CHAPTER - IV

Profiles of child labour households

In the foregoing chapter we presented the profile of the study village and the slum where-from the child labour came as our respondents. We tried to show that child labour occurred only in the families of landless agricultural labour and some marginal farmers. We have also observed that not all the children of marginal farmers were labourers. Even among marginal farmers, general caste households do not throw up any child labour. The presumption that child labour household generally cannot provide two square meals a day for all the members of the households was valid in case of the study households. Many of these household-heads are aware of the dangerous consequences of child labour. Even then they send their children to the labour market.

In the past, and even now the structure in our society consists of various caste groups which are organised in a hierarchical order. Each caste tries to pursue some occupations in a hereditary fashion and so any transgression of such occupational boundaries are discouraged. Due to such negative sanction, the aspirational-motivational level of the caste people in the realm of social and economic achievements remain static and low. That is how the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes are treated as of lower social status and so their children are pushed to labour force.

We would now try to present the details of the situation in child labour households in both urban and rural areas.

These data are on population-demography, literacy, occupation, income, consumption, savings and asset formation.

URBAN AREA (TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM) :

We already introduced the Tiljola Pub Para Slum area of Calcutta previous chapter. Now let us introduce the child labour households of this slum.

In this context it would be worthwhile to discuss as to where from these households came to live in this city slum. All these households had rural background. They migrated to the city of Calcutta from across several neighbouring States, especially from Bihar and from the neighbouring districts of West Bengal. Most of the Biharis come from Chapra, Purnea and Darbhangha districts, whereas the Bengalees came from 24 paraganas, Nadia, Midnapore and Burdwan. 24 parganas by now was divided into two districts viz., North and South 24 paraganas. Households living in this slum came from both parts , viz., Joynagar, Diomond Harbour, Amtala in the South and Bangaon, Ranaghat and Machhlandapur in the North. So, geographically speaking as of now our subject came from three districts of Bihar and 5 districts of West Bengal. There is a commonality among all these households regarding the reasons of migration that is to say there was lack of employment in the village and they could not eke out their living. So, they came to the city in search of employment . Most of the households so migrated were either landless or had very little land of their own.

Demography :

These households do not necessarily have one child only in the age group of 5 years to 14 years. Incidentally, only one child has been thrown to the labour force by the 50 households under study. They belong to different caste of Hindu community as well as to Muslim community. We found 29 such Hindu households of whom only 6 belonged to Scheduled caste and the rest to the General

caste. Muslim households were 21 in number. In this connection, it can be noted that out of 50 households 47 households belong to nuclear family type and only 3 households are joint. There is one joint family in each of the General Caste, Scheduled Caste and Muslim communities. The sex ratio among the population is a bit unusual in the sense that women constituted only 35.97 percent of the total population. The explanation to this fact may be found in only male migration to the urban slums from villages spread in the countryside. The average family size in the slums of the child labour households is 5.06. The size of General caste households in only 4.39. Muslim's average family size is 5.85. The family size of Scheduled caste is 4.83 whereas a Hindu households is of the size 4.48 (vide Table No. 4.U.1).

Table 4.U.2 gives the break up of population by age group and by sex where from we find that out of 78 belonging to 5 years to 14 years age group 50 were child labour. During the time of enumeration it was found that 64.10 per cent of this group has been forced to child labour . It may be interesting to note that within this group girl children are less than 25 percent of the boys (15 out of 63).

Literacy :

Table 4.U.3 gives that the population above 5 years are 232 out of a total population of 253. Literacy among these 232 population is very low , 23 out of 82 female and 96 out of 150 male are literate. Again among them 18 female and 80 male are just literate. Only 16 male and 5 female ever went to primary school. Therefore the level of literacy was very low not only compared to rural area but also compared to other level of aggregates.

Table 4.U.4 gives that among the 5 years to 14 years age group only 42 out of 63 male and 6 out of 15 female are literate. Of these again, only 30 male and 3 female

TABLE 4.U.1 : HOUSEHOLD, POPULATION , AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE AND TYPE OF FAMILY OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLD BY COMMUNITY AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM

Community		No. of House-hold	Population			Average Family Size	Type of family	
			Male	Female	Total		Nuclear	Joint
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Hindu	General Caste	23	70 (69.31)	31 (30.69)	101 (100.00)	4.39	22	1
	S.C	6	18 (62.06)	11 (37.94)	29 (100.00)	4.83	5	1
	Sub total	29	88 (67.69)	42 (32.31)	130 (100.00)	4.48	27	2
Muslim		21	74 (60.16)	49 (39.83)	123 (100.00)	5.85	20	1
Total/Overall		50	162 (64.03)	91 (35.97)	253 (100.00)	5.06	47	3

The column header spans: "No. of households, population by sex, average family size and type of family of child labour households by community"

Note : S.C. = Scheduled Caste ; Figures in parentheses indicate percentage .
Source : ॑॑ Primary Data (1996)

TABLE 4.U.2 : DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION BY AGE , SEX AND BY COMMUNITY OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM

Community		Population			below 5 years			5 years to 14 years			above 14 years		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
Hindu	General Caste	70	31	101	2	2	4	32	5	37	36	24	60
	S.C	18	11	29	2	0	2	6	2	8	10	8	18
	Sub total	88	42	130	4	2	6	38	7	45	46	32	78
Muslim		74	49	123	8	6	14	25	8	33	41	35	76
Total		162	91	253	12	8	20	63	15	78	87	67	154

Source : Primary Data.(1996).

TABLE 4.U.3 : LEVEL OF LITERACY AMONG POPULATION (OF 5 YEARS AND ABOVE) BY SEX AND COMMUNITY OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM

Community		Population (5 years and above) of child labour households			Population (5 years and above) of child labour households by literate and illiterate												
					Illiterate			Literate			Level of literacy					
											Just literate			Primary (Class I-IV)		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(0)	(1)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)
Hindu	General Caste	68	29	97	7	15	22	61	14	75	51	11	62	10	3	13
	S.C.	16	10	26	3	6	9	13	4	17	11	3	14	2	1	3
	Sub total	84	39	123	10	21	31	74	18	92	62	14	76	12	4	16
Muslim		66	43	109	44	38	82	22	5	27	18	4	22	4	1	5
Total		150	82	232	54	59	113	96	23	119	80	18	98	16	5	21

Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.U.4 : LEVEL OF LITERACY OF CHILDREN (5 YEARS TO 14 YEARS) OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY SEX, COMMUNITY AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM.

Community		Population (5 years to 14 years) of child labour households by literate and illiterate											
		Illiterate			Literate			Standard of literacy					
								Just literate			Primary (Class I-IV)		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Hindu	General Caste	3	1	4	29	4	33	21	2	23	8	2	10
	S.C.	1	2	3	5	0	5	4	0	4	1	0	1
Sub-total		4	3	7	34	4	38	25	2	27	9	2	11
Muslim		17	6	23	8	2	10	5	1	6	3	1	4
Total		21	9	30	42	6	48	30	3	33	12	3	15

Source : ibid.

are just literate. Here we see that out of 78 children only 12 boys and 3 girls ever visited primary school inspite of existence of free primary school in the area (many Free-primary schools in the city get no students. Better-off families send their children to "good" schools and even lower middle class households send their children at least to Corporation school).

Table 4.U.5 gives the literacy among adult population (above 14 years of age) 71 out of a total of 154 . Only 54 of 87 male and 17 out of 67 female are literate. Only 4 male and 2 female ever visited primary school out of a total literate population of 71.

Occupation :

Let us now look at the occupational situation of the adult persons among these 50 child labour households . It has been noted that 54 women out of 67 were found to be engaged in household work alone and they had no earnings in cash and kind. . Others are engaged (87 males and 13 females) in occupations from which they earn some incomes i.e., a total of 100 people are earning for a population of 253. So the earner-dependent ratio comes to 1 : 2.53. Again, 28 men are engaged in skilled labour (viz. carpenter, taxi driver, electric mistri, motor mechanic and foundry worker) and 34 males and 13 females are working as un-skilled labourers either as maid servant or a coolie in foundry or tannery. There are 7 males in service (menial) , 15 males are engaged in petty trades and 3 in cultivation . It may be noted that women are engaged only in un-skilled labour. Inspite of the fact that the Government has programme for development of child and women (DWCRA), it is clear that no benefit from that programme has reached these women at Tiljola slum area. Out of 100 people who have any kind of income, 47 are engaged as un-skilled labour whereas only 20 are in skilled labour (vide Table 4.U.6).

TABLE 4.U.5 : LITERACY AMONG ADULT POPULATION (ABOVE 14 YEARS) OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY SEX AND COMMUNITY AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM

Community		Adult population (5 years and above) of child labour households by literate and illiterate											
		Illiterate			Literate			Level of literacy					
								Just literate			Primary (Class I-IV)		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Hindu	General Caste	4	14	18	32	10	42	30	9	39	2	1	3
	S.C.	2	4	6	8	4	12	7	3	10	1	1	2
	Sub total	6	18	24	40	14	54	37	12	49	3	2	5
Muslim		27	32	59	14	3	17	13	3	16	1	0	1
Total		33	50	83	54	17	71	50	15	65	4	2	6

Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.U.6 : OCCUPATION OF ADULT POPULATION OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY SEX AND COMMUNITY AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM

Community--->	Occupation of Adult Population of child labour households by community														
Occupation	General Caste			Scheduled Caste			Hindu			Muslim			Total		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Skilled Labour	11	0	11	4	0	4	15	0	15	13	0	13	28	0	28
Unskilled Labour	9	6	15	2	1	3	11	7	18	23	6	29	34	13	47
Service	3	0	3	3	0	3	6	0	6	1	0	1	7	0	7
Petty Trades	10	0	10	1	0	1	11	0	11	4	0	4	15	0	15
Cultivation	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	3
Household Work	0	18	18	0	7	7	0	25	25	0	29	29	0	54	54
Total	36	24	60	10	8	18	46	32	78	41	35	76	87	67	154

Source : ibid

Income :

Table 4.U.7 gives the annual income of the child labour households. For convenience, we have categorized those households in several fractile groups. Two households , 1 Hindu and 1 Muslim belong to the income group of lowest category (between Rs.6000.00 to Rs. 11500.00) 5 households earn between Rs.11501.00 to Rs. 17000.00, 32 households earned between Rs.17001.00 to Rs.22500.00 in last one year. Only 4 households earned above Rs.22501.00 . The per capita income in the lowest fractile group is Rs.2600.00 per annum and in the highest fractile group it was Rs.4813.13. But per capita income in the category of Rs.17001.00 to Rs.22500.00 was highest i.e., Rs.5252.44 per annum. While the overall per capita income per annum is Rs.4487.11, it is different for different communities of households. The per capita income for a General caste Hindus is highest (Rs.5465.74) while an average Hindu it is Rs.5151.07. The per capita income for a Scheduled Caste person is Rs.4055.17 and that for a Muslim is the lowest Rs.3785.36. If we accept the poverty line definition recognised by the Government, we can easily see from the Table 4.U.7 that 17 households out of 50 fell much below poverty line (Rs.283 per capita per month). During field work we observed that very few of the households could afford two square meals a day even among the rest 33 households.

Income-consumption :

Table 4.U.8 gives the annual per capita income and consumption (figures in parentheses) by community. We are aware that by referring to the community we are ignoring the intra-community inequality of households which we will take into account a little later. But as it appears, an average General Caste household has a per capita income of Rs.5465.74 as against annual consumption of Rs.5395.44. In other words,

TABLE 4.U.7 : ANNUAL INCOME (RS.) OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY COMMUNITY & INCOME CATEGORY AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM

Community	Annual income (Rs.) of child labour households & their population by community & income category														
Income Category	General Caste			Scheduled Caste			Hindu			Muslim			Total		
	House-hold	Popu-lation	Annual Income	House-hold	Popu-lation	Annual Income	House-hold	Popu-lation	Annual Income	House-hold	Popu-lation	Annual Income	House-hold	Popu-lation	Annual Income
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Rs. 6000.00 to Rs. 11500.00	1	3	6600.00	0	0	0.00	1	3	6600.00	1	3	9000.00	2	6	15600.00 (2600.00)
Rs. 11501.00 to Rs. 17000.00	9	˙˙	123120.00	1	5	12000.00	10	41	135120.00	5	25	73800.00	15	66	208920.00 (3165.45)
Rs. 17001.00 to Rs. 22500.00	9	43	319120.00	3	15	54600.00	12	58	373720.00	5	32	99000.00	17	90	472720.00 (5252.44)
Rs. 22501.00 and above	4	19	103200.00	2	9	51000.00	6	28	154200.00	10	63	283800.00	16	91	438000.00 (4813.18)
Total	23	101	552040.00 (5465.74)	6	29	117600.00 (4055.17)	29	130	669640.00 (5151.07)	21	123	465600.00 (3785.36)	50	253	1135240.00 (4487.11)

Note : Figures in parentheses give the per capita income in rupees per annum)

Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.U.8 : ANNUAL INCOME , CONSUMPTION AND SAVINGS (IN RS.)OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM

Community		Annual income, consumption and savings (Rs.) of child labour households by community				
		No. of Household	Population	Annual Income (in Rs.)	Annual Consumption (in Rs.)	Annual Savings (in Rs.)
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Hindu	General Caste	23	101	552040.00 (5465.74)	544940.00 (5395.44)	7100.00 (70.29)
	S.C.	6	29	117600.00 (4055.17)	134910.00 (4652.06)	(-)17310.00 (-596.90)
	Sub total	29	130	669640.00 (5151.07)	679850.00 (5229.61)	(-)10210.00 (-78.53)
Muslim		21	123	465600.00 (3785.36)	533185.00 (4334.83)	(-)67585.00 (-549.47)
Total/Over All		50	253	1135240.00 (4487.11)	1213035.00 (4794.60)	(-)77795.00 (-307.49)

Note : Figures in parentheses give the per capita income, consumption and savings per annum.
Source : ibid.

he has some saving capability (around Rs.70.29 per annum). But in case of a Scheduled Caste person, there is a net dissavings of Rs.596.90 per annum. An average Hindu person has no saving capability and has a dissaving of Rs.78.53 per annum whereas a Muslim has a net dissaving of Rs.549.47 per annum. The overall dissaving for all the child labour households members pooled together comes to Rs.307.49 per annum.

One cannot however, jump into any conclusion about the saving capability because the data does not make any allowances for any emergency expenses.

Table 4.U.9 discusses the intra and inter community inequality in consumption based on different fractile groups of income earners. The consumption of an average Hindu households is lower than that of Scheduled Caste households but higher than a General caste household. The average per capita consumption of a Muslim household is lowest (Rs.4334.83) compared to the other community. What however appears from the per capita consumption of different communities by different income group shows no pattern. Table 4.U.7 read together with Table 4.U.9 shows that while average per capita income of General Caste household was Rs.5465.74, their consumption was much less (Rs.4504.35). The per capita income of Scheduled Caste households was Rs.4055.17, whereas the per capita consumption was much higher (Rs.4652.06). An average Hindu household earned per capita per annum Rs.5151.07 but spent only Rs.4537.30, indicating that average Hindu households saved something while the Scheduled Caste households had much dissavings. This also shows that General Caste households are savers while Scheduled Caste households are losers. The savings by General Caste households out weighs the dissavings of Scheduled Caste households. In case of Muslims there are dissavings. The data may seem confusing as there is no pattern in consumption when we come to intra community inequality. Rather, there is a trend of greater consumption on the part of poorer households. The explanation may lie in some

TABLE 4.U.9 : ANNUAL CONSUMPTION (IN RS.) OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY COMMUNITY AND INCOME CATEGORY AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM

Community-->	Annual consumption (Rs.) of child labour households with their population by community & income category														
	General Caste			Scheduled Caste			Hindu			Muslim			Total		
Income Category	House-hold	Popu-lation	Annual Consump-tion	House-hold	Popu-lation	Annual Consump-tion	House-hold	Popu-lation	Annual Consump-tion	House-hold	Popu-lation	Annual Consump-tion	House-hold	Popu-lation	Annual Consump-tion
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Rs. 6000.00 to Rs. 11500.00	1	3	14111.00 (4703.66)	0	0	0	1	3	14111.00 (4703.66)	1	3	13604.00 (4534.66)	2	6	27715.00 (4619.16)
Rs. 11501.00 to Rs. 17000.00	9	36	164613.00 (4572.58)	1	5	23761.00 (4752.20)	10	41	188374.00 (4594.48)	5	25	110872.00 (4434.88)	15	66	299246.00 (4534.03)
Rs. 17001.00 to Rs. 22500.00	9	43	192541.00 (4477.69)	3	15	69532.00 (4635.46)	12	58	262073.00 (4518.50)	5	32	138689.00 (4334.03)	17	90	400762.00 (4452.91)
Rs. 22501.00 and above	4	19	83675.00 (4403.94)	2	9	41617.00 (4624.11)	6	28	125292.00 (4474.71)	10	63	270020.00 (4286.03)	16	91	395312.00 (4344.08)
Total/Overall	23	101	454940.00 (4504.35)	6	29	134910.00 (4652.06)	29	130	589850.00 (4537.30)	21	123	533185.00 (4334.83)	50	253	1123035.00 (4438.87)

Note : Figures in parentheses give the per capita consumption in rupees per annum.

Source : ibid.

non-economical factors which need be further probed. One can however make some guesses from the trend. Households with better income can afford to think about tomorrow whereas lower income households can not care for tomorrow. Again the backward communities like Scheduled Caste and these poor Muslims also cannot care for tomorrow whereas General Caste households try to do their best. Such psychological explanations also needs further probing. We keep this data as a special category.

One may however, argue in the following manner to explain the apparent inconsistencies in consumption-expenditure by taking into account the stock of durable-cunsumer goods of the households by the community.

Durable consumer goods :

Table 4.U.10 would show that durable consumer goods used by an average household is Rs.718.08 whereas a general caste Hindu household posses durable consumer goods worth Rs.430.43. The corresponding figures for Scheduled Caste's, Hindu's and Muslim household's were Rs.1595.83, Rs.650.86 and Rs.672.85 respectively. Those might have pushed up the relatively poor household's consumption-expenditure and so there may not be any positive correlation between income earned and the spendings.

Income, consumption and saving :

Table 4.U.11 shows the saving capability of child labour households vis-a-vis that of non-child labour households in the slum. It appears that child labour households except for general caste have no saving capability. The per capita dis-saving per annum for a member of the child labour household belonging to

TABLE 4.U.10 : DURABLE CONSUMER GOODS (IN NUMBER & BY COST) AMONG THE CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS AND BY COMMUNITY AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM

Community		Owning of durable consumer goods by child labour household												Number of child labour household	Popula-tion
		COT		CHAIR/TABLE		RADIO		CYCLE		T.V.SET		TOTAL			
		Numbers	Cost (Rs.)	Numbers	Cost (Rs.)	Numbers	Cost (Rs.)	Numbers	Cost (Rs.)	Numbers	Cost (Rs.)	Numbers	Cost (Rs.)		
(0)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)
Hindu	General Caste	35	2970.00	22	1855.00	14	2975.00	2	1800.00	1	2600.00	74	12200.00 (530.43)	23	101
	S.C.	7	750.00	8	600.00	3	675.00	4	3450.00	2	4100.00	24	9575.00 (1595.83)	6	29
	Sub total	42	3720.00	30	2455.00	17	3650.00	6	5250.00	3	6700.00	98	21775.00 (750.86)	29	130
Muslim		32	3185.00	35	2675.00	18	4950.00	5	3320.00	0	0.00	90	14130.00 (672.85)	21	123
Total		74	6905.00	65	5130.00	35	8600.00	11	8570.00	3	6700.00	188	35905.00 (718.08)	50	253

Note : Figures parentheses give per household ownership of goods..
Source : ibid.

60

TABLE 4.U.11 : ANNUAL INCOME, CONSUMPTION AND SAVINGS (IN RS.) OF CHILD LABOUR AND NON-CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY COMMUNITY AT TILJOLA PUB PARA SLUM.

Community	Child labour households					Non-child labour households				
	Population	Income	Consumption	Saving	Savings Per capita per annum	Population	Income	Consumption	Saving	Savings Per capita per annum
General Caste	101	552040.00	544940.00	7100.00	70.29	184	592006.00	566840.00	25166.00	136.77
S.C.	29	117600.00	134910.00	-17310.00	-596.9	24	88716.00	73139.00	15577.00	649.04
Muslim	123	465600.00	533185.00	-67585.00	-549.47	58	175808.00	117567.00	58241.00	104.15

Source : ibid.

scheduled caste and muslim came to Rs. 596.90 and Rs. 549.47 respectively. The general caste has a nominal saving per capita per annum which is negligible.

Compared to this, the non-child labour households in the slum were better-off having per capita per annum saving to the tune of Rs. 136.77, Rs. 649.04 and Rs. 1004.15 for general caste, scheduled caste and muslim respectively.

The data clearly brings out the reason for incidence of child labour. Non-child labour households are as a rule savers and child labour households were as a rule dis-savers. The pertinent point which should be noted in this connection is that the per capita dis-saving of child labour households would have been much greater if the contribution of child labour to their family incomes were excluded. In that case, even the general caste child labour households would be a dis-savers (which they are) and would lose being termed as a nominal savers.

The evidences arising out of the table. 4.U.11 clearly explains the reason of incidence of child labour and confirms our major hypothesis related to poverty.

RURAL AREA : (VILLAGE HATIASULI) :

Let us examine the child labour households located in rural setting :-

Demography :

Table 4.R.1 gives the total number of child labour households at Hatiasuli by class and by community. Out of 25 households 19 belonged to marginal farmers and 6 to landless labourers. Among the marginal households Scheduled Caste is predominant (14 out of 19) whereas general caste and scheduled tribe households are 2 and 3 respectively. The incidence of landless labour is predominant among Scheduled tribes at Hatiasuli.

The total population of the above households are 120 of whom 47 are children (leaving aside 10 infants i.e. below 5 years of age) . Among these 47 children (vide Table 4.R.2) 32 are child labour.

The child labour households are of two categories , 78.33 percent belonged into marginal farmers. and the rest to landless households. Among household-population 25 percent belongs to Scheduled Tribe. The corresponding figures for Scheduled Caste and General Castes are 60.84 per cent and 14.16 per cent respectively (vide Table 4.R.3).

Table 4.R.4 gives the average family size of child labour household which was 4.8, ranging between 4 and 6.5 . The general caste-marginal households had greatest family size whereas scheduled tribe, marginal and landless of general caste and scheduled caste had an average family size of 4.

TABLE 4.R.1 : CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY CLASS AND COMMUNITY AT HATISULI VILLAGE

Class--> Community	Marginal farmer	Landless	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
General Caste	2	1	3
S.C	14	1	15
S.T.	3	4	7
Total	19 (76.00)	6 (24.00)	25 (100.00)

Note : S.C. = Scheduled Caste ; S.T. = Scheduled Tribe ;
Figures in parentheses give percentage to total
Source : Primary Data (1996)

64

TABLE 4.R.2 : DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY AGE AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Age	Male	Female	Total	No. of child labour by age-category
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Below 5 years	7	3	10	N.A.
5 years to 14 years	31	16	47	32
Above 14 years	32	31	63	N.A.
Total	70	50	120	32

Note : N.A. = Not applicable.
Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.R.3 : DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY CLASS AND COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class--> Community	Marginal farmer	Landless	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
General Caste	13	4	17 (14.16)
S.C.	69	4	73 (60.84)
S.T.	12	18	30 (25.00)
Total	94 (78.33)	26 (21.67)	120 (100.00)

Note : Figures in parentheses give percentage to total.
Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.R.4 : AVERAGE FAMILY SIZE OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY CLASS AND COMMUNITY AT HATISULI VILLAGE

Class--> Community	Family size of child labour households by class and community		
	Marginal farmer	Landless	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
General Caste	6.50	4.00	5.60
S.C.	4.90	4.00	4.80
S.T.	4.00	4.50	4.30
Total	4.90	4.30	4.80

Source : ibid

The family type of these households were both nuclear (20) and joint (5) . It is clear from Table 4.R.5 that joint households are very few and General Caste - landless labourers or marginal farmers have no joint families al all.

Table 4.R.6 gives the number of children of these child labour households. The General Caste children and Scheduled Tribe children were 8 each in this category whereas the Scheduled Caste children were 31. This table also presents the children population by class, community and sex. It also brings out that girl children were only 50 per cent of male children.

Table 4.R.7 gives the class and community wise break up of the population belonging to 25 child labour households at Hatiasuli. It appears that overwhelming majority of the population belonging to child labour households were marginal (78.33 per cent) . Again by caste category Scheduled Caste children were 60.83 per cent whereas General Caste and Scheduled Tribe children were 14.17 per cent and 25 per cent respectively.

Literacy :

Table 4.R.8 shows that almost all the children (30 out of 32) are somehow literate . The exceptional 2 were, 1 Scheduled Caste female and another Scheduled Tribe male child. By class, marginal farmer households of General Caste category were all literate. Same was the case with landless.

Among the literates, there are at least 3 (around 10 per cent) were above primary level, almost half of them were in the primary level and the rest were just literates. The details of literacy of the child labour at Hatiasuli can read from Table

TABLE 4.R.5 : CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY FAMILY TYPE AND BY CLASS & COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Type of family--->	Nuclear			Joint			Total number of households		
Class--> Community	Marginal farmer	Landless	Total	Marginal farmer	Landless	Total	Marginal farmer	Landless	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
General Caste	2	1	3	0	0	0	2	1	3
S.C.	11	1	12	3	0	3	14	1	15
S.T.	2	3	5	1	1	2	3	4	7
Total	15	5	20	4	1	5	19	6	25

Source : ibid

69

TABLE 4.R.6 : POPULATION (OF 5 TO 14 YEARS) OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY SEX AND BY CLASS & COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class-->	Marginal farmer			Landless			Total		
Community	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
General Caste	5	1	6	1	1	2	6	2	8
S.C.	17	12	29	1	1	2	18	13	31
S.T.	3	1	4	4	0	4	7	1	8
Total	25	14	39	6	2	8	31	16	47

Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.R.7 : POPULATION OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY SEX AND CLASS & COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class-->	No. of population child labour households by class & community								
	Marginal farmer			Landless			Total		
Community	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
General Caste	10	3	13	2	2	4	12	5	17 (14.17)
S. C.	36	33	69	2	2	4	38	35	73 (60.83)
S. T.	7	5	12	13	5	18	20	10	30 (25.00)
Total	53	41	94 (78.33)	17	9	26 (21.67)	70	50	120 (100.00)

Note : figures in parentheses indicate percantage to total.
Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.R.8 : LITERACY OF CHILD LABOUR BY SEX AND BY DIFFERENT CLASS AND COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class commu- nity	Number of child labour by literate and illiterate, by sex and by different class and community																	
	Marginal farmer						Landless						Total					
	Illiterate			Literate			Illiterate			Literate			Illiterate			Literate		
	Maie	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
General Caste	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	3
S. C.	0	1	1	13	7	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	14	7	21
S. T.	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	1	3	0	3	1	0	1	5	1	6
Total	0	1	1	17	8	25	1	0	1	4	1	5	1	1	2	21	9	30

Source : ibid

4.R.9. This may however be noted that the number of female child labour were 10 out of 32. Of them 1 female child went above primary level belonging to Scheduled Tribe although she could not continue her study and joined the labour force. Same was the case with 1 tribal boy. The cases of just literate, and primary education makes no significant difference in joining labour force. Table 4.R.10 presents the details of level of literacy by sex class and community.

The population of children in the age group of 5 to 14 years were 47, of whom 42 were literates. Of 31 male children 28 were literate and of 16 female children, 14 were literates (vide Table 4.R.11). The rate of literacy was however low among the adult population (above 14 years of age). Of the total adult population of 63, 24 out of 32 male and 19 out of 31 female adults were literate. Percentage of literacy among women was 61.29 per cent , whereas that among male was 75 per cent . The overall literacy for the adult population was 68.25 per cent and that among children 89.36 per cent (vide Table 4.R.11 and Table 4.R.12).

The level of literacy among the adult population is presented in Table 4.13 where we find that out of 43 literates 8 persons (7 male and 1 female) went above primary school whereas others were drop-out i.e., just literates. They did not even reach primary level (vide Table 4.R.13) .

Marital status :

Among adult population of 63, 25 out of 32 male and 29 out of 31 female were married. 7 were yet to be married (all male) , 1 is widow and 1 is a separated woman (vide Table 4.R.14) . We however did not find any person below 15 to be married. That is, child marriage was not observed among our subjects although marriages do take place violating minimum age (for male 21 and female 18 as prescribed) bar.

TABLE 4.R.9 : LEVEL OF LITERACY OF CHILD LABOUR BY CLASS AND COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class-->	Level of literacy of child labour by different class and community											
Comm-unity	Marginal farmer				Landless				Total			
	Just Literate	Primary (I - IV)	Middle (V - VIII)	Total	Just Literate	Primary (I - IV)	Middle (V - VIII)	Total	Just Literate	Primary (I - IV)	Middle (V - VIII)	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
General Caste	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	3
S. C.	11	9	0	20	0	1	0	1	11	10	0	21
S. T.	1	1	1	3	0	2	1	3	1	3	2	6
Total	13	10	2	25	0	4	1	5	13	14	3	30

Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.R.10 : LEVEL OF LITERACY OF CHILD LABOUR BY SEX AND BY CLASS & COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class--> Level of literacy--> Community	Marginal farmer								
	Just Literate			Primary (I - IV)			Middle (V - VIII)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
General Caste	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
S. C.	7	4	11	6	3	9	0	0	0
S. T.	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1
Total	9	4	13	7	3	10	1	1	2

Class--> Level of literacy--> Community	Landless								
	Just Literate			Primary (I - IV)			Middle (V - VIII)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
General Caste	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
S. C.	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
S. T.	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	0	1
Total	0	0	0	3	1	4	1	0	1

Level of literacy--> Community	Total								
	Just Literate			Primary (I - IV)			Middle (V - VIII)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(20)	(21)	(22)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)
General Caste	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
S. C.	7	4	11	7	3	10	0	0	0
S. T.	1	0	1	3	0	3	1	1	2
Total	9	4	13	10	4	14	2	1	3

Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.R.11 : LITERACY OF POPULATION (5 YEARS TO 14 YEARS) OF CHILD
LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY CLASS AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class	Population (5 years to 14 years)			Literate		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Marginal farmer	25	14	39	23	12	35
Landless	6	2	8	5	2	7
Total	31	16	47	28	14	42

Source : ibid.

**TABLE 4.R.12 : LITERACY OF ADULT POPULATION (ABOVE 14 YEARS)
OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY CLASS
AT HATIASULI VILLAGE**

Class	Adult population (above14 years) of child labour households			Literates among the adult population		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Marginal farmer	25	25	50	20	17	37
Landless	7	6	13	4	2	6
Total	32	31	63	24	19	43

Source : ibid.

TABLE 4 . R.13 : LEVEL OF LITERACY OF ADULT POPULATION (ABOVE 14 YEARS) OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY SEX AND CLASS AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Community	No. of literate among the adult population of child labour households			Level of literacy of adult population of child labour households by sex and class								
				Just literate			Primary (Class I to IV)			Middle (Class I to IV)		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Marginal farmer	20	17	37	14	16	30	0	0	0	6	1	7
Landless	4	2	6	3	2	5	0	0	0	1	0	1
Total	24	19	43	17	18	35	0	0	10	7	1	8

Source : ibid.

78

TABLE 4 .R. 14 : MARITAL STATUS OF ADULT POPULATION OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY SEX AND BY CLASS AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class	No. of adult population			Marital status of adult population of child labour households by sex and class											
				Married			Unmarried			Widow / Widower			Divorce / Separate		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Marginal farmer	25	25	50	19	23	42	6	0	6	0	1	1	0	1	1
Landless	7	6	13	6	6	12	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	32	31	63	25	29	54	7	0	7	0	1	1	0	1	1

Source : ibid.

79

Occupation :

There are 63 adult population in 25 child labour households. the adult population can be classified on the basis of their primary occupation. Only 4 were cultivator (3 male and 1 female), 20 were agricultural labour (all women). 35 were unspecified labour (28 male and 7 female) and one in private service (male). The primary occupation of 3 female members was however non-remunerative household activities. It is therefore clear that the majority of population of child labour households have no guarantee of employment, so they are to depend on unspecified kind of work as and when available (vide Table 4.R.15).

The above categorisation of primary occupation has been based on the availability of major share of income and not on the basis of time spent on the occupational work. But since these primary occupations do not guarantee their survival some of them depend on other subsidiary occupations. We find 19 out of 25 households have secondary occupations (vide Table 4.R.16).

Income :

The average annual income of the child labour households during one year period prior to our data collection (1996) was Rs. 9868.00 and per capita it was Rs. 2055.83 . By community , these figures ranged between Rs. 8692.85 and Rs. 12416.66. The corresponding income per capita ranged between Rs. 2028.33 and Rs.2191.17. The General Caste child labour households had highest income per household and also per capita. Scheduled Caste households came second followed by Scheduled Tribe households (vide Table 4.R.17) .

TABLE 4 . R.15 : PRIMARY OCCUPATIONS OF ADULT POPULATION OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY SEX AND COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Commu-nity	No. of child labour house holds	Number of adult population of child labour households			Primary occupation of adult population of child labour households by sex and community														
					Cultivation			Agricultural labour			Unspecified labour			Private service			Household work		
		Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
(1)	(1A)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)	(17)	(18)	(19)
General Caste	3	6	3	9	2	0	2	0	1	1	3	0	3	1	0	1	0	2	2
S. C,	15	19	20	39	0	0	0	0	16	16	19	3	22	0	0	0	0	1	1
S. T	7	7	8	15	1	1	2	0	3	3	6	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	25	32	31	63	3	1	4	0	20	20	28	7	35	1	0	1	0	3	3

Source : ibid.

TABLE 4 .R. 16 : DISTRIBUTION OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS HAVING SECONDARY OCCUPATION BY CLASS & COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class	No. of child labour households having secondary occupation (done by adult members)			
	General Caste	S. C.	S. T.	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Marginal farmer	2	14	3	19
Landless	0	0	0	0
Total	2	4	3	19

Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.R. 17 : ANNUAL INCOME (IN RUPEES) OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY DIFFERENT COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Community	No. of child labour households	Population	Annual income (in Rs.) of child labour households from different sources by community						Total Annual Income (in Rs.)	Agerage Annual Income (in Rs.)
			Agricul-ture	Agricultural labour	Unspecified labour	Private service	Maid Servant	Animal product		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
General Caste	3	17	12000.00	7500.00	9250.00	8500.00	0.00	0.00	37250.00 (2191.17)	12416.66
S. C.	15	73	38000.00	63100.00	45000.00	0.00	2000.00	500.00	148600.00 (2035.61)	9906.66
S. T	7	30	10000.00	10700.00	38850.00	0.00	0.00	1300.00	60850.00 (2028.33)	8692.85
Total / Over All	25	120	60000.00	81300.00	93100.00	8500.00	2000.00	1800.00	246700.00 (2055.83)	9868.00

Note : Figure in parentheses indicate per capita income per annum
Source : ibid.

Table 4.R.18 gives the class-wise child labour households' income ranging between Rs.8233.33 to Rs. 10384.21 per household per annum. The corresponding range of per capita income by class is from Rs. 1900.00 to Rs. 2098.93.

Table 4.R.17 read with Table 4.R.18 show that the floor income per capita of child labour household was Rs. 1900.00 per annum and the highest income per capita was Rs. 2191.17 per annum.

Consumption :

While collecting data on income of child labour households we also collected data on consumption-expenditure of these households. The expenditure was on food, clothes, shelter, education, treatment, expenses for recreation during festival or at other times of the year. But obligatory expenses like attending certain social function of the relatives, expenses on funeral or other such work etc. are not treated as consumption-expenses . While collecting annual expenses we also came across some other expenses as on repayment of loan which is also not strictly consumption expenses. But since these child labour households incurred these loans from relatively richer households mainly for consumption, it was convenient to group only such repayments with consumption expenses.

Table 4.R.19 gives the consumption-expenses on the aforesaid items of the child labour households by community while the per capita consumption-expenses per annum was Rs. 2797.08 i.e. Rs. 7.66 per capita per day (p.c.p.d.). But the income per capita per day was Rs. 5.63 . In other words, each of the members of child labour households has a dissaving of Rs.2.03 per capita per day. That explains the reason of their heavy indebtedness and their compulsion to send the children as wage labourer. There is however some variation among the child labour households of different communities but these differences are not very important because child

TABLE 4 .R. 18 : ANNUAL INCOME (IN RUPEES) OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY CLASS AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class	No. of child labour households	Population	Annual income (in Rs.) of child labour households from different sources by class						Total Annual Income (in Rs.)	Agerage Annual Income (in Rs.)
			Agricul-ture	Agricultural labour	Unspecified labour	Private service	Maid Servant	Animal product		
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Marginal farmer	19	94	60000.00	67200.00	58600.00	8500.00	2000.00	1000.00	197300.00 (2098.93)	10384.21
Landless	6	26	0.00	14100.00	34500.00	0.00	0.00	800.00	49400.00 (1900.00)	8233.33
Total / Over All	25	120	60000.00	81300.00	93100.00	8500.00	2000.00	1800.00	246700.00 (2055.83)	9868.00

Note : Figures in parentheses indicate per capita income per annum
Source : ibid.

TABLE 4 . R.19 : ANNUAL CONSUMPTION -EXPENDITURE (IN RUPEES) OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY ITEM AND BY COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Commu-nity	No. of child labour households	Population	Annual consumption (in Rs.) of child labour households by different item and community									Total Annual Consumption (in Rs.)
			Food	Cloth	Shelter	Education	Medical	Festival	Social ob-ligation	Recrea-tion	Loan re-payment	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
General Caste	3	17	35800.00	2500.00	400.00	800.00	900.00	250.00	2300.00	150.00	0.00	43100.00 (2535.29)
S. C.	15	73	173480.00	8200.00	3750.00	850.00	3450.00	1350.00	16850.00	300.00	3600.00	211830.00 (2901.70)
S. T.	7	30	71200.00	3400.00	1200.00	1100.00	1350.00	420.00	1600.00	450.00	0.00	80720.00 (2690.66)
Total / Over all	25	120	280480.00	14100.00	5350.00	2750.00	5700.00	2020.00	20750.00	900.00	3600.00	335650.00 (2797.08)

Note : Figures in parentheses indicate per capita consumption per annum
Source : ibid.

labour households of all categories are incurring debt. The data of the year 1996 present this bleak picture and show that the asset situation of these households are fast depleting. In one year, the dissaving from all the 25 households was Rs.188950.00 whereas the total value of the asset of the all the child labour household was Rs. 325962.00. With this rate of depletion of assets they will be paupers in no time without of course, the wages earned by their children.

Income, consumption, saving and asset :

Table 4.R.20 gives the dissavings of child labour households by community in the year 1996 and Table 4.R.21 gives the asset situation of the households as in 1996. The data clearly show that all the child labour households irrespective of their community are fast losing their assets. If such situation continues, the marginal farmer households who have very little land would all be losing these land and become landless very fast.

This is the situation which would increasingly force even other poor families to send their children as child labourer. The indication is that there would be more child labour in the coming years and naturally there would be less schooling.

Frequency of child labour :

It would be interesting to point out (vide Table 4.R.22)as to how many children of particular households had joined the labour force. During enumeration we could know that child labour household of marginal category had sent 1 child, 5 households sent 2 children each and 1 had sent 3 children. All those children became labourer. In case of landless households 6 had 1 child each to the labour force. That is, how 25 households sent 32 children into the labour force. The child population of all these households were 47.

TABLE 4 .R. 20 : ANNUAL INCOME, CONSUMPTION, SAVINGS / DISSAVINGS
(IN RS.) OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY
COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Community	No. of child labour househlds	Population	Annual income, consumption & savings / dissavings (in Rs.) of child labour households		
			Income	Consump-tion	savings
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
General Caste	3	17	37250.00	43100.00	(-) 5850.00
S. C.	15	73	148600.00	211830.00	(-) 63230.00
S. T.	7	30	60850.00	80720.00	(-)19870.00
Total	25	120	246700.00	335650.00	(-)8895..00

Source : ibid.

88

TABLE 4 .R. 21 : ASSET (IN RS.) SITUATION OF CHILD LABOUR HOUSEHOLDS BY ITEM AND BY COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Commu-nity	No. of child labour households	Popula-tion	Asset (in Rs.) owning by child labour households by item and by community									Total Asset (Rs) of child labour households
			Inmovable property				Movable property					
			Cultivated land	Homestead	House	Total	Agricultu-ral Imple-ments	Domestic Animal	Consumer durable	Policy	Total	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
General Caste	3	17	2800.00	1200.00	22500.00	51700.00	2370.00	9800.00	2030.00	580.00	14780.00	66480.00
S. C.	15	13	88620	4200.00	75000.00	167820.00	1657.00	20000.00	4830.00	0.00	26487.00	194307.00
S. T.	7	30	23520	1650.00	32500.00	57670.00	605.00	5200.00	1700.00	0.00	7505.00	65175.00
Total	25	120	140140	7050.00	130000.00	277190.00	4632.00	35000.00	8560.00	580.00	48772.00	325962.00

Source : ibid.

TABLE 4.R.22 : NUMBER OF CHILD LABOUR IN FAMILIES BY CLASS & COMMUNITY AT HATIASULI VILLAGE

Class-->	Number of child labour household having child labour by class and community								
Community	Marginal farmer				Lamdless	Total			
	1 child labour	2 Child labour	3 Child labour	Total	1 Child labour	1 child labour	2 Child labour	3 Child labour	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
General Caste	2	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	3
S. C.	8	5	1	14	1	9	5	1	15
S. T.	3	0	0	3	4	7	0	0	7
Total	13	5	1	19	6	19	5	1	25

Source : ibid.

From the above discussion of the data regarding child labour households in urban and rural areas, it is clear that poverty is the root cause for the continuation of child labour system. We observed that in village also the same reason prevailed. The break-even line separating a child labour and a non child labour household could also be determined from the primary data generated by us.

As a rule, landless labourer households in the village and household's earning Rs. 1900/- or less per month per household are sending their children to the labour market. From the analysis of household-data it was revealed that households owning more than one acre of cultivable land do not generally send their children for work. That is, only sub-marginal farmers[1] and landless are forced to send their children as child labour. The break-even line for urban-child labour household was an income of Rs.1850.00 per month.

It was also revealed from the data that scheduled caste and scheduled tribe households of the low income category sent their children as labour whereas general caste category try to avoid sending their children as labour. Even then child labour has become the natural outcome of the rural and urban poverty. It is therefore doubtful whether enactment for preventing child labour would make any head-way in future.

In the following chapter we would try to deal with the social and economic aspects of child labour system in urban and rural area.

---

[1]   Sub-marginal farmer are included among marginal farmer category as per Government classification.