countries. That of family workers is on the decline, and since 1960 that of paid farmworkers has been relatively stable.

۰.

The absolute decline in the number of farmers has moved at much the same rate since 1963 as it had before. The sharpest decline was in Belgium.

The category of male family workers showed the fastest decline in Belgium, followed by the Netherlands and Italy. The decline in the number of female family workers was sharpest in Belgium, Italy and France.

	Male farmers	Female farmers	Male family workers	Female family workers	Male paid workers	Fomale paid workers	Total
Numbers in				· · ·	· ·	•	
1963 ('000)	3 854	362	1 501	2 269	1 572	336	9 894
<sup>1</sup> of <b>total</b> in 1963	38.95	3.66	15.17	22.93	15.89	3.40	100
Decline 1950-63 ('000)	1 441	242	1 683	1 129	1 215	585	6 495
2 <b>decline</b> 1750-03	27	40	. 55	33	44	64	4C
6 linear leclinc per year	2.4	3.9	6	3	4.4	7.6	3.8
Source: SOF	EC, Agricul	tural Statis	stics 1965/5	)			
Total fan	nily worker	s (including	g farmers)	······································	Male	)	Female
Numbern i	in 1963 ('O	<b>0</b> 0)		· · · · · · · ·	5 35	5	2 631
# and tate	2 <b>1</b>				c -	54.12	26.59
10 J. 6000					3 12	рл	1 371
Decline 1	1950-63 (•0	) ( 000			J 14	-4	- 5(-

· · · ·

# Fable 6: Permanent agricultural labour force in the EEC, trend between 1950 and 1963

.../...

ì

J

### - 15 -

Table 7: Permanent labour force by industrial status<sup>1</sup>

	· · · ·		<b>D</b> e			Б. <u>-</u> -	mi 1							
	·	··· •• •	rarm	ers	1. <b>a</b>	ra	ni ly	worke:	rs	r:	ald W	d workers		
		<b>19</b> 50	1955		1963	1950	1955	1960	1963	1950	1955	1960	1963	
	Germany	46	53	58	60	33	28	27	27	21	19	15	13	
	France	54+	54	58	60	22+	22	19	23	24+	24+	23+	17	
Males	Italy	40	41	48	49++	32	32	24	19++	28	27	28	32++	
	Netherlands	54	54	57	63	24	24	21	17	22	22	22	20	
	Belgium	59	63	67	75	32	28	23	15	9	9	11	10	
	Luxembourg	39	45	50	58	46	43	40	32	15	12	10	10	
	EEC	47	48	53 	55	29 	28	23	22	24	24	24	23	
	Gormany		<u> </u>	8	10	70	71	80	84	22	18	12	6	
	France	16+	15	16	10	72	75	75	88 88	11+	10+	<u>т</u> с От	3	
_	Italy	1-3	15.	17	) 16++	57	63	65	60++	30	22	18	24++	
sacles	Netherlands	-5	6	8	7	89	91	90	91	· 6 · · ·	·	- 2	. 2	
	Belgium	12	12	17	27	85	86	81	- 69	3	2	2	4	
	Luxembourg	4	5	6	6	93	92	92	93	3	3	2	1	
	EEC	12	13	15	12	69	72	72	77	19	15	13	11	
	Germany	32	37	40	39	47	44	46	51	21	19	14	10	
	France	40+	39	43	45	41+	42	39	42	19+	19+	18+	13	
otal	Italy	35	35	<b>4</b> 0	41++	37	39	35	29++	28	26	25	30++	
	Netherlands	47	48	50	56	33	33	31	26	20	19	19	18	
	Belgium	42	43	51	62	52	51	42	29	6	6	7	9	
	Luxembourg	<b>2</b> 2	26	32	34	69	66	61	60	9	8	7	6	
	EEC	36	38	42	43	41	41	38	38	23	21	20	19	

+ Certain assumptions and approximations have been made for France; see Agricultural Statistics 1965/5, p. 23.

++ For Italy approximations have been made for 1963 on the basis of samples;

Table 8: Farmers by country and sex 1

ì

(1950 = 100)

	<b>.</b>			******	··		• <u>-</u> • • • • •								,
,		Ma.	le			1	Temal	Ð	,		T	otal			
•	1950	1955	1960	1963	%	1950	1955	1960	1963	%	1950	1955	1960	<b>1</b> 963	ç,
Germany	100	97	81	74	-2.3	100	100	85	119	+ 1.	3 100	97	81	77	- 2
France	100	93	86	71	-2.6	100	83	73	25	-10.	0 100	92	84	64	- 3.
Italy	100	91	88	71	-2.6	100	109	133	94	<del>~</del> 0,	5 100	92	92	72	- 2.
Tetherlands	100	98	91	89	-0.8	100	94	120	<b>8</b> 6	- 1,	2 100	98	92	89	- 0.
Belgium	100	89	79	73	-2.4	100	99	87	80	- 1,	,8 100	90	80	74	<del>-</del> 2.
Lauxembourg	100	94	90	86	-1.2	100	100	86	71	- 2.	6 100	95	90	85	- 1.
EEC	100	93	86	73	-2.4	100	94	93	60	- 34	9 100	93	87	71	-2.0
···· ~	~ ~				<b>-</b>										
	·			. <u>N</u>	umb	eri	3 ('	000)							
			Me 1					 ס					Tota	1	

	1950	1960	1963	Decline	1950	1960	1963	De	cline	1950	1960	1963	Declin
Germany	1057	853	783	274	81	69	96	+	15	1138	922	879	259
France	1750	1513	1251	499	320	234	79		241	2070	1747	1330	740
ltaly	2087	1842	1475	612	177	236	166	-	11	<b>2</b> 264	2078	1641	623
Netherlands	219.5	300	196	23.5	3.5	4.2	3	-	0.5	223	204.	2 199	24
Belgium	194.1	153.3	142.	6 51.5	22	19.1	17.6	6	4.4	216.	1 172.	4 160	<b>2 55 .</b> 9
Luxembourg	7.2	6.5	6.	2 1.0	0.7	0.6	0.5	5-	0.2	7.	9 7.	16	.7 1.2
EEC	53 <b>15</b>	4568	3854	1441	604	563	362		242	5919	5131	4216	17703

- 17 -

Table 9: Family workers

												(	1950	= 100	)
	<b>.</b>	Maj	le				F	emale				Т	otal		`
-	1950	1955	1960	1963	%	1950	1955	1960	1963	%	1950	1955	1960	1963	6 <sup>1</sup> 10
Germany	100	72	53	47	5.6	100	80	6 <b>9</b>	86	1.2	100	76	62	69	2.8
France	100	93	70	67	3.0	100	93	75	52	4.9	100	93	73	57	4.2
Italy	100	89	55	35	7.8	100	106	117	78	1.9	100	95	75	48	5.5
Netherlands	100	96	76	53	4.8	100	87	81	69	2.8	100	93	78	59	4.0
Belgium	100	72	49	26	9.8	100	95	57	29	9.1	100	86	54	28	9.3
Luxembourg	100	77	61	42	6.5	100	80	54	51	5.0	100	79	57	48	5.5
EEC	100	<b>8</b> 6	58	45	6.0	100	92	82	67	3.0	100	89	70	56	4.4

Numbers ('000)

		Ma.	le ·	•		- Fer	nzle			Tota	al	
-	1950	1960	1963	Decline	1950	1960	1963	Decline	1950	1960	1963	Decline
Jermany	744	391	346	398	9 <b>5</b> 6	661	825	131	1700	1052	1171	529
France	732	513	491	241	1430	1068	743	687	2162	1581	1234	928
Italy	1675	918	5 <b>8</b> 0	1095	777	910	606	171	2452	1828	1186	1266
Motherlands	99-5	76	53	46.5	59	47.5	41	18	168.5	5 123.	5 94	64.5
lolgium	105.1	51.7	27.8	77.3	160.1	90.6	<b>45</b> •7	114.4	265.2	2 142.	3 73.5	5 191.7
Luxembourg	8.4	5.1	3.5	4.9	16	8.7	8.1	7.9	24.4	1 13.	8 11.6	5 12.8
YEC	3364	1955	1501	1863	3398	2786	2269	1129	6762	4741	37 70	2992

)

1

)

- 18 -

Table 10: Paid workers

			·····												~
		Ma	le				Fe	male				т	otal		
-	1950	1955	1960	1963	%	1950	1955	1960	1963	%	1950	1955	1960	1963	8 <u>1</u> 10
Germany	100	77	48	35	7.7	100	64	36	22	11.1	100	72	43	30	8.8
France	100	92	<b>7</b> 9	45	6.0	100	87	64	13	4.0	100	91	76	38	<b>7.</b> 2
Italy	100	86	76	69	2.8	100	72	62	59	4.0	100	83	73	66	3.1
Metherlands	100	94	85	68	2.9	100	49	32	24	10.4	100	92	82	66	3.1
Belgium	100	86	<b>7</b> 9	72	2.5	100	76	56	54	4.6	100	84	75	69	2.8
Juzembourg	100	67	48	41	6.6	100	80	40	20	11.8	100	69	47	38	7.2
EEC	100	86	72	56	4.4	100	73	54	36	7.6	100	83	68	51	5.0
			<u>,</u>	N	umb	) <del>0</del> T	<b>s ('</b> 0	00)							
		-	Male		<b></b>			Fem	ale		anger ben fan men		Tota	 al	<u></u>
	19	50	1963		Decli	ne 1	1950	<b>1</b> 96	53	Decli	ne	1950	) ]	.963	Dec li
												•			· • · •
Germany	47	4	165		309		292	e	55	227		766	5 2	230	536
France	77	0	348		422		210	2	27	183		980	) 3	75	605

$\sum_{i=1}^{n}$									
EEC	2787	1572	1215	921	336	585	3708	1908	1800
Luxembourg	2.7	1.1	1.6	0,5	0.1	0.4	3.2	1.2	2
Belgium	27.6	19.9	7.7	5	2.7	2.3'	92.6	22.6	10
Nethorlands	90.1	61	29.1	4.1	1	3.1	94.2	62	32.2
Italy	1423	977	<b>4</b> 46	409	240	169	1832	1217	615
France	770	348	422	210	27	183	980	375	605

Source:

-

1

j

SOEC, Agricultural Statistics 1965/5.

..../...

### Main-d'ocuvre permanente par statut (1)

### Répartition en pourcentage par statut (chefs d'exploitation, aides familiaux, ouvriers salariés), main-d'oeuvre permanente totale = 100

Vasto arbeidskrachten naar positie in bedrijf (1)

Percentuele verdeling naar positie in bedrijf (bedrijfsnoofden, medewerkende gezinsleden, betaalde arbeidskrachten), totale aantal vaste arbeidskrachten = 100

Manodopera permanente per statuto (1)

Ripartizione in percentuale per statuto (dirigenti d'azienda, coadiuvanti familiari, lavoratori salarizti), manodopera permanente totale = 100

Ständig beschäftigte Arbeitskräfte nach der Stellung im Beruf (1)

Aufteilung in prozentualen Anteilen nach der Stellung im Beruf (Betriebsinhaber, mithelfende Familienangehörige, Lonnarbeitskräfte), Gesamtzahlt der ständig beschäftigten Arbeitskräfte = 100

Tab. 11

١

		Chefs d'exploitation	Aides familiaux	Ouvriers salaries	
		56/57 60/61 64/65 66/67	56/57 60/61 64/65 66/67	56/57 60/61 64/65 65/67	
	<u>A.</u>	<u>51 56 58 59</u>	30 28 28 28	19 16 14 13	
		50 55 60 63 66	50 55 60 63 66	50 55 60 63 66	
	<u>F.</u>	59 57 59 60 61	22 24 24 23 22	<u>19 19 17 17 17</u>	
		62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	<u>62 63 64 65 66</u>	
	1.	48,2 48,9 50,4 51,4 51,4	21,5 19,5 18,2 19,0 18,1	30,3 31,6 31,4 29,6 30,5	
		-1962 1965	1962 1965	1962 1965	
М.	P8.	61,3 65,5	20,9 18,1	17,8 15,4	
		62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	
	8.	74,7 75,6 76,6 77,2 78,0	19,6 17,8 17,1 16,4 15,5	5,7 6,6 6,3 6,4 6,5	
		1961 1966	1961 1966	1961 1966	
	ι.	52,8 56,9	34,7 32,0	12,5 11,1	
		56/57 60/61 64/65 66/67	56/57 60/61 64/65 66/67	56/57 60/61 64/65 66/67	
	٨.	7 6 7 7	84 88 86 89	9 6 5 4	
		50 55 60 63 66	50 55 60 63 66	50 55 60 63 66	
	F.	14 13 12 11 10	79 80 81 84 85	7 7 7 5 5	8
		62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	. 8
	۱.	16.0 16.0 17.1 16.4 17.7	58,6 56,1 56,5 59,1 58,0	25.4 27.9 26.4 24.5 24.3	
		1962 1965	1962 1965	1962 1965	
F.	P8.	- 4.3	- 94.2	- 1.5	م أ م
•		62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	nag Se la
	в.	24.0 26.1 26.3 26.5 29.3	74,2 71,9 71,8 71,3 68,2	1,8 2,0 1,9 2,2 2,5	c a c c c c
	*••	1961 1966	1961 1966	1961 1966	
	٤.	10,3 8,2	87,5 89,7	2,2 2,1	Å65 ogn es
		56/57 60/61 64/65 66/67	56/57 60/61 64/65 66/67	56/57 60/61 64/65 66/67	ein ein
	۸.	28 29 29 29	58 61 62 63	14 10 9 8	ດ <u>ເ</u>
		50 55 60 63 66	50 55 60 63 66	50 55 60 63 66	ant. Ian
	F.	40 42 44 48 50	45 43 40 38 36	15 15 14 14 14	ۍ به ه به د د آن ه
		62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	i ff end ene
to-	۱.	38,9 39,0 40,7 41,8 42,4	32,2 30,6 29,3 30,0 28,8	28,9 30,4 30,0 28,2 28,8	e de la d
tal		1962 1965	1932 1965	1962 1965	di di
	P8.	- 51,3	- 35,8	- 12,9	e e e e
		62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	62 63 64 65 66	0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
	8.	61,2 62,5 63,7 64,5 66,6	34,1 32,0 31,2 30,1 27,9	4,7 5,5 5,1 5,4 5,5	die die
		1961 1966	1961 1966	1961 1966	
	L.	34,4 35,3	57,6 57,6	8,0 7,1	

(1) Source : "Statistique Agricole" 1965 nº 5 de l'Office Statistique des Communautés Européennes

(1) Bron : "Landbouwstatistiek" 1965 nº 5 ~ Bureau voor de statistiek der Europese Gemeenschappen

(1) Fonte : "Statistica Agraria" 1965 nº 5 - Istituto statistico delle Communita Europee

(1) Quelle : "Agrerstatistik"

1965 nº 5 - Statistisches Amt der Europäischen Gemeinschaften.

**~** - 19 -

Le pourcentage de diminution entre les deux dates de recensement, divisé par le nombre d'années. La moyenne nationale de chaque pays tombe dans la catégorie D. La diminution moyenne par an est de 2,5 % pour le Benelux, 2,8 % pour l'Allemagne et la France et 3,3 % pour l'Italie.

Afnamepercentages tussen beide teldata (zie kaart IX) gedeeld door het aantal jaren. Landelijk gemiddelde voor elk land valt in categorie D. Gemiddelde afname per jaar is voor Benelux 2,5 %, Duitsland en Frankrijk 2,8 % en Italië 3,3%

Percentuale di diminuzione fra le due date dei censimenti divisa per il numero di anni. La media nazionale di ogni paese ricade nella categoria D. La diminuzione media annuale è del 2,5 % per il Benelux; 2,8 % per la Germania e la Francia e del 3,3 % per l'Italia.

Der Prozetsatz der Verminderung zwischen den beiden Daten der Zullung, geteilt durch die Anzahl der Jahre. Das nationale Mittel eines jeden Landes fällt beträgt 2,5 % für die Benelux-staaten, 2,8 % für Deutschland und Frankreich und 3,3 % für Italien.





Benelux B.R. Deutschland

Italia

France

λ	1,7	2,0	2,0	2,5
B	1,8 - 2,0	2,1-2,3	2,1-2,3	2,6 - 2,8
C	2,1-2,3	2,4 - 2,6	2,4-2,6	2,4 - 2,6
D	2,4 - 2,6	2,7 - 2,9	2,7 - 2,9	3.2 - 3.4
E	2,7 - 2,9	3,0 - 3,2	3,0 3,2	3.5 - 3.7
F	3,0-3,2	3,3 - 3,5	3,3 - 3,5	3,8 - 4,0
đ	3,3 -	3,6 -	3,6 -	4,1 -

- 21 -

The biggest decline in the number of male paid workers was in Luxembourg and the Netherlands. Female paid workers showed the biggest decline in France after 1960.

The trend for casual workers - a category not yet considered - has been much the same as that for regular paid workers since 1963 except in Italy and in France. The trend in Italy has been very irregular since 1960, though there was a constant decline, and after 1964 this was at a higher rate for female workers in particular. The trend in France was the opposite to that for regular workers until 1963, which resulted in a relative increase. After 1963 numbers declined substantially especially in the case of female workers.

The tables on pages 15 to 20 show the trend within the various categories of the agricultural labour force. There was a relative increase in the number of male farmers - as in the number of female family workers. This last category, however, includes the wives of farmers. If it is assumed that the percentage decline in other female family workers is comparable with that of male family workers and that the number of wives is greater than the number of other female family workers, then the relative increase in the share of female family workers indicates that wives are taking on a growing share of the work on farms. There is good reason to think that this is in fact what is happening. - 22 - 7 368/X/68-E

In certain areas of the Community the number of one-man farms is going up. Male farmers are beginning to work outside agriculture, leaving their wives to take over on the farm. So there is a causal link between the trend of the different categories and the increase in the number of one-man farms (a point we shall come back to later).

### II. 3 The trend by age group

II. 3 a The age chart

ī

Here we can use the chart drawn by the SOEC showing the age distribution of the EEC farm population in 1960.<sup>1</sup>

The age groups above 50 are shown to be relatively bigger than the other age groups.

The chart is based on the figures in the table on page 23. More detailed analysis shows that:

- (i) the share of the categories above 60 is substantial, with rather more for males than for females;
- (ii) the distribution of farmers and of male family workers shows a typical relationship in the 20 to 30 age group and the 30 to 40 age group; in 1960 the average age for beginning to run a farm was over 30;
- (iii) the relation between the number of male family workers in the 20 to 30 age group and the farmers in the 50 to 60 age group can be considered favourable, since there are appreciably fewer in the first category; this is of great importance for the "generation pressure", which we shall be discussing below.

Because certain figures are lacking, the various age groups must be moved up eight years if the current situation as regards age structure is to be assessed. Répartition par classe d'âge (1)

Population active agricole, par âge, sexe et statut, en milliers (1960)

Indeling naar leeftijdsklasse (1)

Beroepsbevolking in de landbouw, naar leeftijd, geslacht en positie in bedrijf, in duizendtallen (1960)

### Suddivisione per gruppi di eta (1)

Popolazione attiva agricola, per età, sesse e qualifica in migliaia (1960)

Aufteilung nach Altersklassen (1)

Landwirtschaftliche Erwerbspersonen nach Alter, Geschlecht und Stellung im Beruf im Jahre (1960)

Tab. 13

)

		Hor	nmes	49 <u>9</u>		Fen	mes			Ensemi	ole			%	
Age	Chefs expl.	Aid <b>e</b> s fam.	Sal <u>a</u> riés	Ense <u>m</u> ble	Chefs expl.	Aides fam.	Sala- riées	Ense <u>m</u> ble	Chefs expl.	Aides fam.	Sal <u>a</u> riés	Ensem ble	Ho <u>m</u> mes	Fe <u>m</u> mes	En sem- ble
14 - 19	18	510	261	789	5	391	103	499	23	901	364	1288	8	8	8
20 - 29	250	757	537	1543	52	833	184	1069	302	1590	721	2612	17	17	17
30 - 39	864	377	603	1845	129	949	190	1268	993	1326	793	3113	20	21	20
40 - 49	980	108	411	1499	197	794	151	1143	1177	902	562	2642	16	19	17
50 - 59	1454	76	466	1997	250	865	139	1253	1704	941	605	3250	21	21	21
60 - 64	599	34	120	753	111	275	29	414	710	309	149	1167	8	7	8
65	691	116	94	900	131	247	27	406	822	363	121	1306	10	7	9
	4856	1978	2492	9326	875	4354	823	6052	5731	6332	3315	15378	100	100	100

- (1) Source : "Statistique Agricolé' 1965 n° 4 de l'Office Statistique des Communautés Européennes
- (1) Bron : "Landbouwstatistik" 1965 nº 4 Bureau voor de statistiek der Europese Gemeenschappen
- (1) Fonte : "Statistica Agraria" 1965 nº 4 Istituto Statistico delle Communita Europee
- (1) Quelle : "Agrarstatistik" 1965 nº 4 Statistisches Amt der Europäischen Gemeinschaften

	;	1		$C = \frac{1}{2}$	+	1	1	(		1	1			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·	i					1 .	· · · · ·	,		1			
1	•					÷ .	<u> </u>	{	· ·			_ ·>u	_			• ·			·					<sup>+</sup>	<u></u> }-	···-	' <del>}</del>	
							!	<u> </u>		! <u> </u>	<u> </u>	- 27			1			<u> </u>							┨╍┿			
-	÷							1	1						1				1 '				.i	ļ				
						1	i			1	1				   		   	1 : 1						· 1				<u> </u>
	1	.	1 :		; <u>-</u>	1		Î										1	1			1	1	1	1 1	I.		
	1			[				1																				
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1	4	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		. <u>.</u>	¦	•	• · · ·						 	+	<del>-</del>					;	1			<u> </u>	
		Kaart	II		1	1		· ·	1		1				<b>4</b> - 1		···								1			
•••								<b>↓</b> ↓									ļ	<u> </u>						<u> </u>	┼─┼			
-					1.	ł			Dumo	ni da	aram					( 10F	01	1.1.1							╂			
		<u> </u>		ļ	 	<u> </u>	1 :		TATE	ii ue	u ak	e ue	1.01			(1)	<b>v</b> )											
	1			Ι.	1				1_ 1		1 :									ļ	-1+						_	
		Tammor	] .					;-	Leef	ti j <u>d</u> s	່ງງາວ	nide	van	le Ce	ncen	schar	<b>(</b> 1.96	<u>0}:</u>					1 1	Gnime	6			
			1	1	1	1				1	1				i	1									ſ i			
		– Manner	1 ·	: 		1			Pire	nide	d'et.	A del	la C	oruni	tà (	1960)							~ \	Poun	en			
		I. Itomini			<u></u> .	↓ <u>↓</u>			1						<u> </u>	1	· · · ·						- 1	STINE				1
		- 0 ¢111.111	1	· · · · · · ·					Alte	rsnvi	ami d	a für	die	Geme	insc	haft	( 196	0)				• • • • • •			t-1-			
		– Männer	<b></b>	<b> </b>				min	111117		Innn			111111	11111	11111	<u></u>	╤┼╴		+	<b>-</b>			<u>2816</u>	<u>n i</u>		+	
					ļļ			illi li	illith.	XIIII	iiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii	Ag	e	illilli:	HIII I			<b>↓</b> <u>+</u>			••••••			<u> </u>				
				1	I	;		IIIII.	(IIII)	TIII	uuu	Leei	tija	IIII.	IIIII	IIIIA	////			<u>      -</u>	i	·		<u> </u>	1			<u></u>
								iiiii.		XIIIIX	illilli.	Et	a	IIII.				1		1	.			·		1: 1: 		回世
								illilli	illithe an	illili	illilli	ALU	er	illli	illiti					1.1			1					
									IIIII.	IIIII.			<b>7</b>	<u>IIII</u>	IIIII			1					4			16		- 111-
						1			illille	illili	iiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii	i sa	160	IIIII.	HHH	illilli		1-1-	,									
			inne		inne	inni i	innn	HH	HHH -	<i>iiiii</i>	iiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii		104	iiiiii	<i>iiiin</i>	tti th	n XIII.	inni.	<u>iinn</u>	(IIII)	inn.	nin	<u>III</u>	anne				1.
			HHH.				IIIII.	IIII.				50	150	IIIII.		illith.		illit.		IIIII	IIII	IIII.		illilli		- [	亡日	
		0111118	11111	<i>}}}}}</i>	<i>4444</i>	HHH.	HHHH	HHH		<i>41111</i>	HHHH			HHH.	<i>#}}}}</i>	HHH	HHH.	<i>HHH</i>	HHH.	<i>4111</i> 4	HH	<del>/////</del>	HH.	HAM.	<u> (</u>		+	
							IIIII.	illilli	illille.	IIIII	illik.			illille.		iiiiii.	IIIII.	IIII.	HIII			IIII.	m	<u></u>		-+		
			:		<u>IIII</u>	<u>IIIII</u>	<u>IIIII</u>	11111	<u>IIIII</u>	<u>IIII</u>	<u>ann</u>	<b>4</b> 0	/49	$\overline{\eta}\overline{\eta}\overline{\eta}$		<u>UM</u>	<u>IIIII</u>	ШÜ	11111	11111)	ΗÜ	<u>III</u>	444	Щ.,			$\square$	
-									IIIII.				1	illille.	illilli	IIIII			IIIII			IIII.	1111	ann a' an a'				
	ł				IIIII.	IIIII.		IIIII	IIIII.		HIII	30	1/39	illilli		illille	IIIII.	IIII			IIII	1111		<u>IIIII</u>			<u>+</u>	
				<u>illilli</u>	<u>IIIII</u>	<u>MM</u>	<u>IIIII</u>	<u>IIIII</u>	<u>MM</u>	illilli	<u>MMM</u>			IIIII.	IIIII.			IIII.		IIIII	MU	INN.		F. 4		1		1.1
	•				illilli				illilli		illilli	20	129	IIIIII.	illitti				IIIIII			IWI:						1.111
		·†			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	, 777.277	1	iiii ii i	<del>iiiiii</del>	iiiiii	iiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiiii		· ··· ·	ittitti.	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	iiiiiii	, illiti	1	<u></u>	1 1	1 :	<u>~~~~</u>	3	1				
			}	4		- '					illilli.		140	illilli						· [·· ] - · ·			· • • • • • •	<u>-</u>			-	
		······		1		·	l		hnnn	<u>unn</u>	771111	14	7.19	711111	mm	, illilli	1000	<b>_</b>	-+ <u>-</u>							-	+ +	
		1		:	i		<b>j</b> .		<b>;</b> .	Ì						4		<u>⊢</u> ∔										
1 						i 		·	L				:		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	[		ļ		<u></u>			1	<u> </u>	_∔			<u> </u>
	d		ĺ	l i		Í.	1		:		: : ;							11			1			L				
	70		1	1	1								. 1		]								$  _{ }$		1		j	16
•	2	2 20 18	1 1	6 1	4 1	2	10	8 6	1	4	2				2	4 6	7	8	10	12 1	14	16	11	3 2	0	22		
		· · · · · · ·			1	:			•••••		1					<b>  </b> <sup>::</sup>		1-1-		· • • • • •				(				ह्यम
, 			<u></u>	<u> </u>	·	+		<u> </u>					<u>.</u>	<u> </u>			+	┼──┼─						<u>i −1</u> −−−− 1 −−−1				11111
	· • • •	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				<u> </u>						<b> .</b>					<u> </u>	+		-	-1			t				
L						1 i .	1.1			1 :	F. F	1.1	1		<b>1</b>	<u> </u>	<u> · 1</u>			1.		<u> </u>	1	1		<u>e 1</u> ::	لتثنك	

- 25 -

....

A breakdown by member country from more recent figures shows rather substantial differences in the relations between age groups (see Table 12).

			-
Germany	15 to 45	45 plus	
1960	47.97	52.03	
1964	53.17	46.83	
France	less than 40	40 plus	
1954	42.91	57.09	
1962	39.28	60.72	
Luxembourg	less than 40	40 plus	
1961	33.73	66.27	
1966	34.25	65.75	
Italy	less than 40	40 plus	
1962	40.76	59.24)	
1967	41.68	58.32)	
Netherlands $^2$	less than 40	40 plus	
1962	43.54	56.46	
1965	42.86	57.14	

Table 12:	Age groups	in farm	population
-----------	------------	---------	------------

Working population

1

2

Male workers only.

In France, Luxembourg and Italy the proportion of the farm population in the older age group has increased sharply - and this is true up to a certain point in the Netherlands too. The change in Germany is the biggest. If the relatively sharp decline in the 45 plus age group were to continue in the long term, the prospects for structural adaptation would be good. However, it must be borne in mind that this picture is somewhat distorted since farms do not always become vacant when farmers leave agriculture. A considerable proportion of those leaving the land keep their farm on, either because their wives run the business or because they combine work on the farm with work elsewhere ("Zuerwerbsbetriebe" and "Nebenerwerbsbetriebe"). - Nombre de chefs d'exploitation (H + F) par aide familial masculin (1960-1962)

Ì

- Aantal bedrijfshoofden (M + V) per mannelijk medewerkend gezinslid in de landbouw (1960 1962)
- Numero degli indipendenti (M + F) per coadiuvantie familiari maschili (1960 - 1962)
- Anzahl der Betriebsinhaber im Verhältnis zu den männlichen Familienangehörigen (1960 1962).



- 20 -- 26-

27 **-** 7 368/X/68-E

#### II. 3 b "Generation pressure"

The index of "generation pressure" indicates the relation between the number of potential successors to farms and the number of farmers who will have to leave before the farm can be taken over by the younger generation. Each country has its own methods and ages for beginning to work in agriculture, for taking over the management of a farm and for retirement (see Table 14).

		Germany	Belgium	France	Italy	Luxem- bourg	Nether- lands
Aver	age age for:			<u></u>			<b></b>
(a)	beginning work	15	15	16	14	15	15
(b)	starting to manage a farm	31.5	30	34	32	30	30
(c)	retirement	64.5	65	65	65	64	65
Year	ទ	156/57	'62	165	'61	'61	<b>'</b> 59
Gone	ration pressure	1.02	0.55	0.66	1.72	1.30	0.91
Year	S	<b>'66/6</b> 7	<b>'</b> 66	<b>'</b> 66	'65	<b>'</b> 66	<b>'</b> 65
Gene	ration pressure	0.81	0.42	0.60	1.44	1.15	0.57

### Table 14: Data relating to "generation pressure"

Source: Information from member countries.

In theory succession presents no problem if the number of successors equals the number of those who wish to hand over the management of farms. In these circumstances the generation pressure will equal unity.

No direct comparison between member countries is possible on the basis of the data in Table 14: the years to which the figures apply are too divergent. So that some comparison can nevertheless be made, the following method of calculation is employed:<sup>1</sup>

.../...

The principle of calculation is taken from Maris and Reinveld, "Bedrijfsopvolging en beroepskeuze in de land- en tuinbouw" (LEI, The Hague, 1959).

1

28 -

If it is assumed that:

- (a) the starting age for work in agriculture is 15
- (b) the average age for starting to manage a farm is 32
- (c) the average age for retirement is 66,

then young male<sup>1</sup> workers will on average be active for 17 years as family workers and then for 34 years as farmers. So each year one seventeenth of the potential successors will become farmers and one thirty-fourth of farmers will cease to run farms.

### Generation

# pressure: number of male family workers 17 (number of years between 15 & 32) 34 (number of years between 32 & 66)

Thus calculated, the generation pressure for the member countries is shown in the table below.

	1950	1963
-		
Germany	1.31	0.79
France	0.71	0.74
Italy	1.48	0.71
Netherlands	0.89	0.53
Belgium	0.97	0.35
Luxembourg	2.1	1.03
EEC	1.14	0.71

Table 15: Generation pressure in EEC member countries

1 The number of female potential successors is very small, seen relatively, and can therefore be disregarded.

- 29 -

### 7 368/x/68-E

It must be pointed out immediately that this method can only provide an approximation to the real situation. Moreover, comparison between the countries can only be made if we assume complete mobility of labour within the Community and a similar structure of farming in all member countries. In actual fact, this is by no means the case, of course.

The table shows that the generation pressure has declined in five out of the six countries. It has gone up in France. In 1963 the lowest figure was in Belgium, the highest in Luxembourg. Map III gives a picture of the result if calculations are carried out for the different regions.

The highest generation pressure in Italy is in the centre and south, and the values are fairly high also in southeastern Germany, southwestern France and Brittany.

In Belgium and the Netherlands the number of family workers has dropped so rapidly that there is a considerable gap between the number of farmers wishing to leave their farms and the number of potential successors. In Germany the pressure is highest in Middle and Upper Franconia, Upper Bavaria and Swabia and in Osnabrück/Münster. These are areas in which there are many small family farms.

In Italy the figures go from 1.5 to 2.5 in Emilia-Romagna, Tuscany, the Marches and Umbria in the centre and in Apulia, Basilicata and Calabria in the south. Small holdings, concealed unemployment and high seasonal unemployment usually accompany high generation pressure.

In France too there are large differences from region to region. Normandy, the Paris region and the Mediterranean coast have a generation pressure of less than 0.30, while Brittany, Aquitaine, Limousin and South/Pyrenees have between 0.57 and 0.78. - 30 -

Apart from regional differentiation, account should also be taken o' the size of farms. As no details are available at Community level, figures from the different member countries' statistics are given here.

In 1965 the situation in Germany was as follows:

Size	:	0.5 - 21	ha 2	- 5 ha	5 - 7	ha 7 ·	- 10 ha	10 <b>-</b> 20 ha
Generation pressure: 0.41			0.38		0.62		•77	0.98
			20	- 30 ha	30 <del>-</del>	50 ha	50 ha j	olus
			]	.20	1.1	.2	0.97	
In 1959 in Belg	gium:							
Less than 5 ha	5.	- 7 ha	7 - 1	0 <b>ha</b>	10 - 1	5 ha	15 - 20	) ha
0.38	0.6	58	0.8	19	1.10	)	1.35	5
			20	– 30 ha	a 30	) - 50 h	<b>a</b> 50	ha plus
				50		1.66	1.	77
In 1963 in Fran	nce: <sup>1</sup>							
l ha	1 -	2 ha	2 <b>-</b> 5	he.	5 <b>-</b> 10 h	ia l	0 <del>-</del> 20 ha	a
0.06	0.0	 07	0.16		0.22		0.66	
			20	- 50	ha 50	) - 100 (	ha 100	ha plus
				1.21		1.61		1.75
In 1965 in the	Netherla	2 ands:						
Less than 5 ha	a 5.	- 10 ha	10 -	- 15 ha	15 -	<b>-</b> 20 ha		
0.22		0.41	(	0.65	0.	.82		
		20 -	30 ha	30 h	a plus			
		0.	82	0	.69			

Italy and Luxembourg are missing because no series of this kind were available. A comparison of the figures shows that there are still considerable differences even if the size of farm is taken into account. Farms with a small area have a considerably lower generation pressure than bigger farms in all four countries.

- 31 -

Although in present circumstances this may be termed a favourable phenomenon in view of the need to eliminate small (and often submarginal) farms, the prospects for the future are not so good. For it may be assumed that a large proportion of the bigger farms (especially those of ten to twenty hectares), which are those where the generation pressure is high, will become insufficiently viable also in the near future.

The importance of the figures for generation pressure differentiated by size of farm must also be seen in relative terms. The foregoing might give the impression that only purely demographic factors are significant. ....This is not so: the type of farm (intensive, extensive, livestock, arable) may also be important. And not all demographic factors have been taken into account: for instance, consideration should be given to the age of farmers. Young children of farmers are not covered by statistics until they are fifteen years old, though they should naturally be considered potential successors before they reach this age.

For big farms the determination of age margins (when a person starts work, etc.) must take into account the position of successors, which is different in small farms. In many cases they do not begin work until they are older, because they are studying or taking courses, etc.

)

1

)

١

The link between generation pressure and the number of one-man farms was referred to above, when we saw that between 1950 and 1963 male family workers had declined 6% and male and female paid workers 5% while male and female farmers had only gone down 2.6%. This points to a decline in the average number of workers per farm. The number of one-man farms must therefore have increased.

Average decline by industrial status 1, 2

Table 16:

32 -

				(%)
		Family workers (male)	Paid workers (male and female)	Farmers (male and f rale)
Germany	1956/57 1966/67	5.6	9.2	3.4
Belgium	1962/66	10.5	2.2	4.3
France	1950/66	2.2	4.2	2.7
Italy	1962/66	8.2	4.8	2.7

1 The figures relate to total agricultural labour force.

2 No data were available for the Netherlands or Luxembourg.

.../...

### - 33 -

# COUNCI DIRECTIVE ON THE MARKETING OF MATERIAL FOR THE ASEXUAL

### MULTIPLICATION OF VINESTOCK

At its 31st session on 9 April 1968 the Council adopted the Commission's proposal for a directive on the marketing of material for the asexual multiplication of vinestock. This is the sixth directive on seeds, following those on the marketing of beet seed, herbage seed, cereal seed, seed potatoes and forestry reproductive material. Further proposals for Council directives are being prepared by the Commission.

This latest directive, unlike the preceding ones, makes specific reference to Article 43 of the Treaty only: the reference to Article 100 is omitted because Germany abstained in the voting in the Council.

Although the vine (Vitis L.), as an asexual perennial, occupies a special place in agriculture, the present text has nevertheless been based on the general outline of the previous directives.

It is, however, confined to material obtained and marketed within the Community. Material produced outside the Community is deliberately excluded; the Council will have to lay down rules on this subject by qualified majority vote no later than 31 December 1969.

The directive requires member countries to restrict marketing to the categories of "basic reproductive material", "certified reproductive material" and "standard reproductive material". All three categories must officially satisfy the criteria of varietal identity and purity by means of checks on the crop. However, the category of "standard reproductive material" is to be abolished gradually, so that eventually only material obtained by clonal selection will be marketed.

There will be official controls on the health as well as on varietal identity and purity. The rules for grading (diameter, length) are included

1 Official gazette of the European Communities No. L 93, 17 April 1968, pp. 15-23.

الأرابية والمرورة

- 34 -

in the provisions on external characteristics.

Like the directive on forestry reproductive material, this directive contains no provisions on official sealing of packages and bundles or on official marking. These operations will fall to the persons responsible for the material. Labels and colours (white for basic material, blue for certified material and dark yellow for standard material) are to be uniformly laid down.

Here, as in the previous directives, each member country is to draw up a list of varieties qualifying for approval or inspection on its territory. They must be distinguishable from other varieties and be sufficiently homogeneous and stable. The directive leaves in abeyance the matter of restrictive lists, which exist in some member countries and which require that varieties can profitably be grown. These lists are to be included in a Community catalogue of varieties. It will also have to be decided whether the requirement of profitability should not be dropped and the matter of selection settled when rules for cultivation are introduced. Geological data should be taken into account first of all, and these will sometimes vary considerably within the Community.

Member countries where no vinestocks are normally cultivated or where reproductive material is not normally marketed need not institute procedures for official approval or carry out controls on standard reproductive material. However, they will still be obliged to restrict trade to officially approved or controlled reproductive material.

For asexual material for vinestocks obtained within the Community only such marketing restrictions relating to control, marking and sealing as **are** laid down in the directive will be valid from 1 July 1969. Reproductive material of this kind will thus be freely marketable within the Community provided there is no restrictive list in any member country.

The member countries will be obliged to check materials with a view to ensuring identity from the point of gathering to that of delivery to the wine grower. This directive - like the directives on herbage seed - provides for Community tests for judging the quality of reproductive material. Initially the tests will be aimed at harmonization of methods for the approval of certified material and the control of standard material, so that comparable results can be achieved.

- 35 -

The Standing Committee on Agricultural, Horticultural and Forestry Seeds and Seedlings set up by the Council on 14 June 1966 will be consulted on these tests and on other matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission.