

The Poverty and Vulnerability of Migrant Workers in India

A Post-earthquake Study in the State of Gujarat

Prepared for IOM by

Darshini Mahadevia

Centre for Environmental Planning and Technology
Ahmedabad, India

November 2002

Acknowledgements

Report prepared by: Darshini Mahadevia

With assistance from: Rajnish Parmar
Neelam Dwivedi
Jigisha Mehta

Survey Team: Rakes Panchal Apexaben Patel
Jigisha Patel Archana Vyas
Hemaben Panchal Bhavin Pandya
Dipak Parmar Nilesh Patel

Collaborating NGOs: Samerth
Akhand Jyot Foundation
Setu
Oxfam India
Action Aid
Unnati
Vikas
Behavioural Science Centre
Hind Swaraj Mandal

With thanks to Achyutbhai Yagnik and Bhabani Das for consultations throughout the study, from design to finalizing the recommendations; Varsha Ganguly for initiating the study and carrying it through to the stage of primary survey, and to all collaborating NGOs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	5
1. Introduction	7
2. Internal Migration in India	11
2.1 Research and legislation	11
2.2 Patterns of migration in India	16
3. Laws to Protect Migrant Workers	24
4. The State of Gujarat	27
4.1 Basic facts about Gujarat	27
4.2 Impacts of the January 2001 earthquake	30
5- Methodology of the Study	33
6. Labour Migrants in Gujarat	39
6.1 Social and demographic profile	39
6.2 Working conditions and wages	58
6.3 Living conditions and security	73
7. Migrants' Links with their Places of Origin	79
8. Earthquake Experience and Effects	86
9. Conclusion: Developing Support for Migrant Workers	97
Endnotes	103

Preface

Migrant workers contribute positively to the development of the local economy both at their places of destination through their involvement in various economic activities, and at the places of their origin through remittances. The area affected by the devastating earthquake of 26 January 2001 in the state of Gujarat hosted hundreds of thousands of inter- and intra-state labour migrants. The assessment mission of the International Organization for Migration (IOM) to the earthquake-affected areas highlighted the fact that many of these migrant workers fell outside the criteria for relief assistance provided by the government and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). IOM conducted this research to better understand the circumstances of labour migrants in the state of Gujarat and their conditions following a natural disaster.

This study shows that low-income labour migrants in India, often compelled to migrate out of lack of other alternatives, form the most marginalized stratum of the society and require special attention regarding policy and programming. This requires that specific research be undertaken to understand their migration dynamics, living conditions and the causes for the lack of other options open to them. The study reveals that this population segment tends to be excluded from relief and rehabilitation measures provided by the Government and NGOs, during and in the wake of disasters. The main reasons are the lack of information about the presence of the migrants, failure to acknowledge them and the lack of proper identity and registration mechanisms.

The study highlights the urgent need to develop appropriate institutional mechanisms, in partnership with national, state and local governments, international organizations such as IOM and relevant UN agencies and grassroots NGOs, to assist the poorest of all labour migrants in normal times and, in particular, to reach out to them in times of disaster. The study was made possible thanks to the financial assistance from the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) and is being published under the IOM Migration Research Series with the hope of widely disseminating the findings among policy makers, academics and welfare organizations concerned with the well-being of labour migrants in India.

Sarat Das
Programme Manager
International Organization for Migration
B-502, Premium House, Ahmedabad –380009

1. INTRODUCTION

Migration movements are and have been an integral part of human history, including labour migration. However, labour migration in noticeable proportions goes back to the beginning of the industrial age, when wave upon wave of the rural population migrated to urban areas to find work in the burgeoning industries, leaving behind them their traditional rural occupations. Since then, the issue of migration has also been the subject of various development theories. With all its complexity, migration today is one of the most challenging issues facing governments and societies. According to Brunson McKinley, Director General of IOM,

Migration will be one of the major policy concerns of the twenty-first century. In our shrinking world, more and more people will look to migration – temporary or permanent – as a path to employment, education, freedom or other opportunities. Governments will need to develop sound migration policies and practices. Properly managed migration can contribute to prosperity, development and mutual understanding among people.¹

It is estimated that there are approximately 150 million international migrants (IOM, 2000), some of whom are voluntary migrants, while the others are compelled to leave their homes through circumstances beyond their control. Voluntary migrants move for economic reasons, to study, for family reunification and a variety of other personal motives. Forced migrants flee from persecution, conflict, repression, natural and man-made disasters, ecological degradation or other situations that endanger their lives, personal freedom or livelihood. Furthermore, governments or other authorities sometimes compel individuals to leave as part of a process of ethnic cleansing (IOM, 2000).

Since World War II, 20 million people have died in armed conflicts, 90 per cent of them civilians (UNDP, 1994: 47). Internal conflicts have led to an alarming increase in the number of refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) worldwide. In 1960, the United Nations estimated the number of refugees at 1.4 million. In 1992, the number had swollen to 18.2 million, with a further 24 million having been displaced within their own countries.² In 2000, however, the number of refugees had again declined (US Committee for Refugees' 2000 World Survey, US Committee for Refugees, 2000), to 14 million as of the beginning of that year. That survey also indicated that there are now more than 21 million internally displaced persons, warning that the total number may be even higher (IOM, 2000: 15-16).

In the past, labour migrants from different regions were typically required to work as indentured labour on plantations in a number of countries. This was a major cause of cross-border labour migration streams during the last two centuries. Today, a number of international instruments concluded under the auspices of the International Labour Organization (ILO) mandate international labour standards for labour migrants. In addition, in 1990 the UN General Assembly adopted the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families. The Convention reaffirmed basic human rights principles and embodied them in an instrument applicable to migrant workers and their families. To date, the Convention has been ratified by 19 governments, one short of the 20 ratifications required to come into force. Another 11 states had signed, but not yet ratified the Convention. The distinction made between voluntary and forced migration is not always clear cut. Some migrants do not strictly fall into the classification of forced migrants, nor do they fit into the category of voluntary migrants in the normal sense of that term, since they have been pushed by poverty to migrate. In India, there are labour migrants

who have migrated under such conditions and, in a manner of speaking, they might be considered as internally displaced persons due to environmental degradation, poorly planned development projects, social exploitation and regional economic and social underdevelopment. Most of these are to be found in the most marginal occupations, some as seasonal migrants, others continually moving in search of some work and livelihood. Some tend to stay for longer periods on the same work sites, living in virtually semi-bonded conditions.

This study concerns that category of internal labour migrants in India, forced to eke out a living at the fringes of society in the most marginal of occupations at their places of destination. It also intends to foster an understanding of the situation of such migrants in times of disaster, such as the earthquake that struck Gujarat, both in terms of the destruction caused, and to highlight their vulnerability in general.

Following India's economic reforms, large-scale investments were made in the industrial and infrastructure sectors of some states where labour migrants are found in large numbers. Although this is a continuation of the previous practice concerning labour migrants in the pre-reform period, it occurs today on a much wider scale. Such labour migrants are largely found in the developed states, the traditional migrant-receiving states, typically, coming from underdeveloped regions of the country and being comprised primarily of the most marginalized sectors of society, namely the Tribals and the Scheduled Castes (SCs). These migrants are entirely without legal protection or social security. They are "invisible", and overlooked in times of disasters. They have no identity in the places where they live and no voice in the places they have left behind. Disaster strikes them more severely than it strikes the local population.

In a vast and extremely diverse country such as India, inter- and intra-state migration transposes workers into unfamiliar cultural and social settings, the latter because of India's federal system. There are substantial issues related to the basic human rights of inter-state migrants and India has sought to address them through two legislative measures: the Inter-State Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act of 1979, and The Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act of 1970. The latter is applicable to contract labourers as well as to inter-state labour migrants working on a contract basis.

According to the most recent statistics on migration in India from the 1991 population census,⁴ the proportion of inter-state migrants in the total population of India amounted to 3.18 per cent.⁵ The figures from the 2001 census are not yet available. However, assuming that the same proportion of the population counted in 1991 continued as inter-state migrants in 2001, there would be roughly 32 million inter-state migrants in India today - a significant number of people whose economic and social needs have to be specifically addressed.

The inter-state migrants tend to remain beyond the reach of relevant policies, since they are rarely acknowledged within the societies where they live. Thus, they are not acknowledged and passed over in their places of destination while having also forgone any possibilities of making their voices heard in their places of origin. They are, in fact, drifting in a kind of legal and social vacuum. In time, some of them do tend to integrate into the local society of their place of destination. However, until they do, they continue to be a highly vulnerable population group. In times of disaster they tend to be excluded because assistance for home building is provided to those who are registered on electoral rolls. Being the poorest of all of the population groups, they tend to live in temporary shelters. Hence, in a situation such as an earthquake, they are extremely vulnerable to the effects of the disaster, yet are

barely considered to be part of the population for the purpose of aid and relief. Even the local NGOs tend to overlook them and direct their relief and rehabilitation measures towards the native local population where the disaster struck. Lastly, if they are able to do so, such labour migrants tend to leave again the areas affected by a disaster and, thus, also to miss out on the benefits of any relief and rehabilitation efforts provided after the disaster. In India, where linguistic and religious kinship is very strong, people tend to affiliate socially with those who speak the same language or belong to the same ethnic group, inter-state migrants and tribal populations who are viewed as outsiders, and are not included in governmental or non-governmental policy measures. It is, therefore, a matter of high importance to draw attention to the needs and conditions of internal labour migrants in India. The first section of this report offers a general description of migration in India and related legislation. In the second section, the living conditions of labour migrants are presented through key indicators of their social and demographic characteristics, wages and living and working conditions, security and links with their places of origin. Their plight in times of disaster is then discussed, based on their experience after the severe earthquake that struck Gujarat in January 2001. The labour migrants studied are inter-state as well as intra-state migrants, working in some of the most marginal economic activities in India. Together with this analysis, there is also a brief discussion on migration issues of concern to scholars working in India, an introduction to Gujarat State where the study was carried out, and a discussion of the impact of the earthquake on the State, its population and economy.

2. Internal Migration in India

2.1 Research and legislation

In development theory internal migration, *per se*, is considered as a positive phenomenon. These development theories, dominated by neo-classical economists, have argued that labour flows from low to high-wage regions, and that capital flows in the reverse direction.^{6,7} The Lewis-Fei-Ranis model, developed in the late 1950s and early 1960s, which regarded rural-urban migration as essential to economic development (Lewis, 1954; Ranis and Fei, 1961) was the first well-known economic model of migration to deal with the shift of labour from the rural labour-surplus sector to the labour-deficit industrial sector. Based on the concept of a dual economy, this model considered migration as a balancing mechanism for transferring labour from labour-surplus to labour-deficit regions, which would eventually lead to an equilibrium in both sectors - assuming that the modern industrial sector would continue to absorb the surplus labour. The model presumed that urban wages would remain higher than rural wages, which, in reality, in developing countries was found to be not so.

However, rural-urban migration continued despite increasing urban under- and unemployment and stagnant or falling urban wages. Todaro (1980) explained this paradox through a model suggesting that rural-urban migration proceeded in response to expected urban-rural wage differentials. In fact, the phenomenon of rural surplus labour actually exacerbated the already serious urban unemployment caused by economic and structural imbalances between urban and rural areas (Todaro, 1985). Such realization notwithstanding, labour migration continued to be placed at the centre of the process of industrialization and economic growth. This process was also referred to explain the process of urbanization, as migration was considered to be a process of economic mobility and a sign of economic growth and development and, therefore, not requiring any intervention.

In developing countries, these models were challenged, arguing that rural-to-urban migration was not induced by pull factors, i.e., that it did not occur in response to perceived unlimited employment opportunities in urban areas. On the contrary, despite the lack of formal and well-paying opportunities in urban areas, rural labour was being pushed out of the rural economy through poverty, landlessness and social and economic degradation towards the urban, industrialized sector. Those who left were mainly rural youth. The reasons for being pushed out of the rural economy included the widespread fragmentation of farm lands and the diminishing capacity for agriculture to sustain the growing rural population against a background of lack of rural employment diversification, the spread of education, rural youth looking towards non-farm employment, and social discrimination against backward communities which continued to be in the grip of feudal lords established in the rural areas. With economic progress in India making itself felt, and at the cost of environmental degradation in some areas and development-related population displacement, the rural population started to migrate towards urban or other, better-off rural areas in search of livelihoods. This migration stream became quite prominent in India. At the same time, the capital-intensive industrial development in India, pursued since the eighties, led to a reduction in the rate of urbanization, mainly because of the slowing rural-urban migration (Kundu, 1986; Kundu and Gupta, 1996; Mohan, 1996), while also leading to the creation of an informal urban economy (Kundu, 1996; Mahadevia, 1998a; Mahadevia, 2002).

A significant number of migration studies [have](#) been carried out by Indian researchers from various disciplines. Economists have looked at the role of wages, income and levels of unemployment and underemployment in influencing migration flows (Oberai and Bilsborrow,

1984). Studies have attempted to identify the causes of migration and whether these occur in response to “pull” or “push” factors, with many arguing that rural poverty, land fragmentation and discrimination constitute powerful push factors for rural-urban migration.⁸ Others give prominence to perceived better employment opportunities and social facilities in urban areas as “pull” factors for the migration process.

The studies have also looked at the various implications of migration both at the source⁹ and the destination¹⁰ in terms of their respective employment levels and wages, investment levels in the source areas, the skill levels of labour migrants relative to non-migrating populations in the source areas and local residents in the destination areas, and the working conditions of labour migrants¹¹ and the occupations where they could be absorbed. Other aspects of the migration process have also been the subject of investigation. Thus, the questions of whether the decision to migrate was taken individually or as a group, where the labour migrants were most likely to be absorbed, i.e. the traditional or modern sectors, whether migration tended to be permanent or seasonal/cyclical¹² and, if not permanent, the likely length of stay at the point of destination were all looked into and analysed.

On arrival in urban areas, migrants often end up in the informal sector, where wages are determined solely by surplus labour and the resultant low wages. On the other hand, the wage rates in the formal sector continue to be determined by non-market forces, such as wage negotiations through labour unions. Entry into the formal market is restricted as such jobs are disappearing in the wake of a new culture of flexible production. Furthermore, they are primarily accessible through privileged and personal contacts that the new labour migrants do not have. It has been argued that labour migration “...is not always impelled by labour scarcity. It implies more of a labour-control strategy within the overall context of capitalist accumulation” (Srivastava, 1998: 603).

Moreover, a labour increase in the informal sector, especially in urban areas can, in turn, be a cause of higher urban unemployment, underemployment, poverty and squalor, contributing to urban stress and placing demands on urban services that need to be provided by the Urban Local Bodies (ULBs). The ULBs therefore, resent such labour migrants and refuse to acknowledge them as urban residents. In some instances, it may also lead to local political unrest and conflicts between local and migrant labourers who, in India, tend to have different cultural identities. In these circumstances, labour migration often does not have positive implications and the resulting issues should not be left entirely to the market to address and resolve. There is a need for institutional intervention in the process of migration in order to assist such labour migrants with respect to these and other essential issues.

While economists have primarily looked at issues relating to labour migration, other social scientists have looked at migration from other perspectives. Sociologists have studied the demographic, social and psychological factors in individual and household decisions about migration; geographers have looked at spatial patterns of migration. Political scientists and human rights campaigners have also addressed various aspects of migration. Of particular importance is the last group, which has been working on issues of forced migration from an activist perspective. They have also explored human rights issues of the so-called “voluntary migrants”, who are brought in to keep wages at the destination points low. Thus, low-wage workers are provided for the industrial sector and social responsibility for labour (re)production is passed on to society. Such labour is available at low cost for the long term; hence, it is being increasingly resorted to as a routine employment strategy. Hence, in spite of legislation such as the Inter-State Migrant Workmen Act of 1979 and the Contract Workers Act of 1970, applicable where migrant labour is brought in as contract labour, the condition of

labour migrants in most economic spheres remains very poor. Thus, members of the human rights community have also analysed and attempted to address these issues.

Many migration studies perceive migration as a voluntary phenomenon. However, as referred to in the Introduction, experience shows that the reality is more complex, particularly in developing countries. “migration for survival” is at least partially involuntary or forced. Migrants fleeing poverty and lack of opportunities for employment and livelihood are recruited by labour contractors to work on particular sites. Some migrants are brought in for seasonal work, for example in brick-kilns, sugar-cane cutting and other commercial agricultural work, and construction. Migrants are hired to perform jobs that the natives (locals) are no longer prepared to do, particularly if wages are low and/or the working conditions are harsh.

In India, internal displacement takes place owing to: (i) political causes, including secessionist movements; (ii) identity-based autonomy movements; (iii) local violence, such as caste disputes and riots fuelled by religious fundamentalism and (iv) environment and development induced displacement. While the World Refugee Survey puts the total number of IDPs in India at 507,000, the Indian Social Institute in Delhi puts the figure at 21.3 million in its global survey of IDPs.¹³ Most of these displaced persons are tribal. Environmental changes and natural disasters such as floods and droughts have been reasons for displacement, affecting the populations of both flood-prone areas and excessively dry regions. Therefore, such populations are frequently forced to migrate. A Draft National Policy for Rehabilitation and Resettlement has been framed, but this deals only with displacement caused by land acquisitions. Hence, all other types of displacements remain outside the purview of this policy. The sample of labour migrants covered by this study includes such populations, together with others who have migrated for economic reasons.

The key problems for this category of labour migrants include the following:

1. Not all of the migrants are registered in the population census because of the procedures employed. The census is carried out in cooperation with local officials who assist in the pre-census house-listing operation. Recent migrants or seasonal migrants, whose stay is perceived as temporary, may therefore not find their names in the house-listing operation. In urban areas, especially, there is a strong bias against them because, as mentioned above, they are viewed as a “burden” on the Urban Local Body (ULB), which is responsible for providing basic services. By not acknowledging them, the ULB absolves itself from providing them with basic services, which would otherwise be mandatory. Hence, there are no estimates regarding the total number of such migrants.
2. The majority of these migrants are without records proving either their existence or their residence, whether temporary or permanent, at their places of destination. In the Indian context, for example, one of the most essential documents is the ration card,¹⁴ which migrants are unable to transfer from their original locations to their places of destination. There are many reasons for this, such as: (a) only some members of the family may migrate, but there is only one ration card per family and it is not possible to obtain separate ration cards for migrating family members; (b) most migrants migrate in their youth, when there is a very high possibility that they still live in a nuclear family consisting of their parents and other siblings, with their names being part of the ration card assigned to the family; (c) the procedures for obtaining a ration card are cumbersome, and even more so when transfer is required; (d) there is an inherent bias in the administrative system against

- the poor population. This, in turn, results in a system unwilling to facilitate the need for identity in the place of destination; (e) their temporary status and the uncertainty of permanent residence at the destination point discourages the authorities from doing the work required to issue ration cards.
3. The two legislative measures mentioned previously, which ostensibly are intended to protect the basic rights of labour migrants, are not implemented unless Public Interest Litigation (PIL) is filed, which has been the case at various times in the past. In India, PIL has evolved as a special legal remedy for the most marginalized sectors of society if the fundamental rights mandated by the Constitution of India are violated. However, it can be filed only in matters in which the rights of large groups are violated, not on behalf of individuals. Human rights groups frequently use PIL as a method to protect the minimum rights of poor and vulnerable groups.
 4. Migration often takes place through labour contractors, who offer the migrants advance payments at the place of origin and then deduct the payments from their wages, a practice actually prohibited by the Inter-State Migrant Workmen Act. The wages the migrants receive after deduction of the advances is inadequate to cover their minimum needs and they are obliged to request additional advances from the contractor. Thus, the debt spiral continues, miring the migrants in perpetual debt, unable to break away from the contractor. Their status and level of knowledge prevent them from having access to micro credits; hence they depend on the labour contractor for credit. Often these concern only small amounts for daily subsistence. In times of major expenditures, such as illness, contractors may provide advances, which then also must be repaid through work. Since the migrants and their relatives back home have to depend on this system for work, they are in no position to break away and seek better opportunities. Thus, partly through this system of advances, wages are kept permanently depressed and the possibility to move on or to seek other employment is severely restricted.
 5. Most of these migrants lack adequate basic facilities and their living conditions are often virtually inhuman. They do not have access to standard social benefits, such as health services, education or any type of social security. Most critically, their children do not have access to education if they live on the work sites with their parents.
 6. Geographically scattered, socio-culturally fragmented and economically disenfranchised, these labour migrants are not recognized as a class or a social category. They do not form any constituency and, therefore, are of no concern to political parties. On the contrary, political parties often openly promote ideologies that favour organized labour, through the “sons of the soil”¹⁵ ideology. Many of the migrants do not have their names on the list of voters where they live. As noted above, they also fall outside the constituency of the NGOs and, in fact, there are very few NGOs working with such labour migrants.
 7. In the current context of economic liberalization, labour policies are often considered bottlenecks in the functioning of the free market. Therefore, there is a reluctance to develop or implement measures to assist labour migrants. In fact, the amendment of existing labour protection legislation has been proposed. This, however, has not yet been undertaken owing to strong opposition from trade unions and political opponents of the ruling party.

2.2 Patterns of migration in India

Approximately 28 per cent of the population of India was recorded as migrant in the 1991 census (Table 1), indicating that roughly 233 million people had the status of migrant in India in that year. Of these, 130 million, that is 12.12 per cent of the population, had migrated within the last decade.¹⁶ This substantial figure included inter-state, intra-state and cross-border migrants, excluding those who emigrated out of India, estimated by IOM (2000) to be 15 million in 2000. It should be noted that, in India generally the proportion of females in total migrant numbers is over 60 per cent. Females migrate to accompany their husbands or fathers who are migrating for employment and other reasons, but also following their marriage when they move to the homes of their in-laws. In all of the top four states in terms of per capita income, Punjab, Haryana, Maharashtra and Gujarat, the proportion of migrants in the total populations is more than 30 per cent, that is, nearly one in every three persons has the status of migrant. Two other states, which are not as economically prosperous but have a high proportion of migrants in their populations, are Himachal Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh.

TABLE 1
PROPORTION OF ALL MIGRANTS* TO TOTAL POPULATION,
BY STATE, 1991

Major states	% of migrants to total population	State's share (%) of total migrant population in India	% of female migrants of total migrants	% labour migrants in total migrants
Andhra Pradesh	29.51	8.45	67.94	13.15
Assam	24.13	2.33	61.58	6.61
Bihar	24.93	9.28	88.97	4.11
Gujarat	33.08	5.89	69.34	8.83
Haryana	31.40	2.23	76.20	8.39
Himachal Pradesh	35.61	0.79	71.70	9.67
Karnataka	29.87	5.79	65.47	10.87
Kerala	28.18	3.53	63.97	7.40
Maharashtra	32.26	10.97	62.54	10.06
Madhya Pradesh	32.75	9.34	72.82	8.95
Orissa	26.62	3.63	77.27	6.26
Punjab	34.32	3.00	71.28	9.62
Rajasthan	28.78	5.46	79.50	7.10
Tamil Nadu	24.04	5.79	65.58	13.79
Uttar Pradesh	21.39	12.82	85.12	4.09
West Bengal	26.25	7.70	69.36	7.82
India	27.68	100.00**	72.29	8.77

Note: Migrants are defined by place of last residence; *The total includes interstate, intra-state and crossborder migrants; **The total of all rows do not add up to 100 per cent because all states are not included here.

Source: Census of India, Data processing division of the Registrar General of Census, Government of India.

In the total figure for migrants in India in 1991, approximately 9 per cent were labour migrants, those who gave employment as the reason for migration (Table 1). States showing a higher proportion of labour migrants in their total number of migrants included: Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu (13 per cent), Karnataka (11 per cent), Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and Maharashtra (10 per cent) and Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh (9 per cent). With the exception of Madhya Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh, the rest are either developed states and/or contain a metropolitan city; hence, the attraction for labour migrants.

Of the total 233 million people in India with migrant status in 1991, only six million (0.69 per cent of the total population) were international migrants, that is, those who have come from other countries. An overwhelming majority among the migrants, 200 million (23.81 per cent of the total population) were intra-state migrants. The remaining 27 million migrated between states. Thus, roughly 3.18 per cent of the nation's population were inter-state migrants. Of these, 14 million migrated to other states in India during the past decade, comprising roughly 52 per cent of the inter-state migrants. If it be assumed that about 3 per cent of the nation's population has the status of inter-state migrants, at present, roughly 30 million people in India would be inter-state migrants. The proportion of females in the total population of inter-state migrants is over 50 per cent. This proportion is, however, lower than that observed for all other types of migration, suggesting that more female migrants are intra-state migrants, moving for the purpose of marriage, which tends to take place among the same caste and community and, hence, within the same state.

TABLE 2
INTER-STATE MIGRATION, BY STATE, 1991

Major states	Total population	Number of inter-state immigrants	% of female migrants to total migrants	In-migrants as % share of state's population	State's share (%) of total in-migrants in India
Andhra Pradesh	66,508,008	994,141	61.98	1.49	3.73
Assam	22,414,322	487,761	43.22	2.18	1.83
Bihar	86,374,465	1,031,566	72.18	1.19	3.87
Gujarat	41,309,582	1,465,214	48.16	3.55	5.49
Haryana	16,463,648	1,579,052	65.95	9.59	5.92
Himachal Pradesh	5,170,877	236,830	50.66	4.58	0.89
Karnataka	44,977,201	1,600,231	56.67	3.56	6.00
Kerala	29,098,518	437,087	48.60	1.50	1.64
Maharashtra	78,937,187	4,059,626	46.54	5.14	15.22
Madhya Pradesh	66,181,170	2,457,392	61.38	3.71	9.21
Orissa	31,659,736	592,596	60.59	1.87	2.22
Punjab	20,281,969	1,120,282	58.87	5.52	4.20
Rajasthan	44,005,990	1,470,102	69.89	3.34	5.51
Tamil Nadu	55,858,946	842,996	56.54	1.51	3.16
Uttar Pradesh	139,112,287	1,873,515	72.63	1.35	7.02
West Bengal	68,077,965	2,005,331	45.42	2.95	7.52
India	838,583,988	26,669,810	55.51	3.18	100.00*

Note: Migrants are defined by place of last residence. * The total of all rows do not add up to 100 because all states are not included here.

Source: Census of India, Data processing division of the Registrar General of Census, Government of India.

In five large states, Gujarat, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Kerala and Assam, the proportion of females in the total of inter-state migrants is less than half. The former three states have metropolitan cities and are also highly industrialized states where migration to urban and industrial areas would be primarily of single male migrants, leading to a higher proportion of males as compared to females among the inter-state migrants. The same would be expected to apply in other states with large metropolises, namely, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh; however this was not found to be the case.

TABLE 3
INTER-STATE OUT-MIGRATION,
BY STATE, 1991

Major states	Total population	Number of out-migrants	% of female migrants to total migrants	Out-migrants as % of state population	State's % share in total out-migrants in India
Andhra Pradesh	66,508,008	1,226,447	57.89	1.84	4.62
Assam	22,414,322	353,334	50.28	1.58	1.33
Bihar	86,374,465	3,024,991	47.20	3.50	11.40
Gujarat	41,309,582	935,402	55.14	2.26	3.52
Haryana	16,463,648	1,425,974	68.26	8.66	5.37
Himachal Pradesh	5,170,877	344,176	54.35	6.66	1.30
Karnataka	44,977,201	1,426,629	59.98	3.17	5.38
Kerala	29,098,518	968,941	47.49	3.33	3.65
Maharashtra	78,937,187	1,772,508	60.10	2.25	6.68
Madhya Pradesh	66,181,170	1,486,290	69.91	2.25	5.60
Orissa	31,659,736	621,505	54.39	1.96	2.34
Punjab	20,281,969	1,376,312	56.20	6.79	5.19
Rajasthan	44,005,990	1,951,842	60.52	4.44	7.35
Tamil Nadu	55,858,946	1,466,010	51.11	2.62	5.52
Uttar Pradesh	139,112,287	5,753,999	48.35	4.14	21.68
West Bengal	68,077,965	1,139,915	61.85	1.67	4.29

Note: Migrants are defined by place of last residence.

Source: Census of India, Data processing division of the Registrar General of Census, Government of India.

Among the states that have high proportions of inter-state migrants are the four high per capita income states mentioned above (Punjab, Haryana, Maharashtra and Gujarat), together with Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh and Himachal Pradesh. Bangalore, in the state of Karnataka, is the fifth-largest metropolis of India and has seen much more dynamism than during the post-1991 period. This is a city that has a large concentration of public sector industry, which attracts inter-state in-migrants. As compared to in-migration, the rate of out-migration is lower in these states, with the exception of Punjab.

Of the total migrant population in the state of Gujarat in 1991, as many as 89 per cent were intra-state migrants (Table 4) with inter-state migrants accounting for only 11 per cent. There were also cross-border migrants making up only 0.6 per cent of total migrants to the state. Furthermore, of the total in-migrants, 79 per cent came from rural areas. During the 1980s, there was a slight fall in the proportion of intra-state migrants while that of inter-state migrants increased slightly. Also, the proportion of migrants from rural areas declined somewhat.

TABLE 4
DETAILS OF IMMIGRATION TO GUJARAT, 1991
(per cent)

	Migrants with all durations of residence	Migrants with at least 9 years of residence
Total migrants	100.00	100.00
Intra-state migrants	88.61	86.60
Inter-state migrants	10.72	12.93
Cross-border migrants	0.64	0.43
Migrants from rural areas	78.66	75.39

Note: Migrants are defined by place of last residence.

Source: Census of India, Data processing division of the Registrar General of Census, Government of India.

Gujarat received the largest proportion of in-migrants from the two neighbouring states, Maharashtra (35 per cent) and Rajasthan (22 per cent), with immigrants from Uttar Pradesh contributing 16 per cent of Gujarat's inter-state migrant population (Table 5). Among the inter-state migrants of the last decade, the same three states dominate. However, their share in terms of the total of in-migrants has decreased because the share from two other states, Orissa and Bihar, rose slightly. Thus, there was a slight increase in the rate of in-migration to Gujarat from Bihar and Orissa in the 1980s compared to previous decades.

TABLE 5
STATES OF ORIGIN OF INTER-STATE IN-MIGRANTS IN GUJARAT, 1991

Major States	Migrants of all duration of residence	Migrants with at least 9 years of residence
Andhra Pradesh	2.02	2.09
Assam	0.55	0.61
Bihar	2.78	3.43
Haryana	0.93	0.99
Himachal Pradesh	0.27	0.28
Jammu and Kashmir	0.24	0.34
Karnataka	1.23	1.23
Kerala	2.63	2.94
Madhya Pradesh	6.07	5.87
Maharashtra	35.37	34.92
Orissa	2.48	3.38
Punjab	1.16	1.22
Rajasthan	22.13	20.55
Tamil Nadu	1.63	1.74
Uttar Pradesh	16.22	16.09
West Bengal	1.54	1.73
Total	100.00	100.00

Note: Migrants are defined by place of last residence.

Source: Census of India; Data processing division of the Registrar General of Census, Government of India.

Within the state, some districts have received more migrants than others. For example, Gandhinagar (with migrants accounting for 53 per cent of the population), Surat (40%), Vadodara (38%) and Bharuch and Kheda (36%) (Table 6). While in Gandhinagar district a

new town has been developing since the 1970s, the next three are either highly industrialized or rapidly industrializing districts of the state. The last is the seat of the capital-intensive cash crop agriculture in Gujarat (Mahadevia, 1998b).

In Surat district, about one-third of the total are inter-state migrants. In Ahmedabad district, one in every five migrants is inter-state. While, only 11 per cent of the migrants in the whole of Gujarat are of inter-state origin, in these two districts and in Valsad, Vadodara and even the Dangs (tribal) district, the presence of inter-state migrants in the immigrant population is high. Valsad and Vadodara form a part of the state's industrialized "Golden Corridor". It appears that in the Dangs, labour from the neighbouring regions come for work but, as they are from other states, they are classified as inter-state migrants. It is also important to note that 11 per cent of the migrants in Kachchh are inter-state migrants and comprise about 33 per cent of the population of Kachchh. After 1991, the presence of migrants in Kachchh would have increased and the proportion of inter-state migrants would also have risen because of the number of new manufacturing units which have relocated to Kachchh since 1991 (Mahadevia, 1998b). Since no census was conducted in 2001 in Kachchh, it will be impossible to confirm these figures for some time to come. It should also be noted that the district of Kachchh sends large numbers of migrants. Thus, the natives of Kachchh out-migrate in large numbers and migrants from other states and other parts of India come to work in Kachchh in industry, on construction sites and on the salt farms on the border of Kachchh. This is more or less the situation in many recently industrializing parts of Gujarat.

TABLE 6
MIGRATION PATTERN IN GUJARAT, BY DISTRICT, 1991

Districts	% of migrants to total population	Inter-state	Inter-district	Intra-district
Jamnagar	27.88	5.01	27.92	66.21
Rajkot	34.74	3.51	35.62	59.88
Surendranagar	34.47	2.25	31.48	66.02
Bhavnagar	30.15	2.98	25.55	71.00
Amreli	32.34	1.96	36.63	61.29
Junagadh	30.66	2.77	20.86	75.72
Kachchh	32.67	11.08	14.16	72.83
Banaskantha	26.68	7.29	18.20	73.71
Sabarkantha	29.89	6.63	20.09	73.09
Mehsana	33.27	3.63	24.11	72.02
Gandhinagar	53.12	7.76	75.52	16.40
Ahmedabad	33.46	22.74	49.63	25.97
Kheda	35.53	3.33	24.49	71.82
Panchmahals	26.25	4.09	9.20	86.53
Vadodara	37.55	12.22	33.29	53.66
Bharuch	36.38	8.51	27.16	64.09
Surat	39.67	32.20	36.49	30.87
Valsad	31.27	16.55	17.79	65.19
The Dangs	28.94	12.89	19.50	67.52
Total	33.08	10.72	29.56	56.25

Note: Migrants are defined by place of last residence.

Source: Census of India; Data processing division of the Registrar General of Census, Government of India.

Intra-district migration is low in the four districts of Gandhinagar, Ahmedabad, Surat and Vadodara. In all other districts, short-distance migration dominates. It is interesting to note that in some districts, specifically Kachchh and the Dangs, where the presence of inter-state migrants is high, there is also a high proportion of intra-district migrants, indicating that people from other districts of the state do not go to these districts. The economic status of the inter-state migrants working here is very low, and they arrived through the system of contract-hiring. Gandhinagar district, where the proportion of migrants in its total population is high, has mainly inter-district migrants, that is, people from other districts of Gujarat who have moved there. Ahmedabad is another district receiving a high proportion of migrants from other parts of the state. Similarly, Amreli and Rajkot districts, the former with capital-intensive agriculture and the latter with small-scale industries, also attract people from other districts of the state. Although data from the 2001 census is not yet available, it can be assumed that since 1991 there have been changes in migration patterns in the state because of the changes in industrial investment patterns. In-migration to Jamnagar, Kachchh and Bharuch districts are likely to have increased and a large proportion of that increase can be assumed to represent inter-state migrants.

3. Laws to Protect Migrant Workers

As noted earlier, two key legislative measures were designed to protect the interests of one segment of labour migrants. These are, the Inter-State Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act of 1979, and the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act of 1970.¹⁷ Both are applicable to inter-state labour migrants covered in this study. The Contract Labour Act is applicable to intra-state migrants if they are employed by a labour contractor.

The Contract Labour Act is applicable to any establishment in which 20 or more workers are either currently employed or were employed at any time during the preceding 12 months as contract labour, and to any contractor who currently employs, or has employed at any time during the preceding 12 months, 20 or more workers. A contract labourer is a worker employed through a contract, either directly issued by an employer or by a labour contractor. The Act is not applicable to establishments which carry on work of a casual, irregular or occasional nature. Contractors engaged in the construction of buildings or any other construction activities are covered. Under the Act, contractors must obtain a valid licence from a licensing officer for undertaking or executing any work through contract labour. The licence sets out the conditions imposed by the government regarding working hours, wages and other aspects of contract labour. The contractor is expected to take care of the welfare and health of the contract labourers, through providing certain facilities in accordance with the rules promulgated by the government. The facilities to be provided at the work site include: canteens, a dining hall, rest rooms, drinking-water facilities, latrines and urinals, first-aid facilities and a day-care centre for children if 20 or more women are employed. Other provisions relate to the payment of wages, for example, that wages are to be paid monthly on a fixed date, on a working day, at the work site; that wages are to be paid directly to the workers or to their specifically authorized representatives; that there should be no deductions from wages unless and until authorized by order of the government, and that the payment of wages must be made in the presence of the authorized representative of the principal employer. The Act also stipulates that registers of attendance, wages, wage deductions and for overtime must also be regularly maintained. The workers must sign or put their thumb impression in these registers against all of the entries made. The wage rates, working hours, wage period, dates of payment and the names and addresses of inspectors have to be publicly displayed for the information of all contract workers.

The Inter-State Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of Service) Act of 1979 was promulgated based upon the belief that the system of employment of inter-state migrant labour is an exploitative system. In many parts of the country, and predominantly in states such as Orissa, labour is recruited from various parts of the state through contractors or agents called *Sardars*, and taken outside the state to work on large projects. These workers are generally illiterate and are usually forced to work under extremely adverse conditions. Therefore, this legislation was enacted to regulate their working conditions and to provide for minimum conditions of service. The Act is applicable to every establishment and every contractor employing or having employed five or more inter-state migrant workers at any time during the preceding 12 months. It covers workers recruited by or through a contractor in one state under an agreement for employment in an establishment in another state, with or without the knowledge of the principal employer. All of the legal provisions regarding the registration of the establishment and licensing as applied under the Contract Labour Act, are also applicable under this Act. Without such a certificate of registration, no principal employer is allowed to employ inter-state migrant workers.

Similarly, a contractor has to obtain a valid licence to recruit workers in one state to be employed in another state. The contractor must furnish the relevant authorities within 15 days with information regarding the recruitment of inter-state migrant workers. He must issue all workers with a passbook containing the worker's photograph and giving details such as the name and place of employment, the period of employment, wage rates and the manner of payment, displacement allowance payable, return-fare payable, any deductions made from wages and other particulars, and must notify the authorities about the termination of employment with a certificate that wages payable have been paid, as well as maintaining up-to-date passbooks for the workers.

Under the Inter-State Migrant Workmen Act, the wage rates, holidays, working hours and other conditions of service are the same as those applicable to workers doing similar work in the same establishment. Wages have to be paid as per the Minimum Wages Act of 1948, and must always be paid in cash. The contractor is required to pay a displacement allowance, equal to 50 per cent of the monthly wages payable to the worker, at the time of recruitment, which should not be deducted from subsequent wages. The contractor is further required to pay a journey allowance. The contractor has to ensure regular payment of wages, give equal pay for equal work irrespective of sex, ensure suitable conditions of work, and report to the specified authorities and to close relatives any instances of serious injury or fatal accident of the worker. If the contractor fails to provide such facilities and benefits, the principal employer is liable to provide the same; however, such expenses are to be recovered by the contractor from the principal employer.

However, in practice, these provisions are often largely theoretical, in that even the minimal protective provisions of these two Acts are continuously and flagrantly violated in various ways. For example, one way of circumventing the law is to falsely indicate that workers have not come through a labour contractor, or to engage workers on a piece-rate basis, which exonerates the contractors from some of the legal obligations. The workers are then obliged to report that their employment is not within the purview of a labour contractor, though in many cases this is not true.

This study does not purport to investigate whether these two Acts were applicable, and therefore implemented, within the context of the sample under review. Therefore, the study does not offer detailed findings on issues such as compliance with the applicable provisions of these laws. Rather, it observes in a general manner the working and living conditions of the labour migrants located at different sites in the state of Gujarat.

4. The State of Gujarat

4.1 Basic facts about Gujarat

Gujarat is one of India's most developed states, with a population of approximately 51 million in 2001. While 4.93 per cent of the nation's population live there, the state accounts for more than 6 per cent of national income, and represents the second-most industrialized state in the country and ranks fifth in terms of per capita income. From 1999-2000, only 18 per cent of the state's income came from the primary sector (agriculture, other natural resource-based activities and mining) whereas 42 per cent derived from the secondary sector (manufacturing and construction). The State's annual per capita income in 1999-2000 at 1993-94 prices, was Rs. 13,434, whereas that of India as a whole was Rs. 10,204.

The state gained significantly as a result of the economic reforms of the 1990s. From 1991 to 2001, investments worth Rs. 1,482,090 million were promised to the state, accounting for approximately 16.5 per cent of the proposed investment in the country (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2001). Of this, projects worth Rs. 791,100 million have already been implemented (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2001). Much of the industrial investment and urban population has remained concentrated and confined along the Vapi-Ahmedabad corridor, also called the "Golden Corridor". Following the reforms, and although the importance of the corridor persists, new investments have moved to other areas of the state, mainly on the coastal belt. Two other districts, Jamnagar and Kachchh, have emerged on the industrial map of Gujarat following the reforms (Patel and Surendra, 1991; Mahadevia and Darshini, 1998; Mahadevia, Darshini, and Lalit Kumar Bhati, 2001). Because of the sudden increase in industrial investments in these two districts, construction works are being undertaken at many new industrial sites. Infrastructure, mainly roads, are being improved, widened, resurfaced and converted to the lane system, with flyovers¹⁸ constructed wherever necessary. These are the pockets where large numbers of labour migrants are employed.

In 1999-2000,¹⁹ 14 per cent of the state's population (13 per cent in rural and 15 per cent in urban areas) lived below the poverty line²⁰ compared to 26 per cent (27 per cent in rural and 24 per cent in urban areas) in India²¹ as a whole. In 1993-1994, 24 per cent of the state's population lived below the official poverty line. As in 1999-2000, in 1993-1994 the level of poverty in the state was higher in urban areas (27 per cent of the population living below the poverty line) relative to rural areas (22 per cent of the population living below the poverty line) (Planning Commission, 1997). Development levels in the state are uneven across its five agro-climatic regions. Thus, levels of poverty also vary across the five regions. As per the latest such estimates available (1993-1994), the eastern belt of the state had the highest poverty level, 25 per cent (Dubey and Gangopadhyay, 1998). This belt has the largest concentration of the Scheduled Tribe (ST) population in the state. The indigenous population is commonly called the "tribals". Each state has a schedule (list) of tribes entitled to special status, called Scheduled Tribes or STs. Throughout India, in 1993-1994 nearly half of the ST population in rural areas, and 36 per cent in urban areas, lived below the poverty line (Dubey and Gangopadhyay, 1998: 47). The figures for Gujarat are not available.

Members of Scheduled Tribes, the most deprived of all population groups in India, make up roughly 8 per cent of India's population and about 16 per cent in Gujarat.²² In 1991, only 30 per cent of STs (41 per cent of males and 18 per cent of females) were literate. In the same year, in Gujarat 36 per cent of the STs (48 per cent of ST males and 24 per cent of ST females) were literate. Thus, in 1991, four in every five ST women in India, and three in

every four ST women in Gujarat, were illiterate. Historically, the STs have lived in the forested areas, rich in natural resources, especially in terms of minerals and bodies of water. Large development projects have been undertaken in the tribal areas. As a result, among the internally displaced population, the STs account for a significant proportion; however, no exact figures are available.

After the STs, the second-most deprived population group in India as well as in Gujarat, are the Scheduled Castes²³ (SCs), which do not form a homogenous category, but comprise a hierarchy of lower castes.²⁴ The castes included in the scheduled list vary from one state to another. In 1993-1994, throughout India, 49 per cent of the SCs in rural areas and 42 per cent of the SCs in urban areas were living below the poverty line. The figures for the higher and middle castes were 33 per cent and 24 per cent for rural and urban areas, respectively (Dubey and Gangopadhyay, 1998: 47).²⁵ The proportion of SCs in the total population is 16 per cent in India, and 7 per cent in Gujarat.²⁶ SCs and STs form about 22 per cent of the population in both India and Gujarat. However, their presence among labour migrants, particularly among the low-income labour migrants studied here, is actually much higher.

In 1991, Gujarat was the second most urbanized state in India, but slipped down to third place in 2001. According to the State's Draft Human Development Report of 1999, the state ranked fourth in terms of per capita income as well as in overall human development in the mid-nineties. However, it ranked fifth in the education index, ninth in the health index and thirteenth in the environment index (Hirway and Mahadevia, 1999).

In 2001, the state's position in some of the indicators of social development for which data is available had dropped. Among the 15 large states in India, in 2001n Gujarat ranked fifth in male literacy (80.5 per cent) and sixth in female literacy (58.6 per cent).²⁷ The infant mortality rate is 63 per 1,000 live births.²⁸ The crude birth rate (CBR) is 25.4 per 1,000 and the crude death rate (CDR) is 7.9 per 1,000 (SRS Bulletin, 2001: 1). These rates for India as a whole were 70, 26.1 and 8.7, respectively (SRS Bulletin, 2001: 1). Many demographic and development indicators for Gujarat are, on average, better than those of the rest of India, but lag far behind those of countries with medium human development.

Regarding living conditions, the situation in Gujarat is better than that in many other states in India. According to the 1991 census, 66 per cent of the state's households had access to electricity, 70 per cent had access to safe drinking water and 31 per cent had access to toilet facilities, compared to 42 per cent, 62 per cent and 24 per cent, respectively, for the country as a whole (Registrar General, India, 1998). According to other estimates, a much higher proportion of households, i.e., 80 per cent in Gujarat and 83 per cent in India as a whole, in fact, did not have basic latrine facilities (Central Statistical Organisation, 1999: 521).²⁹ Information concerning the quality of housing based on the National Sample Survey (NSS), fifty-first round, conducted between July 1994 and June 1995, shows that 18 per cent of Gujarat households lived in *katcha* houses, temporary shelters made out of materials such as mud, bamboo mats, gunny bags, plastic sheets, thatch and dry leaves. Throughout India, 32 per cent of households lived in such temporary or *katcha* shelters (Central Statistical Organisation, 1999: 506).

Gujarat is a net immigration state with one-third of the total population of migrant background. Of these, about 11 per cent (1.5 million) are inter-state migrants. Within the state, there is migration from underdeveloped regions to developed regions, to regions experiencing the benefits of the post-1991 economic reforms, and to newly industrializing regions of the state, such as Kachchh district. Of total new investments in the state during

1992-1996, 5.5 per cent went to Kachchh district, by virtue of which it became fifth among the then 19 districts of the state in terms of investments received in this period (Mahadevia, 1998b). Another district which experienced economic dynamism is Jamnagar district, which received 18 per cent of total new investments in the same period (Mahadevia, 1998b). This sudden rise in industrial investments has led to inter-state and intra-state migration into these districts. It should also be noted that these are the districts which suffered some of the most severe impacts of the earthquake.

The migrants in these districts are found in large construction projects currently being carried out, including infrastructure construction such as roads, industrial units and other large projects. A few industrial development enclaves, especially in Kachchh, have attracted considerable numbers of labour migrants. Further, labour migrants are employed in loading and unloading activities on Kandla Port, one of India's 12 major ports, and discharge 16 per cent of the total cargo handled at the major ports in India (Gujarat Infrastructure Board, 1999). The port at Kandla, and the state government's dependence on it for promoting a "Port-led Development Policy" (Gujarat Infrastructure Development Board, 1999: 9) has led to an upsurge in infrastructure development along the highway leading to Kandla Port. Gandhidham town, adjacent to Kandla Port, has the large industrial complex of the Gujarat Industrial Development Corporation (GIDC), with several small-scale industries (SSIs) and thus has also attracted migrant labour. A Free Trade Zone (FTZ) was set up near Kandla Port and was subsequently converted into a Special Economic Zone (SEZ). This cluster of activities has attracted large-scale labour in-migration into Kachchh. In addition, migration has also occurred in a number of traditional economic activities in the region, for example, salt-making and charcoal-making, which attract labour from other districts of the state. There is also considerable labour out-migration to work in other industrial and urban areas of the state, e.g., to large cities such as Mumbai, or overseas to countries in the Middle East, as well as to the United States.

4.2 The impact of the January 2001 earthquake

A severe earthquake, scoring 6.9 on the Richter Scale, struck Gujarat on 26 January 2001, with its epicentre reported to have been 20 kilometres north-east of Bhuj town, Kachchh district. However, there was some disagreement regarding the location of the epicentre and the intensity of the earthquake as reported by the Indian Metrological Department (IMD) as others placed the epicentre in a village near Bhachau town, Kachchh district, and its intensity at 7.7 on the Richter Scale, according to data from the US Geological Survey.

21 of the 25 state districts were affected, partially or totally devastating 7,904 of the 18,000 villages in the state. Maximum damage was caused in Bhuj, Bhachau, Anjar, Rapar and Gandhidham talukas of Kachchh district; Ahmedabad City and Daskroi talukas of Ahmedabad district, Wankaner, Morvi and Maliya-Miyana talukas of Rajkot district, Jodiya taluka of Jamnagar district; Dhrangadhra and Halvad talukas of Surendranagar district and Santalpur and Sami talukas of Patan district. In addition, Banaskantha, Anand, Bharuch, Bhavnagar, Gandhinagar, Junagadh, Navsari, Porbandar, Surat, Vadodara, Mehsana, Kheda, Sabarkantha and Amreli districts were also affected and suffered considerable damage.

The initial death toll was placed at 20,005, with the number of injured put at 166,812 (www.gujarat-earthquake.gov.in). Subsequently, these figures were revised and the death toll was reduced to 17,122, with 166,836 injured (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2001, provided in Gujarat's Socio-economic Review, 2000-01). Finally, when the

compensation claims were made, the death total was further reduced to 13,805, and the number of injured revised down to only 20,516 (Table 7). The final numbers of dead and injured were provided based on the compensation claims made and settled. The number of injured appears to have been substantially under-reported, possibly because those who were not seriously injured did not file claims for compensation.

TABLE 7
EARTHQUAKE IMPACTS, BY DISTRICT

Districts	Male	Female	Children	Total	Injured
Ahmedabad	290	244	218	752	272
Amreli	0	0	0	0	8
Anand	0	1	0	1	20
Banaskantha	9	13	10	32	98
Bharuch	3	4	2	9	17
Bhavnagar	2	1	1	4	17
Gandhinagar	2	0	6	8	14
Jamnagar	28	62	29	119	1,219
Junagadh	1	4	3	8	39
Kachchh	3,229	4,573	4,419	12,221	14,331
Mehsana	0	0	0	0	43
Navsari	7	6	4	17	21
Patan	11	13	14	38	552
Porbandar	4	3	3	10	78
Rajkot	106	204	119	429	1,767
Surat	25	9	12	46	162
Surendranagar	26	46	38	110	1,557
Sabarkantha	–	–	–	–	0
Vadodara	0	1	0	1	0
Valsad	0	–	–	–	1
Total	3,743	5,184	4,878	13,805	20,516

Source: 203.77.201.16/gsdmaweb

In terms of other losses, around 20,717 cattle were killed, a total of 904,011 houses damaged and 200,438 houses destroyed (Directorate of Economics and Statistics, 2001). Industries, public infrastructure, roads, bridges and dams were also damaged. The total cost of reconstruction has been put at Rs. 11,499 million (Directorate of Economics and Statistics 2001). The sample for the study has been drawn from among all of the most severely affected districts, with the exception of Jamnagar, and also from Bharuch, which was less severely affected than other locations.

5. Methodology of the Study

This study is an investigation of the living and working conditions of labour migrants in Gujarat, including the impact of the January 2001 earthquake on them. Information was gathered through a survey using a structured questionnaire. Migrants other than labour migrants are not covered by the study and the respondents were the workers themselves, but not their family members. The study is also restricted to those who had migrated to the earthquake region. Following the earthquake, there was substantial out-migration of those who had come for employment, together with many members of the local population. At the time this study was conducted, these out-migrants had again returned to their places of origin.

In a normal study, a method of stratified sampling would have been adopted, distributing the sample over all of the districts affected by the earthquake. However, as the state of Gujarat is characterized by a large immigrant population, the method of purposive sampling has been adopted for the present study.³⁰ This was done because the study was not only intended to understand the impact of a large disaster on the migrant population, but also to provide information for development of effective policies and programmes to be implemented with governmental and non-governmental cooperation and support. Hence, the sample of respondents was selected through consultation with grassroots NGOs working in the areas affected by the earthquake.

In this regard, the first consultation with the NGOs working in the Kachchh district, parts of Saurashtra, Ahmedabad City and its surroundings, as well as some parts of South Gujarat, was held on 16 August 2001. These NGOs have been working with the most marginalized groups represented in the sample. Lists of economic activities where poor migrants were expected to be found, based on the experience of the NGOs, were drawn up for each geographic area where the NGOs were active. The number of migrants working in each of these activities in each of the locations was estimated and then the sample size for each of the migrant groups decided on that basis. Such purposive sampling was also used because IOM has funded temporary shelters for the migrants in the earthquake-affected regions of Kachchh and Saurashtra, and intends to carry this initiative forward into other policy areas through the grassroots partner organizations. As mentioned previously, inter-state migration in India is as critical an issue as cross-border migration in the case of small countries. Hence, continuing work in partnership with NGOs to address the development problems of migrant labour groups also fits within the IOM mandate.

Migration is a continuous process, with some workers migrating for brief periods and others for life. For this study the first task, therefore, was to identify and define a "migrant". In the consultative workshop mentioned above, the definition adopted was that of a person who had moved to the current place of work within the last ten years.

The questionnaire for this study was developed in cooperation with the NGOs. It solicited information on four areas: (i) general individual and family details, (ii) factors related to migration, (iii) details of employment and (iv) factors related to the impacts of the earthquake. The questions were canvassed by a team of surveyors from the partner NGOs. However, unlike other surveys carried out in partnership with NGOs, in which employees/volunteers of each of the NGOs canvass in their own work areas, here, the team of surveyors remained constant and moved from one NGO work-area to another to maintain consistency in the quality of data.

The survey was carried out during the months of September to November. A significant part of this period coincided with the monsoon season, and some seasonal activities, such as salt, charcoal and brick making were not in progress. Workers engaged in these activities were therefore not found at their work sites but, rather, in their native villages where they were engaged in seasonal agriculture work. Many of the salt-making units, brick kilns and charcoal making sites were located in areas affected by the earthquake, causing many of the migrants to return home. In these cases, questions were canvassed by the surveyors at the respondents' places of origin.



Surveyor amidst labour migrant families

The purposive sample is described first. In all, information for 700 questionnaires was canvassed by the surveyors. Of these, data from 41 questionnaires were found to be incomplete and therefore invalid, with the information from the remaining 659 questionnaires accepted as valid. Twelve types of economic activities were covered by the survey. Of these, two, charcoal and salt making, fall within the primary sector; four, ceramic manufacturing, brick making, construction and “other manufacturing” fall within the secondary sector, and the rest, loading and unloading in general and in ports, transport and hotel services, personal services, petty trade and commerce (including vending and small shop keeping) and all types of casual labour, fall within the tertiary sector.

Respondents forming the samples for each type of activity covered are provided in Table 8. The largest sample size is in “other manufacturing” and the smallest is in general loading and unloading, and port loading and unloading.

The survey was carried out mainly in six districts, Kachchh (348 respondents), Surendranagar (17 respondents), Rajkot (96 respondents), Jamnagar (10 respondents), Ahmedabad (132 respondents) and Bharuch (46 respondents) (Table 8).

Of greater significance for this study was the type of migration, i.e., whether the worker was an inter-state or intra-state migrant. The literature review suggested that inter-state migrants work for longer periods, undertake much more difficult work and, in the end, earn more money than the intra-state migrants who work in less difficult activities and for shorter periods of time. In times of disaster, intra-state migrants appear to have an advantage over inter-state migrants since the former may receive relief benefits, if not in the place of

destination, then in the place of origin. Being from the same state and speaking the same language appears to be of advantage in terms of accessing relief and aid following a crisis. In order to be able to carry out the analysis of differential access to relief and rehabilitation measures, the sample has been divided by type of migrant. A total of 326 respondents were inter-state migrants and 333 were intra-state migrants (Table 9).

While, on the whole, the sample is nearly equally divided between the two types of migration (Table 9), in some activities, such as “other manufacturing”, loading/unloading in general and in ports, and in transport/hotel services, inter-state migrants predominate. In charcoal and salt making, ceramic manufacturing and brick making, there is a predominance of intra-state migrants.

In the total sample, 589 of the respondents are in-migrants and 70 are out-migrants (Table 9). The latter are in the sample because they were working in earthquake-affected regions at the time of the earthquake. They were immigrants in the earthquake region, but at the time of the survey, they had returned to their places of origin and were engaged in agricultural work, and would out-migrate again after the agricultural season. For the purpose of drawing conclusions in this study, no distinction is made between the in-migrants and the out-migrants.

TABLE 8
RESPONDENT DISTRIBUTION BY PLACE OF WORK
(number of persons by district and type of activity)

Activity type	Kachchh	Banas-kantha	Surendra Nagar	Rajkot	Jamnagar	Ahmed-abad	Bharuch	Kheda	Bhav-nagar	Total
Charcoal making	36	2	–	–	–	7	–	3	3	51
Salt making	19	–	10	24	6	–	13	–	–	72
Ceramic manufacturing	1	–	–	19	3	26	–	–	–	49
Brick making	11	1	–	10	1	30	–	–	–	53
Construction	44	–	–	41	–	1	1	–	–	87
Other manufacturing	46	–	–	1	–	25	17	–	–	89
Loading/unloading	18	–	5	–	–	12	–	–	1	36
Port loading/unloading	35	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	35
Transport/hotel services	29	–	–	–	–	5	7	–	–	41
Personal services	35	–	–	–	–	14	6	–	–	55
Trade and commerce	40	–	–	–	–	8	–	–	–	48
Other work	34	–	2	1	–	4	2	–	–	43
Total	348	3	17	96	10	132	46	3	4	659

TABLE 9
RESPONDENT DISTRIBUTION BY TYPE AND STATUS OF MIGRANTS

Activity type	Number		% distribution		Number		% distribution		Total sample
	Inter	Intra	Inter	Intra	In-migrants	Out-migrants	In-migrants	Out-migrants	
Charcoal making	–	51	0.00	100.00	19	32	37.25	62.75	51
Salt making	11	61	15.28	84.72	43	29	59.72	40.28	72
Ceramic manufacturing	16	33	32.65	67.35	49	–	100.00	0.00	49
Brick making	18	35	33.96	66.04	50	3	94.34	5.66	53
Construction	35	52	40.23	59.77	83	4	95.40	4.60	87
Other manufacturing	65	24	73.03	26.97	87	2	97.75	2.25	89
Loading/unloading	31	5	86.11	13.89	36	–	100.00	0.00	36
Port loading/unloading	30	5	85.71	14.29	35	–	100.00	0.00	35
Transport/hotel services	31	10	75.61	24.39	41	–	100.00	0.00	41
Personal services	32	23	58.18	41.82	55	–	100.00	0.00	55
Trade and commerce	24	24	50.00	50.00	48	–	100.00	0.00	48
Other work	33	10	76.74	23.26	43	–	100.00	0.00	43
Total	326	333	49.47	50.53	589	70	89.38	10.62	659

TABLE 10
RESPONDENT DISTRIBUTION BY GENDER

Activity type	Number		% distribution		Total sample
	Female	Male	Female	Male	
Charcoal making	13	38	25.49	74.51	51
Salt making	17	55	23.61	76.39	72
Ceramic manufacturing	4	45	8.16	91.84	49
Brick making	11	42	20.75	79.25	53
Construction	29	58	33.33	66.67	87
Other manufacturing	9	80	10.11	89.89	89
Loading/unloading	1	35	2.78	97.22	36
Port loading/unloading	1	34	2.86	97.14	35
Transport/hotel services	–	41	0.00	100.00	41
Personal services	12	43	21.82	78.18	55
Trade and commerce	8	40	16.67	83.33	48
Other work	9	34	20.93	79.07	43
Total	114	545	17.19	82.81	659

Of the total sample, women accounted for 17 per cent (Table 10). They can be found to work in: (i) seasonal activities such as charcoal, salt, and brick making activities, where the migrants work in teams consisting mainly of family members, and where female members can find work; (ii) construction, as they live with their husbands on the construction sites and (iii) personal services, trade and commerce, and other casual work. They were rarely found to be engaged in other activities and thus were not represented in the survey.

6. Labour Migrants in Gujarat

6.1 Social and demographic profile

Because of the purposive sampling, the distribution of the respondents by their state of origin does not tally with the distribution of all migrants in Gujarat by their state of origin, at least when compared to the census figures of 1991.³¹ In this survey, the largest proportion of labour migrants was from Rajasthan (33 per cent), followed by Orissa (21 per cent) and Bihar (18 per cent) (Table 11). In 1991, the proportion of migrants from Rajasthan was 21 per cent, and from Orissa and Bihar only 3 per cent each. While the largest proportion of recent migrants in Gujarat came from Maharashtra, in this survey migrants from this state accounted for only 2 per cent. Migrants from Maharashtra are mainly found in the southern regions of Gujarat in sugarcane cutting and other agricultural activities related to the cash crop economy. Breman (1978, 1985, 1996) has undertaken extensive study of these sugarcane workers. Since earthquake impacts have not been so severe in southern Gujarat's sugarcane belt, these labour migrants were not included in this study.

There is wide variation in regard to the origins of migrant workers, based, in part, on the type of work in which they are engaged. In salt making, the largest proportion of inter-state migrants were from Uttar Pradesh (Table 11); in brick making, the largest proportion of inter-state migrants came from Rajasthan; in construction and other manufacturing from Orissa and Bihar; in ceramic manufacturing from Bihar; in general loading and unloading from Rajasthan and Orissa; in port loading and unloading from Rajasthan and Bihar; in transport and hotel services from Rajasthan and Punjab; in personal services from Rajasthan; in trade and commerce from Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh and in other casual occupations from Rajasthan and Orissa. No inter-state migrants are active in charcoal making.

The spread of intra-state workers over the districts of origin is fairly even. The largest number of these migrants (21 per cent) are from Kachchh district and migrants engaged in charcoal making are overwhelmingly from there. The next-largest proportion of intra-state migrants (20 per cent), are from Dahod district, the tribal district, and are found in large numbers in the construction sector. The third-largest proportion of migrants studied are from Surendranagar and they account for the largest number of workers in brick making.

Two northern Gujarat districts, Banaskantha and Mehsana, send a noticeably large proportion of migrant workers, accounting for 8 per cent each in the total sample. Migrants from Banaskantha dominate in general loading and unloading and in trade and commerce.

NOTES FROM FIELD INTERVIEWS: 1

The salt fields of Kuda Village, Surendranagar

The market economy is gradually penetrating the rural sector, and those engaged previously in the subsistence economy are unable to maintain their lives by remaining in that sector. Subsistence farming is no longer economically viable because of the increase in the costs of agricultural implements and inputs. In the rural households of the underdeveloped states of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Madhya Pradesh, although the land is fertile, the families are forced to send out young males to earn cash incomes. These young men enter low-paid and unskilled labour sectors with high levels of uncertainty and engage in backbreaking work.

Madhavsingh Darbarsingh Padhiar of Uttar Pradesh is one such labourer. His land yields just enough food to feed his family, and the family is always cash-strapped. In order to survive in an economy that is becoming increasingly market-oriented, Madhavsingh decided to go out to earn cash for the family through migrant labour.

He is now working as a loader and unloader of salt bags. Around the Rann of Kachchh, there are a large number of salt farms, and the salt is carted by trucks to Kuda village, which has a railway line.

When the salt-loaded trucks arrive in Kuda village, salt is unloaded, stacked and packed in bags using specific equipment. The bags are loaded onto railway cars and carted to the salt processing units. The trucks return with salt and leave the labourers in their colony. On the salt farms, the labourers work with no protection. Their hands and feet, continuously exposed to salt, become burnt and black. There do not appear to be any safety measures in place to prevent or ameliorate this exposure.

The salt producers appoint labour contractors responsible for the hiring of labour for the loading and unloading activities. Railway cars come to Kuda roughly 6 to 7 days per month, and on these days the labourers find work. Madhvsingh was brought to Kuda by his uncle and, like him, many of the workers, all of whom are single males, live in huts on the site outside Kuda village with no other family members.

The salt loaders work in groups of 15 or 16, called a "gang". The labour contractor (*mukadam*) pays the labourers. The average monthly earnings of Madhvsingh is Rs. 1,000; some of the workers earn slightly more and many of them look for daily-wage labour (*dahadi*) when loading/unloading work is not available. There is an over-supply of labour here, a condition that thwarts implementation of labour laws and depresses wages. After food expenditures and room rental, Madhvsingh saves Rs. 200 per month. (An urban middle class family in India spends about Rs. 200 per month in rental for cable television.)

In his native village, where Madhvsingh has a house, he studied through class nine. School and health facilities were available in the village, and education was free in the village school. He also has a ration card at home. In Kuda, migrants can use the village facilities, and there is also a school, but the migrants' incomes are inadequate to bring the family to the work site. Madhvsingh has two children, a two and a half year old daughter and an infant son, but he has been unable to go home for a year due to lack of funds.

Madhvsingh has migrated more than 1,000 kms for work with no sustainable future. He feels that for such small savings it is barely worth living away from home. But for now – and perhaps indefinitely – he knows of no other options to support his family.

TABLE 11
DISTRIBUTION OF MIGRANTS BY STATE OF ORIGIN

Activity Type	Orissa	Bihar	Punjab	Rajasthan	U.P	W.B	M.P	Maharashtra	AP	Other states	Total
Salt making	–	–	–	–	9	–	1	–	–	1	11
	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	81.8	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	9.1	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	3	6	–	3	2	2	–	–	–	–	16
	18.8	37.5	0.0	18.8	12.5	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Brick making	3	3	–	10	1	–	–	–	1	–	18
	16.7	16.7	0.0	55.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	100.0
Construction	12	8	–	7	1	–	2	4	1	–	35
	34.3	22.9	0.0	20.0	2.9	0.0	5.7	11.4	2.9	0.0	100.0
Other manufacturing	22	14	–	9	7	1	6	–	2	4	65
	33.8	21.5	0.0	13.8	10.8	1.5	9.2	0.0	3.1	6.0	100.0
Loading/ Unloading	8	6	–	11	4	–	1	1	–	–	31
	25.8	19.4	0.0	35.5	12.9	0.0	3.2	3.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Port loading/ unloading	2	8	–	14	4	1	–	–	–	1	30
	6.7	26.7	0.0	46.7	13.3	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	100.0
Transport/ hotel services	–	4	7	15	3	–	–	–	–	2	31
	0.0	12.9	22.6	48.4	9.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	100.0
Personal services	6	4	3	12	1	–	–	1	2	3	32
	18.8	12.5	9.4	37.5	3.1	0.0	0.0	3.1	6.3	9.3	100.0
Trade and commerce	3	1	–	11	6	1	–	1	–	1	24
	12.5	4.2	0.0	45.8	25.0	4.2	0.0	4.2	0.0	4.2	100.0
Other work	8	6	–	15	2	1	–	–	–	1	33
	24.2	18.2	0.0	45.5	6.1	3.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
All respondents	67	60	10	107	40	6	11	7	6	13	327
	20.5	18.3	3.1	32.7	12.2	1.8	3.4	2.1	1.8	3.9	100.0

TABLE 12
INTRA-STATE MIGRANTS BY DISTRICT OF ORIGIN

Activity Type	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Total
Charcoal making	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	38	74.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	7	51
Salt making	0.0	8	10	0.0	19	13	0.0	0.0	0.0	7	0.0	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	61
Ceramic Manufacturing	11	2	5	2	0.0	0.0	2	7	0.0	1	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33
Brick making	22	1	1	1	0.0	0.0	9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	35
Construction	0.0	2	42	2	1	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	52
Other Manufacturing	4	2	2	1	1	0.0	0.0	5	2	0.0	2	2	0.0	2	1	0.0	24
Loading/Unloading	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5

TABLE 12 (CONT.)
INTRA-STATE MIGRANTS BY DISTRICT OF ORIGIN

Activity Type	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Total
Port loading/unloading	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	1	1	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	5
Transport/Hotel services	0.0	0.0	3	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	1	1	0.0	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10
Personal Services	2	1	2	2	4	0.0	3	3	0.0	0.0	4	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	1	23
Trade and Commerce	8.3	8.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	8.3	8.3	16.7	0.0	4.2	29.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Other work	0.0	2	1	0.0	0.0	4	0.0	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10
All respondents	12.2	6.0	19.6	2.4	20.8	5.4	4.8	8.0	2.4	2.4	3.0	8.3	0.3	0.6	0.6	3.3	100.0

Note: A) Surendra-Nagar; B) Rajkot; C) Dahod; D) Panch-Mahals; E) Kachchh; F) Jamnagar; G) Ahmed-Abad; H) Mehsana; I) Junagadh; J) Valsad; K) Sabar-Kantha; L) Banas-Kantha; M) Bharuch; N) Gandhi-Nagar; O) Anand; P) Patan.

TABLE 13
AGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS

Activity Type	% distribution by age (yrs)					Total	Av. age (yrs)	Av. age at first migration (yrs)
	Up to 14	15 to 29	30 to 44	45 to 59	60 +			
Charcoal making	0.0	37.3	37.3	19.6	5.9	100.0	34	23
Salt making	0.0	40.3	45.8	12.5	1.4	100.0	31	25
Ceramic manufacturing	2.0	49.0	38.8	10.2	0.0	100.0	31	25
Brick making	0.0	39.6	41.5	15.1	3.8	100.0	32	26
Construction	0.0	51.7	43.7	4.6	0.0	100.0	28	24
Other manufacturing	1.1	66.3	30.3	2.2	0.0	100.0	26	21
Loading/unloading	0.0	55.6	41.7	2.8	0.0	100.0	29	23
Port loading/unloading	0.0	40.0	51.4	8.6	0.0	100.0	31	25
Transport/hotel services	0.0	75.6	19.5	4.9	0.0	100.0	26	21
Personal services	3.6	45.5	40.0	10.9	0.0	100.0	30	23
Trade and commerce	0.0	43.8	43.8	10.4	2.1	100.0	32	25
Other work	0.0	55.8	34.9	7.0	2.3	100.0	30	25
Inter-state migrants	1.2	56.0	36.4	6.1	0.3	100.0	29	23
Intra-state migrants	0.0	44.9	41.4	11.6	2.1	100.0	31	24
All respondents	0.6	50.4	38.9	8.9	1.2	100.0	30	24

Half of the respondents were between 15 and 29 years of age, and for the purpose of this study are classified as youth (Table 12). In several activities, including “other manufacturing” and transport and hotel services, more than two-thirds of the respondents belonged to this age group. In contrast, in charcoal making, brick making and salt making, two-fifths or less of the respondents belonged to this age group, and there was also a very high proportion of respondents between 30 and 44 years of age. In charcoal making and brick making, migrants above the age of 45 years were also found in significant proportions. As noted above, these three activities are seasonal, and entire families migrate to engage in them, which explains the presence of older persons who might not be involved in some of the other types of work. Older family members are less likely to become involved in long-distance migration, which

explains their presence in noticeable numbers in intra-state, rather than inter-state, migration. The highest average age for migrants is found in charcoal making, followed by brick making.

Since Gujarat is an industrial and a migrant-receiving state, it has a much higher proportion of people between the ages of 15 and 45 than the rest of India. Within the entire population, the proportion falling into this age group is 58.8 per cent in Gujarat compared to 44.9 per cent in India³² as a whole. Within the working population, the percentage in this age group is much higher. While in the sample of labour migrants studied here, 90 per cent of the population fell within the age group of 15 to 45 years, among the workers in Gujarat State as a whole the percentage of the population in this age group was 82.21 per cent, as of 1991. Within the inter-state migrant population, approximately 96 per cent fall within this age group (Census of India, 1991a).³³

There is also a presence of child labour in this sample, although it is very small. Child labourers are present in personal services (4 per cent), ceramic manufacturing (2 per cent) and other manufacturing (1 per cent).

NOTES FROM FIELD INTERVIEWS: 2

Child labour in Gandhidham

Child labour is found primarily in informal establishments such as road-side eateries. The children working there are mainly boys who also live on the premises. In addition to being paid a salary, they also receive food in the establishment, and since food and shelter are covered, they usually send home their entire monthly salaries of approximately Rs. 800. These children work for 12 hours a day. For example, in one typical such establishment found in Gandhidham town near Kandly Port, the owner, who comes from Rajasthan, brought some children to work in his establishment after paying advances to their parents.

Bhimrao, a 12-year-old boy belonging to the scavenger caste, migrated from Rajasthan along with his mother, who was deserted by his father. Through a relative, Bhimrao and his mother reached Kandla, adjacent to Gandhidham town. His mother is 58 years of age and is suffering from malnourishment and general weakness, and she can only work for up to 15 days a month.

Bhimrao left school to migrate and support the two of them. For now, hopes of further schooling have had to be abandoned and it is unclear what the future holds for Bhimrao and the other children in India who have become the youngest migrant labourers.

In general, nearly all of the workers migrated for the first time when they were in their early to mid-twenties (Table 13). The average age of first migration was 24 years. The inter-state migrants undertook their first migration at a slightly younger age (average 23 years) than the intra-state migrants (24 years).

TABLE 14
MARITAL STATUS OF RESPONDENTS
(percentage of distribution)

Activity Type	Unmarried	Married	Widowed	Divorced	Total
Charcoal making	7.8	92.2	0.0	0.0	100.0
Salt making	15.3	80.6	4.2	0.0	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	10.2	89.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Brick making	18.9	79.2	1.9	0.0	100.0
Construction	10.3	88.5	1.1	0.0	100.0
Other manufacturing	49.4	46.1	1.1	2.2	100.0
Loading/unloading	30.6	69.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Port loading/unloading	22.9	77.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Transport/hotel services	46.3	53.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Personal services	21.8	76.4	1.8	0.0	100.0
Trade and commerce	10.4	87.5	2.1	0.0	100.0
Other work	20.9	79.1	0.0	0.0	100.0
Inter-state migrants	30.3	67.9	0.9	0.6	100.0
Intra-state migrants	14.3	84.2	1.5	0.0	100.0
All respondents	22.2	76.2	1.2	0.3	100.0

Nearly three-fourths of the respondents were married and 22 per cent were unmarried (Table 14); among the intra-state migrants, there was a much higher proportion (84 per cent) who were married and who left their places of origin at a slightly younger age. Thus, there is a higher proportion of unmarried inter-state migrants (30 per cent) as compared to intra-state migrants (14 per cent). In other manufacturing and transport and hotel services, where the average age of the worker is lower and where the average age at first migration is also lower, there is a large presence of unmarried workers, 49 per cent and 46 per cent, respectively. Among those engaged in loading and unloading activities, in the ports or elsewhere, nearly 31 per cent are unmarried.

The average family size of migrant labourers surveyed was 5.19 (Table 15). The family size is slightly smaller among inter-state migrants (5.09) compared to intra-state migrants (5.29). The largest family size is found among migrants working in charcoal making (5.81), followed by those in loading and unloading activities (5.77) and finally by migrants employed in other manufacturing (5.22). However, large family size is not an indication that all family members join the migrants in the place of destination.

Thirty per cent of respondents, mainly male, were single (Table 16) because, in the types of activities covered and the social milieu they come from, there is no possibility of a woman migrating without other accompanying family members. Another 39 per cent had migrated with one to three family members. Among the inter-state migrants, a much higher proportion (47 per cent) were single, while among the intra-state migrants, 46 per cent had brought more than four members of their family with them to the place of destination. Among intra-state migrants, only 17 per cent had done so. This indicates that intra-state migrants tend to migrate with all or part of the family members, while inter-state migrants tend to migrate alone. The average number of family members who had migrated with the workers was 3.31 in general, 2.50 among the inter-state migrants and 4.09 among the intra-state migrants.

More than half of those engaged in port-related loading and unloading, and those in transport and hotel services migrated alone, whereas less than 20 per cent of those engaged in charcoal making, salt manufacturing, brick making, trade and commerce, and personal

services³⁴ migrated alone. Charcoal, salt and brick making activities are paid on a piece-rate basis in which family labour is used. In these activities, therefore, 40 per cent or more of the workers had migrated with four or more family members. The average number of family members with the migrant labour engaged in these activities was 4.12, 4.01, 4.04, 4.17 and 3.87, respectively.

Nearly 91 per cent of the migrants were Hindus and 5 per cent were Muslims (Table 17). In construction, loading and unloading in ports and other work, a noticeable presence of Muslims was noticed. Approximately another 17 per cent of migrants belonging to other religious categories working in transport and hotel services were Sikh.

TABLE 15
FAMILY SIZE OF RESPONDENTS

Activity type	% distribution of respondents with family size				Total	Average family size
	Up to 3	4-5	6-7	7+		
Charcoal making	15.7	45.1	29.4	9.8	100.0	5.81
Salt making	9.7	37.5	33.3	19.4	100.0	5.04
Ceramic manufacturing	14.3	44.9	38.8	2.0	100.0	5.34
Brick making	11.3	52.8	20.8	15.1	100.0	5.48
Construction	14.9	37.9	37.9	9.2	100.0	4.84
Other manufacturing	21.3	47.2	24.7	6.7	100.0	5.22
Loading/unloading	11.1	58.3	19.4	11.1	100.0	5.77
Port loading/unloading	11.4	42.9	28.6	17.1	100.0	4.68
Transport/hotel services	22.0	46.3	29.3	2.4	100.0	5.00
Personal services	18.2	41.8	32.7	7.3	100.0	4.87
Trade and commerce	18.8	45.8	29.2	6.3	100.0	4.79
Other work	25.6	44.2	25.6	4.7	100.0	5.18
Inter-state migrants	18.0	46.8	25.4	9.8	100.0	5.09
Intra-state migrants	14.3	42.6	33.9	9.2	100.0	5.29
All respondents	16.1	44.6	29.7	9.5	100.0	5.19

TABLE 16
NUMBER OF FAMILY MEMBERS ACCOMPANYING THE MIGRANT WORKER

Activity type	% workers accompanied by family members numbering				Total	Average no. of family members accompanying
	0	1 to 3	4 to 6	7 to 9		
Charcoal making	11.76	33.33	45.10	9.80	100.00	4.12
Salt making	19.44	30.56	40.28	9.72	100.00	4.01
Ceramic manufacturing	32.65	36.73	28.57	2.04	100.00	3.33
Brick making	15.09	45.28	32.08	7.55	100.00	4.04
Construction	20.69	54.02	24.14	1.15	100.00	3.16
Other manufacturing	49.44	31.46	19.10	0.00	100.00	2.52
Loading/unloading	41.67	36.11	22.22	0.00	100.00	2.61
Port loading/ unloading	54.29	28.57	11.43	5.71	100.00	2.54
Transport/hotel services	56.10	26.83	17.07	0.00	100.00	2.34
Personal services	14.55	43.64	40.00	1.82	100.00	3.87
Trade and commerce	12.50	43.75	37.50	6.25	100.00	4.17
Other work	39.53	48.84	11.63	0.00	100.00	2.56
Inter-state migrants	47.09	35.78	15.60	1.53	100.00	2.50
Intra-state migrants	12.50	41.37	40.18	5.95	100.00	4.09
All respondents	29.56	38.61	28.05	3.77	100.00	3.31

TABLE 17
RELIGION OF RESPONDENTS
(percentage of distribution)

Activity Type	Hindu	Muslim	Other	Total
Charcoal making	98.0	0.0	2.0	100.0
Salt making	94.4	5.6	0.0	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Brick making	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Construction	85.1	10.3	4.6	100.0
Other manufacturing	93.3	2.2	4.5	100.0
Loading/unloading	97.2	2.8	0.0	100.0
Port loading/unloading	85.7	14.3	0.0	100.0
Transport/hotel services	73.2	9.8	17.1	100.0
Personal services	92.7	0.0	7.3	100.0
Trade and commerce	91.7	6.3	2.1	100.0
Other work	81.4	14.0	4.7	100.0
Inter-state migrants	89.3	4.9	5.8	100.0
Intra-state migrants	92.9	6.0	1.2	100.0
All respondents	91.1	5.4	3.5	100.0

The proportion of Scheduled Castes (SC) (26 per cent) and Scheduled Tribes (ST) (27 per cent) is nearly equal among the labour migrants studied (Table 18). Interestingly, 31 per cent of the intra-state migrants are STs, although in Gujarat their proportion in the population is 15 per cent. In Gujarat, STs live in environmentally degraded regions and still have very low levels of education (Hirway and Mahadevia, 1999). They therefore tend to migrate more than other population groups and, after migrating, tend to work in very low-paying jobs. The proportion of SCs in the population of Gujarat is only 7.5 per cent, much lower than the proportion among the labour migrants studied here.

The largest proportion of ST labour migrants is found in construction and charcoal making activities. Tribals from Dohad district are employed in construction, and the Kolis of Kachchh, classified as tribals, are engaged in the production of charcoal. SCs are present in significant proportions in brick making and loading and unloading at the ports.

Only 14 per cent of the labour migrants were of other (higher) castes. Their largest presence was found in transport and hotel services because of the large proportion of Sikhs who have not classified themselves as either SCs or Other Backward Castes (OBCs). Among the intra-state migrants, there is a very small proportion of higher castes, suggesting that only the lower castes and tribals migrate to work in physical labour activities, whereas from other states, even persons of higher castes migrate to find work in low-paying physical labour.

TABLE 18
CASTE OF RESPONDENTS
(percentage of distribution)

Activity Type	No information	SC	ST	OBC	Others	Total
Charcoal making	19.6	13.7	56.9	9.8	0.0	100.0
Salt making	9.7	25.0	29.2	29.2	6.9	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	12.2	32.7	30.6	16.3	8.2	100.0
Brick making	13.2	45.3	22.6	9.4	9.4	100.0
Construction	6.9	10.3	36.8	37.9	8.0	100.0
Other manufacturing	4.5	25.8	27.0	18.0	24.7	100.0
Loading/unloading	13.9	22.2	19.4	22.2	22.2	100.0
Port loading/unloading	0.0	48.6	11.4	17.1	22.9	100.0
Transport/hotel services	4.9	12.2	17.1	31.7	34.1	100.0
Personal services	18.2	32.7	9.1	27.3	12.7	100.0
Trade and commerce	4.2	31.3	20.8	27.1	16.7	100.0
Other work	9.3	32.6	30.2	18.6	9.3	100.0
Inter-state migrants	8.3	26.0	23.5	19.9	22.3	100.0
Intra-state migrants	10.7	26.8	30.7	26.2	5.7	100.0
All respondents	9.5	26.4	27.1	23.1	13.9	100.0

The literacy rate among the migrants is generally lower than that of the overall population. In 1991, the literacy rate of Gujarat's population was 51 per cent for the population as a whole (61 per cent for males and 41 per cent for females) and 61 per cent for the adult population (ages seven and above).³⁵ In the same year, the literacy rate for the overall migrant population was 48 per cent, 72 per cent for male migrants and 38 per cent for female migrants.³⁶ In 2001, the literacy rate calculated for the population as a whole was 61 per cent.³⁷ In this survey of low-income labour migrants, the overall literacy rate was 54 per cent (Table 19), clearly lower than that of the population as a whole.

While 46 per cent of the migrants were illiterate, another 16 per cent had passed the primary education level, that is, up to class five, and another 17 per cent had passed middle school level (up to class seven). Thus, four in every five migrants was either illiterate or had a very low level of education, placing them in the category of unskilled labour. The greatest percentage of illiterate migrants was found in charcoal making, brick making, salt making and construction activities. There were no labourers engaged in these activities who had received an education above secondary level. These activities require unskilled and semi-skilled workers, where labour migrants can easily find employment or can be brought in by labour contractors. Often, when the marginal groups are displaced due to environmental degradation, which is the case regarding a large section of the migrating population, or due to development projects, they obtain work only in sectors where unskilled and semi-skilled jobs are available.

TABLE 19
EDUCATION LEVEL OF RESPONDENTS

Activity Type	Illiterate	Primary	Middle	Secondary	Above secondary	Total
Charcoal making	78.4	11.8	7.8	2.0	0.0	100.0
Salt making	62.5	20.8	6.9	9.7	0.0	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	34.7	18.4	22.4	22.4	2.0	100.0
Brick making	69.8	13.2	11.3	5.7	0.0	100.0
Construction	64.4	9.2	11.5	14.9	0.0	100.0
Other manufacturing	19.0	14.3	21.4	41.7	3.6	100.0
Loading/ unloading	48.6	5.7	20.0	22.9	2.9	100.0
Port loading/ unloading	40.0	17.1	22.9	14.3	5.7	100.0
Transport/hotel services	17.1	12.2	34.1	29.3	7.3	100.0
Personal services	29.6	22.2	25.9	22.2	0.0	100.0
Trade and commerce	32.6	30.4	13.0	17.4	6.5	100.0
Other work	34.9	14.0	18.6	27.9	4.7	100.0
Inter-state migrants	30.7	18.2	21.6	25.7	3.8	100.0
Intra-state migrants	59.7	13.1	12.8	13.4	0.9	100.0
All respondents	45.6	15.6	17.1	19.4	2.3	100.0

It should be noted that following the economic reforms, construction of infrastructure, especially road sector activities, increased, enabling such unskilled and semi-skilled labourers to find work. Both the inter-state and intra-state migrants on such construction sites are attached to a labour contractor and reach these sites through them.

Other manufacturing, transport and hotel services had the largest proportions of literate migrants. The latter also include a substantial proportion (29 per cent) of migrants who have attained the secondary level of schooling and another 7 per cent who are educated above the secondary level.

There are a number of migrant workers who have attained fairly high, that is, secondary level, education among those engaged in general loading and unloading and port loading and unloading activities. Some workers in these areas are more educated because they come from states such as Rajasthan, Orissa, and Bihar that do not have employment opportunities even for educated workers, who then migrate over long distances to work in unskilled jobs. Thus, despite higher educational qualifications, labour migrants from these states take whatever odd jobs are available after they migrate. Since the sample size is small for some of the activities, such as port loading and unloading, even one or two persons with higher levels of education indicate a reasonable percentage of representation.

NOTES FROM FIELD INTERVIEWS: 3

Labour migrants with high levels of education in unskilled jobs

The workers engaged in loading and unloading at the port, as well as in other activities tend to come from states including Rajasthan, Bihar, and Jharkhand. These workers are by no means illiterate, and in fact some of them are fairly well educated. For example, Prakash Darji, who migrated from Bihar, tried to find a job in Bihar after completing his Bachelors of Arts (BA) degree. Not finding employment in Bihar, he migrated to Kandla and now works as a loader/unloader at the port.

Comparisons between intra-state and inter-state labour migrants show that the former include a much higher (60 per cent) proportion of illiterates than the latter (31 per cent). This is because the intra-state migrants covered in this study are mainly engaged in three activities, charcoal making, salt making, and brick making, which utilize uneducated labour. Also, the scheduled tribes, who have low levels of education, are over-represented among the intra-state migrants in relation to their share of the Gujarat population. Unfortunately, even literate and well-educated labour migrants from the backward states of India have come to Gujarat in search of whatever work they can find.

Male/female comparisons of literacy rates offer the familiar picture of lower rates among females relative to males (Table 20). This is the case in all of the activities as well as within inter-state as well as intra-state migrant populations. The literacy rates in this study, calculated for the entire population of labour migrants, were 63 per cent for males and 13 per cent for females, which are much lower than the literacy rates for male and female migrants for the whole state, as noted previously. In all of the activities studied, the proportion of illiterate females was between 85-100 per cent. Also, there was almost no difference between the literacy rates of inter-state and intra-state female migrants, which is not the case regarding male migrants.

The reasons given for migrating were overwhelmingly economic. For example, nearly two-thirds of those surveyed stated that they had migrated to earn more income (Table 21). At the same time, nearly half also stated that they had migrated because they did not have land, any other source of employment at home, or any other means of remaining gainfully engaged. Another third stated that they had very limited cultivable land, which was not enough for the family to survive on, hence, they had to migrate. As mentioned before, part of the family or other siblings are left behind by the migrants in a typical family system in rural India. One or more brothers decide to migrate in order to earn cash income, while other siblings (brothers) at home can continue in the family occupation, mainly agriculture. By migrating, they are helping their families survive in the native village. All of the economic reasons given by the respondents for out-migration from their native villages fall within the category of push factors. None of them stated that they were aware of great economic opportunities in the places where they migrated to for work.

TABLE 20
LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND LITERACY BY GENDER

Activity Type	Illiterate	Primary	Middle	Secondary	Above secondary	Total
Male						
Charcoal making	92.31	0.00	7.69	0.00	0.00	100.00
Salt making	94.12	5.88	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Ceramic manufacturing	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Brick making	90.91	9.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Construction	89.66	0.00	10.34	0.00	0.00	100.00
Other manufacturing	22.22	11.11	33.33	33.33	0.00	100.00
Loading/unloading	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Port loading/unloading	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Transport/hotel services	-	-	-	-	-	-
Personal services	91.67	8.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Trade and commerce	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Other work	88.89	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Inter-state	87.50	12.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Intra-state	86.67	2.22	7.78	3.33	0.00	100.00
All respondents	86.84	4.39	6.14	2.63	0.00	100.00
Female						
Charcoal making	73.68	15.79	7.89	2.63	0.00	100.00
Salt making	52.73	25.45	9.09	12.73	0.00	100.00
Ceramic manufacturing	28.89	20.00	24.44	24.44	2.22	100.00
Brick making	64.29	14.29	14.29	7.14	0.00	100.00
Construction	51.72	13.79	12.07	22.41	0.00	100.00
Other manufacturing	18.67	14.67	20.00	42.67	4.00	100.00
Loading/unloading	47.06	5.88	20.59	23.53	2.94	100.00
Port loading/unloading	38.24	17.65	23.53	14.71	5.88	100.00
Transport/hotel services	17.07	12.20	34.15	29.27	7.32	100.00
Personal services	11.90	26.19	33.33	28.57	0.00	100.00
Trade and commerce	18.42	36.84	15.79	21.05	7.89	100.00
Other work	20.59	14.71	23.53	35.29	5.88	100.00
Inter-state	26.10	18.64	23.39	27.80	4.07	100.00
Intra-state	49.80	17.14	14.69	17.14	1.22	100.00
All respondents	36.85	17.96	19.44	22.96	2.78	100.00

TABLE 21
REASONS FOR MIGRATING
(percentage of distribution)

Activity type	To help other brothers	Limited cultivable land	No land/ temp. in village	To earn more	Indebtedness	Natural calamities	Social harassment/ boycott	Others	Total
Charcoal making	0.00	39.22	47.06	64.71	11.76	25.49	0.00	0.00	100.00
Salt making	8.33	26.39	61.11	62.50	23.61	20.83	1.39	4.17	100.00
Ceramic manufacturing	6.12	34.69	59.18	83.67	20.41	2.04	2.04	0.00	100.00
Brick making	5.66	32.08	67.92	56.60	35.85	11.32	1.89	0.00	100.00
Construction	8.05	39.08	41.38	66.67	40.23	14.94	2.30	1.15	100.00
Other manufacturing	19.10	30.34	47.19	71.91	20.22	7.87	2.25	2.25	100.00
Loading/unloading	19.44	33.33	52.78	69.44	27.78	8.33	2.78	0.00	100.00
Port loading/ unloading	22.86	54.29	54.29	71.43	20.00	5.71	0.00	0.00	100.00
Transport/hotel services	9.76	39.02	53.66	60.98	9.76	2.44	2.44	2.44	100.00
Personal services	12.73	23.64	54.55	76.36	18.18	16.36	3.64	1.82	100.00
Trade and commerce	14.58	25.00	66.67	66.67	22.92	6.25	2.08	2.08	100.00
Other work	9.30	23.26	60.47	62.79	16.28	18.60	4.65	0.00	100.00
Inter-state migrants	16.51	37.92	48.62	71.56	22.94	7.95	1.53	0.92	100.00
Intra-state migrants	5.65	27.98	59.52	63.99	23.51	16.67	2.68	1.79	100.00
All respondents	11.01	32.88	54.15	67.72	23.23	12.37	2.11	1.36	100.00

Apart from the lack of economic opportunities and inadequate possibilities to earn a living in their native villages, there are also other factors that compel migration. These include indebtedness and the need to out-migrate to seek work in cash-paying economic activities to support a family. Income thus earned is used by the joint family to repay debts. About 23 per cent of the respondents indicated that this was a primary reason for out-migration.

Roughly 12 per cent of the respondents stated that they had migrated because of natural calamities such as drought or floods in their native regions. In times of natural calamities, families tend to incur debts which must be repaid by earning cash incomes as migrant workers.

Lastly, some migrants, albeit a minute proportion, stated that they had migrated because they had suffered social harassment or social marginalization in their native villages, which is also a common phenomenon observed. Most particularly, the people of backward castes experience social harassment which can drive them to out-migrate.

However, none of the reasons for out-migration stated herein classifies the migrants discussed as forced migrants in the strict sense of the term. Nor, however, do they fit strictly into the category of voluntary migrants. Issues like social harassment, indebtedness and the impossibility of earning a living in the native villages can, to some extent, be addressed through policy measures. Even the severity of the consequences of natural calamities can be mitigated by appropriate disaster management and planning, as well as sustainable environmental policies.

Hence, this study covers the poorest of all labour migrants and those in the lowest social strata. The levels of education among this group are very low, placing most of the respondents within the categories of unskilled or semi-skilled labour. The women in the sample are virtually illiterate. Such a marginal segment of the population is completely excluded from rehabilitation initiatives in times of disaster, and their visibility in terms of relief efforts is very low. The following sections of the study review the economic status and living conditions of these labour migrants.

6.2 Working conditions and wages

The nature of the work and the payment of migrant labourers vary according to the activity. In charcoal making, salt making and brick making, the work is overwhelmingly piece-rate; in loading and unloading, 56 per cent of the workers were employed on a piece-rate basis, and in port-related loading and unloading 40 per cent of the workers were paid on a piece-rate basis. The remaining workers in the above-referenced activities were working as day labourers. In construction, three out of every five workers and in other (casual) work, one out of every two workers were day labourers and the rest on a monthly basis. Only in transport and hotel services were the migrants employed exclusively on a monthly basis. Trade and commerce workers were solely self-employed, and in personal services there were equal proportions of self-employed and salaried workers.



TABLE 22
NATURE OF WORK

Activity Type	Daily wagers	Self-employed	Salaried	Piece-rate	No Info	Total
Charcoal making	3.9	0.0	3.9	92.2	0.0	100.0
Salt making	31.9	0.0	1.4	63.9	2.8	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	44.9	0.0	36.7	16.3	2.0	100.0
Brick making	15.1	0.0	3.8	81.1	0.0	100.0
Construction	58.6	2.3	28.7	1.1	9.2	100.0
Other manufacturing	46.1	3.4	37.1	13.5	0.0	100.0
Loading/unloading	22.2	0.0	16.7	55.6	5.6	100.0
Port loading/unloading	48.6	0.0	8.6	40.0	2.9	100.0
Transport/hotel services	0.0	7.3	92.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Personal services	18.2	41.8	40.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Trade and commerce	4.2	91.7	2.1	0.0	2.1	100.0
Other work	51.2	9.3	34.9	4.7	0.0	100.0
Inter-state migrants	38.2	12.2	32.4	15.9	1.2	100.0
Intra-state migrants	24.7	11.9	17.9	42.3	3.3	100.0
All respondents	31.4	12.1	25.0	29.3	2.3	100.0

Among the inter-state migrants, more than one-third were employed as day labourers and another third received monthly wages, while among the intra-state migrants, 42 per cent were employed on a piece-rate basis and one-quarter worked as day labourers. In short, among the low-income labour migrants in the state, the large majority were generally employed either on a piece-rate or a daily basis and thus constantly under pressure to work whenever there was work available, while simultaneously unable to demand either higher wages or the respect of applicable labour laws. The piece-rate wages vary depending on the category of work. For example, for loading and unloading of salt bags, a wage of 40 paise per bag is paid.

NOTES FROM FIELD INTERVIEWS: 4

Construction labour on a road project near Moti Chirai Village

Gujarat, the second-most industrialized state of India, has always been a migrant-receiving state. Following the economic reforms of 1991, the state embarked on a process of rapid economic growth, taking advantage of its long coastline. The state has adopted a philosophy of port-led development. Kandla port is among the 12 major ports in India and is one of the largest ports on the west coast. While the Kandla port belongs to the Port Trust of India, a central public sector undertaking, the Gujarat government's public sector undertaking, the Gujarat Maritime Board, is promoting a number of large ports in the state. One such is in Mundra, which is being developed by the private sector. To take advantage of the ports, the state government is strengthening development of road infrastructure, an essential requirement for promoting port-led development. As a result, a new bridge connecting Kachchh to the Gujarat mainland was under construction at the time of the earthquake and was completed soon after to facilitate transport of relief materials, and a number of roads in Kachchh are being upgraded.

Migrant labourers, both inter-state and intra-state, are employed on all of these construction sites and live on the premises, moving from one site to another with the labour contractors. The state government has turned the construction contract over to a private company, who employs the contractors to find workers.

Bhalubhai, in his mid-twenties, came from Chhatisgarh State, with a labour contractor and has worked in Rajkot and Nagpur with the same contractor. He has come with his wife, who also works on the construction site as unskilled labour. He has land in his home village, where the family carries out dry agriculture, but Chhatisgarh state has been in the grip of a drought for the last two years, so they are now working as unskilled labourers in construction.

Abdul Khan, another worker on this site, is 21 years old and unmarried, and suffers from malaria. He migrated four years ago, at the age of 17, because the land in his village was inadequate to support his family. He earns roughly Rs. 100 per day in reinforcement tying work, with monthly savings of about Rs. 1,500-1,600 that he sends home. He begins work at 8.00 a.m., comes home to cook and eat, and returns to work until 10.00 p.m., with one day off per week.

Construction workers are paid better than other labourers. They can earn up to Rs. 3,000 per month, which is considered a high income among the day labourers. Some of the construction labour is skilled work, such as erecting steel reinforcement and concrete. However, there is no stability because the workers continually move from one construction site to another, and most of these workers live away from their families. If the wife stays with the worker, she also works, often as unskilled labour in construction, which normally means that the children will be unable to have access to education, and will end up following in the footsteps of their parents.

Among all of the activities studied, there was an eight-hour workday only in the areas of salt making and construction. In all other activities, including charcoal making, ceramic manufacturing, general loading and unloading, and other types of work, the workday was at least nine hours. In still other activities, the workday was 10 hours or longer. For example, in brick making, the workday can stretch to 13 hours. Inter-state migrants worked longer hours per day than intra-state migrants.

TABLE 23
WORK HOURS PER DAY AND WORKDAYS PER MONTH

Activity Type	Av. work hours per day	Av. workdays per month
Charcoal making	9	Between 26 to 30
Salt making	8	Between 21 to 25
Ceramic manufacturing	9	Between 21 to 25
Brick making	13	Between 26 to 30
Construction	8	Between 21 to 25
Other manufacturing	10	Between 21 to 25
Loading/unloading	9	Between 21 to 25
Port loading/unloading	10	Between 21 to 25
Transport/hotel services	12	Between 26 to 30
Personal services	10	Between 26 to 30
Trade and commerce	11	Between 26 to 30
Other work	9	Between 21 to 25
Inter-state migrants	10	—
Intra-state migrants	9	—

Note: For seasonal activities such as charcoal making, salt making and brick making, this data is for working months.

In certain types of activities, such as charcoal making, brick making, transport and hotel services, personal services and trade and commerce, the respondents worked between 26 and 30 days per month, suggesting that work was available for most of the month. In some other types of activities, they worked 21 to 25 days per month. It should be noted that the low-income workers prefer working nearly every day of the month, without any days off; hence, if they do not work every day, it is because no work is available. While the former (trade and commerce, etc.) engage self-employed persons who tend to work throughout the year, in the seasonal work of charcoal and brick making, the work is more sporadic. Since, in all other activities, the payment for work is either on a piece-rate or daily basis, the lack of work for 5 to 9 days per month is a serious problem as it reduces the workers' monthly wages.

Brick making offers the maximum monthly income (Rs. 2,500), however, this is a seasonal activity (Table 24). It is an activity with very long workdays, often stretching to 13 hours. In transport and hotel services and trade and commerce, where work is available throughout the month, the income is above Rs. 2,200 per month. In other manufacturing activities, even if there is no work available for nearly two days a week, monthly income can be about Rs. 2,400. In all other activities, the average monthly income is Rs. 2,000 or less. Charcoal and salt making provide the lowest monthly incomes, about Rs. 1,600 and, since these are only seasonal activities, these migrant labourers are the poorest of the group covered in this study. If two members per family were engaged in this work for eight months per year, the annual income of the family would total Rs. 25,600 (US\$ 522), which is very close to the 1999-2000 official poverty line of Rs. 19,902 for rural areas, and far below the poverty line of Rs. 29,603 for urban areas in the same year. This income amounts to roughly a per capita/per day income of 28 US cents. In the period 2001-2002, the rural and urban poverty lines were higher, and close to the annual income of the charcoal makers and salt workers. Both of these activities engage intra-state labour, as a result of which the monthly income of intra-state migrants is lower than that of inter-state migrants. Inter-state migrants make up the majority in activities in which monthly incomes are higher, such as other manufacturing and transport and hotel services.

TABLE 24
MONTHLY INCOMES OF RESPONDENTS*

Activity Type	Ave. (Rs.)	% with monthly income of (Rs.)						Total
		Up to 1,000	1,001-1,500	1,501-2,000	2,001-3,000	3,001-4,000	Above 4,000	
Charcoal making	1,574	13.7	47.1	37.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Salt making	1,623	19.4	41.7	29.2	9.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	2,088	2.0	30.6	32.7	28.6	6.1	0.0	100.0
Brick making	2,521	3.8	17.0	34.0	26.4	13.2	5.7	100.0
Construction	1,966	8.0	23.0	48.3	17.2	3.4	0.0	100.0
Other manufacturing	2,377	2.2	16.9	29.2	42.7	6.7	2.2	100.0
Loading/unloading	1,806	8.3	36.1	36.1	19.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
Port loading/ unloading	2,049	2.9	28.6	42.9	25.7	0.0	0.0	100.0
Transport/hotel services	2,244	9.8	22.0	31.7	19.5	12.2	4.9	100.0
Personal services	1,933	16.4	25.5	32.7	20.0	3.6	1.8	100.0
Trade and commerce	2,227	6.3	20.8	37.5	31.3	2.1	2.1	100.0
Other work	1,855	16.3	30.2	25.6	25.6	2.3	0.0	100.0
Inter-state migrants	2,129	9.5	21.7	32.4	27.8	6.7	1.8	100.0
Intra-state migrants	1,919	8.6	33.3	37.8	17.6	1.8	0.9	100.0
All respondents	2,029	9.0	27.6	35.1	22.6	4.2	1.4	100.0

* For seasonal activities, average income is for months when the work is carried out and not averaged over the year.

TABLE 25
PROPORTION OF WORKERS WHO RECEIVE EXTRA PAY FOR EXTRA WORK
(percentage of distribution)

Activity Type	Yes	No	Info NA	Total
Charcoal making	90.2	9.8	0.0	100.0
Salt making	79.2	18.1	2.8	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	63.3	32.7	4.1	100.0
Brick making	88.7	9.4	1.9	100.0
Construction	67.8	31.0	1.1	100.0
Other manufacturing	60.7	29.2	10.1	100.0
Loading/unloading	63.9	27.8	8.3	100.0
Port loading/unloading	51.4	45.7	2.9	100.0
Transport/hotel services	14.6	80.5	4.9	100.0
Personal services	21.8	30.9	47.3	100.0
Trade and commerce	0.0	10.4	89.6	100.0
Other work	55.8	30.2	14.0	100.0
Inter-state migrants	50.2	33.9	15.9	100.0
Intra-state migrants	63.7	22.3	14.0	100.0
All respondents	57.0	28.1	14.9	100.0

The average monthly income of these labour migrants was Rs. 2,029 (US\$ 41.4), which, as was seen, provides a living just at the level of the poverty line. The income of factory workers in the organized sector would be two to four times that of these workers; that of a bank clerk would be at least five times as much; that of a university professor, 15 to 20 times as much and that of a company executive 25 to 50 times as much. *A pair of Nike walking shoes or a brand name shirt costs Rs. 1,000 at least, half the monthly income of these labourers.* There are many similar examples which highlight the fact that an entire range of goods available in the market are outside their reach. This average monthly income would provide a per capita income of 52 US cents per day.³⁸

57 per cent of workers surveyed stated that they received extra pay for extra work. This question does not arise for the piece-rate workers. For day labourers also, as in loading and unloading activities at the port, and in construction, as well as in salaried activities such as other manufacturing, there seems to be a perception among the workers that they will receive higher wages if they work more hours. If this is true, since the majority of these activities have a longer workday than the maximum eight hours stipulated, on the one hand, and yet provide very low monthly incomes on the other, the pay provided for extra work must be very low indeed. Nonetheless, this perception of receiving extra pay for extra work gives the migrant workers a positive impression of their employers.

Roughly 72 per cent of labour migrants surveyed indicated that their employers were either very supportive of them or helped them whenever required (Table 26). Only 9 per cent stated categorically that their employers were not helpful. Interestingly, about 15 per cent either did not know their employers or were unable to provide any information about them. Despite the fact that the majority of the migrants expressed a positive attitude in regard to their employers, the concern still remains as to whether migrant workers are aware of their rights under the two applicable national laws and whether they are not, in some instances, manipulated without their knowledge.

Labour contractors are a very important vehicle through which migration takes place. A labour contractor goes to the native villages of migrant workers and recruits them into work

gangs. Generally, the contractor comes from their own or a nearby village and is someone whom everyone knows and trusts. Typically, this person has experience working in an establishment and subsequently finds labour from his native village for the same establishment. At the time of recruitment, the contractor pays an advance to the migrant worker, who generally gives this amount to the family or uses it for family commitments. Then the worker migrates, alone or with his wife, depending on the work and, through work at the destination site repays the advance. The worker is unable to leave the job if the work is unsuitable. The labour contractors are responsible for the payment of wages, which, to a large extent, they can determine, more often than not at rates much below market wages. The worker who has migrated or sought work in this way thus remains in a semi-bonded condition to the labour contractor indefinitely, often for as long as he is able to work, preventing any hope of improvement. The labour contractor deducts the advance that was previously paid from the worker's wages. The amount that the worker then receives on the work site is usually quite small and inadequate to cover living expenses, forcing him to request further advances from the contractor. In this way, a cycle of dependence develops, resulting, in fact, in a form of bondage to the contractor in perpetuity, with no legal documentation (Table 27) or recourse.

TABLE 26
EMPLOYERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS MIGRANT LABOURERS,
AS EXPERIENCED BY THE MIGRANTS
(percentage of distribution)

Activity Type	Very supportive	Helps whenever required	Never helps	Never asks for help	Labourers do not know the employer	Info NA	Total
Charcoal making	25.5	64.7	5.9	3.9	0.0	0.0	100.0
Salt making	26.4	65.3	1.4	2.8	1.4	2.8	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	34.7	63.3	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Brick making	35.8	64.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Construction	21.8	51.7	14.9	4.6	2.3	4.6	100.0
Other manufacturing	24.7	57.3	9.0	2.2	0.0	6.7	100.0
Loading/unloading	13.9	47.2	16.7	11.1	2.8	8.3	100.0
Port loading/ unloading	14.3	54.3	17.1	11.4	2.9	0.0	100.0
Transport/hotel services	34.1	43.9	7.3	7.3	2.4	4.9	100.0
Personal services	14.5	21.8	14.5	3.6	1.8	43.6	100.0
Trade and commerce	4.2	6.3	2.1	0.0	0.0	87.5	100.0
Other work	2.3	55.8	23.3	7.0	0.0	11.6	100.0
Inter-state migrants	16.8	49.5	12.2	5.8	0.9	14.7	100.0
Intra-state migrants	26.8	51.5	6.0	2.1	1.2	12.5	100.0
All respondents	21.9	50.5	9.0	3.9	1.1	13.6	100.0

TABLE 27
RESPONDENTS ATTACHED TO A CONTRACTOR
(percentage of respondents)

Activity Type	Yes	No	Does not know	Info NA	Total
Charcoal making	43.1	37.3	15.7	3.9	100.0
Salt making	45.8	43.1	4.2	6.9	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	22.4	55.1	4.1	18.4	100.0
Brick making	18.9	50.9	22.6	7.5	100.0
Construction	55.2	34.5	2.3	8.0	100.0
Other manufacturing	48.3	42.7	2.2	6.7	100.0
Loading/unloading	38.9	50.0	5.6	5.6	100.0
Port loading/unloading	48.6	42.9	0.0	8.6	100.0
Transport/hotel services	7.3	70.7	7.3	14.6	100.0
Personal services	16.4	36.4	5.5	41.8	100.0
Trade and commerce	4.2	31.3	0.0	64.6	100.0
Other work	30.2	58.1	0.0	11.6	100.0
Inter-state migrants	39.4	41.6	2.8	16.2	100.0
Intra-state migrants	28.6	47.9	8.3	15.2	100.0
All respondents	33.9	44.8	5.6	15.7	100.0

However, there are also some advantages to such methods of labour recruitment. Migrant labourers are assured of work if they remain attached to a contractor. In times of disaster, when the work stops, as happened in the case of the Gujarat earthquake, the migrant worker moves to another site with the contractor. This was the case in the construction sector, although not necessarily the case in brick making or other manufacturing activities.

TABLE 28
DETAILS OF ADVANCES FROM CONTRACTORS

Activity Type	% receiving advance from contractor	% dist. of respondents by advance amount (Rs.) accepted							Total
		Up to 1,000	1,001-2,000	2,001-3,000	3,001-4,000	4,001-5,000	5,001-6,000	above 6,000	
Agriculture/ fishing	25.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Charcoal making	33.3	23.5	17.6	5.9	17.6	23.5	0.0	11.8	100.0
Salt making	34.7	12.0	8.0	12.0	8.0	4.0	4.0	52.0	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	24.5	16.7	0.0	0.0	8.3	33.3	8.3	33.3	100.0
Brick making	47.2	8.0	36.0	12.0	16.0	4.0	0.0	24.0	100.0
Construction	11.5	20.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	30.0	0.0	20.0	100.0
Other manufacturing	16.9	40.0	6.7	13.3	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	100.0
Loading/ unloading	16.7	50.0	0.0	16.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	100.0
Port loading/ unloading	14.3	20.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	100.0
Transport/hotel services	9.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	100.0
Personal services	7.3	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Trade and commerce	4.2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	100.0
Other work	16.3	14.3	14.3	14.3	0.0	42.9	0.0	14.3	100.0
Inter-state migrants	15.3	16.0	20.0	12.0	8.0	22.0	0.0	22.0	100.0
Intra-state migrants	24.7	20.5	14.5	9.6	7.2	14.5	2.4	31.3	100.0
All respondents	20.1	18.8	16.5	10.5	7.5	17.3	1.5	27.8	100.0

In this sample, nearly one in every three migrant labourers was attached to a labour contractor and had moved or come to the work site with him (Table 27). In the construction industry, this was so for the majority of workers. Even in other types of manufacturing, and in port-related loading and unloading, the migrants had come to the work site or found work through the labour contractor. In charcoal and salt making, at least two in every five migrants had migrated through the channel of labour contractors. This method of migration was

observed more frequently among inter-state migrants (two in every five) than intra-state migrants. In personal services, transport and hotel services, and trade and commerce, migration is not handled through labour contractors.

Wages are settled by the contractor and not by the principal employer. Though one in every three labourers had migrated through a labour contractor, only 20 per cent of the migrants stated that they had received an advance from the contractor (Table 28). The proportion of migrant workers taking advances from the contractors was higher among the intra-state migrants, though a smaller proportion stated that they had migrated through a labour contractor. As many as 40 per cent of the inter-state migrants indicated that they had migrated through a labour contractor, but only 15 per cent had asked for advances. The receipt of advances from contractors was most prevalent among the charcoal makers, brick makers and salt makers, and did not exist at all among those engaged in transport and hotel services, personal services (as a large proportion of them are self-employed) and trade and commerce (in which the majority are also self-employed).

It is important to note that low for a large proportion of those who had requested them the amounts of the advances were very low. . Roughly 45 per cent received advances of less than Rs. 3,000. Twenty-eight per cent received advances above Rs. 6,000.

Migrant workers continue to take advances in order to purchase food rations (43 per cent), to send money to their elders at home (17 per cent) or for festive purposes (13 per cent) (Table 29). A large proportion of inter-state migrants specifically indicated that they accepted advances from contractors in order to be able to send money home, primarily to their elders. The intra-state migrants accepted advances mainly to purchase food rations.

As concerns working conditions and safety at work, the situation is dismal. For example, in nearly all activities, less than 10 per cent of migrant workers received any safety equipment from the employer (Table 30). Only in ceramic manufacturing and “other manufacturing”, about one-sixth of the workers stated that they received some safety equipment from the employers.. The work is contracted out to a private firm or contractor, who in turn locates the labourer through the *mukadam*. This is the case even though provision of safety equipment is required under the Contract Labour Act. No female workers reported having access to necessary special facilities at the work site.

TABLE 29
USE OF ADVANCES
(percentage of distribution)

Activity Type	Purchase of rations	Paid off debt	Used for festival	Sent home to elders	Gave to spouse	Kept for self	Other	Total
Charcoal making	68.8	12.5	6.3	6.3	0.0	0.0	6.3	100.0
Salt making	50.0	7.1	28.6	10.7	0.0	0.0	3.6	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	27.3	9.1	18.2	18.2	0.0	9.1	18.2	100.0
Brick making	72.0	8.0	8.0	8.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	100.0
Construction	36.4	9.1	0.0	27.3	0.0	9.1	18.2	100.0
Other manufacturing	23.5	0.0	0.0	47.1	5.9	5.9	17.6	100.0
Loading/unloading	33.3	16.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	16.7	100.0
Port loading/ unloading	40.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Transport/hotel services	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	100.0
Personal services	40.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	100.0
Trade and commerce	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
Other work	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	16.7	66.7	100.0
Inter-state migrants	27.8	7.4	9.3	25.9	5.6	3.7	20.4	100.0
Intra-state migrants	52.9	5.9	15.3	10.6	0.0	2.4	12.9	100.0
All respondents	43.2	6.5	12.9	16.5	2.2	2.9	15.8	100.0

TABLE 30
WORKING CONDITIONS AND SAFETY AT WORK

Activity Type	% workers receiving safety equipment from		% workers receiving day off	% workers receiving financial assistance when needed		% female workers with access to special facilities	
	Government	Employer		Government	Employer	Government	Employer
Charcoal making	2.0	2.0	41.2	2.0	15.7	0.0	2.0
Salt making	2.8	11.1	68.1	1.4	50.0	1.4	2.8
Ceramic manufacturing	0.0	16.3	67.3	0.0	46.9	0.0	2.0
Brick making	0.0	1.9	71.7	1.9	67.9	0.0	0.0
Construction	1.1	8.0	55.2	1.1	39.1	0.0	2.3
Other manufacturing	1.1	16.9	48.3	0.0	25.8	1.1	2.2
Loading/unloading	2.8	5.6	27.8	0.0	27.8	0.0	0.0
Port loading/ unloading	0.0	0.0	37.1	0.0	17.1	0.0	0.0
Transport/hotel services	2.4	9.8	41.5	0.0	26.8	0.0	0.0
Personal services	0.0	0.0	16.4	0.0	10.9	0.0	0.0
Trade and commerce	4.2	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other work	0.0	7.0	30.2	0.0	14.0	0.0	0.0
Inter-state migrants	1.2	9.8	35.5	0.6	21.4	0.3	1.2
Intra-state migrants	1.5	5.1	53.0	0.9	38.7	0.3	1.2
All respondents	1.4	7.4	44.3	0.8	30.2	0.3	1.2

TABLE 31
MIGRANT LABOURERS' KNOWLEDGE ABOUT THEIR RIGHTS

Activity Type	Registered	% workers				
		Have knowledge about welfare programmes	Know about trade unions	Know about NGOs or social organization	Know of legal rights	Have observed visit by Labour Commission representatives
Charcoal making	9.8	0.0	5.9	9.8	3.9	2.0
Salt making	33.3	1.4	0.0	5.6	2.8	9.7
Ceramic manufacturing	49.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	4.1
Brick making	11.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction	23.0	2.3	0.0	0.0	3.4	1.1
Other manufacturing	58.4	4.5	1.1	2.2	3.4	5.6
Loading/unloading	33.3	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Port loading/unloading	11.4	0.0	5.7	2.9	0.0	2.9
Transport/hotel services	34.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.9	0.0
Personal services	25.5	3.6	0.0	1.8	1.8	3.6
Trade and commerce	12.5	0.0	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.1
Other work	39.5	0.0	4.7	0.0	2.3	7.0
Inter-state migrants	39.8	2.8	2.1	0.9	3.4	3.7
Intra-state migrants	20.5	0.6	1.5	3.3	1.2	3.3
All respondents	30.0	1.7	1.8	2.1	2.3	3.5

However, some of the workers surveyed stated that they had received days off during the week, as well as financial assistance from their employers when required. Approximately 44 per cent of the workers stated that they were given days off, and 30 per cent stated that they had received financial assistance. A higher proportion of intra-state workers had received days off as well as financial help from employers. The inter-state migrants, therefore, seem to be at some disadvantage in terms of additional benefits provided by employers.

The level of awareness among migrant workers regarding their rights and organizations that could assist them is very low. Only 30 per cent reported that they are registered, that is, have their names listed in the register of the employer (Table 31). This means that, in contravention of the two legislative measures mentioned, 70 per cent of the labour migrants are not registered. Inter-state migrants were better off in terms of employer registration. About half and sometimes even more than half of the workers in manufacturing activities reported that they were registered. In charcoal and brick making and port loading and unloading, only 10 per cent were registered. Very few were aware of any of their legal rights, or of organizations that could assist them in safeguarding their rights. They were also unaware that they were eligible for government welfare programmes.

While a significant proportion of these migrant workers were registered by their employers, only 10 per cent had actually received an identity card. Regarding registration or the receipt of identity cards, inter-state migrants were also slightly better off. About 25 per cent of the migrant workers engaged in loading and unloading at a port stated that they had received identity cards. Possibly, ports being restricted areas, identity cards may be required for the workers to enter the site. A significant proportion of workers in ceramic manufacturing also stated that they had received identity cards.

It is clear that the legislation protecting the interests of contract labourers and inter-state migrant workers had been consistently violated. Necessary conditions, such as provision of identity cards and registration of workers, had not been implemented. Other requirements under these two legislative measures, such as provision of certain types of facilities for workers on the site, are routinely disregarded. The poor working conditions and low wages are reflected in the living conditions of these workers, as will be discussed below.

6.3 Living conditions and security

These labour migrants had no certification of employment, and their proof of residence at their places of destination was inadequate. Proof of residence is necessary when compensation claims have to be made in the wake of a disaster. Nearly 48 per cent stated that they had some proof of residence (Table 32). Approximately 31 per cent stated that they had a ration card, and 17 per cent stated that they had other proof of residence at their workplace. A greater proportion of intra-state migrants relative to inter-state migrants had either a ration card or other proof of residence. Among the various groups of labour migrants, a larger number of charcoal makers, salt makers, and workers in personal services and trade and commerce had ration cards or other evidence of their place of residence, as compared to labour migrants in other activities.



Housing in salt farms

Large numbers of migrant workers live on the work site in shacks constructed out of tin sheets and gunny bags. This type of housing is provided by employers and is prevalent on several of the sites, especially those of charcoal and brick makers and construction and ceramics workers (Table 33). Workers engaged in certain other types of activities, such as “other manufacturing”, also stated that they had received housing from their employers. Wherever housing was provided by employers, there was also provision of basic facilities such as water supply and minimum sanitation facilities. Compared to inter-state migrants, a larger proportion of intra-state migrants received such housing and basic services from their employers.

TABLE 32
PROPORTION OF WORKERS WITH PROOF OF RESIDENCE OR WORK

Activity Type	% workers having		% workers given identity cards by	
	Ration card	Other proof of residence	Government	Employer
Charcoal making	47.1	31.4	3.9	2.0
Salt making	36.1	25.0	4.2	2.8
Ceramic manufacturing	26.5	12.2	0.0	22.4
Brick making	17.0	7.5	0.0	3.8
Construction	33.3	12.6	3.4	6.9
Other manufacturing	21.3	7.9	2.2	13.5
Loading/unloading	16.7	16.7	0.0	8.3
Port loading/unloading	22.9	8.6	0.0	25.7
Transport/hotel services	24.4	9.8	2.4	4.9
Personal services	43.6	27.3	5.5	18.2
Trade and commerce	45.8	35.4	4.2	0.0
Other work	23.3	9.3	0.0	11.6
Inter-state migrants	22.0	10.7	0.9	12.8
Intra-state migrants	39.0	22.9	3.9	6.5
All respondents	30.6	16.9	2.4	9.7

Living conditions of labour migrants

Workers in the salt fields of Kuda Village live in huts outside the village or sometimes in rented rooms together with other workers. There is electricity and the stove may be home-made, from a metal coil and ceramic base fitted in a metal case. Some of the labourers repaired their huts, which were demolished by the earthquake, using mainly plastic sheets and jute cloth. Other labourers live in huts without electricity and cook on kerosene stoves. Five to six share a hut, which is primarily used for storing belongings. For the most part, they sleep in the open. A small enclosure, with jute walls on three sides and open at the top, is used for bathing, and the open grounds are used as latrines. Water is carted from the village water taps.

Workers on the Moti Chirai construction site were provided “quarters” by the contractor, with metal beds, raised from the ground to safeguard against insects and reptiles. The shacks are constructed on wasteland and consist of plastic sheets on top and bamboo mats for walls. Something like toilets are built behind the shacks, also open from the top, and the construction company provides water. A few labourers share each “quarter”.



Temporary shelters provided by IOM for labour migrants after the earthquake



TABLE 33
PROPORTION OF WORKERS RECEIVING HOUSING AND BASIC FACILITIES

Activity Type	% workers receiving housing from		% workers receiving basic services from	
	Government	Employer	Government	Employer
Charcoal making	11.8	17.6	3.9	41.2
Salt making	5.6	65.3	1.4	59.7
Ceramic manufacturing	4.1	67.3	4.1	83.7
Brick making	3.8	79.2	1.9	88.7
Construction	0.0	73.6	0.0	65.5
Other manufacturing	1.1	58.4	0.0	53.9
Loading/unloading	0.0	22.2	0.0	33.3
Port loading/unloading	5.7	31.4	0.0	20.0
Transport/hotel services	2.4	29.3	7.3	29.3
Personal services	10.9	21.8	3.6	23.6
Trade and commerce	12.5	6.3	16.7	6.3
Other work	2.3	44.2	4.7	39.5
Inter-state migrants	4.0	46.5	2.4	44.0
Intra-state migrants	5.4	47.9	4.2	52.7
All respondents	4.7	47.2	3.3	48.4



Temporary shelters provided by IOM for labour migrants after the earthquake

This study clearly reveals that regarding access to social facilities, the low-income labour migrants are particularly disadvantaged, with those from outside the state being at an even greater disadvantage. Less than 5 per cent of the workers benefited from governmental or employer-based welfare programmes; nor did they have access to educational facilities for their children through the government or their employers. Their wives did not receive any assistance from either the employer or the government in case of childbirth. Neither did female workers receive such assistance. Only 9 per cent of workers stated that they had access to any health care facilities through their employers.



The workers' quarters!



The workers' quarters!

Thus, health and education are both areas that are severely neglected in terms of access by migrant workers. When pregnant women do not obtain access to health care facilities, the chance of maternal mortality increases, although with such a small sample, it was not possible to calculate maternal mortality rates in this study. However, it is clear that medical care for pregnant women, prophylactic treatment, post-natal care and provisions for child health, are also very poor or non-existent. High infant mortality rates (IMR) are also more likely, but, again, it was not possible to arrive at a statistical analysis based on such a small sample.

7. Migrants' Links with Their Places of Origin

Most labour migrants continue to maintain direct and intimate linkages with their native villages. Many left their families behind in their native villages, their wives and children in the case of married migrants, and parents and siblings in the case of those who are unmarried or have migrated with wife and children. Such links are maintained through regular visits and through the regular or periodic sending of remittances. Some workers send their children back to their places of origin when they reach school age, since such facilities are not available at the work sites. Women also return home for childbirth, particularly if there are no other female family members on the site to assist them during their pregnancies and with post-natal care.

NOTES FROM FIELD INTERVIEWS: 6

Intra-state casual labour on salt farms: Radhanpur families in Gandhidham

The situations in both the Radhanpur area and Gandhidham require brief explanation. Radhanpur Taluka is in the North Gujarat region and is part of the most backward district of the state in terms of human development. It is also an environmentally degraded region, with the entire district declared as either drought prone or under desert development programmes. The watertable in Radhanpur Taluka has gone down significantly, in some places decreasing at the rate of 4-5 metres per year. The Taluka has a high concentration of Other Backward Castes (OBCs) with very low education levels, particularly in the case of females. In some communities, the female literacy rate is zero. The taluka is covered under the District Primary Education Programme (DPEP), funded by the World Bank. In the taluka there are also some known NGOs, one of them being SEWA (the Self Employed Women's Organisation) of Ahmedabad.

Gandhidham is an industrial town, built initially to rehabilitate Sindhi migrants from Pakistan who came and settled here after the partition in 1947. Subsequently, the state government decided to put up an industrial estate through the Gujarat Industrial Development Corporation. The town had a population of 104,000 in 1991, which has increased to 160,000 in 2001 (according to unofficial estimates). This means that the town has witnessed a decadal population growth rate of about 54 per cent or annual growth rate of 4.4 per cent, which are fairly high rates of growth. Gandhidham town is adjacent to Kandla Port, the only major port in Gujarat State. According to statistics provided by the local government, 26,000 people, or roughly 16 per cent of the total population of the city, live in slums. The Kandla township area has a population of roughly 18,500, which has fallen because the Kandla Port Trust (KPT) shifted its employees to Gandhidham after the devastating 1999 cyclone. Gandhidham has grown mainly because of Kandla Port, the GIDC industrial estate and the Free Trade Zone (FTZ) set up by the state government.

Bharwad is a community in which the residents traditionally raise cattle, and Gandabhai and his wife worked as agricultural labourers in their village while also raising cattle and buffalo. They had to leave their cattle behind in a Panjara Pol (cattle camp) when they migrated to Gandhidham after the three consecutive droughts of the 1980s (1985-87). They currently live in Ambedkar colony, which has about 4,000 hut tenements, on the highway connecting Gandhidham with Kandla Port.

Gandabhai and his wife, who are now aged and frail, live in huts in a family compound, constructed of bamboo poles, jute cloth and plastic sheets. There is no water supply nearby and no sanitation. They live on railway land and the open space between their dwellings and the railway tracks is used as a latrine area.

Gandabhai, his wife, and now his sons and daughter, work as loaders/unloaders on the salt farms, located some 10 to 15 kilometres from Gandhidham.

The children have not attended school since there has been none in the vicinity. However, recently a primary school has been opened in the settlement by missionaries. The family has close contacts with the native village, where they have strong ties with family members and the community. They do not have a ration card for Gandhidham and, as a practical matter, live in Gandhidham in order to earn a living, but in essence are residents of their village in Radhanpur, returning home at least twice a year, and more often if financially possible.

Migrants like Gandabhai, who have strong emotional and physical linkages to their native villages, do not easily assimilate into urban and industrial settings. At this time, the children are not in school and they are unkempt and suffer from skin diseases because of lack of water. While urbanization can lead to an improvement in the quality of life for some, this has not been the case for Gandabhai, his family or his grandchildren, who have been unable to develop capabilities to become assimilated into urban settings, and have received little assistance which would have enabled them to do so.

TABLE 34
PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WITH SAVINGS

Activity Type	% of respondents with some savings
Charcoal making	11.8
Salt making	23.6
Ceramic manufacturing	32.7
Brick making	20.8
Construction	28.7
Other manufacturing	34.8
Loading/unloading	38.9
Port loading/unloading	34.3
Transport/hotel services	34.1
Personal services	14.5
Trade and commerce	25.0
Other work	27.9
Inter-state migrants	33.3
Intra-state migrants	20.5
All respondents	26.8

Nearly 27 per cent of the workers surveyed stated that they managed to save something to send home, even from such small monthly incomes. More inter-state migrants were able to put money aside than their intra-state peers. In fact, nearly one in every three of the inter-state migrants was able to save some amount (Table 34).

With regard to migrants in specific occupations, it was found that among the charcoal makers most were unable to put aside any savings at all. More than a third of the loaders and unloaders, those working in port-related activities and those in other manufacturing activities, as well as in transport and hotel services, were able to save. Even one-third of the ceramic-manufacturing workers were able to save some small amount to send home. In all of these activities, the monthly income per worker was over Rs. 2,000, as seen earlier.

NOTES FROM FIELD INTERVIEWS: 7

Loaders and unloaders at Kandla port

Among the casual labourers working at the port site, there are migrants from all communities and all states. Anand Nayak, from Khurda district of Orissa State, lives with eight people in one room, paying Rs. 600 per month. Recently Anand assisted his brother Pramod to immigrate to Kandla, to work at the port in loading and unloading activities. Anand himself has been working in the port at Kandla for the last six years. He left his home village because of the lack of employment opportunities. Young people like him wait for an opportunity to out-migrate and when any contact person who has previously out-migrated informs them of an opportunity, they leave their native villages and attempt to adjust to the new environment, in turn assisting others from the native villages to migrate also.

Anand and Pramod have three acres of land at home, which is looked after by their father. Anand is married and has left his wife and daughter with his parents back home, visiting them twice a year and sending them money. Both do back-breaking work in order to earn the wages, knowing that that the work is not sustainable and offers no future.

Nearly three in every five migrant workers surveyed sent remittances home (Table 35). Among the inter-state migrants, the proportion was three in every four, whereas among intra-state migrants it was two in every five. The sending of remittances back home was quite prevalent among the construction workers and those engaged in loading and unloading activities in general, as well as on Kandla port. As many as four out of every five of these workers sent remittances back home. In transport and hotel services, three in every four workers sent home some remittances. These are mostly single male migrants whose goal is to work and save as much as possible to support their families back home. Naturally, the amount of the remittances sent home depended on their incomes, and those in transport and hotel services sent back the largest amounts per month (Rs. 1,049), which was equal to nearly half of their monthly salaries (Table 35). Similarly, those engaged in loading and unloading at the port also sent home half of their monthly earnings. Those engaged in general loading and unloading activities sent back 40 per cent of their monthly wages. However, those working in other manufacturing industries, having the highest per worker income, could send back only one-third of their monthly earnings.

Nearly three-fourths of the workers sending remittances back home were doing so regularly once a month (Table 36). Another 19 per cent sent back remittances once every three months. Thus, the dependence by the families back home on the earnings of migrant workers is quite high. Nearly half of them send the remittances by money order. This was predominantly the case with the inter-state migrants, among whom nearly 70 per cent sent the remittances through money orders. The rest sent remittances through personal contact, that is, with someone who was going back home. Among the intra-state migrants, remittances were sent home largely through personal contacts (as high as 65 per cent). Only 9 per cent sent the remittances by money order.

The migrant population studied here is virtually devoid of assets (Table 37). Nearly all of the migrants who provided information about their assets in their native villages stated that they had none.

This study covers the poorest of all the migrant labourers found in Gujarat. They come from regions deprived of adequate living opportunities and from families which are either landless or who are marginal farmers. They own virtually nothing and look to migration as an opportunity to ensure their families' survival in their native villages. Unfortunately, these strong linkages with their native villages actually render them "invisible" at their place of work, and thus dissuade government authorities from adopting policies to assist them in normal times, let alone in times of disaster. In the next section, the impact of the earthquake on these migrants is discussed, together with observations as to whether they received any assistance after the disaster.

TABLE 35
DETAILS OF REMITTANCES SENT HOME

Activity Type	Workers sending money home		Av. Amt. sent per month (Rs.)	Of those sending, % sending remittances in the range (Rs.)					
	% sending	Info NA		1-500	501-1,000	1,001-1,500	1,501-2,000	2,001-3,000	Above 3,001
Charcoal making	51.0	31.4	367	50.0	42.3	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0
Salt making	43.1	48.6	528	56.3	15.6	6.3	9.4	0.0	12.5
Ceramic manufacturing	51.0	40.8	510	24.0	52.0	12.0	12.0	0.0	0.0
Brick making	32.1	58.5	250	64.7	17.6	11.8	5.9	0.0	0.0
Construction	78.2	14.9	609	52.9	32.4	7.4	7.4	0.0	0.0
Other manufacturing	66.3	19.1	871	22.0	37.3	20.3	13.6	3.4	3.4
Loading/ unloading	83.3	11.1	733	46.7	33.3	10.0	6.7	3.3	0.0
Port loading/ unloading	82.9	11.4	997	20.7	51.7	0.0	20.7	6.9	0.0
Transport/hotel services	75.6	14.6	1049	16.1	45.2	9.7	16.1	6.5	6.5
Personal services	34.5	49.1	349	42.1	31.6	21.1	0.0	0.0	5.3
Trade and commerce	33.3	54.2	298	37.5	50.0	6.3	6.3	0.0	0.0
Other work	62.8	16.3	747	25.9	33.3	22.2	14.8	3.7	0.0
Inter-state migrants	74.3	15.9	834	28.8	40.7	13.6	11.9	3.3	1.6
Intra-state migrants	40.8	46.4	372	52.9	29.0	8.0	6.5	0.0	3.6
All respondents	57.3	31.4	600	37.5	36.5	11.5	10.0	2.1	2.4

TABLE 36
FREQUENCY AND METHOD OF SENDING REMITTANCES HOME

Activity Type	Frequency of sending money (%)					Sending money through (%)		
	Monthly	Quarterly	End of season	Once or twice a year	Uncertain frequency	Money-order	Personal contacts	Other
Charcoal making	80.8	19.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	84.6	15.4
Salt making	54.5	15.2	18.2	9.1	3.0	26.5	32.4	41.2
Ceramic manufacturing	70.8	25.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	35.7	60.7	3.6
Brick making	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	61.1	22.2	16.7
Construction	76.8	20.3	0.0	0.0	2.9	38.2	58.8	2.9
Other manufacturing	79.0	12.9	0.0	6.5	1.6	71.9	18.8	9.4
Loading/ unloading	76.7	23.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	63.3	33.3	3.3
Port loading/ unloading	69.0	31.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	75.9	20.7	3.4
Transport/hotel services	74.2	16.1	0.0	9.7	0.0	29.0	51.6	19.4
Personal services	63.2	26.3	0.0	10.5	0.0	34.8	56.5	8.7
Trade and commerce	73.3	6.7	0.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	20.0	20.0
Other work	74.1	25.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	70.4	25.9	3.7
Inter-state migrants	73.7	21.1	0.0	4.5	0.8	69.6	27.3	3.2
Intra-state migrants	75.9	14.6	4.4	2.9	2.2	9.2	64.8	26.1
All respondents	74.5	18.8	1.6	3.9	1.3	47.8	40.8	11.4

TABLE 37
ASSETS IN PLACE OF ORIGIN

Activity type	Info. NA	Nothing	Land	Jewellery	Vehicle	Other	Total
Charcoal making	5.88	92.16	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.96	100.00
Salt making	41.67	56.94	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.39	100.00
Ceramic manufacturing	20.41	75.51	0.00	2.04	0.00	2.04	100.00
Brick making	67.92	32.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Construction	47.13	50.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.30	100.00
Other manufacturing	20.22	74.16	1.12	1.12	0.00	3.37	100.00
Loading/unloading	16.67	77.78	0.00	0.00	2.78	2.78	100.00
Port loading/unloading	37.14	60.00	2.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Transport/hotel services	14.63	85.37	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Personal services	25.45	74.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Trade and commerce	43.75	54.17	0.00	0.00	2.08	0.00	100.00
Other work	18.60	79.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.33	100.00
All respondents	31.37	66.21	0.30	0.30	0.30	1.51	100.00

8. Earthquake Experience and Effects

FLEEING MIGRANTS FLOOD AHMEDABAD RAILWAY STATION

The Ahmedabad railway station resembles a virtual refugee centre with trains from Gandhidham bringing in more homeless, injured and shell-shocked each day. Akbar Ali, a factory worker from Bhachau, with a group of 40, including 20 children, had fled the quake-struck town that once was. They are all from a village in West Bengal and want to rush to Howrah as soon as possible.

Most refugees recount horror stories of being trapped in the debris for hours. Some fled and crossed the Little Rann of Kachchh and remained without water for over two days. Almost all fled with nothing more than their clothes on. Most refugees at the Ahmedabad railway station are from Puri, Chennai, Bangalore and Howrah. The railway authority deployed extra trains to carry these refugees to Mumbai and Howrah.

Based on a report in *The Times of India*, Ahmedabad, 01 February 2001

This chapter focuses on the labour migrants who experienced the Gujarat earthquake. For all of them, this was the first experience of an earthquake. In their shocked state, many remained in fear that another equally damaging earthquake could strike again. Indeed, within a year, over 967 aftershocks have occurred in the region.

The first direct effect of the earthquake on the migrants studied here was extreme fear, although the majority of them, nearly 74 per cent, escaped unharmed. However, 20 per cent of them were directly affected, (Table 38); about 8 per cent physically injured, another 13 per cent affected psychologically and 1 per cent (six persons in the total sample), suffered injuries rendering them permanently physically disabled.

TABLE 38
DIRECT EFFECT OF EARTHQUAKE ON WORKERS AND THEIR FAMILY MEMBERS
(percentage of distribution)

Activity Type	Nothing	Mentally affected	Physically injured	Disabled	Died	Info NA	Total
Workers affected	73.5	13.0	7.7	0.9	0.0	5.0	100.0
Workers' family members affected	61.2	6.6	2.1	1.8	0.6	27.6	100.0

Family members of the migrant workers were also affected. About 7 per cent of the workers stated that their family members were mentally affected by the quake (Table 38). Another 2 per cent stated that some members of their families were physically injured; a further 2 per cent stated that at least one member of the family had become physically disabled as a result of the injury and 0.6 per cent stated that a family member had died due to the earthquake. That is, nearly four deaths were reported among the families of the labour migrants covered in this study.

Feelings of despair and depression were common among the earthquake-affected population, and migrant labourers felt even more of a sense of despair than the native population because as they lacked any social support systems. In the context of this study, with its focus only on migrant workers, it was not possible to draw more precise comparative observations. Nonetheless, it was found that most migrants interviewed simply did not know how to cope. Fifteen per cent stated that non-availability of immediate relief after the earthquake was the gravest problem. Other problems faced after the earthquake were inability

to ask for any help, inability to cope with the disaster effects, inability to go back to their native villages, and being neglected by the government machinery which failed to reach them with relief or assistance.

TABLE 39
EXTENT OF PROPERTY LOSS SUFFERED BY WORKERS
(percentage of distribution)

Activity Type	None	House damage	Household goods loss	Food grain loss	Info. NA
Charcoal making	15.7	82.4	62.7	35.3	5.9
Salt making	26.4	62.5	48.6	37.5	11.1
Ceramic manufacturing	36.7	36.7	6.1	0.0	44.9
Brick making	26.4	71.7	26.4	9.4	7.5
Construction	43.7	48.3	27.6	23.0	13.8
Other manufacturing	39.3	36.0	20.2	7.9	20.2
Loading/unloading	44.4	30.6	8.3	8.3	33.3
Port loading/unloading	28.6	37.1	17.1	11.4	28.6
Transport/hotel services	43.9	31.7	17.1	12.2	24.4
Personal services	27.3	54.5	27.3	25.5	16.4
Trade and commerce	22.9	62.5	43.8	31.3	8.3
Other work	30.2	41.9	23.3	16.3	20.9
Inter-state migrants	41.3	31.5	19.6	13.1	24.8
Intra-state migrants	24.1	68.8	37.5	24.7	12.2
All respondents	32.6	50.4	28.7	19.0	18.4

Note: Row total is not 100 because of multiple losses suffered by some workers

Apart from physical, mental and psychological injuries suffered, the respondents also suffered property loss due to the earthquake. In the total sample, only one-third did not suffer any type of property loss (Table 39). Nearly half reported that their houses were damaged. of their monthly income home as remittances and therefore may not possess as many goods at the work location as intra-state migrants, who send smaller remittances back home.

Many work sites were also damaged after the earthquake, forcing some to close down for at least a few days following the earthquake, and others for much longer. Nearly 35 per cent of the migrant workers stated that their workplaces were damaged after the earthquake (Table 40), of which 32 per cent stated that their workplaces – primarily factory premises – though damaged, were in a condition that allowed them to function. However, a high proportion of workers active in the transport and hotel services, charcoal and salt making, and other loading and unloading activities, stated that their work places had not been damaged by the earthquake. This was because most of these work sites are not housed in buildings. The Kandla port suffered some damage and halted operations for a few days. The port loaders and unloaders thus stated that their workplaces were damaged but were able to function again soon thereafter.

However, all of them reported that their workplaces had closed down for a few days after the earthquake, even though not all had suffered severe damage. The periods for which the work sites were closed varied and this resulted in loss of wages for the workers during those periods. For about 40 per cent of the workers, the work sites were closed for 10 days after the earthquake; for another 38 per cent, the work sites were closed for a period greater than 10 days but less than a month (Table 41). For the remainder, the work sites remained closed for

more than a month. Brick making and ceramic manufacturing units resumed soonest, and nearly 20 per cent of the salt-making units and the same percentage of workers in trade and commerce were able to resume work after one month.

TABLE 40
DAMAGE TO WORK SITES
(in per cent)

Activity Type	Extent of damage					Total
	No damage	Totally damaged	Damaged & dysfunctional	Damaged but functioning	Info. NA	
Charcoal making	62.7	5.9	2.0	2.0	27.5	100.0
Salt making	48.6	1.4	2.8	9.7	37.5	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	24.5	0.0	2.0	51.0	22.4	100.0
Brick making	28.3	0.0	0.0	39.6	32.1	100.0
Construction	40.2	1.1	1.1	16.1	41.4	100.0
Other manufacturing	27.0	0.0	2.2	57.3	13.5	100.0
Loading/unloading	55.6	0.0	2.8	33.3	8.3	100.0
Port loading/ unloading	31.4	0.0	0.0	60.0	8.6	100.0
Transport/hotel services	58.5	2.4	0.0	19.5	19.5	100.0
Personal services	32.7	0.0	0.0	38.2	29.1	100.0
Trade and commerce	25.0	0.0	4.2	20.8	50.0	100.0
Other work	39.5	2.3	0.0	51.2	7.0	100.0
All respondents	38.8	1.1	1.5	32.3	26.4	100.0

TABLE 41
DURATION OF WORKPLACE CLOSURE FOLLOWING EARTHQUAKE
(number of days)

Activity Type	% of respondents – no. of days of closure						Total
	less than 10	11 to 30	31 to 60	61 to 90	91 to 120	Above 120	
Charcoal making	33.3	39.2	15.7	9.8	2.0	0.0	100.0
Salt making	33.3	44.4	19.4	2.8	0.0	0.0	100.0
Ceramic manufacturing	71.4	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Brick making	67.9	30.2	0.0	0.0	1.9	0.0	100.0
Construction	25.3	37.9	17.2	6.9	5.7	6.9	100.0
Other manufacturing	32.6	39.3	14.6	9.0	3.4	1.1	100.0
Loading/unloading	50.0	22.2	13.9	5.6	5.6	2.8	100.0
Port loading/ unloading	40.0	48.6	8.6	0.0	2.9	0.0	100.0
Transport/hotel services	51.2	36.6	7.3	2.4	0.0	2.4	100.0
Personal services	52.7	32.7	10.9	0.0	0.0	3.6	100.0
Trade and commerce	27.1	45.8	20.8	4.2	2.1	0.0	100.0
Other work	20.9	46.5	20.9	9.3	0.0	2.3	100.0
Inter-state migrants	39.4	33.0	16.5	6.1	2.1	2.8	100.0
Intra-state migrants	41.4	42.6	10.1	3.0	2.1	0.9	100.0
All respondents	40.4	37.9	13.3	4.5	2.1	1.8	100.0

TABLE 42
COPING STRATEGIES CHOSEN DURING WORK CLOSURE

Activity Type	% adopting choices for coping during work closure					
	Waited until workplace re-opened	Tried to obtain help from the government	Tried to obtain help from the employer	Went back to native place	Sent children to native place	Info. NA
Charcoal making	64.7	15.7	23.5	37.3	2.0	15.7
Salt making	68.1	22.2	29.2	23.6	2.8	18.1
Ceramic manufacturing	85.7	4.1	42.9	28.6	0.0	8.2
Brick making	94.3	13.2	37.7	11.3	0.0	11.3
Construction	40.2	31.0	26.4	44.8	0.0	12.6
Other manufacturing	59.6	4.5	19.1	38.2	0.0	21.3
Loading/unloading	66.7	5.6	16.7	30.6	2.8	22.2
Port loading/ unloading	45.7	25.7	28.6	40.0	5.7	5.7
Transport/hotel services	39.0	9.8	14.6	19.5	2.4	34.1
Personal services	60.0	21.8	9.1	12.7	0.0	36.4
Trade and commerce	60.4	29.2	0.0	31.3	0.0	31.3
Other work	51.2	11.6	18.6	37.2	0.0	14.0
Inter-state migrants	52.9	14.4	18.3	33.6	1.2	20.2
Intra-state migrants	68.5	19.3	27.1	26.8	0.9	18.2
All respondents	60.8	16.9	22.8	30.2	1.1	19.2

Note: Row totals do not add up to 100 because multiple choices were made by some respondents.

The key question concerned the choices available to the workers to allow them to survive during the closure of the workplace. For the majority, there was virtually no choice but to wait for the work site to resume functioning. As many as 61 per cent had to settle for this choice (Table 42). During that period, nearly 30 per cent opted to go back to their native villages until the work sites re-opened. Roughly 23 per cent attempted to obtain assistance from their employers, and 17 per cent attempted to obtain assistance from the government. Thus, the migrant workers adopted multiple strategies to cope during the periods of workplace closure. A higher proportion of inter-state migrants relative to intra-state migrants, returned to their homes during the work closure.

TABLE 43
PROPORTION OF MIGRANTS REPORTING RECEIPT OF ASSISTANCE

Activity Type	% reporting receipt of assistance
Charcoal making	29.4
Salt making	38.9
Ceramic manufacturing	4.1
Brick making	5.7
Construction	6.9
Other manufacturing	7.9
Loading/unloading	2.8
Port loading/unloading	0.0
Transport/hotel services	12.2
Personal services	14.5
Trade and commerce	12.5
Other work	0.0
Inter-state migrants	7.6
Intra-state migrants	16.7
All respondents	12.2

This study set out from the assumption that migrant labourers are by-passed or entirely excluded in post-disaster relief and rehabilitation efforts. The survey found that this was,

indeed, very much the case. Only 12 per cent of the respondents stated that they had received some assistance after the earthquake (Table 43), and the proportion of those receiving assistance among intra-state migrants was higher than among inter-state migrants. Those in ceramic manufacturing, brick making, construction, other manufacturing, and loading and unloading in general and in port-related activities, received negligible assistance. None of the migrants working as port-based loaders and unloaders, nor those in other casual work, reported receiving any assistance. Among charcoal- and salt-makers, a much higher proportion, 29 per cent and 39 per cent, respectively, stated that they had received some assistance.

Unlike the local residents of the earthquake region, who were all covered by the immediate relief measures organized primarily through NGOs and charitable institutions and networks (Mahadevia, 2001), a significant proportion of the migrant labourers were excluded from these relief and rehabilitation efforts.

NOTES FROM FIELD INTERVIEWS: 8

Earthquake and Casual Labour in Industry (*Free Trade Zone*): *Gandhidham*

Shantidevi Kishore Rajput works as an unskilled labourer in construction in an industry in the Gandhidham Free Trade Zone (FTZ). She lives in a housing colony on the railway lands with several other people, with access to water, but without latrines or electricity.

She has migrated from the district of Rajasthan, neighbouring Gujarat. Her family of small farmers was forced to migrate for better work, and came to Gandhidham, which is viewed by migrant labourers as a land of job opportunities. They visit their native village once a year.

Since her husband was injured while working on a machine in a factory and has been unable to work, she is the primary wage earner in the family. Work is available for about four days a week and she earns Rs. 800 - Rs. 1,000 per month.

Her children and those of her neighbours go to school, walking for about an hour each way, due to lack of funds for public transportation.

After the earthquake, there was no work available for a month; Shantidevi and her neighbours received Rs. 500, from the government, as well as grain from charitable organizations. Previously, the 1999 cyclone had also caused the destruction of their houses, for which residents had received cash compensation and roofing materials of asbestos sheets from the government.

The Oriya Cultural Association has now opened an office in the settlement. The association was active in rescue and relief work after the earthquake and took responsibility for the Orissa workers affected by the earthquake. The association also helped the migrants of other states living in the colony after the earthquake.

According to labourers working at this site, in times of disaster, the aid received from voluntary organizations such as cultural associations has been much more effective than that provided by the government machinery.

A number of organizations, including government agencies, were active in relief distribution following the earthquake. This was the case with all earthquake-affected populations, including the migrants. Less than one-fourth of the migrants stated that they had received any help from the government. The proportion of migrants receiving help from other agencies was even lower. Neither the village leader nor any political party workers played a role in the distribution of assistance after the earthquake. The village leaders themselves were affected by earthquake damage and hence were not able to be of assistance to others. Government assistance did not reach more than three-fourths of the migrant workers. Around 13 per cent of them stated that they had received help from social organizations and 16 per cent stated that they had received help from an NGO. Thus, on the whole, the migrant labourers did not receive assistance from relief agencies immediately active after the

earthquake (Table 44), unlike the rest of the population, among whom nearly everyone was covered by relief efforts.

TABLE 44
PROPORTION OF MIGRANTS ASSISTED BY DIFFERENT AGENCIES

Agency	% migrants assisted by different agencies		
	Inter-state	Intra-state	All
Government	19.57	25.30	22.47
Village leader	6.42	3.27	4.83
Political party worker	1.53	2.38	1.96
Social organization	10.70	14.88	12.82
NGO	13.46	18.75	16.14
Employer	10.70	5.95	8.30
Relatives	8.87	8.04	8.45

The assistance received by those affected included food grains, cash assistance, cash for building houses, materials for building houses and other types of materials, such as blankets, clothes and tents. Nearly 30 per cent of the migrants surveyed stated that they had received food grain aid (Table 45), with very few migrants receiving other types of help. Almost none received money for the reconstruction of their houses, although about 10 per cent stated that they had received materials to help them reconstruct their houses. Once again, it can be seen that a higher proportion of intra-state migrants received various types of assistance, as compared to inter-state migrants. For example, only 2 per cent of the inter-state migrants reported receiving either money or building materials for house reconstruction. In general, labour migrants primarily received food grain assistance, but were excluded from most other types of aid following the disaster.

Finally, among the different types of assistance received, the government had provided cash assistance only. Of those who had received cash assistance (13 per cent of the surveyed migrants), 55 per cent received it from the government (Table 46). Of those who had received cash for house repairs (only 3 per cent), nearly half had received it from the government. Social organizations and NGOs were more active in distributing food grains, materials for houses and all other types of assistance. However, only a very small proportion of labour migrants had actually received any aid at all, except food grains.

TABLE 45
DIFFERENT TYPES OF ASSISTANCE RECEIVED

	Food grain	Money	Money for house	Materials for house	Other
Inter-state	29.97	10.40	1.53	2.14	9.48
Intra-state	30.65	15.77	3.57	17.56	9.82
All respondents	30.32	13.12	2.56	9.95	9.65

TABLE 46
TYPE OF AID FROM DIFFERENT SOURCES

Agency	Food grain	Money	Money for house	Material for house	Other
Government	21.39	55.17	47.06	15.15	12.50
Village leader	2.99	3.45	0.00	0.00	6.25
Political party worker	1.99	2.30	0.00	0.00	1.56
Social organization	27.36	9.20	35.29	31.82	21.88
NGO	30.35	1.15	11.76	48.48	40.63
Employer	12.94	22.99	5.88	4.55	7.81
Relatives	2.99	5.75	0.00	0.00	9.38
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Thus, the labourers had different experiences following the earthquake depending on a variety of circumstances, such as where they worked, whether and what form of aid was provided, whether they could afford to leave and whether or not they were among the fortunate group who had locally-based ration cards. In some cases, they were assisted in coping with the tragedy because of practical aid provided, such as assistance to return home, while in other instances, there was simply no relief available.

The few notes below, as relayed to the interviewers, represent countless migrant workers who were caught in the devastation, with limited options for coping or returning home:

A number of salt loaders from the salt farms in Kuda village urgently wanted to return home after their huts had collapsed. Without ration cards with which to establish their identity as local residents, they received neither compensation from the government nor relief aid distributed by non-governmental organizations. They lacked the funds to return home and were unable to raise them. One organization, Swati, works in the village and has formed womens' savings groups, but male labourers were unable to benefit from these efforts. Thus, these workers were forced to remain at the destination points without homes or jobs until their work resumed. Similarly, migrants from Orissa, living in Oriya Colony in Gandhidham, who also wanted to return home but lacked the train fare, were also forced to stay in the city in spite of the total breakdown of normal life.

On the other hand, thanks to the efforts of the state government, a husband and wife from Godhra, employed as loader/unloaders in a factory in Bhachau town, were able to return to their native villages after the earthquake because a bus service had been organized by the state agency. Both had migrated together to work in this factory to repay debts incurred for their daughter's wedding. Had transportation not been arranged by the state, they would not have been able to return home.

In a factory in Bhachau town, Deelipbhai Mohanrao from Orissa, was on duty at the time of the earthquake and was injured. However, he received no help from the government and had to get to the hospital on his own for treatment. Premaram Lunaram Marwadi, who came to work in this factory as a child because of lack of adequate agricultural land in his native village in Rajasthan, was also seriously injured and was taken to the hospital by the labour contractor. Kunibhen Bipinbhai Kshatriya, also from Orissa, was living with her brother in a factory at the time of the earthquake. Her leg was fractured and she was in hospital for two months.

A migrant in Gandhidham lost his house and sustained serious injury to his hand in the earthquake. Since he lacked a ration card, he received no assistance for the reconstruction of his house, and the only aid provided was food donated by local social organizations while he was in hospital.

Arundas, a migrant from West Bengal, worked in a plywood factory for seven years, living on the factory premises in a house provided by the employer with his wife, two sons and younger brother. The living quarters collapsed during the earthquake and one of his sons was buried and died. His brother's leg was also fractured. After cremating his son's body, the family left for their native village, where he reverted to agricultural work. Later, he was informed that the government was providing compensation to those who had lost a family member. He returned to the factory site with his wife and remaining son, leaving his injured brother back home. However, he discovered that he was unable to receive compensation for the loss of his son because he did not have a ration card or proof of his residence in the earthquake region at the time of the earthquake. His previous employer was unwilling to certify that he had worked in the factory at the time or to give him his job back. He and his wife now survive by begging.

9. Conclusion: Developing Support for Migrant Workers

This study of recent, low-wage labour migrants located in Gujarat's earthquake zone covers a group of individuals who are neither covered by the definition of voluntary nor of forced migrants, and their relocation is sometimes referred to as "migration for survival". Economic reasons, usually of the lack of opportunities for work in their native villages compelled them to move away in search for a living. As a result, they are to be found in the most difficult and low-paying activities. The inter-state and intra-state migrants covered in this study are engaged in 12 types of occupations. These occupations were selected in consultation with NGOs working with the labour migrants. The sample of migrants is by no means representative of all labour migrants in the state of Gujarat. As Gujarat ranks as the second-most industrialized, the third-most urbanized and the fifth-richest among the large Indian states, it attracts significant numbers of labour migrants. At the same time, intra-state labour migration is also high.

This study focused on general socio-demographic conditions, wages and working conditions, living conditions and security, the labour migrants' links with their native villages and post-earthquake experiences. Though the principal objective of this study was to observe the post-earthquake experiences of such labour migrants, this could not have been done without familiarising ourselves first with their general socio-economic status and living and working conditions. A distinction was made between inter-state and intra-state migrants, and it was found that the former were normally at a greater disadvantage than the latter. This discrepancy is even more pronounced in times of disaster. A further distinction was made depending on the type of occupation migrants were engaged in, as each entailed different methods of wage payment and determined the processes through which migration took place, which also partially determined the migrants' wage levels and working conditions. All of the occupations covered by this study fall within the category of non-organized and unprotected labour. Although India has promulgated two laws aimed at improving the working conditions of such labour migrants (see Chapter 4), to date their impact has been negligible, at best.

A large proportion of labour migrants surveyed came from Rajasthan, neighbouring Gujarat, and Orissa, from where migration is organized through labour contractors. In Orissa, such migrants are known as *Dadan* labour. While labour migrants generally tend to originate mainly in the states neighbouring Gujarat, including Rajasthan, Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh, due to purposive sampling, this study also covered labour migrant from the states of Orissa, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. The intra-state migrants represented in this study are either from the tribal districts of Gujarat or from the arid regions of north Gujarat and Kachchh.

The main findings of the study include:

1. The study confirms that labour migrants tend to leave their places of origin at a very young age, with inter-state migrants leaving at even lower ages than intra-state migrants;
2. Larger proportions of inter-state migrants tend to migrate as single males, whereas the intra-state migrants are found to migrate more often with their family, including older family members;
3. There are child labourers among the inter-state migrants;
4. The labour migrants are mainly illiterate, or with very low educational levels. However, some of the inter-state migrants covered in this study have high educational

qualifications but are nevertheless engaged in labour activities because of the lack of employment opportunities in their native, principally backward, states;

5. A significant proportion of these labour migrants are of either Scheduled Tribe or Scheduled Caste status;
6. These migrants are from families who are either landless or marginal farmers and come from regions unable to offer adequate living conditions. Therefore, the primary cause for migrating is economic, as they seek to eke out a living elsewhere (survival migration);
7. Nearly two-thirds of the labour migrants studied here are engaged as either piece-rate workers or day labourers, and, as such, are often excluded from the protection of applicable labour legislation;
8. The working day for most labour migrants is often much longer than eight hours, and the availability of work varies considerably;
9. Average monthly wages are not more than Rs. 2,500 (US\$ 52) per worker;
10. Nearly one in every three labour migrants has migrated with the help of a labour contractor, a highly exploitative system;
11. In violation of the two laws regulating labour migration, the Migrant Workmen Act and the Contract Labour Act, more than half of the labour migrants surveyed had not been issued identity cards. This was one of the main reasons that these labour migrants were not eligible for assistance after the earthquake, despite the fact that they had suffered either death of a family members or substantial damage and/or injury;
12. The majority of the respondents reported having no assets at all. For many, migration was the only means of ensuring the survival of their families in their native villages, to whom they regularly sent remittances;
13. They maintain strong links with their native villages, to which they try to return in times of disaster. However, these same linkages, which in themselves are a positive element, lead to their being ignored at their current locations, and dissuade government authorities from adopting particular policies in their favour;
14. Neither the government nor private organizations reached these workers after the earthquake, with the exception of food grains for some and, in very few cases, cash aid. Less than 10 per cent received any other aid, such as cash or materials for housing or other elementary items such as tents, blankets and clothes, which otherwise actually poured into Kachchh after the quake. The cash assistance came from the government, whereas the other items came from NGOs and social organizations;
15. Inter-state migrants in particular, were excluded from relief assistance. Large numbers immediately left for their native villages after the quake. Since they are not natives of their places of destination and did not have ration cards, they did not receive compensation or aid for rebuilding their homes there.

This study demonstrates the urgent need to address development issues related to labour migrants, especially those engaged in the lowest-paying and most difficult occupations. Although IOM typically works with cross-border migrants, it is believed that the Organization, in cooperation with UN agencies such as ILO and UNDP, is well placed to address the issues related to internal labour migrants in India, particularly in view of its mandate to assist international labour migrants. In India, a huge country generating a very large number of inter-state migrants, it would be of invaluable help if IOM, along with relevant UN agencies, were to assume responsibility for addressing the development issues related to inter-state migration.

Two types of strategies are recommended to reach and protect inter-state migrants during and after disasters. The first would be to work with them in normal times so that viable systems to reach and support the poorest and the most mobile migrants are created well before

a disaster strikes. By virtue of such systems, the inter-state migrants would be recognized and acknowledged as representing a special labour and migrant class, facilitating and ensuring their eligibility for welfare benefits which are due to all labourers. Since these labourers are bereft of any official social support systems, institutional intervention is essential to fill that gap and to extend the necessary support. Further, special efforts are needed to ensure their access to social benefits and protective measures at the work site. In order to ensure this, a special action component targeting inter-state migrants should be added to all governmental programmes.

In conclusion, the following specific actions are recommended:

1. The development of special institutional mechanisms aimed at reaching inter-state migrants, to assess and record their numbers and to develop data-collection resource centres to assist with the gathering and analysis of relevant data. Relevant NGOs could create such a resource centre in a major city such as Ahmedabad, for the State of Gujarat. Subsequently, similar resource centres could be created for other migrant-receiving states in India;
2. The creation and, where they exist, the improvement of identification and registration methods which would safeguard the entitlement of inter-state labour migrants to support programmes and assistance from the government in general and in times of heightened need, in particular;
3. Implementation of existing labour legislation. However, together with such basic implementation, there is a need to review and revise the two existing laws, which, in their current form, act on behalf of contractors rather than labourers.;
4. In sectors such as construction, efforts at the self-regulation of some labour practices have already been undertaken. Some architects are including stipulations in their contract documents regarding the living conditions of labourers at the work sites. Nearly all labourers on construction sites are migrants, hence such efforts would benefit them. Through an NGO, IOM could assist in creating and maintaining such awareness among professionals engaged in the construction industry;
5. Institutions should be created to provide basic social benefits, such as education and health care, to inter-state migrants. Efforts should also be undertaken to improve their economic development and their living conditions. Institutions that work with the children of labour migrants should be supported.
6. Labour migrants should be given assistance which would enable them to upgrade their skills and thus to escape a life mired at the lowest income levels and at the margin of society. Development of programmes to support such assistance aimed at integrating migrants into the local economies of their places of destination;
7. For seasonal and other labour migrants, opportunities for increased development activities in their native villages should be explored so that, over time, migration caused by general economic and social deprivation can be minimized. This means that some organizations would have to work with the labour departments of migrant-receiving and migrant-sending states.

The second strategy, complementary to the first, would be to establish viable mechanisms to reach inter-state migrants in times of and following, disaster. This requires that the presence of inter-state migrants be acknowledged in all aspects of disaster preparedness, management and mitigation planning. In addition, if institutional arrangements such as those proposed above are created to assist in normal times, these mechanisms will be particularly helpful in times of disaster. IOM could be a partner in the process of creating and strengthening disaster preparedness, management and mitigation plans so that issues relevant

to migrant workers can be incorporated. Detailed action plans can be devised by IOM through wider consultations. Lastly, with the help of the government and NGOs, return assistance for inter-state migrants in the wake of a disaster could also be put in place.

NOTES FROM FIELD INTERVIEWS: 10

Charcoal makers benefiting after earthquake: *Hamlet Limbdi-1*

Limbdi-1, of Kachchh district, is a small hamlet of 34 households, most of whom are related to each other and constitute an extended family.

In this hamlet, all households belong to the Koli caste, which subsists on agriculture, charcoal making and salt farms. As agriculture is rain-fed, the working adults out-migrate and work as labourers, mainly in charcoal making and salt production, after the monsoons. Thus, after the harvesting of monsoon crops, the working adults out-migrate for the season, working for four months in agriculture and eight months in other activities. In times of drought, they out-migrate for the entire year for work.

When the working adults move, the old and infirm stay, and children may be taken with the parents or left behind. Many of the families have placed their children (mainly the boys) in the Nilpar ashram *shala* (school), which is run by a Gandhian organization called Gram Swaraj Sangh, about 30 kilometres from Limbdi-1.

Dajabhai Sadhubai Surani is an old man who spent his life partly in charcoal making and partly in salt making. He has seven children, all of them married and living in the hamlet.

One of his sons, Vajabhai Surani, works in charcoal making and he and his wife now stay behind in the village. Vajabhai's wife, Baluben, has tuberculosis, but still works with him in charcoal making and, when not migrating for work in charcoal making, works as a construction labourer. Vajabhai borrowed Rs. 5,000 for agricultural activities and to feed the family of four, and in the coming charcoal making season expects to earn Rs. 10,000, with which he will repay his debt and support his family for the season.

In a way, the earthquake benefited this hamlet, in that an NGO, the Behavioural Science Centre (BSC), from Ahmedabad, came to work in the village. They helped the residents construct temporary shelters consisting of cast iron poles and a roof made of cast iron angles and Mangalore tiles. The family is expected to construct the walls with whatever materials they can find; the debris of the old houses is still lying in the hamlet. The BSC has also started a primary school in the village and Baluben has shifted to cooking midday meals for the children in the school. A youth related to Dajabhai but living in a neighbouring village, and who studied up to class 9, has been employed by the BSC to teach. The school is just a temporary room constructed out of bamboo mats and cast iron poles. The main problem of the village residents is the availability of work throughout the year in the village itself, as agriculture is possible only during the monsoon season. The organization has plans to undertake village road construction and the digging of a village water pond for water harvesting. An existing village had dried up because of two consecutive droughts in 1999 and 2000. Through village labour, deepening of the pond and other public works will be carried out for which, BSC will pay wages of Rs. 70 per day. If the monsoon of 2002 brings sufficient rains, the village will be able to look forward to a good crop in 2002 and have enough drinking water to last until the summer of 2003.

The main cause of out-migration from Limbdi-1 and similar hamlets in the region is the lack of employment throughout the year. Since the residents of the village out-migrate, they have ration cards in the village and received relief and compensation after the earthquake. Organizations such as BSC that have come into the region after the earthquake with development funds, would be able to create long-term public assets in the village that would be able to address the issue of out-migration. Necessary social facilities like primary schools, community centres, etc. would also emerge in the region. Through the sustained efforts of the development NGOs, the long-term development issues of such hamlets could be addressed. This would also address the issue of forced migration. When such local development takes place and out-migration is for positive reasons rather than forced, the wage rates in industries where migrants are absorbed can also increase. That would prepare the population to cope with natural disasters better. Hence, organizations working in the interests of the migrant population must also think of investing in development programmes in the locations from which out-migration occurs in order to address the problems of such populations in times of disasters.

Notes

1. Statement of IOM Director General Brunson McKinley in May 2000.
2. Korten, quoting report *State of the World's Refugees* of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in (Korten, 1998).
3. <http://www.december18.net/UNconvention.htm>.
4. The last population census was carried out in 2001, but the migration data from that census is not yet available.
5. The figures of migrants included in the census tend to exclude recent migrants and seasonal migrants, mainly because of the census procedures. The local authorities tend to exclude migrants from the house-listing operations. Hence, the category of migrants studied in this report may not have been totally included in the census figures. In fact, there are no estimates of seasonal migrants in India.
6. A number of studies on internal migration in India are now available. These studies largely deal with issues of labour migration. The development paradigm within which these are placed is that of neo-classical economics. They look at, in essence, validation of the models mentioned here. For review of models see Chaudhari (1993); Srivastava (1998); Kundu and Gupta (1996).
7. These models of labour and capital flows were first developed by Solow and Swan and then modified by Borts and Stein. Leontiff analysed diffusion of growth in terms of demand for input from other regions by an industry, thereby considering labour migration as an input in the production process, and thereby linking labour migration to production processes (Ray, 1993). Hirschman (1958) linked labour migration to the development process through a "trickle down" process suggesting that disguised unemployment reduces, and marginal productivity of labour (measured through increase in per capita income) increases, through labour migration.
8. For discussion of various push factors, see Dandekar and Rath (1971); Lipton (1976).
9. These studies are: Bardhan and Rudra (1978); Breman (1974); Breman (1985); Sharma (1997).
10. Some studies on impacts at destination areas are Breman (1985); Breman (1996); Chopra (1982); Das (1993); Singh and Gopal Iyer (1985).
11. Together with the above-referenced studies, others that review the working conditions and wages of migrant labour are: The National Commission on Rural Labour (1991), and The National Commission on Self-Employed Women in the Informal Sector (1988).
12. Some of the studies on seasonal migration are: Breman (1978); Patel (1987).
13. Walter Fernandes's contribution to Hampton, I. (ed.) (1998): *Internally Displaced People: A Global Survey*, Earthscan, London, in Lama (2000).
14. The ration card is a very important document providing proof of residence. Names of all family members are entered in the ration card and it is issued by the local administration. The primary function of this card is to permit entitlement to subsidized food grains, subsidized cooking fuel and some essential non-food items to families below the poverty line. In the British period, as the name suggests, ration cards were issued to Indian residents during the period of scarcity of the Second World War, to ration food items to the households. In independent India, the practice of issuing ration cards continued, but for the purpose of maintaining the food security of the people. Over time, it became an important proof of residence. It has been put to varied uses, for instance, for obtaining cooking gas connections, for claiming relief and compensation after a natural or man-made disaster, for obtaining passports, etc.
15. In India, "Sons of the soil" refers to residents of the state who speak the language of the state. States in India are by and large organized on the basis of language and hence, an inter-state migrant would generally not be speaking the language of the locals. Thus, the "Sons of the soil" ideology evokes strong regional feelings in India and now there are political parties in each state that support this ideology.
16. Estimated from 1991 population census data on migration.
17. Information on these two Acts taken from Mathew (1999).
18. Flyover is an elevated road that crosses over another road or over railway lines.
19. Most macro data are collected thus and not for a calendar year.
20. The Planning Commission in India sets the poverty line from time to time when the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) carries out quinquennial consumption/expenditure surveys. The last such survey, which is the fifty-fifth Round survey of the NSSO, was carried out in 1999-2000. Separate poverty lines are set for rural and urban areas for each state in India. The rural poverty line for Gujarat was Rs. 318.94 per capita per month and the urban poverty line was Rs. 474.41 per capita per month. Considering that the household size is 5.2, as per this survey, the annual poverty line income would come to Rs. 19,902 for rural areas and Rs. 29,603 for urban

areas. In 2001-2002, the annual poverty line for rural and urban Gujarat would come to about Rs. 22,000 and Rs, 32,600 respectively (Source for poverty line, Indian Planning Commission's website).

21. Poverty estimates using 30-day recall period. Data taken from the website of Planning Commission (www.planningcommission.com).
22. According to the Population Census of 1991. This proportion would have remained the same in 2001.
23. Caste, in India, has its antecedents in the organization of labour, each caste having a specific occupation. Those engaged in the lowest of the economic activities – such as scavenging and disposal of human waste (called scavengers), disposal of dead animals, treating their skins and making of leather goods, and so on – are at the bottom of the caste hierarchy and are at the lowest rung in the hierarchy of SCs. Brahmins are at the top of the caste hierarchy. Despite the proclamation in the Indian Constitution about equality in practice, especially in marriage arrangements and social interaction, the caste structure still plays a dominant role.
24. Some of the SCs were treated as “untouchables” until legislation banned this practice. Nonetheless, the phenomenon of untouchability may be found in some places even now.
25. Latest poverty data available for social groups is for the years 1993-1994.
26. As per the National Population Census.
27. Based on provisional population census of 2001.
28. In 1999, based on Sample Registration System (2001), pp. 1.
29. This is as per the fifty-fourth Round survey, conducted during January-June 1998, of the National Sample Survey. The statistics pertain to rural Gujarat.
30. For any survey questionnaire, the sample has to be drawn in such a way that the results of the survey are representative of the universe from which it is drawn. These are objective surveys, for which the universe, which often has diverse characteristics, is stratified using some of the characteristics. For example, in a survey of labour migrants over a large universe, such as the State of Gujarat, for sample selection the universe would be stratified using various criteria, such as urban-rural, administrative boundaries, size of the settlement, agro-climatic region and so on, for the selection of settlements for surveying. Thereafter, migrant labour within settlements selected are listed and then a sample drawn. Purposive sampling is that in which the sample is drawn with a purpose, here the purpose being that of tying the sample with the NGOs working with the labour migrant groups.
31. As mentioned before, this is the latest year for which migration data is available in India at the moment.
32. Population projection for India and States 1996-2016, Registrar General, India, in Directorate General of Health Services (2000).
33. These figures are from population census of 1991. It will be some time before similar data are available for 2001. Census of India (1991b).
34. Personal services include various activities including domestic work, mending shoes, ironing clothes, cleaning shops, hair cutting, and so on.
35. Population census.
36. Based on data from D-series census.
37. Based on provisional population census of 2001.
38. Considering the family size as 5.2, as per this study.

Bibliography

- Asthana, R.
1996 "Involuntary resettlement: Survey of international experience", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 31, 15 June: 1468-1475.
- Bardhan, P.K., and A. Rudra
1978 "Interlinkages of land, labour and credit relations: An analysis of village survey data in east India", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Annual Number, February: 367-84.
- Breman, J.
1974 *Patronage and Exploitation: Changing Agrarian Relations in South India*, University of California Press, Berkley.
1978 "Seasonal migration and co-operative capitalism: Crushing of cane and labour by sugar factories of Bardoli", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 13(31/32).
1985 *Of Peasants, Migrants and Paupers: Rural Labour and Capitalist Production in West India*, Oxford University Press, Delhi.
1996 *Footloose Labour: Working in India's Informal Sector*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Census of India
1991a *Economic Tables Part III-B Series*, Directorate of Census Operations, Gujarat.
1991b *Socio-Cultural Tables, Part IV A, C Series*, Directorate of Census Operations, Gujarat.
- Central Statistical Organisation
1999 *Statistical Abstract India, 1999*, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Chaudhari, J.R.
1993 *Migration and Remittances – Inter-Urban and Rural-Urban Linkages*, Sage, New Delhi.
- Chopra, S.
1982 "Bondage in a green revolution area: A study of Muzaffarnagar brick-kiln workers", *Social Scientist*, 10(3).
- Dandekar, V.M., and N. Rath
1971 *Poverty in India*, Indian School of Political Economy, Poona.
- Das, B.
1993 *Migrant Labour in Quarries and Brick-kilns: An Overview*, mimeo, Centre for Social Studies, Surat.
- Directorate of Economics and Statistics
2001 *Socio-economic Review, Gujarat State, 2000-01*, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar.
- Directorate General of Health Services
2000 *Health Information of India, 1997 & 1998*, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Dubey, A., and S. Gangopadhyay
1998 *Counting the Poor: Where Are the Poor in India*, Sarvekshana Analytical Report Number 1, Department of Statistics, Government of India.
- Gujarat Infrastructure Development Board
1999a *Gujarat Infrastructure Vision, Volume I: Summary and Recommendations*, GIDB, Gandhinagar.
1999b *Gujarat Infrastructure Vision Volume II: Sector Reports*, GIDB, Gandhinagar: 90.
- Hirschman, A.O.
1958 *The Strategy of Economic Development*, Yale University Press, New Haven.
- Hirway, I., and D. Mahadevia
1999 *The Gujarat Human Development Report*, Draft, Mahatma Gandhi Labour Institute, Ahmedabad.
- International Organization for Migration
2000 *World Migration Report, 2000*, IOM, Geneva.
- Korten, D.
1998 *When Corporations Rule the World*, Other India Books, Mapusa, Goa.
- Kundu, A.
1986 "Migration, urbanisation and inter-regional inequality: The emerging socio-political challenge", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 21(46): 2005-8.

- 1996 "New economic policy and urban poverty in India" in C.H. Hanumantha Rao and H. Linnemann (Eds), *Economic Reforms and Poverty Alleviation in India*, Sage, New Delhi: 199-227.
- Kundu, A., and S. Gupta
 1996 "Migration, urbanisation and regional inequality", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 31(52): 3391-98.
- Lama, M.P.
 2000 "Internal displacement in India: Causes, protection and dilemmas", *Forced Migration Review*, Issue 8: 24-26, downloaded from www.fmreview.org/fmr088.htm.
- Lewis, A.W.
 1954 "Economic development with unlimited supply of labour", *Manchester School of Economics and Social Studies*: 179-92.
- Lipton, M.
 1976 *Migration from Rural Areas of Poor Countries: The Impact of Rural Productivity and Income Distribution*, IBRD Research Workshop on Rural-Urban Labour Market Interactions, The World Bank, Washington DC.
- Mahadevia, D.
 1998a "Informalisation of employment and poverty in Ahmedabad", *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 41(3): 515-30.
 1998b *Development Dichotomy in Gujarat*, Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Ecology, New Delhi.
 2001 "Privatising earthquake rehabilitation", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36(39): 3670-3673.
 2002 "Changing economic scenario: Informalisation and increased vulnerability", in A. Kundu and D. Mahadevia (Eds), *Poverty and Vulnerability in a Globalising Metropolis: Ahmedabad*, Manak Publishers, Delhi: 30-79.
- Mahadevia, D., and L.K. Bhati
 2001 "Industrialisation and urbanisation in Gujarat – regional level analysis", *Review of Development and Change*, January-June: 28-50.
- Mathew, P.D.
 1999 *Workers' Rights*, Legal Education Series No. 8, Indian Social Institute, New Delhi.
- Mohan, R.
 1996 "Urbanisation in India: Patterns and emerging policy issues", in J. Gugler (Ed.), *The Urban Transformation of the Developing World*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- National Commission on Rural Labour
 1991 *Report of the Study Group on Migrant Labour*, Ministry of Labour, Government of India.
- National Commission on Self Employed Women in the Informal Sector
 1988 *Shramshakti*, Delhi.
- Oberai, A.S., and R.E. Bilsborrow
 1984 "Theoretical perspectives on migration", in Bilsborrow et al. (Eds), *Migration Surveys in Low-income Countries*, Croom Helm, London.
- Patel, B.B.
 1987 "Seasonal rural migration pattern and some alternatives for effective protection of legal rights of migrant labour", in V. Joshi (Ed.), *Migrant Labour and Related Issues*, Oxford IBH, Delhi.
- Patel, S.J.
 1991 "Growing regional inequalities in Gujarat", *Economic and Political Weekly*, 26(26): 1618-23.
- Planning Commission
 1997 *Estimates of Poverty*, March 11, Press Information Bureau, Government of India, Delhi.
- Ranis, G., and J.C. Fei
 1961 "A theory of economic development", *American Economic Review*, 57: 538-65.
- Registrar General
 1998 *State Profile, 1991*, Government of India, New Delhi.
- SRS
 2001 *Sample Registration Survey Bulletin*, 35(1), Registrar General of Census, Government of India, New Delhi.
- Sharma, A.N.
 1997 *People on the Move: Nature and Implications of Migration in a Backward Economy*, Vikas, Delhi.

Singh, M., and K. Gopal Iyer

1985 "Migrant labour in rural Punjab", in U. Patnaik and M. Dingwaney (Eds), *Chains of Servitude: Bondage and Slavery in India*, Sangam Books, New Delhi.

Srivastava, R.

1998 "Migration and the labour market in India", *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 41(4): 583-614.

Todaro, M.P.

1980 *Internal Migration in Developing Countries*, International Labour Office, Geneva.

1985 *Economic Development in the Third World*, Orient Longman, New Delhi.

United Nations Development Programme

1994 *Human Development Report, 1994*, Oxford University Press for the UNDP, Delhi.

US Committee for Refugees

2000 *World Refugee Survey*, US Committee for Refugees, Washington DC.