

A Critical Study of the Official Policies on Child Labour in India 1947-1979

Dr. Samiparna Rakshit¹

ABSTRACT

This article essentially analyses the different constitutional provisions, all the laws and regulations, committee resolutions regarding child labour during the period from 1947(the year of India's Independence) to 1979 (International Year of the Child) to tease out the actual official attitudes of the post-colonial Indian nation-state to the problem of child labour. We have also resorted to critical reading and deconstruction of texts as official policies are largely reflected in the drafts and final texts of the Five Year Plans, other policy documents and the wrings, speeches and comments of ministers, legislators and policy-makers. In order to situate the Plans, policies and official programmes discussed in this article in their appropriate economic and political context, we have also drawn upon the relevant gamut of social-scientific literature. The child labourers were obviously elided by the State's policy makers as they were exposed to successive links in a chain of exploitation. The poorer sections were being systematically exploited because an unequal economic system was pinning the lower classes down to poverty.

Key words: Child labour, exploitation, constitutional provision, laws, parliamentary debates

The term 'child labour' is often defined as work that deprives children of their childhood, their potential and their dignity, and that is harmful to physical-mental development. It refers to work that is mentally, physically, socially or morally dangerous and harmful to children, and interferes with their schooling by depriving them of the opportunity to attend school, obliging them to leave school prematurely or requiring them to attempt to combine school attendance with excessively long and heavy work. The statistical figures about child workers in the world have variation because of the differences in defining categories of age group and engagement of children in formal and informal sector.²

Despite a number of important constitutional provisions and legislations prohibiting child labour, even today the child labour scenario in India presents an alarming picture. According to the Census 2001 figures there are 1.26 crore working children in the age group of 5-14 as compared to the total child population of 25.2 crore. There are approximately 12 lakhs children working in the hazardous occupations/processes which are covered under the Child Labour (Prohibition & Regulation) Act i.e. 18 occupations and 65 processes. As per survey conducted by National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) in 2004-05, the

¹The author is working as Assistant Professor of History, Vijaygarh Jyotish Ray College, Kolkata

number of working children is estimated at 90.75 lakh. As per Census 2011, the number of working children in the age group of 5-14 years has further reduced to 43.53 lakh. Though it shows that the efforts of the Government have borne some desired fruits for the improvement of the scenario still a mammoth task is left in dealing with this grave quandary. Had the government of India taken any concrete measure to tackle the issue of child labour right from the beginning of the post-independent era? Did the government policy makers show any sign of concern for the plight of the child workers? Last but not the least, what was the actual official attitude to the peril of child labour in the post-independent era to the International Year of the Child?

Keeping all these queries in mind this article would try to essentially analyse the different constitutional provisions, all the laws and regulations, committee resolutions regarding child labour during the period from 1947 (the year of India's Independence) to 1979 (International Year of the Child) to tease out the actual official attitudes of the post-colonial Indian nation-state³ to the problem of child labour. A separate focus would be given on the girl child labourers to find out whether the official attitude of the policy makers to the problem of child labour was gender sensitive or not of the period under review.

The crucial consideration of the official attitude of the post-colonial Indian nation-state to the child makes it pertinent to divide the whole period from 1947 to 1979 into two consecutive periods. The first period would consist of the years from 1947 to 1964 and the second one would indicate the timeframe from 1964 to 1979. The first period (1947-1964) is the period of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's prime ministership and thus this period can be called the Nehruvian era. This is because the existing literature on the official policies and plans in India has, indeed, treated the so-called Nehruvian era as a distinct period. There is also a sense in which Nehru and his vision as reflected in the teamwork of Nehru inspired statesmen, policy makers and planners gave the period of Nehru's tenure as the Prime Minister a character on its own. What makes the separate study of Nehruvian years all the more pertinent is Nehru's proclaimed love for children. The period 1947-64 covers the first three Five Year Plans: the First Plan (1951-56), the Second Plan (1956-61) and the Third Five Year Plan (1961-66). The subsequent discussion would denote the period from 1964 to 1979 (International Year of the Child) or the Post-Nehruvian period.

It seems that the problem of 'child labour' had already become an important topic of discussion in the Parliament of India in 1950. A discussion was held on the topic of 'Child Labour in Bombay Docks' on 24th February 1950, between ShriSdhva and The Minister of Labour, ShriJagjivan Ram. The Minister of Labour informed that there was no child employed in Bombay docks either by Bombay Port Trust or by other employers in the dock. But he also said that children had been noticed doing several minor works – unconnected with handling of goods.⁴

It cannot be denied that the Constitution of India recognized the need for granting the special protection to children. As regards Fundamental Rights, specific provisions, in regard

to children, were made in Part III of the Constitution. Article 21 guarantees to every child the protection of life and personal liberty. Article 24 provided, categorically, that no child below the age of 14 years would be employed to work in any factory or mine, or engaged in any other hazardous employment. 'State', in this context, includes the Parliament of India and the Government and Legislature of each of the States and all local or other authorities within the territory of India or under the control of Government of India. Article 32 required the states to interfere and stop hazardous working conditions – detrimental to the health of child labour – and look into their proper physical, mental and social development. It also asked the states to legislate, fixing minimum age, working hours and conditions for the child labourers, and at the same time to prohibit the employment of a child below the age of 14 years. Regarding the Directive Principles of the State policy; it will be appropriate to refer to Article 39 (contained in Part IV of the Constitution). It incorporated a directive principle of the State policy in the following two terms. Those were that the tender age of children are not abused and that citizens are not forced by economic necessity to enter avocations – unsuited to their age or strength; and that children are given opportunities and facilities to develop in a healthy ambience and in conditions of freedom and dignity and that childhood and youth are protected against exploitation and against moral and material abandonment. Article 45 directed the State to make endeavour to provide within a period of ten years from the commencement of the Constitution, for free and compulsory education for all children until they complete the age of 14 years. Article 47 required the State to raise the level of nutrition and the standard of living of its people. Though the Constitution of India had enough articles against child labour, the First Five Year Plan made no discussion on child labour. Furthermore we do not find any mention of child labour or welfare of child labourer in the Second and Third Five Year Plan.

The constitutional philosophy found concrete shape in the post 1950 legislative activities, in the sphere of child labour, as in the many other spheres of social welfare.⁵ The problem of child labour continues to exist despite the provisions contained in Article 24 of the Constitution of India that no child below the age of fourteen years shall be employed to work in any factory or employed in any hazardous employment and the Directive Principles of State Policy contained in Article 39 (e) along with the commitment of the State to provide free and compulsory education to our children till the age of 14 years.

The reality regarding exploitation of the child workers becomes clear from the discussion that held on 3rd April 1951 on Employment of Child Labour, between Shri Sanjivayya and the Minister of Labour Shri Jagjivan Ram. The Minister of Labour said that enquiries undertaken by the State Governments have shown that children, below the prescribed age, are being employed generally in small establishments not covered by the Factories Act. He also said that the Government was trying to amend the Employment of Children Act, 1938, so as to completely prohibit the employment of children below 15 years of age in any occupation in port areas and there are a large number of children employed in industries or establishments

not covered by the Factories Act. The Government was trying to amend these Acts with a view to comply with the Conventions of the International Labour Organization (henceforth, I.L.O).⁶ On 9th August 1951 another discussion was held on 'Employment of Children (Amendment) Bill' between the Minister of Labour ShriJagjivan Ram and Dr.Deshmukh. The Minister of Labour – ShriJagjivan Ram – moved the Bill first to amend the Employment of Children Act, 1938 and later said that it was a very simple measure to ratify the Convention of the International Labour Conference, prohibiting the employment of the young persons during night time in the factories, mines, railways and ports. Dr. C.D. Deshmukh was a member of the Congress party and member of the Planning Commission from 1950. The important part of the discussion, which was elaborated by Dr.Deshmukh, was that so far as the welfare and care of children were concerned, the attention would not remained confined to formalities, but go a little deeper and see that provisions that had already been made were really brought into effect, and were observed. It was clear from Dr.Deshmukh's speech that child labour was being exploited in a very cruel and harsh manner and the Government of India was lacking an effective machinery to enforce the acts or to see whether the acts were really respected and obeyed and the provisions of the laws did not merely remain on the statute book. Dr.Deshmukh made an exceptional speech which was practically different in that period regarding child labour, but at the same time, it was really disheartening to find Dr.Deshmukh to comment that 'there was no other commodity in India, which was more neglected than children. We care for trees; we care for even manure and fertilizers. But, so far as children are concerned, they are left more or less entirely to their fate.'⁷ This comparison points to the fact that some parliamentarians like Dr.Deshmukh were able to think differently regarding the child in that period of time, but even their thought did not allow them to consider the child as a human being not a commodity. He said that the Government would hold itself responsible, as provided in the Constitution, not only for the care of children, but also for their employment when they come of age and there should be a more careful supervision over child labour throughout the country and some steps ought to be taken in the direction of seeing that child labour was not exploited in the manner in which it was being exploited.⁸ Therefore it is crystal clear from this debate that India faced the problem of proper enforcement of acts and laws from the 1950s onwards. Series of the enactments were made to combat with the situations prevailed regarding child labour but the situation did not improve a little bit, rather the problem became complicated day by day.

Now discussion would be made about the Acts, which were promulgated to secure the future of the children, taking into account the problems of child labour. This discussion would also help to understand the situation that prevailed still after the enactments of these Acts. In 1952, the Mines Act prohibited the employment of children under 15 years in mines. The act also stipulated the conditions for the underground work. In this case, the child should be at least of 16 years of age and should have a certificate of physical fitness from a surgeon. During 1953, the Labour Bureau conducted a rapid ad hoc enquiry into labour conditions. It reported that, no sooner did factory inspectors or other officers make

their appearance on the scene than a large number of children ran away from the premises. These were often the children below the minimum age for employment. In this connection, the Labour Investigation Committee remarked that it must be remembered that the concerns supplying figures were more law abiding than some of the others and also that employment of children was almost always clandestine. The important fact that has emerged from the investigations was that in various industries, mainly smaller industry, the prohibition of the employment of children was disregarded quite openly and owing to the inadequacy of the inspection staff, it has become difficult to enforce the relevant provisions of the law. The Committee observed that a large number of children were being employed in cashew nut processing factory in Madras and Travancore-Cochin, in a large number in mica-mines, in establishments coming under the Factories Act, *bidi* workshops, carpet weaving, matches and mica splitting. This was in contravention of the provisions of the Mines Act, Employment of Children Act and Factories Act.

As far as this situation was concerned when children in many numbers were being employed in factories and industries all over the country, the insensitivity of the parliamentarians to this problem was really disheartening in 1952. On 16th July 1952 a long discussion was made on the topic 'Failure to improve the conditions of labour', but no point was discussed on child labour policy or its welfare.⁹ The discussion held on 18th December 1952 about 'Employment of Children' between Shri Morarka and the Minister of Labour proved again that, so far as the employment of children below the prescribed age limits in contravention of the statutory requirements is concerned, enquiries show that children are employed in a few industries.¹⁰ Surprisingly enough against this grave situation, child labour did not get any importance in the parliament of India in the year 1954.¹¹ Again a discussion was made on labour welfare in the year 1954, but no discussion was held on child labour welfare.¹² Another discussion was held on labour welfare, but no point was discussed on child labour welfare.¹³

The Labour Organization Committee of 1953 has remarked that in contravention of the provisions of the Act regarding employment of women and children, both women and children appeared to be employed underground in mica mines. Workers collude with the employers in the employment of women and children in order to augment the family income. The situation is more or less the same in the iron ore industry in regard to which the Report says: 'In particular, the employment of children under 15, in contravention of the law is frequent', and it further adds: 'Although no figures are available, it is likely that children are employed even in the coal mines. Employment opportunities for the workers' children are available in the coal field to a limited extent in seasonal occupations and domestic services which are beyond the scope of the Mine Act, 1952.' In factory industries, the official figures of employment of children are small, but to quote again the Report: 'It is, however, doubtful, if statistics compiled from the returns under Factories Acts tell the whole story regarding child labour. For it is well within the experience of factory inspectors as well as other

officers engaged on field enquiries that no sooner they make their appearance on the scene than quite a large number of children run away from the factory premises...often factory premises are crowded with such children ranging in age from 5 to 12.¹⁴ Data on the conditions of child labour are not generally available except through occasional surveys. A Report on Child Labour in India was published by the Labour Bureau way back in 1954.

In 1955, after being asked by Shri M.R. Krishna, the Minister of Health, RajkumariAmritKaur answered that the Government had no record of mothers with children below earning ages who have to work in order to support the family and there is no such proposal to conduct any survey by the Government.¹⁵ This attitude of parliamentarians brings forth the insensitivity of the Government of India to the problem of child labour. It seems the honourable members of the parliament and as well as the state policy makers did not want to interfere within the family where the parents themselves were responsible for sending their child to earn. Family has been accepted as a safe haven for the care, nurture and bringing up of the child from the period of anti-colonial nationalism and this legacy has been continued by the post-colonial Indian nation-state. In reality the child is exploited inside the family by its own parents for economic reasons. But the state policy makers avoided critiquing the politics inside the family. Both the parliamentarians and the policy planners did not address this practical problem.

It was very clear from the book entitled *Social Welfare in India*, published in 1955 on behalf of the Planning Commission of India that only promulgation of a number of Acts could not change the situations faced by the child workers or child labour completely. Thus it was evident from the book that till 1955 the conditions regarding the child workers were not changed. To understand the situation – prevailed at that time – it is necessary to show that the book said, ‘As primary education is not yet universal, free and compulsory and as the ILO Convention regarding the minimum age of employment, which the Government of India has ratified, is not fully enforced, many children work with their parents or share their work with a view to supporting the lean family budgets. The best way to take the child out of a factory, it is said, is to open a school. Many families cannot afford to lose the help of the children in domestic and bread-winning work nor can they carry on without the earning of the child, however small it may be. Yet, all children must have free primary education. It should, therefore, be so arranged that after school hours, children might take up employment in healthy environment and under controlled conditions, subject to the minimum age and health requirements. In this connection it may be mentioned that legislation affecting employment of children and young persons needs proper enforcement’.¹⁶ It is thus clear that the state accepted the employment of children and it will be clearer if we say that the state contradicted its own Constitution when the state made certain educational facilities for the employed child labourers to fulfil the constitutional directive of free, compulsory and universal primary education.

In 1954, the Factories Act was amended to include the prohibition of employment of children under 17 years between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. In 1958, the Merchant Shipping Act prohibited the employment of children under 15 in any ship, except in school ship, in ship where all employees were members of a family. In 1961, the Motor Transport Workers Act was passed to prohibit the employment of children under 15 in motor transport undertakings and this act required adolescent workers to obtain certificates of fitness. The Merchant Shipping Act and the Motor Transport Workers Act were later amended to define the child as being only those who were under 14 years by the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986. In 1961, the Apprentices Act was passed which prohibited the apprenticeship or training of a child under 14 years and the case of the apprenticeship of other minors, required a contract between the guardian and the employer. In 1962, the Atomic Energy Act, prohibited the employment of persons under 18 years of age as radiation workers, except with the permission of the competent authority. In 1966, the *Bidi* and Cigar Workers (Conditions of Employment) Act was passed. It prohibited the employment of children under 14 in industrial premises. It is clear from the above acts promulgated by the State that the minimum age for employment of a child varied with every different act. It points to the fact that legislations were passed not with a focus on the employment of children or, for that matter, persons falling under any other age group or any particular general category, but with reference to the need to regulate employment in a particular industry as and when such need arose. It is surprising that no 'general' law regulating child labour is to be found on the Indian Statute Book. It is also unfortunate that no national statistics exist in regard to the employment of children in factory industries by categories and by ages, due to the fact that this employment is almost clandestine. So far as the nature of the work is concerned, children are often assigned comparatively light work such as packing, pasting, labelling etc.

The government has identified family poverty on the one hand, and lack of educational and training facilities, on the other, as the two basic obstacles in the way of abolishing child labour. The Government of India's report on child labour, to which we have often referred, says: 'Invariably the employers of child labour are the workers themselves and often the children are related to the workers whom they help. Several workers stated that they realized that such work was deleterious to the children but they could not afford to send them to school and to buy books, slates and clothes for them.'¹⁷ It seems that the government of India was well aware of the condition of the large number of child labourers who were engaged in different factories and industries. As some of the industries were largely depended on the child labour and some of the families were dependent on the income of the child labourers, the government could not afford to abolish child labour totally. A number of acts were promulgated but without proper enforcement machinery those acts remained only in the statute book. Article 39 said that the tender age of children should not be abused. We do not find the reflection of this provision of the article in any of the initiative taken by the state during the period of our discussion.

The National Commission of Labour observed, in 1966, that the employment of children was indeed more of an economic problem than anything else. However, denial of opportunity to children for their proper physical development and education was considered a serious issue keeping in view the larger interests of society. The Commission recommended fixing the minimum age for children, along with the fixation of the working hours of child labour and also made arrangements for work with education.¹⁸ Apart from the recommendations in the above-mentioned areas, the National Commission could not give any solution for the economic problem which is, according to the commission, the actual cause behind child labour. The commission pointed out that the child's proper physical development and education was meant for the larger interests of the society. But what about the fundamental point of child's own interest? The official attitudes of the Nehruvian period point to the fact that during this timeframe the child's subjectivity is completely denied. It can be assumed from the above statement that the state thinks that the proper physical development and education of the child are essential as those will help the child to grow up into an able adult citizen in the future. This is essential for the biological and cultural reconstruction of the Indian nation-state. It should be kept in mind that social security as practiced in many of the countries, particularly in Scandinavia, was practically absent in the case of independent India, given the specific nature of economic policy pursued by the state. Any questioning of the invariable authority of the family over the child particularly in relation to the poorer classes and marginal groups would have entailed the necessity of the state to provide social security to the children ill-treated, exploited, repressed or abused by family members themselves; such an eventuality had to be avoided at any cost.

Post Nehruvian Period (1964-1979)

It is only to be expected that the focus on poverty eradication would bring the problem of child labour up like never before in the domain of public policy. It should be recalled in this connection that the policy-makers in India had shown considerable insensitivity towards this problem during the Nehruvian era. In that sense it is significant that in the 1971 census child labour or the workers of 0-14 age group was shown for the first time.¹⁹ According to 1971 census there were 10.74 million child workers of less than 15 years age and 5.95% of the total labour force, of these about 7.9 million were boys and 2.8 million girls. Out of the total number of 10.7 million child workers, 0.7 million or 7% were in urban areas and the rest of 10 million or 93% in rural areas. And in the context of this publication of statistics the goal of abolition of child labour was accepted in principle even before the Fifth Five Year Plan.

The legislators displayed an increasing degree of concern about the issue of child labour during the period from 1964 to 1979, the issue having been raised approximately eight times in the parliament during this time. In 1972 when 10.74 million children were working in India, the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation, R.K. Khadilkar had to face questions regarding child labour from Kodanda Ram Reddy in Parliament on 14th December 1972.

The Minister said that the Government wanted to ultimately abolish child labour though it was not feasible to do so immediately. Till total abolition was achieved, Government would regulate the minimum age of employment through various laws.²⁰ The government's justification for such a stand was that the root cause was poverty. The Draft Fifth Five Year Plan said that due to poverty, parents compel children to work. During 1977-78, it was estimated that approximately 48 per cent of the people in rural and tribal areas lived below the poverty line. Work alone helped their children contribute to the family income and this helped meet some of the basic needs even of the children themselves. Low family income and bigger family size, low living standards and lack of self-confidence were some other factors responsible for the problem.²¹

The case of child labour – the most glaring form of multi-layered inequality in India – may be specially cited to illustrate the above-mentioned point. Kodamba Ram Reddy, a Member of Parliament, asked the Minister of Labour and Rehabilitation in 1978 whether the Government was contemplating to bring in legislation for the abolition of child labour. The government's reluctance to commit itself to such abolition was present as a sub-text in the Minister's reply in Parliament.²² The Working Group on Employment of Children, too, avoided giving the advice of outright abolition and expressed its preference for the status quo in the matter of the legal aspect of the child labour question. It stated, 'Better enforcement of existing provisions in law in regard to child workers and an in-depth study of all legislations relating to children should be taken up and changes proposed wherever necessary.'²³

We are not surprised, therefore that even as late as 1979 (interestingly, the International Year of the Child) the newly appointed Gurupadaswamy Committee on Child Labour did not advise complete abolition of child labour but merely enunciated some welfare measures 'to benefit the working children'.²⁴ The Committee examined the problem in detail and made some far-reaching recommendations. It observed that as long as poverty continued, it would be difficult to totally eliminate child labour and hence, any attempt to abolish it through legal recourse would not be a practical proposition. Significantly, the members of the Committee mainly comprised bureaucrats - Joint Secretaries of the Ministries of Law, Justice and Company Affairs (Legislative Department), Social Welfare, Education and Social Welfare besides the Secretary of Labour Social Welfare and Tribal Department, Government of Gujarat. The only two members from outside the domain of the state were the Deputy Director of National Institute of Public Cooperation and Child Development, New Delhi, and M. Khandekar from the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay. Despite a long debate these two members – from two autonomous research institutes - could not influence the resolution of the Committee.²⁵ The Committee merely suggested no initiative other than 'examining existing laws, their adequacy and implementation and suggest corrective action to be taken to improve implementation and to remedy defects.'²⁶

Based on the recommendations of Gurupadaswamy Committee, the Child Labour (Prohibition & Regulation) Act was enacted in 1986. The Act prohibits employment of

children in certain specified hazardous occupations and processes and regulates the working conditions in others. The list of hazardous occupations and processes is progressively being expanded on the recommendation of Child Labour Technical Advisory Committee constituted under the Act. In consonance with the above approach, a National Policy on Child Labour was formulated in 1987. The Policy seeks to adopt a gradual and sequential approach with a focus on rehabilitation of children working in hazardous occupations and processes in the first instance.

What was being obviously elided by the State's policy makers was that the child as labour was exposed to successive links in a chain of exploitation; the poorer sections were being systematically exploited because an unequal economic system was pinning the lower classes down to poverty. The Planners and policy makers were not alone in eliding this systematic perpetuation of poverty. This poverty, in its turn, was forcing the parents in these poor families to send their children to earn through hard adult-like labour. After all the family – whether rich or poor - was almost invariably ruled by patriarchy, which also connoted the domination of adulthood over childhood. The Parliamentary debates of the period reveal that the vast majority of the Parliamentarians, as part of State power, were party to the same elision.²⁷ It is important that even as the policy makers and legislators elided the root cause of poverty in India, they also carefully sustained the patriarchal silence about politics within the family as if the family was a natural, pre-political institution.²⁸ Any questioning of the invariable authority of the family over the child particularly in relation to the poorer classes and marginal groups would have necessitated the state to provide social security to the children who were ill-treated, exploited, repressed or abused by family members themselves; given the specific nature of economic policy pursued in India, the state was anxious to avoid such an eventuality at all cost.

¹Geneva, Switzerland: ILO; 2003. International Labour Organisation Combating Child Labour through Education 2003.

² It is important to admit in passing that thanks to the very rich gamut of post-colonial theory, the word post-colonial has come to acquire critical-theoretical connotations. However, in this instance we use the word post-colonial nation-state in a more simple way to refer to the replacement of the colonial state by a state that derived its justifications from the claim that the Indian nation, howsoever imagined, had achieved political independence and had come to constitute a state of its own. This nation-state, in its turn, invariably related to the child as an integral part of the population under its sovereignty and governance.

³*Parliamentary Debates*, Part I, 1950, p. 173.

⁴*Report of the Committee on Child Labour*, p. 26.

⁵*Parliamentary Debates*, Third Session, Second Part, 1951, pp. 2839-2840.

⁶*Parliamentary Debates*, Part II, Vol. XIV, 1951, Parliament Secretariat, New Delhi, p. 263.

⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 262-267.

⁸*Parliamentary Debates*, Part II, House of the People, Official Report, 13th May to 12th August, 1952, Parliament Secretariat, New Delhi, pp. 2145-2235.

⁹*Parliamentary Debates, 1952*, Part I, House of the People, Vol. IV, Parliament Secretariat, New Delhi, pp. 1805-06.

¹⁰*Parliamentary Debates, 1954*, Part II, House of the People, Official Report, 15th February to 21st August, 1954, 6th Session, Parliament Secretariat, New Delhi, p. 3706, pp. 3711-23, pp.3745-51, p.3781-86, p.3791.

¹¹*Parliamentary Debates, 1954*, Part II, House of the People, Official Report, 15th February to 21st August, 1954, 6th Session, Parliament Secretariat, New Delhi, pp. 1593-1642.

¹²*Lok Sabha Debates, 1955*, Part II, Vol. 1, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, p. 1472, pp. 1479-82, p. 1502, p. 1955.

¹³ Government of India, Ministry of Social Welfare, *Profile of the Child in India: Policies and Programmes*, Bureau of Nutrition and Child Development, Evaluation and Monitoring Division, New Delhi, 1983, p. 49.

¹⁴*Lok Sabha Debates*, Part I, Vol. III, 1955, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, p. 2642.

¹⁵ Government of India, Issued on behalf of The Planning Commission, *Social Welfare In India*, Foreword by Jawaharlal Nehru, New Delhi, 1955(First Publication), Revised Publication, 1960, p.22.

¹⁶Ika Paul Pont, *Child Welfare In India*, Chief of the Service of Coordination of Activities in Africa and Asia, International Children's Centre (Paris), Government of India, Ministry of Education, 1963.

¹⁷ Helen R. Sekar, *Child Labour Legislations in India: A Study in Retrospect and Prospect*, pp. 40-43.

¹⁸ Government of India, Planning Commission, *Draft Fifth Five Year Plan, 1974-79*, Vol.1, p. 2.

¹⁹*Lok Sabha Debates*, 6th Session, Vol. 22, 1972, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, p. 64.

²⁰*Draft Fifth Five Year Plan, 1974-79*, p.33.

²¹*Lok Sabha Debates*, 6th Session, Vol. 22, 1972, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, p. 64.

²²*Lok Sabha Debates, 1978*, 5th Session, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, vol. 18, pp. 213-218. The debate was held among Shri G.M. Banatwalla, Shri Mukhtiar Singh Malik, Shri Shyam Sunder Gupta and the Minister of State in the Ministry of Education, Social Welfare and Culture, Smt Renuka Devi Barakataki on 28th August 1978.

²³*Lok Sabha Debates, 1979*, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, vol. 26, pp. 1-8

²⁴*Ibid.*

²⁵*Lok Sabha Debates, 1979*, Seventh Session, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, vol. 25, pp. 36-37. The debate was held among Shri Shankar Singh Vaghela, Shri Mukhtiar Singh Malik and the Minister of Education, Social Welfare and Culture Smt. Renuka Devi Barakataki on 9th April 1979.

²⁶*Lok Sabha Debates, 1979*, Seventh Session, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, vol. 22, pp. 67-69.

²⁷*Lok Sabha Debates, 1979*, Seventh Session, Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi, vol. 23, pp. 12-15.