

Child Labour in Rajasthan

A Preliminary Analysis of Census 2001 Data

I: INTRODUCTION

(A) MEANING

Though the problem of Child Labour is spread world over, it is much deeper and wider in the developing countries where millions start working at a very young age for historical reasons. The distinction between the world of work of a child and an adult is not of a recent origin in human history, the child labour came on the scene later than the concept of wage labour. Wage labour is a creation of the industrial society. The concept of child labour thus should not be more than two-three hundred year old. It is indeed related with the developed industrial society. At the root of the emergence of the child labour is the observed impact of long hours of work on the young working-hands in industries.

It is for the reason of highly variable level of development between countries and the academia that there is no unanimity with regard to the concept child labour, as has been the case with most of the social categories. In certain respects there are diametrically opposite views with regard to very definition and consequently on the detailed description of the problem and strategies to tackle the same. Thus the term, child labour, has been defined differently by different organizations, agencies and countries. According to the Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences (1979), “when the business of wage earning or of participation in itself or family support conflicts directly or indirectly with the business of growth and education, the result is child labour”.

A distinction has also been made between ‘child work’ and ‘child labour’. Writes Francis Blanchard (Former Director General of the International Labour Organization (ILO), “Child labour includes children prematurely leading adult lives, working long hours for low wages under conditions damaging to their health and to their physical and mental development, sometimes separated from their families, frequently deprived of meaningful education and training opportunities that could open up for them a better future” (ILO : 1983).

On the other hand, Shantha Sinha of MV Foundation, India who has done pioneering work in area of child labour, defines any child who is out of regular school as child labour. We shall, however, without going into the nuances of the debate, proceed further by briefly describing our understanding of the problem in particular context of India. There is unanimity on two counts at least. One, severe exploitation of child cannot be tolerated and secondly, the child must get an opportunity to develop that is it cannot be denied of opportunities. In a nutshell therefore, the definition of child labour is any work within or outside the family that threatens health and mental development of the child by denying him or her fundamental as well as non-fundamental rights like formal education and freedom and liberty to explore at its own place. We find ILO’s definition of child labour as given in the Handbook for Parliamentarians brought out in the year 2002 as reasonably acceptable. It defines any 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 or by forcing them to drop out or by combining school with excessively long and heavy work.

(b) Role of ILO and UN

Over the years, with the development of democratic consciousness, the growing exploitation of children at work place has got global attention. In the wake of First World War, International Labour Organization (ILO) was set-up in 1919 under the League of Nations, to protect and further the rights of the workers by setting international labour standards. Over the years, in addition to all other types of labour, the ILO has also become the lead organisation to promote child labour related policies and programmes among different nations. To begin with it issued international guidelines about minimum age for entry into different employments. Over the years ILO adopted different conventions to prescribe minimum age for different types of employment like agriculture and industry. In 1973, it adopted Convention Number 138 on Minimum Age wherein sector-specific conventions adopted earlier were consolidated. This convention linked education with employment and provided that the age of entry into employment should not be less than the age of completion of compulsory schooling. The minimum age prescribed was 15 years. In the year 1999, ILO adopted another convention number 182 on Worst Forms of Child Labour as an immediate measure to eliminate worst forms of child labour which included all forms of slavery, prostitution, pornography and trafficking of drugs. This Convention however appears to have weakened the cause of mass of child labour because of over attention to the four specific forms of child labour. The ILO has been setting bench marks for labour standards including child labour.

In November 1989, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Convention on the Rights of the Child setting standards for the welfare of the children in general. This Convention is the primary basis of the programmes of UNICEF. Right to education (Article 28) and right to protection from economic exploitation and work (Article 32) are relevant to the context of child labour. Unfortunately the important UN agencies like UNICEF (working for exclusively for the welfare of children) and UNESCO (working exclusively for education) which are directly involved to ensure right to education mandate have not been putting required emphasis on child labour despite the known facts that it the mass of the child labour in countries like India whose right to education stand most violated.

In practice the international agencies seem to follow the pro-employer policies of employers rather than welfare of the child labour in true sense of the word. They seem to be toeing the line of World Bank(WB) which has in the recent past spelt out its understanding about the child labour and has spent lot of money on education in developing countries. In the consideration of the WB the main cause of child labour is the poverty and its abolition may cast disaster in the lives of the poor households. It also holds that all works are not harmful for children and thus in fact legitimises child labour. It thus suggests combining work with education as one of the approached to education. Its stand on child labour is thus pragmatic in line with employers but most obnoxious in our view.

© **The State and the Child Labour in India**

The State has played most important role in combating the problem of child labour world over. It is through the efforts of the State that the children in developed as well as developing countries like Sri Lanka or state of Kerala within India have been put out of labour and in formal schools. Observes Weiner on the basis of the historical and comparative evidences,

Thus there is historical and comparative evidence to suggest that the major obstacles to the achievement of universal primary education and the abolition of child labour are not the level of industrialisation, per capita income and the socio-economic conditions of families, the level of overall government expenditure in school, nor the rapid expansion in the number of school children, four widely suggested explanations. India has made less of an effort to move children out of the labour force and out of their homes into the school system than many other countries not for economic or demographic reasons but because of the attitudes of government officials, politicians, trade unions leaders, workers in voluntary agencies, religious figures, intellectuals, and the influential middle class toward child

labour and compulsory primary education. (Myron Weiner, *The Child and the State in India*, Oxford University Press, Delhi).

It is obvious therefore that the state in India has lacked the interest in solving the problem of child labour, especially during seventies and eighties of 20th century when the issue was debated and policies and programmes were put in place.

The first intervention on the part of State was in colonial India when a law to protect children from employment was enacted at too early an age date back to 1881 in the form of the Factories Act fixing the minimum age of employment at seven years. Since then, successive amendments have in raised the minimum age of employment, restricting the hours of work, improving the employment conditions, and providing measures for health and safety. New areas of industrial activity have also been covered through protective legislation, beginning from 1901 when the Mines Act was passed.

After transfer of power in 1947, the Constitution of India provided protection to children under fundamental rights and directive principles. It prohibited forced labour under Article 23, what the ILO envisages in the 1999 Convention Number 182 referred above. But the policies and programmes as well legal framework in India is not commensurate with the intentions and spirit of the various provisions of the Constitution till date. Just to cite one example, the constitutional mandate to provide free and compulsory education up to the age of 14 by the year 1960 is yet to be implemented.

Till the beginning of the eighties there was hardly any system to address to the problem of child labour barring the provision of Factories Act wherein employment in industries covered by the Act was barred below the age of 15. In 1979 a committee was constituted to look into the issue relating to the child labour. During early eighties there were many discussions and finally the government of India came out with three different instruments with regard to child labour- (i) Child Labour (Regulation and Prohibition) Act, 1986, (ii) Education Policy, 1986 and (iii) Child Labour Policy, 1987. The principal basis of all these was the expressed understanding that in the given socio-economic reality the problem of child labour cannot be taken out of work. Thus the child labour act of 1986 legalised child labour and the education policy emphasised the need for non-formal education in place of free and compulsory education up to the age of 14 years ignoring constitutional obligation. Thus, the government of India accepted the usual argument of the poverty and relation between formal education and incidence of child labour was totally ignored. This dominant thought continues not only in the corridors of the power but also in the minds of the many well-meaning persons. The recently (July 2007) draft bill to protect unorganised sector workers is the case in point. The proposed bill refers to the Child Labour Act of 1986 thus legalising the child labour. The minimum wage acts of many states including that of West Bengal continue to prescribe different wage rates fro child, adolescents and adults.

The current legislation in force in the matter of employment of children is the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 which replaced the Employment of Children Act, 1938. Part-II of the Act contains provisions which prohibit the employment of children less than 14 years in certain occupations and processes listed in two schedules included in the Act. Although subsequent notifications, latest being on 6th Oct 2006 including domestic work and work in dhabas and restaurants, have expanded the list of the occupations, yet the Act has failed to effectively tackle the problem of child labour which continues unabated. The main criticism in regard to the Act relates to section-3 which, as mentioned above legitimizes child labour. The act totally exempts family based workshops thereby providing a major loophole. Besides, the Act also does not prescribe for any minimum age for the non-prohibited employments. Thus, the problem of child labour continues unabated. Moreover, the implementation of this

act remains extremely poor. In the current environment of globalization and constant ‘hammering of labour’, the Act seems to have been literally reduced to book-shelves.

The impact of such an approach in the context of India is well reflected in the problem of child labour that continues unabated as we shall examine with particular reference to Rajasthan in next part of this pamphlet. For the present we may only like to refer to the fact that as per Census data the number of child labour, the number of child labour in India in 1971 was 10.7 million and in 2001 it is 12.7 (main+marginal) millions.

(d) The Child Labour Problem in India

There is no definite estimate about the number of child labour in India, but it is a universally accepted fact that India houses largest number of child labour in the world. It is thus a matter of serious social concern. The estimates of the number of child workers in India vary. The difference in estimates is largely due to the difference in the methodology followed. According to the census reports there appear to be a progressive decline in the number of child workers in terms of percentages to total workers but the number seems to be stagnant at around 11-13 millions. As per 2001 Census there are 12.7 (main+marginal) millions CL in India. But Census figures are only indicative as they do not reflect the true number. Census 1981 reported about 13 million child workers. However, the 43rd round of the National Sample Survey which was conducted in 1987-88, estimated the number of working children to be 17.02 million. The ORG study which was conducted in 1980 and which included activities which are economic as well as non-economic and also related to household level, estimated 44 million working children up to the age of 15. According to concerned for working children (CWC), a Bangalore based organisation, all children below 15 years of age who are not attending school are child labourers and they have estimated the figure of child labour to be hundred million. The estimates may differ but fact remains that India continues to saddle with the massive number of child labour.

The three states with the highest number of child labour in the country are U.P., Andhra Pradesh and Rajasthan as per 2001 Census. The reported numbers (main+marginal) are 19.3, 13.6 and 12.6 lakhs respectively. Other states where child labour population is more than one million are Bihar and Madhya Pradesh. Almost 90% of the child workers (main) are in rural areas. The 2001 (1991) census gives the 5-14 age specific work participation rate of 2.28 (4.33%) in the case of main workers and 2.72 (1.05%) in the case of marginal workers giving a total WPR of 5.01 (5.37%). Thus the over participation rate has marginally declined during the decade of nineties from 5.37 to 5.01 per cent.

Child workers are found in myriad kinds of works. In the rural areas they are engaged in agriculture and allied occupations like cultivation, agricultural labour, livestock, forestry and fisheries. In the urban and semi-urban areas, they are engaged in a wide variety of production processes and services in different parts of the country. There are some locations where such employment is more apparent for long hours and very difficult conditions of work. Prominent among them have been well-known: the match industry in Sivakasi, Tamil Nadu; the diamond polishing industry in Surat, Gujrat; the precious stone polishing industry in Jaipur, Rajasthan; the glass industry in Firozabad, Uttar Pradesh; the brassware industry in Moradabad, Uttar Pradesh; the handmade carpet industry in Mirzapur – Bhadohi, Uttar Pradesh and parts of Rajasthan; the hand-made carpet industry in Jammu and Kashmir; the lock-making industry in Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh; the slate industry in Markapur, Andhra Pradesh and in Mandsaur, Madhya Pradesh. The working conditions in these industries is extremely bad, some being specific to the production process which is outdated, surviving on cheap child labour and totally unmindful of the effect on the work.

(e) Globalisation and Child Labour

Over the years the problem of child labour has further aggravated with globalisation. A very interesting feature of the capital – intensive production based countries is the shifting of the labour components of their production to cheap labour countries and sub-contracting work to their local informal sectors. (krvijitbosh, 1996). Likewise, employers in the developing countries in order to compete to get a higher share in the world market for products, try to keep prices low by minimising the cost of labour. They sub-contract part of their production which is labour intensive, to small unregistered units where women and children can be grossly underpaid and can work beyond the stipulated work schedule without journeying unions and demanding social securities.

In light of this exploitation, the world Trade Organisation (WTO) has been trying to introduce the social clause into trade agreements, with a view to setting certain core labour standards. The issue of child labour holds prominence in the social clause debate. Following the social clause debate, the employers have started talking about the child labour and devising strategies to skirt the issue in various ways. ILO is helping them in this. The sports goods industry of India is case in point which was attacked for employing a large number of child labourers. Following that ILO funded FICCI for a study and based on that study gave money to employers for running child labour projects. The sports goods industry thus solved the problem of child labour!

Globalisation promotes Child labour in Agriculture:

Globalisation brought MNCs like Monsanto and Unilever on to Indian farm scene. Bt cottonseed is the classic case. These big seed companies in the recent past have promoted farming of cottonseed production at large scale in states like Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Gujarat. This labour intensive farming has widely promoted child labour. Child labour in lakhs has been found to be working on these seed production farms at pittance of a wage. Reports Hindu about Andhra farmers who with the help of a seed company taking irrigated farms on lease in bordering villages of Karnataka,

“Balamani, a 13-year-old girl hailing from Mudhol village in Sedam taluk (Gulbarga District), is a farm labourer in a seed production farm in this small village. Balamani says that she is paid Rs 20/- a day as wages. Like Balamani, several children are made to toil in the fields for a paltry sum, while the wages paid to unskilled agriculture labourers here range from Rs 60 to Rs 80 a day” (<http://www.thehindu.com/2006/02/02/stories>).

In Andhra Pradesh lakhs of children are working on such seed farms. In Gujarat lakhs of tribal migrant child labour from southern Rajasthan toil on cottonseed production farms.

The issue of child labour has been raised with the MNCs but they have hardly done anything about that. Moreover, they just don't talk on the issue of prices which is directly related to the wages to workers. The companies are making super profits on the seeds. They buy seeds from farmers at a much cheaper rate than the rate at which they sell to farmers. The price gap has been to the extent of five to seven times. The seed purchased at Rs 230 per kg has been sold for 1500-1800 per kg. When one of the Unions working with the labourers approached the company on the issue, they did not even respond. Moreover, it is a known fact that when the Government fixed MRP of Rs 750/- per packet (450 grams) the seed company approached supreme court to stop the government on the argument that in a free market economy the market mechanism should be allowed to determine the price of a commodity.

(g) The Present Study:

Objective: This analysis has been a first attempt to understand the child labour situation in the state of Rajasthan. Census is the only source of district-wise data on the age and classification of workers and participation rates. Therefore in order to have a broad understanding of work participation rates and worker profiles Census with all its limitation is a good source data to begin with. The present analysis has been attempted in the backdrop of a Public Hearing on the issues of child labour in the state of Rajasthan.

Methodology: The data analysis is restricted to 2001 census data. The data have been analysed mainly in terms of percentages to population and total workers by districts, age groups (5-9, 10-14 and 5-14), area (rural/urban), major religion (hindu and muslim) and caste (SC, ST & Total).

WPR= Percentage of Main + Marginal workers to total population in the respective age group

GWPR= Percentage of Main+Marginal+Non-Workers seeking/available for work to total population in the respective age group

CL = Workers in the age group 5-14 years

An attempt has been also made to see relationship between education and child labour. We have done this to re-test the generally believed explanation that the level of education is negatively correlated to the child labour. A district wise analysis has been attempted to understand regional variations.

II CHILD LABOUR IN RAJASTHAN

As per Census 2001, Rajasthan is ranked third from above in terms of absolute number of Child Labour (CL) (workers in the age group 5-14 years). Out of total population of 1.53 crores, 3.9 lakh children were reported to be full time (who worked for more than six months) workers and 8.73 lakhs were reported to have worked for up to six months during the reference year. The Work Participation Rate (WPR) thus comes to 8.25%. Moreover, there were 1.49 lakh non-workers in this age group who were available for/seeking work. If we include these job seekers in the category of workers than the total number of CL increases to 14.11 lakhs and the GWPR becomes 9.22 percent. In other words these many children were either working or searching for work instead of being in schools learning and developing skills.

In terms of share in the overall labour force, we find that 2.24% of total main workers were CL. However, among marginal workers the respective share is high to the tune of 13.78%. Among total workers (main+marginal), the share of CL comes to 5.31%. Large share of CL among total marginal workers can be explained in two ways. One, the children available for work do not have enough job opportunities to be employed for longer periods. Secondly, the reason may lie in the fact that the children resent work and only when forced that they work. Either way, these children are certainly the ones who are out of formal education system and therefore are to that extent similarly placed with the main workers. Hence, when we discuss the issue of CL distinction between main and marginal workers is of not much relevance as both have to be taken out of work and put in formal education system.

Child Labour in Rajasthan is found in innumerable employments. One can find anywhere and everywhere. It is spread over all the areas- villages, towns and big cities. It is found across all the three major sectors of economy- primary, secondary and tertiary. The most important sector where a large number of children are found as main workers is cottage industries. In production of Handicraft products of various kinds, rugs, block printing, wool-gathering, gem-polishing, carpet weaving, zari-work and so on. In dirty and odd jobs like manual scavenging, rag-picking, small restaurants, mechanic shops, domestic work, hawking, buses, jeeps, trucks, begging, prostitution. Many children migrate for work- some times alone, some times in groups and at other times with families. They migrate within district, within state and inter-state. They

work in agriculture, at construction sites, to tend milch and draught animals, to take care of siblings, domestic chores.

(a) Distribution CL by Sex: Table 1 suggests that Rajasthan is probably placed in an unusual position. Usually males dominate as main workers, but case of CL in Rajasthan it is almost equally distributed. Among the total main workers in 5-14 year age-group, 50.25% are boys and rest girls. The corresponding figure for total workers is 73.64%. On the other hand, among marginal workers the share of girls/women is high among both CL and total workers, 58.25% and 70.7% respectively. Compared with the main workers, we find that the situation is upside down. This clearly reflects towards gender biases in the society. When it comes to necessity of CL, the families opt for girls and boys are sent to schools to the extent possible. When turn adults, society make men earners and women housewives.

(b) Distribution by Religion: A reading of the figures on the basis of religion suggests that compared to Hindus, the WPR is higher among Muslims, the two ratios being 6.22 and 7.3 respectively. Similarly the share of CL among total workers is also more in the Muslim community (2.48%) compared to Hindu (1.9%) community. If we look distribution of CL by sex within religious communities, we find that the distribution of main CL is much higher in favour of boys (62.5%) among Muslims. On the contrary, girls (51.38%) are more in number than boys among Hindus. The sex-wise distribution of marginal workers is similar in both the communities, girls out number boys. It appears that Muslim community places more emphasis on work than education. The data may also be interpreted in terms of gender discrimination in Hindu society. If a family has to depend on CL, than the boy will be sent to school and girl to work. Such cases are not uncommon in rural India especially.

Table 1
Distribution of Child Labour by Sex and Religion (In Percent)

Category	Hindu		Muslim		Total	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5-14 Years						
Main Workers	48.6%	51.4%	62.5%	37.5%	50.3%	49.8%
Marginal workers	41.5%	58.6%	44.9%	55.1%	41.8%	58.3%
All Workers						
Main Workers	72.7%	27.3%	81.3%	18.7%	73.6%	26.4%
Marginal Workers	28.9%	71.1%	35.2%	64.8%	29.3%	70.7%

© **Distribution by Caste:**

(d) Regional Variations

District analysis of the distribution of GWPR for CL suggests that there is wide variation in the incidence of child labour among various districts. Out of the 32 districts, Kota district is least infested with the problem of child labour with GWPR of just 3.8. Jalore district with GWPR of 24.6 suggest that out of every four children in the age-group of 5-14, one is either working or is available for work. The district which has reported second highest level of child labour is the tribal district of Dungarpur with GWPR of 17.4.

III: CASE OF WIDESPREAD TRIBAL MIGRANT CHILD LABOUR

One most important area that recently has come into light involving a large number of migrant tribal children is tribal dominated southern Rajasthan. Children are taken to work for Bt cottonseed production, domestic work, tobacco work, textile market. These children are taken to neighbouring state of Gujarat for work.

Production of Bt Cotton seeds is one of the important labour intensive farming activities in North Gujarat providing employment to over two lakh workers for about two months between mid-July to mid-Oct every year. Almost all these workers belong to tribal community from Southern Rajasthan stretching from Abu Road block in Sirohi district to Kotda, Jhadol, Kherwada and Sarada in Udaipur to all the five blocks of Dungarpur district to adjoining blocks of Banswara district. About ninety percent should be below twenty years of age. Around 45 percent of these are girls. A good number of these workers, almost fifty percent, are children between 10-14 years of age. Some are as young as 7-9 years. There are areas from where girls outnumber boys. Thus about one lakh children are taken for work to north Gujarat just for one employment- cross-pollination work for cottonseed farms. All these children are literally trafficked. The movement is in the dead hours of night. Parents are by and large not aware where their children are being taken to.

The wage in BT Cotton was Rs 40/- per day in the year 2005. The working hours usually extend up to 10-12 hours a day. Moreover, the work has to be finished during a specific time period forcing labourers to continue work even if it starts raining. The main hazard is from frequent and heavy spray of pesticides/insecticides. Instances of children inhaling dangerous pesticides are not uncommon. The other major problems arise from sleeping in makeshift arrangements in open making young workers susceptible to insect and snakebite. Cases of sexual exploitation and even deaths are regularly heard. The children in particular are exploited and cheated by the mates as well many a times.

Table 2
Incidence of Child Labour among Tribal Families in Southern Rajasthan

District	Population	MW	MRW	NWAW	Total	WPR(MW)	WPR	GWPR
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Sirohi	59604	2673	5156	670	8499	4.5	13.14	14.3
Udaipur	357849	7974	25060	5277	38311	2.2	9.23	10.4
Dungarpur	196320	4699	31408	3911	40018	2.4	18.38	20.4
Banswar	307219	11248	29040	4349	44637	3.7	13.11	14.5
Total	920992	26594	90664	14207	131465	2.89	12.73	14.27

MW= Main Workers; MRW=Marginal Workers; NWAW=Non-Workers Available for Work

Apart from this work child workers are taken to Gujarat for tobacco work to Oonjha district, for textile market of Surat district and for dhabas, domestic work almost across the state.

The Census 2001 data reveal that among the tribal families of the four districts of Southern Rajasthan (14.27) the GWPR is more than one and half times of the high average of Rajasthan (9.2). And in one of the districts it is as high as 20.4%. (Table 2)

Therefore the estimates of migrant CL appear realistic rather on lower side as Census estimates are on lower side. These high rates clearly reveal that the community at large does not feel very agitated about the child labour.

IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our conclusion is no way different than the generally accepted social reality that the problem of child labour in Rajasthan continues unabated. The study highlights the seriousness of the problem in spread and magnitude. High GWPR among 5-14 year age group to the extent of about 25 per cent in Jalore is an eye-opener. Equally worrisome is the fact that in ten districts the GWPR is more than double digit. The incidence is highest among the ST population, then among SC and then Muslims. Residual Hindus have least incidence.

One of the important reasons for perpetuation of the problems is attitude of the state towards child labour issue. The child labour related act legitimises child labour. Accordingly there has been total lack of emphasis on formal education. The historical as well as comparative evidences from across the world including from within the Indian states clearly suggest that the CL can be reduced considerably by enrolling children in formal education system. The state of Kerala is not a developed state like like Pubjab or Haryana but has reported lowest incidence simply because of universal formal primary education. It is necessary that the children are provided with formal school education.

Recommendations

Let us all resolve, in the first place, to say an emphatic NO to child labour in the sixtieth year of impendence. Every thing else can wait in world for tomorrow, not the right to education for child. Childhood lost today is lost forever. Put child in his rightful place- SCHOOL. Let us resolve to launch a mass awakening campaign today to universal formal education. Earlier we had observed that the Child Labour related act of 1986 legitimises child labour. Repeal 'regulation' and through amendment prohibit CL completely without any exception. And make the violation unacceptable by providing stringent punishment including compulsory imprisonment on second offence. Otherwise, the recent constitutional amendment to provide free and compulsory education up to the age of 14 and employment guarantee act will lose its social relevance.

Further, we strongly recommend that recruitment of CL by any type or category of contractor, including parent, for full-time work should be totally banned through amendment in relevant law like contract-labour related Act or Minimum Wage Act. Hiring of child labour with or without advance and to take the child out of village should be declared "child trafficking" and be dealt with accordingly.

Equally important priority of the state government with regard to CL should be strengthening the education system. In this context a series of tough measures are required like (a) introduction of finger-print based biometric attendance machines for both teachers and pupils to effectively control of teachers absence and drop outs (b) concurrent evaluation of every school and teacher by the specially constituted district-level social audit teams and linking teacher performance to conditions of job, there should be zero-tolerance for non-delivery (c) total transparent transfer policy (d) minimum three year placement of a teacher in one place (e) promoting effective interaction between community and teachers.

In some areas like tribal southern Rajasthan, where considerable number of children is forced to migrate for work due to hunger, measures for food-security be announced after proper study and dialogue with the community and other stake holders. One alternate worth consideration could be employment to an additional member of the family for 100 days under employment guarantee scheme. This could be funded by the state. As a matter of fact an area development policy needs to be developed for such labour catchments areas. Similarly problem of ensuring adequate wages to workers and social security should also be quickly addressed as a part of strategy to combat CL.

Table 1 Showing Distribution of Population and Main Workers by Districts for 5-9 Age Group in Rajasthan

	Population			Main workers			Percentage of Main Worker to Total Population		
	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females
	2	3	4	5	6	7	5	6	7
RAJASTHAN	8068070	4242507	3825563	52808	28484	24324	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%
Ganganagar	235248	125915	109333	1322	879	443	0.6%	0.7%	0.4%
Hanumangarh *	205709	108751	96958	811	578	233	0.4%	0.5%	0.2%
Bikaner	241852	126545	115307	1910	1164	746	0.8%	0.9%	0.6%
Churu	287220	149959	137261	1490	794	696	0.5%	0.5%	0.5%
Jhunjhunun	262150	139404	122746	529	364	165	0.2%	0.3%	0.1%
Alwar	442112	234524	207588	2559	1363	1196	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Bharatpur	320972	172884	148088	1572	993	579	0.5%	0.6%	0.4%
Dhaulpur	160797	88171	72626	764	514	250	0.5%	0.6%	0.3%
Karauli *	189317	102829	86488	1394	797	597	0.7%	0.8%	0.7%
Sawai Madhopur	161849	86011	75838	1148	530	618	0.7%	0.6%	0.8%
Dausa *	204829	107933	96896	1006	445	561	0.5%	0.4%	0.6%
Jaipur	717862	377607	340255	4062	2378	1684	0.6%	0.6%	0.5%
Sikar	333117	176148	156969	1169	720	449	0.4%	0.4%	0.3%
Nagaur	408921	213761	195160	2646	1394	1252	0.6%	0.7%	0.6%
Jodhpur	412952	215836	197116	1889	1106	783	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%
Jaisalmer	76045	40990	35055	532	328	204	0.7%	0.8%	0.6%
Barmer	295785	155824	139961	2330	1260	1070	0.8%	0.8%	0.8%
Jalor	223994	117555	106439	2910	1394	1516	1.3%	1.2%	1.4%
Sirohi	124294	65943	58351	677	383	294	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%
Pali	259398	135774	123624	2111	1218	893	0.8%	0.9%	0.7%
Ajmer	281919	147751	134168	2627	1068	1559	0.9%	0.7%	1.2%
Tonk	172547	90467	82080	1526	607	919	0.9%	0.7%	1.1%
Bundi	138515	73114	65401	839	462	377	0.6%	0.6%	0.6%
Bhilwara	276573	143223	133350	3764	1618	2146	1.4%	1.1%	1.6%
Rajsamand *	138188	71589	66599	600	316	284	0.4%	0.4%	0.4%
Udaipur	368206	189661	178545	1972	1104	868	0.5%	0.6%	0.5%
Dungarpur	158304	81287	77017	1574	922	652	1.0%	1.1%	0.8%
Banswara	222219	114048	108171	2326	1232	1094	1.0%	1.1%	1.0%
Chittaurgarh	238175	123098	115077	2600	1248	1352	1.1%	1.0%	1.2%
Kota	200040	104923	95117	810	516	294	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%
Baran *	146032	76610	69422	568	358	210	0.4%	0.5%	0.3%
Jhalawar	162929	84372	78557	771	431	340	0.5%	0.5%	0.4%

**Table-2 Showing District Wise Gross Work Participation Rates
For 5-14 Age Group By District, 2001**

District	Total workers (Main+Marginal+Non-worker seeking work)			Work Participation Rates (WPR)		
	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
RAJASTHAN	1411774	645931	765843	9.2%	8.0%	10.6%
Ganganagar	29946	17230	12716	6.5%	7.0%	5.9%
Hanumangarh *	22561	12226	10335	5.6%	5.7%	5.4%
Bikaner	42119	20928	21191	9.2%	8.7%	9.8%
Churu	69026	32748	36278	12.6%	11.4%	13.9%
Jhunjhunun	36174	18202	17972	6.8%	6.5%	7.2%
Alwar	145100	69803	75297	17.3%	15.6%	19.3%
Bharatpur	42461	20312	22149	7.0%	6.1%	8.0%
Dhaulpur	44461	25536	18925	14.9%	15.4%	14.3%
Karauli *	21053	9341	11712	6.0%	4.8%	7.4%
Sawai Madhopur	26576	10916	15660	8.6%	6.6%	10.9%
Dausa *	24400	9328	15072	6.5%	4.6%	8.5%
Jaipur	63245	29257	33988	4.6%	4.0%	5.2%
Sikar	43268	20343	22925	6.6%	5.8%	7.4%
Nagaur	60941	26281	34660	7.8%	6.4%	9.3%
Jodhpur	60398	27537	32861	7.6%	6.6%	8.8%
Jaisalmer	14491	7709	6782	10.4%	10.2%	10.8%
Barmer	63174	26707	36467	11.6%	9.2%	14.3%
Jalor	103686	47538	56148	24.6%	21.5%	28.0%
Sirohi	19684	8455	11229	8.6%	6.9%	10.6%
Pali	38499	15083	23416	7.7%	5.7%	9.9%
Ajmer	40464	16619	23845	7.4%	5.8%	9.3%
Tonk	29411	10367	19044	9.0%	6.0%	12.4%
Bundi	36497	17733	18764	13.9%	12.7%	15.3%
Bhilwara	53958	22004	31954	10.7%	8.4%	13.2%
Rajsamand *	14839	6236	8603	5.9%	4.8%	7.1%
Udaipur	52033	22891	29142	7.7%	6.6%	8.9%
Dungarpur	49534	22656	26878	17.4%	15.4%	19.4%
Banswara	52756	22343	30413	13.0%	10.7%	15.5%
Chittaurgarh	52526	21913	30613	12.0%	9.6%	14.6%
Kota	15096	8217	6879	3.8%	3.9%	3.7%
Baran *	15422	6811	8611	5.5%	4.6%	6.5%
Jhalawar	27975	12661	15314	9.2%	7.9%	10.6%