

FOREWORD

The Committee of the Indian Merchants' Chamber have arranged to publish a series of brochures on different questions affecting Labour, the fundamental object being to get all such questions properly studied by all those who have the interests of industries at heart. With the setting up of autonomous Governments in different Provinces, there has naturally set in a movement for ameliorating the condition of Labour and for a forward Social policy. It is desirable that all the pros and cons of different questions be set forth by people who have studied these questions from a comparative point of view, and it is hoped that this series will be useful in inducing a study of such questions.

This is the first of the series and concerns "Holidays with Pay". It will be supplied free to all the Chambers of Commerce, Commercial Associations and to the Press. Extra copies can be had at a nominal price of *annas four* each from the Office of the Chamber.

While they are sponsoring these studies, the Committee of the Chamber may not necessarily be in agreement with the views contained therein which, however, being the views of men who have studied these questions, deserve all attention.

J. K. MEHTA

Secretary,

Indian Merchants' Chamber.

Bombay, April, 1938.

101384

HOLIDAYS WITH PAY

for

Factory Labourers

SYNOPSIS

Introduction.—Whether the system is new—Rapid spread due to great industrialization—Definition of—(i) “Holidays with Pay”, (ii) Labour.—History of the Movement—Some Tables for Consideration—What are the salient points in those tables—Discussions at Geneva—Draft Convention—How many countries follow—Answers from Member-states—Government of India’s reply—Discussion in the Central Assembly—Verdict.

Some Observations.—Peculiar features of Indian Labour and Industry—What Prof. List and Justice Ranade say—Efficiency of Indian Labourer compared with a European Labourer—Must be All-India Legislation—Migratory character of an Indian Labourer—Whitley Commission Report quoted.

Conclusion.—Under the circumstances not desirable and possible.

Bibliography.

HOLIDAYS WITH PAY

Introduction

The movement to give annual holidays with pay to all workers is not a product of the twentieth century; nevertheless the idea took rapid strides in this century—especially during and after the Great War, when industrialization went on with great speed.

A review of the principal features of the history of annual holidays with pay should begin with a reminder that it was long customary for craftsmen to stop work on a certain number of religious festivals—apart from Sundays—in the Christian nations and other days in non-Christian nations. It is only since modern industry aimed at the stricter regulation of labour or at least at the fullest possible use of its technical equipment that a number of these festivals have been struck off the list without compensation to the worker. More recently, since methods of rationalization have come into general use in industry and commerce and been introduced into many business offices, there has been a growing realization of the necessity of giving to workers an opportunity of relaxation and rest period without loss of earnings.

It is also supported on various other grounds viz., (i) Physiological, (ii) Social, (iii) Economical and (iv) Logical. We shall deal with these points in our study, when we discuss the problem of “Holidays with Pay” in reference to India. In the meanwhile, let us be clear what we mean by the expression “Holidays with Pay”, and the expression worker or labourer.

‘Holidays with Pay’

Although no legislation so far adopted contains a definition of an annual holiday with Pay, agreement on the meaning to be attached to the term is essential.

First of all public holidays and days of sickness and convalescence for which the employed person is paid should not be confused with the annual holiday granted to the worker so that he may have an opportunity for rest and recreation. (1)

(1) International Labour Conference. Holidays with Pay. 20th Session. 1936. 4

The Nineteenth Session of the Labour Conference defined the expression in a more elaborate way. It stated:—

‘The term annual holidays with Pay for employed persons signifies a number which shall be determined in advance in consecutive days, other than public holidays and days of Sickness and Convalescence, during which each employed person who has fulfilled certain conditions in respect of service ceases work every year while continuing to receive habitual remuneration.’ (2)

Worker or Labourer

Labourer, in economics, as in ordinary discourse is used as a name for the general body of wage-earners. It is in this sense, for example that one speaks of ‘Organised Labour.’ In a more special and technical sense, however, labour means in Economics any valuable service rendered by a human agent in the production of wealth. It includes the services of manual labourers, but covers many other kinds of services as well. (3) The division of labouring-class into different groups is not the same in India, as it is in the West; however for our present study we shall use the term labour to mean factory labour, mine labour, etc.

Section II, clause (a), (b), (c) of the Indian Factory Act XXV of 1934 defines:—

- (a) Adolescent means a person who has completed his fifteenth year, but has not completed his seventeenth year, whereas an adult implies a person who has completed his seventeenth year. (4)

Having defined the two expressions, let us now trace the history of the movement on “Holidays with Pay” and see as well the legislation enacted so far in different countries of the world. It may be mentioned here that it is not by mere study of legislation that we can know the situation, but there are other methods as well by which the regulation of “Holidays with Pay” is observed. The other methods are:—

- (i) Collective Agreements. (ii) Local Customs.

(2) International Labour Conference. Holidays with Pay. 19th Session 1935, p. 84.

(3) Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 17, Page 544.

(4) Labour Legislation in British India, Page 28.

History

In 1910, the International Association for Labour Legislation considered the question of annual holidays with Pay at its general meeting at Lugano. The officers of the Association suggested that enquiries be made into the holidays with Pay allowed in public and private undertakings. This suggestion was complied with by Switzerland, Germany and Finland, and the information obtained was submitted to the Association at its General Meeting at Zurich in 1912.

The information so collected showed that Germany, Switzerland, Finland, Denmark, Berne, Iceland had passed some laws, but the number of days so enjoyed by the labourers did not reach the number they enjoy today.

In 1926, the study published by the International Review, on this subject under Collective Agreement showed that in Europe about 19 millions of workers (40% of all total workers) were receiving annual holidays with Pay. The study also showed that miners in Canada, France, Belgium and India, till 1927, did not receive any benefit of Holidays with Pay. (5) At its Sixty-fourth Session, in October 1933, the Governing Body of the International Labour Office, decided to place the question of holidays with Pay on agenda of the Nineteenth Session of the International Labour Conference and the question accordingly came before the session for first discussion in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Conference.

Here we defer the study of the history of this movement, for a while, and read the tables attached herewith and try to find out what particular points the tables stress.

(5) International Labour Review, February 1930, Page 219.

TABLE I

Table Showing Holidays with Pay by Collective Agreement in the Textile Industry.

Country and the date of Agreement	Sphere of application	Qualifying Service	Length of Holidays	Payment
Denmark 1931 ...	Textile Workers	Each year ...	6 Working days combined with two Sundays ...	Based on number of hours excluding overtime etc., worked by the worker in the industry during the previous year, irrespective of whether he has changed his employer.
Italy 1932 ...	Cotton Workers	One year ...	6 days ...	Wage based on average earnings of 8 weeks preceding holiday.
Piacenza, Milan and Varese ...	Artificial Silk Workers ...	One year ...	6 days ...	Normal wages.
Mexico 1927 ...	Cotton, wool, etc. Workers ...	One year ...	6 days (may be given in two instalments of three days each.)	Days based on average earnings of preceding fortnight.
Netherlands 1932	Textile Workers	Six months ...	3 Working days ...	Normal wage. If both husband and wife are employed in the same undertaking, only husband is paid during the holiday.
Norway 1931 ...	Textile Workers	One year ...	8 Working days

The study points out to us one important thing.

We see that a labourer or a worker to entitle himself for a holiday with pay must of necessity put in six months or a year's work **Continuously**. Again it is only in Mexico, that we find holidays granted to labourers by instalment ; in the rest of the cases holidays are **Consecutive**. (6)

Let us study now Table No II 'Length of Holidays with Pay for Miners in Countries where the System of Holidays applies to all Miners'.

TABLE II

Length of Holidays with Pay for Miners in Countries where the System of Holidays applies to all Miners.

Country and Category of Workers	Length of Service	Length of Holidays
Czechoslovakia	1—5 Years ..	5 days
	5—10 Years ..	7 days
	10—15 Years ..	10 days
	Over 15 Years ..	12 days
Germany All Workers	After 1 year ..	3 days
	„ 2 years ..	4 „
	„ 3 years ..	5 „
	„ 4 years ..	6 „
	„ 5 years ..	7 „
	„ 6 years ..	8 „
	„ 7 years ..	9 „
Underground Workers	„ 10 years ..	10 „
	„ 15 years ..	11 „
	„ 20 years ..	12 „
Ruhr Coalfield Young persons of 15-16 years	After 1 year ..	3 days
Netherlands	After 1 year ..	2 days
	„ 2 years ..	3 days
	„ 3 years ..	4 days
	„ 4 years ..	5 days
	„ 5 years ..	6 days
Saar	After 1 year ..	3 days
	„ 2 years ..	4 days
	„ 3 years ..	5 days
	„ 4 years ..	6 days

In this table too, the most salient fact that is marked is that a miner must have necessarily put services between one and five years to entitle him for a holiday of 5 days in case of Czechoslovakia, and 2 or 3 days in Ruhr and Netherland Coalfields. (7)

Thus the chief facts brought about by the study of these two tables are:—firstly that service in a factory must be Consecutive lasting for a minimum period of 6 months and secondly that holidays would be granted not by piecemeal but at a stretch.

History Continued

The Nineteenth Session, accordingly discussed the Grey-Report prepared by the Labour office, containinig a statement of the law and practice in various countries in the matter of holidays with pay. After examination of the Grey-Report, the Conference decided to place the question on the Agenda of its twentieth session in 1936. A questionnaire was accordingly drawn up by the office and circulated to Governments of state-members.

The proposal, though highly laudable in itself did not however find a smooth sailing at the time of discussion.

Mr. Hovszowski (Polish Government representative), raised three objections to the proposal when it came for discussion. In the first place, he said that the questionnaire issued would have no better than an academic value. Secondly he said that the questionnaire was incomplete, and asked what effect would holidays with pay have on accident rate, the sickness rate, the loss of time resulting from sickness, etc.? Lastly the speaker stated that the information already existed in the report on social changes published by the office and that that point was also mentioned in the Report Committee.

Mr. Calderon (Government delegate, Mexico) expressed his surprise that the question should have been raised thus. He argued, "I consider holidays with pay to be a vital necessity to the workers and that being the case it is not necessary for us to go further into the question of economic aspects of such a measure."

At the twentieth session, the subject again came for discussion. Mr. Forbes Watson (Employers' delegate British Empire) stoutly opposed the move. In his forceful speech—full of facts and figures, Mr. Watson declared, "It is a proposal that this Conference should compel every ratifying state

(7) International Labour Review, February 1930, p. 227.

to impose upon the employers in its country in every section (8) of industry almost without exception, a rigid system of holidays with pay regardless of what it means in unemployment and regardless of what consequences may be." "My Country," continued Mr. Watson, "is an exporting country. It must export, if it is to import food and raw materials to maintain its population of 46 millions in the standard of life in which it keeps them; and I say that to ask my country to embrace this Convention is *to ask my country to commit industrial suicide*. I am going to submit to you that this is the most unfair Convention that was ever put before this Conference. I was brought up to think and I have found it to be true—and possibly some of you here have also found it to be true that you cannot take more out of a pint pot than you put inside it. My country each year puts into the National Exchequer £800,000,000 and into the exchequer of local authorities £300,000,000—a total of £1,100,000,000 a year, and what does it do with it. It takes £280,000,000, 25%, and spends it on what?—on the sick and the injured, the fatherless and the unemployed. And now I am told to take on a new burden which I estimate may cost my country £25,000,000 a year, and I am asked to do it in the name of Social justice. I am asked to transfer from the weak and the unfortunate that little they have got in order to give it to those who already are in employment—who have the greatest security this world can give to any one—the chance to work and the strength to perform it—if that be social justice," asked Mr. Watson to his audience, "then I stand here to disown it."

The Draft Convention was however passed by a large majority of 95 to 16 votes. (9)

In pursuance of the mandate of the proceedings, the I. L. O. sent the Draft Convention to various state-members for their ratification.

Here are some of the replies received by the Office.

Norway :—Decided to postpone ratification.

Portugal :—Submitted to the competent authority, 29th August 1936.

(8) The Section in short was :—

ARTICLE (I) The draft includes all places of refreshment, all places of public amusement, all trading establishments, that is every shop big or small, all newspaper establishments,—in fact every branch of occupation one can think of except agriculture estates and sea-going vessels. ARTICLE (II) deals with the length of holidays. It asks for an annual holiday of six working days for adults, and 12 for persons under 16, but adds that duration should increase with length of service.

(9) Record of Proceedings—International Labour Conference, 20th Session, p. 462.

Rumania :—Submitted to the competent authority with no proposals.

Siam :—Not at present prepared to take any action. (10)

Union of South Africa :—Ratification rejected by the competent authority. It further mentioned—“The law of the Union is not in compliance with the provisions of the Convention, *nor would the time appear to be ripe for the enactment of the legislation required to bring it into compliance.*”

Sweden :—Convention submitted to the competent authority with proposal to adjourn or reserve ratification.

Australia :—Convention submitted to the competent authority with no proposal.

China :—Convention submitted to the competent authority with no proposal.

Great Britain :—Convention submitted to the competent authority with no proposal.

Japan :—Opposed to it (Gathered from the speech of Sir F. Noyce).

Newzealand :—The same as in Great Britain.

Uruguay :—*No decision.*

Out of 51 state-members (including Germany) only 11 state-members have so far answered on the matter. Let us now see the attitude of India towards this draft Convention.

When the Government of India received this draft for ratification, the Central Government consulted the Provincial Governments and after having gathered their views, it wrote to the office at Geneva thus :—

“The Government of India believe that the principle is sound, but every sound principle of labour welfare is not capable of satisfactory general enforcement by legislative enactment. In the present case, any attempt to enforce a general system in India would meet with grave difficulties. . Much of the labour employed in industry is drawn from and maintains contact with villages at long distances from Industrial centres and a holiday would be of little value to the workers unless it made it possible for them to revisit their villages. But few

(10) The chart information says:—Ratification rejected by the competent authority.

could afford to make such a journey every year. Again, holidays would lose much of their value for the worker unless they could be taken at a time when on account of family events or other circumstances,—such as harvest work, he desired it, and for a period varying with his needs at the time. The systems in force in state establishments are nearly all elastic in the sense that holidays can be allowed to accumulate for a period of years and taken in substantial blocks. A system of this kind can be worked by mutual arrangement between the employer and the employee, but could hardly be enforced by law in any large number of establishments without extensive administrative machinery, whose cost might be disproportionate to the benefits received. Any legal system would have to be of an experimental nature, and could only be applied on a limited scale for some time to come.”

“The Government of India are therefore not in favour of any draft Convention. Any attempt to lay down detailed provisions in a convention would probably render the convention largely infructuous.” (11)

On January 26, 1937, Sir Frank Noyce (Member for Industries and Labour) moved a resolution in the Central Assembly that the Governor-General-in-Council do not ratify the draft Convention. It stated (i.e. resolution):

“This Assembly having considered the draft Convention and the recommendation concerning Annual Holidays with Pay adopted at the Twentieth Session of the International Labour Conference recommends to the Governor-General-in-Council that he does not ratify the Convention or give effect to the Recommendation.”

In the course of his speech, the Labour Minister emphasised, “I can only repeat that like a number of conclusions of the International Labour Conference, the draft Convention views the subject much too exclusively in the light of western conditions. In this country, I doubt if many of our factory workers would greatly appreciate a six or even a ten days’ annual holiday—particularly if the pay they got then represented a reduction from their wages throughout the year, as it certainly would in many cases. They will probably tell you that they would prefer longer spells away to enable them to go back to their villages, even if they did not get pay for the period. It is not only we oppose the Convention, even Great Britain and Japan too reject it.”

In support of this resolution, Sir H. P. Mody remarked,

"I also see it is stated that the holidays should be earned after one year's work regardless of whether this period has been spent in the employment of the *same or of several employers*. On economic grounds too, I strongly oppose the ratification of the draft."

Mr. N. M. Joshi pleaded that it may not be enforced, but all the same the draft may be passed to which the member for industry retorted, "I am not prepared to follow a course which is definitely dishonest." (12)

The resolution was passed.

Some observations on the subject

We thus complete our study of the Problem of "Holidays with Pay", in its historical aspect.

In the course of our study, we found that certain countries have this system working either through legislation, Collective Agreements or through custom. According to the International Labour Report 1936-37, we gather that no less than Twelve States have considered schemes of "Holidays with Pay," applying to both manual workers and salaried employees in commercial and industrial undertakings. In addition, very great number of workers enjoy annual holidays with pay by virtue of collective agreements or as a matter of custom.

Viewed in the light of this state of affairs, do we think that India should adopt this scheme? Is it advisable economically, for India to adopt this system? Supposing it is possible and advisable to adopt it—is it desirable, India should adopt it ?

The answers to these questions must be based on the peculiar conditions of Indian Labour and Indian Industry. It would not be logical to argue the case on the ground that Western Countries—some of them—have adopted the scheme under discussion, and therefore India should adopt it. To argue it in this way is to assert that economics for all over the world is uniform—which from the knowledge we have is contrary to facts. Nearly 100 years ago, List, a German professor proclaimed that every country has its own problems to deal, and there cannot be a uniform system of Economic laws. Justice Ranade pleaded the same and hence the birth of Indian Economics as a branch in itself.

The Government of Bombay, in their letter dated 19th October, 1937, besides contemplating certain schemes for Industrial workers maintain that they

propose to introduce a System of 'Holidays with Pay' to workers in factories in Bombay Presidency. To quote the relevant passage from the letter, they say:—

“..... A large number of workers in Western countries also enjoy the benefit of an annual holiday with pay, and not less than 22 countries had established by law the right of wage-earners to paid holidays every year.”*

(i) While one ought to be in favour of doing what is practicable and desirable for the advancement of social welfare of Industrial workers, one must also consider that the rate of advance is dictated by the industry's capacity to bear such schemes as visualised, by the Government, without imperilling the competitive capacity. Prof. Jathar and Beri, discussing the efficiency of an Indian labourer and a European labourer write thus:—

“In his evidence before the Industrial Commission, Sir Alexander McRobert stated that the English worker was 3'5 or even 4 times as efficient as the Indian. Sir Clement Simpson calculated that 2'67 hands in an Indian cotton-spinning and weaving mill are equal to one hand in a Lancashire Mill.” (13)

In the face of this disparity of the capacity between an Indian labourer and a European labourer, we cannot see how a western scheme can be followed with advantage in India.

(ii) Again legislation in matters like the one we are discussing must be of an All-India character, otherwise the economic effects on the industry would positively affect the cost of production in that province and probably the industry would suffer due to interprovincial competition. It is therefore of paramount importance to see that before a Provincial Government ventures to enact laws of this nature, it must be sure that an All-India legislation is foreshadowed immediately. A Provincial Government, not bearing this salient point in mind would be instrumental in digging the grave of an industry in that province!

(iii) Countries which have introduced systems of 'holidays with pay' have of necessity insisted on their labourers to work in the factories for a continuous period of six or twelve months. Is a worker in an Indian factory

* We do not know what particular annual Report the Government of Bombay rely upon when they quote that 22 countries have established by law the system of Holidays with Pay. Our authority is the I. L. O. Year Book, which gives 12 countries having answered to the draft convention (1936-37)

found to be so? The Royal Commission on Labour dealing with this aspect of an Indian Labourer remarks :—

“It is here that we strike perhaps the most fundamental difference between the Indian factory workers and the corresponding class in the West. The latter is drawn mainly from persons brought up in towns and partly from those who have abandoned the country for the towns. The Indian factory operatives are nearly all migrants. A true understanding of this position is a necessary approach to nearly all problems affecting this type of labour and we must go on to examine in greater detail the character of the contact between the village and the factory.” (14)

Profs. Jathar and Beri maintain:—

“The factory labourer in India do not constitute a wage-earning class exactly corresponding to the factory labourers in Western countries; in the latter there is a permanent class of Industrial workers completely divorced from the land and solely dependent upon their wages. In India on the other hand though there has lately been a tendency for a rise of a permanent class of factory workers in industrial centres like Ahmedabad and Cawnpore, most of our labour is *migratory in character. The average Indian factory operative is an agriculturist by preference and a factory hand by necessity.* Again increase in wages does not seem to evoke a response by way of more efficient and speedy work, but often results in increased absenteeism.” (15)

Dealing specifically on the subject of “Holidays with Pay,” the Royal Commission definitely warns and says:—

“We do not suggest that private employers should or could attempt to emulate this practice (viz., Holidays with Pay). The worker looks forward to a time when his work in the factory will be over and can return to the village for the good.” (16)

Conclusion

It appears to us then after a thorough analysis of the subject that the scheme as envisaged in the Government Circular is not possible and desirable under the present circumstances. There is no logic, economically it is unsound—socially it is harmful to the labourer himself, and if the

(14) Royal Commission on Labour, P. 11-12.

(15) Indian Economics, Vol. II, P. 91-92-98.

(16) Royal Commission on Labour, P. 18.

Government, were to try to impose the scheme on the industrialists and labourers, it would not be attended with beneficial results.

HOLIDAYS WITH PAY

Bibliography

(A) References:—

- (i) Encyclopaedia Britannica, Vol. 13, Page 544.
- (ii) Royal Commission on Labour 1932.
- (iii) Indian Economics, Vol. II.
- (iv) International Labour Conference ; Nineteenth and Twentieth Sessions: 1935-36.
- (v) International Labour Conference.
Record of Proceedings : Sessions $\frac{19\text{th \& } 20\text{th}}{1935-36}$
- (vi) International Labour Conference Year Books for 1934-35
1935-36; 1936-37.
- (vii) Legislative Assembly Debates (Central) 26th January 1937.

(B) Magazines :—

International Labour Review; articles on "Holidays with Pay" years $\frac{\text{January}}{1925}$, $\frac{\text{December}}{1926}$, $\frac{\text{February}}{1930}$, $\frac{\text{December}}{1931}$.

(C) Books :—

- (i) Factory Legislation in India.
By P. K. Mukerjee (Haelika Press, Calcutta 1937).
- (ii) General Wage Census—Third Report May 1934.

TABLE III
Table Showing the Length of Holidays with Pay in case of Commercial Employees only.

Country	Class of Worker	Qualifying Service	Length of Holidays
Greece	... (1) Salaried employees in Joint Stock companies and banks (2) Employees in offices and shops with two or more employees in town with more than 10,000 inhabitants	One year	... Fifteen days
Salvador	... Commercial Employees	One year	... Fifteen days
<i>Laws Applying to Shop Assistants only.</i>			
Gibraltar	... Shop Assistants	... One year	... Seven consecutive days.
Grenada	... Assistants in certain classes of shops	... One year	... Sixteen consecutive days.
Kenya Colony and Protectorate	... Shop Assistants	... One year	... Twelve consecutive days.
Orange Free State	... (1) Shop Assistants (2) Assistants in restaurants and similar establishments open on Sundays	... One year ... One year	... Twelve days. ... Fourteen days.
Transvaal	... Shop Assistants Assistants in shops open on Sundays	... One year ... One year	... Twelve days. ... Fourteen days.

TABLE IV
Table Showing the Length of Holidays Granted to Manual Workers only.

Country	Class of Worker	Qualifying Service	Length of Holidays
China	... Workers	... 1 year	... 7 days.
		... After 3 year	... 10 days.
		... „ 5 years	... 2 weeks.
		... „ 10 years	... An additional each day for each year's service upto a maximum of 30 days.
Luthuania	... Manual Workers	... One year	... Ten days.
Sweden	... Manual Workers in general	... The workers must have been employed all the year round without any appreciable interruption.	Four consecutive working days.
<i>Laws Applying only to Salaried Employees in Industry and Commerce.</i>			
Panama	... Salaried employees in general	... Two years	... One month.
Switzerland Tincino	... Salaried employees in technical and administrative offices of Private Industrial and Commercial undertakings	... One year	... Ten days.
Uruguay	... Salaried employees in general	... One year	... Fifteen days.
Yugoslavia	... Salaried employees in general	... Six months	... Ten days.
		... Five years	... Two weeks.
		... Ten years	... Three weeks.
		... Fifteen years	... Four weeks.
		... Twenty years	... Five weeks.

TABLE V
Length of Holidays

(1) Laws applying mainly to Manual Workers and Salaried Employees in Industry and Commerce.

Country	Class of Worker	Qualifying Service	Length of Holidays
Austria	(1) Manual workers in general	One year Five years	One week Two weeks
	(2) Young persons under 16 years of age	One year	Two weeks
	(3) Salaried employees	Six months Five years Ten years Twenty-five years	Fifteen days Three weeks Four weeks Five weeks
Brazil	(1) Workers, Members of Trade Unions	150 to 200 days 200 to 250 days More than 250 days	Seven days Eleven days Fifteen days
	(2) Salaried employees of commercial establishments, banks and Private relief institutions and employees in Commercial departments of industrial undertaking	Twelve consecutive months	Fifteen days
Czechoslovakia	(1) Manual workers in general	More than 220 days More than 288 days	Seven days 15 days
	(2) Salaried employees	One year	15 working days
	(3) Domestic workers	One year	Seven days
Italy	(1) Manual workers in general	One year	The length of the Holiday is determined by collective agreement
	(2) Salaried employees	1 to 5 years 5 to 15 years 15 to 25 years More than 25 years	10 days Fifteen days 20 days Thirty days
Switzerland (a) Basle Town	Manual workers and salaried employees	One year	6 working days
		Five years Ten years	Nine " " 12 " "
(b) Ualais	(1) Apprentices and young persons upto 18 years of age	...	Twelve working days
		(2) Wage-earning and salaried employees in undertakings to which the Federal Laws do not apply	One year

Laws applying to Manual Workers only.

TABLE VI
**Length of Holidays with pay for Miners in Countries where the System of Holidays applies only to
 Certain Categories of Workers in Mines*** (1925).

Country and Category of Workers	Length of Service entitling to a holiday	Length of Holidays
(A) Great Britain:		
(1) Coal Mining Deputies		
Derby		8 days
Notts		7 days
Lancashire		1 week
South Yorkshire		6 days
(2) Firemen		
South Wales		12 days
Leicestershire		
Somerset		1 week
(3) Clerks, foremen and weighers		
Cheshire, Lancashire		14 days
(4) Coal Mining under Managers		
Cannock Chase	12 months	14 days
(B) South Africa :		
Natal		
Transvaal		
Official underground	12 months	3 weeks to 1 month according to class
Official working at the surface	12 months	2 to 4 weeks according to class
Other workers	312 shifts	12 days

*International Labour Review, December 1931, p. 719.

TABLE VII

It Summarises the Results of Inquiry concerning the Length of Holidays to Private Employees (Netherland) 1926.*

Kind of Establishment	Less than two weeks		Two weeks or more		Period not stated	
	Offices	Employees	Offices	Employees	Offices	Employees
(1) Banking	20	200	168	9,509	6	4
(2) Insurance	12	82	68	2,718	2	23
(3) Metal Industry	32	440	49	4,023	6	49
(4) Shipping	35	538	67	3,405	9	162
✓(5) Printing	30	227	47	680	2	35
(6) Various offices	426	2,865	644	11,628	65	251
Total	555	4,352	1,043	31,963	90	524

*International Labour Review, December 1931, p. 719.

TABLE VIII

**Laws applying principally to Manual Workers and Employees in
Industry and Commerce.**

Country	Qualifying Service	
Austria	Workers	One year
	Employees	Six months
Brazil	Workers	150 days
	Employees	One year
Chile	Workers	220 working days
	Employees	Twelve months
Czechoslovakia	Workers	One year
	Employees	Six months
Italy	Workers	One year
Latvia	{ Workers }	Six months
Mexico		One year
Peru		260 working days
Poland	Workers	One year
	Employees (1)	Six months
Rumania		One year
Spain		One year

(1) Employees means such as Managers, Directors, Engineers, Technicians, Designers and Superintendents.

X: 953.2.N6

101384 98